

THE
PRESBYTERIAN
QUARTERLY.

EDITORS: G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., AND E. H. BARNETT, D. D.

MANAGING EDITOR: GEORGE SUMMEY, D. D.

VOL. XI.

1897.

JANUARY—APRIL—JULY—OCTOBER.

Richmond, Va.:

WHITTET & SHEPPERSON.

NEW YORK: A. D. F. RANDOLPH Co., LT'D.

1897. 3

PRINTERS,
WHITTET & SHEPPERSON,
RICHMOND, VA.

9/22/30
Budget fund
\$4.00

X
Per
P9284
v. 11

CONTENTS.

VOLUME XI.

	PAGE.
Anglican Order, Leo on Validity of,	R. C. Reed, 308
Aryans, Literature and Worship of,	Dunlop Moore, 52
<i>Autobiography of Charles Force Deems</i> ,	George Summey, 405
Beattie's <i>Presbyterian Standards</i> ,	R. A. Webb, 99
Beet's <i>Nature and Christ</i> ,	R. A. Webb, 249
Bible Study Union Lessons,	Erastus Blakeslee, 538
Canon, The Old Testament,	William W. Elwang, 125
Carus' <i>Religion of Science</i> ,	R. A. Webb, 108
Church Polity, Normative Principle, etc.,	C. O'N. Martindale, 231
City Life, Decadent Tendencies in,	F. L. Ferguson, 201
Civil Sabbath, The,	W. L. Nourse, 39
Criticisms and Reviews,	99, 243, 399, 550
Education, Ministerial, and the Presbyteries,	T. C. Johnson, 60
Elder, The, in his Ecclesiastical Relations,	Ralph E. Prime, 81
Eldership in the Old Testament, The,	Harris R. Schenck, 433
Ely's <i>Social Law of Service</i> ,	Jas. E. Fogartie, 110
Experience and the Doctrine of the Trinity,	Jas. E. Fogartie, 415
Faith, The Speculative View of,	W. J. Wright, 142
Fisher's <i>History of Christian Doctrine</i> ,	T. C. Johnson, 550
Flournoy's <i>Searchlight of St. Hippolitus</i> ,	Robert Price, 399
Gaines' <i>Bible Course</i> ,	George Summey, 257
General Assembly, Southern, of 1897,	W. McF. Alexander, 382
Gordon's (G. A.) <i>Immortality and the New Theodicy</i> ,	R. A. Webb, 562
Gordon's <i>Ministry of the Spirit</i> ,	John W. Primrose, 556
Hadley's <i>Economics</i> ,	J. A. Quarles, 407
Infallible Revelation Practicable and Necessary,	T. W. Raymond, 531
Jehovah—May Know that I am,	John W. Primrose, 523
John's Second and Third Epistles,	J. Ritchie Smith, 482
Johnson's <i>Sketch of the United Synod</i> ,	George Summey, 404
Johnston's <i>Systematic Theology</i> ,	Francis R. Beattie, 102
Language, The Public, of Our Lord,	R. B. Woodworth, 325
Latter-Day Judaism,	W. A. Alexander, 503
Literature and Worship of Early Aryans,	Dunlop Moore, 52
Malachi iii. 17,	R. B. Woodworth, 240
Mariolatry,	Robert P. Farris, 296
Mark of the Church, The Main,	P. D. Stephenson, 467
Marshall, William Kilpatrick, D. D.,	D. W. Egleton, 365

	PAGE.
Matthew xxiv. and Prof. Milligan's Exegesis, -----	Luther Link,----- 23
McClure's <i>Another Comforter</i> , -----	W. A. Alexander,----- 401
Melanchthon, Philip, Scholar and Reformer, -----	John De Witt, ----- 273
Ministerial Education and the Presbyteries, -----	T. C. Johnson, ----- 60
Ministerial Scholarship, Decline of, -----	Robert L. Dabney,----- 161
Normative Principle of Church Polity, -----	C. O'N. Martindale, --- 231
Old Testament Canon, -----	William W. Elwang,--- 125
Old Testament Eldership, The,-----	Harris R. Schenck,----- 433
Probation—Death—Judgment,-----	E. C. Gordon,----- 218
Recent Publications,-----	115, 260, 408
Regeneration Real, not Figurative, -----	John W. Primrose, --- 1
Revelation, An Infallible, Practicable and Necessary, T. W. Raymond, -----	531
Ritter's <i>Moral and Civil Law</i> , -----	Francis R. Beattie, --- 250
Sabbath, The Civil, -----	W. L. Nourse,----- 39
Scholarship, Decline of Ministerial,-----	Robert L. Dabney,----- 161
Schurman's <i>Agnosticism and Religion</i> , -----	Francis R. Beattie, --- 110
Scott's <i>Nicene Theology</i> , -----	R. A. Webb,----- 245
Seminary Life, Aims and Conditions of,-----	W. T. Hall,----- 73
Southern General Assembly of 1897,-----	W. McF. Alexander,----- 382
Speculative View of Faith,-----	W. J. Wright,----- 142
Stearn's <i>Evidence of Christian Experience</i> , -----	J. A. Quarles,----- 406
Sterrett's <i>The Power of Thought</i> , -----	R. L. Dabney,----- 567
Stevens' <i>Doctrine and Life</i> , -----	R. A. Webb,----- 243
Stifler's <i>Romans</i> , -----	R. A. Webb,----- 564
Sunday-School, Its Present Peril, -----	T. D. Witherspoon, --- 175
Tendencies, Decadent, in City Life, -----	F. L. Ferguson, ----- 201
Terry's <i>The New Apologetic</i> , -----	George Summey, ----- 403
Townsend's <i>Evolution or Creation</i> , -----	Francis R. Beattie, --- 247
Treasure, A Peculiar -----	R. B. Woodworth,----- 240
Trinity, The Fact of, and Experience,-----	Jas. E. Fogartie,----- 415
Unity, a Plea for,-----	Robert P. Kerr,----- 376
Vance's <i>The College of Apostles</i> ,-----	R. C. Reed,----- 251
Vrooman Case. The, -----	R. C. Reed,----- 88
Watson's <i>The Mind of the Master</i> ,-----	J. F. Cannon,----- 190
Weber's <i>History of Philosophy</i> ,-----	J. A. Quarles,----- 407
Whitsitt's <i>Question in Baptist History</i> , -----	R. A. Webb,----- 104
Workers, Divine Manual for, -----	A. W. Pitzer,----- 357

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 39.—JANUARY, 1897.

I. REGENERATION, REAL, NOT FIGURATIVE.

THERE are doubtless those who think that in a discussion of regeneration nothing new can be said that is true, and nothing true that is new. However this may be, it is certain that opinions differ widely, and that much confusion prevails. It is not our purpose to review the variant and widely diverse opinions which are held on this subject. That were a profitless task. We propose to study the subject anew from the standpoint of the Scriptures, and to compare the conclusion reached with the view generally accepted as orthodox. What is that view?

A very few years ago a report was made to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., by a committee appointed to revise *The Confession*. In that report the following words were found: "The act of regeneration wherein being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit he is enabled to answer God's call and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it." Had this been approved, new matter would have been added to *The Confession*. This report teaches that the act of regeneration enables the subject to believe on Christ. That this is the commonly accepted view a few citations from Doctors R. L. Dabney and A. A. Hodge may be allowed to show. Dr. Dabney in his *Syllabus and Notes* (Student's Edition, Part II., p. 85) says under the caption "Regeneration properly defined," "we prove that regeneration is not a mere change of human purpose, occurring in view of motive; but a supernatural renovation of the dispositions which determine the moral purpose and of the understanding, in the apprehension of moral and spiritual truth." Says Dr. A. A. Hodge in his *Outlines*: "In the new creation God

recreates the governing disposition of the regenerated man's heart holy. These dispositions are anterior to moral action, and determine the character as to good or evil. . . . When it is said that regeneration consists in giving a new heart. . . . What is meant by the term heart? The term heart signifies that prevailing moral disposition that determines the volitions and actions." (P. 458.) "What relation does sanctification sustain to regeneration? Regeneration is the creative act of the Holy Spirit, implanting a new principle of spiritual life in the soul. Conversion is the first exercise of that new gracious principle in the spontaneous turning of the new-born sinner to God." (P. 521.) Again, "The instant God regenerates a sinner he acts faith in Christ." (P. 522.) And so, according to this view, regeneration is a change of disposition which enables the sinner to believe on Christ. We are in perfect accord with the psychology of the foregoing statements; and also with their scripturalness, except in one important particular. We heartily concur in the view that the Spirit works in us a change of disposition, "whereby convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ, and renewing our wills, he doth persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ freely offered to us in the gospel." But this is defined by the Catechism of the Westminster divines to be "effectual calling"—not regeneration.

In entering upon a scriptural study of regeneration the first thing to determine is this: What did the Son of God come on earth to do? He himself has answered the question. "He came to fulfil all righteousness." He was made under the law. According to the law, the soul that *doeth* these things shall live by them. Jesus said: "Therefore doth my father love me because I do always those things which please him." Says the law: To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life will God award. Of Jesus it is said: He was obedient in all things, wherefore God hath highly exalted him. By the deeds of the law this man earned the reward of righteousness. Only he is called the Holy One and the Just. He finished the work the Father gave him to do.

That this man was entitled to glory is plain enough. But while he was successful it is equally plain that all other men are failures. The Scripture is obviously true which says: "By the deeds of the law shall no flesh living be justified, for by the law is the knowledge of sin." If Christ came to save us by example alone, he is, as a Saviour, a manifest failure.

* The question, then, may be justly raised, What good can come to us because of his success? What good can it do us that he has won the reward of righteousness? We have not. And yet, the possibility of lawfully entering upon another's labors is not unfamiliar. The young lad who has never earned a dollar enters into the possession of his father's estate. We say he is entitled to do so as the next of kin. The close tie of consanguinity makes him his heir. This view of redemption is presented in all those Scriptures which speak of the saved as the sons, and, therefore, the heirs of God, because joint-heirs with Christ.

But let us suppose the young man has violated the criminal law of the land, and by a jury of his countrymen has been adjudged guilty and condemned to death. What good will the estate now do him? He cannot come into possession. There is a rope about his neck. And there is a halter about our necks. We, too, are under the condemnation of the law. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." We have not only come short of the glory of God, in consequence of failure to comply with his law, but we have incurred the penalty which it imposes for disobedience.

And just here it is to be noticed that this man Jesus not only obeyed all the precepts, but submitted also to the penalty of the broken law. "He was obedient in all things, even unto death. Wherefore God hath highly exalted him." Had he been a sinner he would have continued under the power of death. But God would not suffer his Holy and Just One to see corruption. He rose again from the dead, and is crowned with glory and honor. Had he remained under the power of death, there would have been no salvation for any, "for if Christ be not risen ye are yet in your sins." We are begotten again to a living hope by his resurrection from the dead. Here, then, is a man who has earned eternal life by submission to the penalty of violated law,

and if it be possible for any one to share it with him, it is possible even for the sinner with the rope about his neck—under condemnation of the law.

But was he unto death *obedient*? Our death is not an act of obedience. We are no more obedient therein than the criminal, who swings from the gallows. "God taketh away our breath." We have no option in the matter; we cannot help ourselves. But how was it with Jesus? He used remarkable language. He said: "No man taketh my life from me, I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." His death within a few hours of his crucifixion was most remarkable. Pilate marvelled that he was so soon dead. The victims of crucifixion rarely ever died until the third day. Crucifixion did not terminate the lives of the two thieves on either side of Jesus. Because the next day was an holy day, the Jews besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away. Neither was crucifixion the immediate cause of the death of Jesus. In process of time death would have ensued, but we read that "Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, saith, 'I thirst.'" . . . When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, "It is finished," and he bowed his head and gave up the ghost." The plain import of this language is, that when the last prophecy concerning Jesus was fulfilled he dismissed his own Spirit. Certainly his death was due neither to crucifixion nor to the vinegar which he drank. Jesus was active in his death. He was priest as well as sacrifice. As Hugh Martin says: "His dying was his grandest doing." Referring to Prof. Mac Lagan's beautiful "figure of the empty scabbard bound upon the warrior's person, while the unsheathed sword is in his hand," with which Mac Lagan illustrates the fact that in the state of the dead Immanuel's body and his soul remained, each in union with his Godhead, Martin justly asks, "Is there the action of greater power and prowess in the gentle ease with which that warrior, the battle being fought and won, returns the sword to its sheath (the spirit to its body), or in the prior princely, peerless act in which—what shall I say?—in which, having girt thy sword upon thy thigh, O most mighty, thy right hand teach-

ing terrible things, flashed it forth for victory?" It may be objected that the voluntary surrender of life is not obedience, but suicide. It is a sufficient answer to cite the words of Jesus: "This commandment have I received of my Father, that I should lay down my life for the sheep." His dying was his own act of obedience.

Just here the fact should be emphasized, that obedience unto death is absolutely impossible for every one, save this man Jesus. Obedience is essentially voluntary; but the condemned criminal has no option in the matter; his life is wrested from him. Only the sinless man could say, "No one taketh my life from me." For the sinner, therefore, salvation by works is impossible.

It is important that we turn now to a somewhat closer examination of Christ's work as to its merit. 1st. The Father said of Jesus, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." Why the Father was well pleased with him, Jesus himself explains: "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I do always those things that please him." Jesus was obedient in all things, even unto death. What was it in the death of Jesus that pleased the Father? Certainly not as suffering did his death please the Father; for he taketh no pleasure in the death of the sinner even. Jehovah does not love blood and suffering. He is not sanguinary. There is nothing in the Bible to justify the idea that the Father found pleasure in the Christ's agony on the cross. It is true Jesus said, "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life for the sheep." The Father found pleasure in Jesus, not that he was glad to see him suffer, but because of the merciful purpose to accomplish which he consented to suffer. "Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? He has showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" The Father was pleased, not with the sufferings of Jesus, but that he should consent to suffer in mercy to others. What, then, was the virtue in Christ's death that was meritorious of blessings for others? Simply that obedience which satisfied all demands of law and justice. The sole merit of Christ's death was its obedi-

ence. Its sacrificial value is obedience. "If Christ be not risen ye are yet in your sins." But why is he risen? Because he was obedient. The merit we share who are risen together with him is his righteousness. 2d. This obedience was owed by Jesus, for the doing of that which is not required is not obedience. Inasmuch as unto death he was obedient, it is clear that death was required of him. But how could death, the penalty of sin, be required of a sinless man? That were an injustice; and yet the Scriptures say that though he knew no sin, he was made sin for us. Our sins were imputed to him—laid upon him—in the sense that he became liable to the penalty of sin. But how in justice? To condemn the just is an abomination in the eyes of Jehovah, say the Scriptures. Birth is the explanation. Being born of a woman, made partaker of flesh and blood, he has fellowship with us not only in our humanity, but in all our relations to the law.

Says Dr. A. A. Hodge in his *Atonement*: "The apostle declares that the principles upon which sin and misery came upon the race through Adam are identical with those upon which righteousness and blessedness came upon the elect through Christ." This is certainly true. We have fellowship by birth with Adam in his nature and death; we have fellowship by birth with Jesus in his nature and life.

With these reflections let us come back to the question, How can the success of Jesus profit others? How can God justly treat the unrighteous with all the favor and honor he bestows upon the righteous Jesus?

Let us see what some others say in answer to this question. Say some, the merits of Christ Jesus have justified the Father in requiring less of man than perfect obedience. His blood wipes out all their sins, and the residuum of sincere obedience is accepted in lieu of perfect righteousness. This theory does not explain how the blood of Jesus wipes out sin. We have seen that the merit of Christ's sacrifice was his obedience unto death. How the obedience of Jesus secures favor for any besides himself is the very problem to be solved. And, again, that the obedience of one man can charm God into greater tolerance of sin is a theory which is self-contradictory and violative of morals,

common sense, and Scripture. So pleased with perfect righteousness, that he will henceforth be equally pleased with imperfection! Surely this theory need not be seriously considered for a moment.

The commonly received opinion is, that the believer is entitled to the same reward Christ earned through his obedience simply because God has promised it to them who accept it by faith. It is, of course, a righteous thing in God to perform his promises, but this solution only removes the difficulty a step further back. How could God justly require less of one than another? How could he righteously give to others, merely because of their faith, that reward which Jesus earned by perfect obedience? Question seventy-three of the *Larger Catechism* of the Westminster divines wisely repudiates the idea that faith deserves salvation: "Faith justifies a sinner in the sight of God, not because of those other graces which do always accompany it, or of good works that are the fruits of it; nor as if the grace of faith, or any act thereof, were imputed to him for justification; but only as it is an instrument by which he receiveth and applieth Christ and his righteousness." Faith, then, justifies because it receives Christ's obedience as the ground of eternal life. This is still more explicitly set forth. Question thirty-three of the *Shorter Catechism* reads: "Justification is an act of God's free grace wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us and received by faith alone." Question seventy-two of the *Larger Catechism* thus defines justifying faith: "Justifying faith is a saving grace, wrought in the heart of a sinner by the Spirit of God, whereby he receiveth and resteth upon Christ and his righteousness for pardon of sin, and for the acceptance and accounting of his person righteous in the sight of God for salvation." Most true it is, that faith accepts and God imputes the righteousness of Christ. Christ's obedience is the sole ground of the sinner's salvation. As in consequence of the imputation of our sins to Jesus, he died; so in consequence of the imputation of his obedience to us, we live. But why? The question persistently demands an answer. How can God justly reckon the sinner entitled to the

reward which Jesus earned? As we have seen, the merit of Christ's obedience entitled him to reward. This obedience was due from him as the legal condition of his personal exaltation. And yet the symbols of the Presbyterian Church only echo the Scriptures which declare, that by the obedience of one many are made righteous. Our quest is for the righteous ground of the imputation. Certainly it is not to be found in any change of our dispositions towards God whereby we are enabled to accept Christ and his righteousness by faith. If "faith does not justify because of the graces which always accompany it, or of the good works which are the fruit of it . . .," much less does it justify because of the dispositions of which itself is the fruit. This change of the disposition, therefore, which, as we have seen by citation from Dabney and Hodge, is commonly called regeneration, is not the righteous ground of Christ's imputation and the sinner's salvation. Regeneration, as defined by Dabney (*Syllabus and Notes—Student's Edition, Part I., p. 224*) to be "a radical moral change, being not merely a change of purpose of life by volition, but a revolution of the propensities which prompt our purposes," is certainly not the righteous ground of imputation.

Reference has already been made to the lawful entrance of a son into possession of his father's estate. We have seen, too, that the Scriptures commonly speak of Christians as sons of God and heirs because joint-heirs with Christ. Most unquestionably, if Jesus be only a man, we can find no title to his estate of glory by virtue of the filial relation. We are not the children of Jesus according to the flesh. "He was cut off from the land of the living, and who shall declare his generation?"

Nevertheless, continued the prophet Isaiah, "he shall see his seed." Jesus was not man merely; he was also God. The Spirit of God is the Spirit of Christ. By making us "partakers of the divine nature," by communicating to us his Spirit, we have, in the fellowship of the Spirit, fellowship with the Father and with his Son Christ Jesus. The imputation of Christ's obedience is just, because the believer is one with Christ by being partaker of his Spirit, just as we have seen that the imputation of our sins to Jesus was just, because he became partaker of our flesh and blood.

Dr. Dabney has scriptural warrant for his statement that "it is through his union to Christ that the whole application of redemption is effectuated on the sinner's soul." Fellowship (communion, partnership, *κοινωνία*) is the grand doctrine of the Bible.

Now, how did the Son of God take fellowship with us in our human nature? By birth of a woman. Our very word "nature" is derived from the Latin word signifying "born." Fellowship in nature comes of birth. To partake of the nature of anything is the necessary consequence of being born of that thing. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." How may we be one with Christ in his nature? Obviously, by birth. If one be born of the Spirit, and made a partaker of the divine nature, evidently, such a one is born from above. If they who are born of the flesh are born again of the Spirit, evidently, this birth is a new birth, a regeneration. Real regeneration is the righteous ground of the imputation of Christ's obedience, and of a share in his reward. Birth is the solution of the problem. The only righteous ground for treating Christ as a sinner was that he was born of a woman, and had fellowship with us in our human nature and in sin's penalty. The only righteous ground for treating us as saints is that we are born of the Spirit, and so made partakers of the divine nature and of piety's reward. We are justified in consequence of this real regeneration. Union with Christ by the impartation, not of the Spirit's influence, but of the Spirit himself, making our bodies his temples, this is what the Scriptures call regeneration. The word is misapplied when used as a synonym for "effectual calling." Such a use is only figurative. When assigning the processes of the application of redemption their logical order, Calvinistic theologians generally state them thus: (1), Effectual calling (regeneration, figurative); (2), Faith; (3), Justification. The scriptural order is, (1), Effectual calling; (2), Faith; (3), Regeneration (real); and (4), Justification.

It is passing strange that the grand fact which unites the soul to Christ, the fact which justifies God in saving sinners by the imputation of Christ's righteousness, cannot be so much as named among us, because the only word which literally and scripturally and aptly designates it has been misappropriated.

And, obviously, that which has no name among us will have no place in our thoughts. There is no excuse for this unnatural divorce of the name "regeneration" from the thing itself, for the Scriptures afford not one word of authority for calling a change of disposition a new birth. A birth is not a change; it is a new creation.

A real regeneration, giving us partnership of the Spirit, and thereby fellowship with Christ Jesus in the reward of his human righteousness, seems to us clearly demonstrated as the divine scheme of redemption. Let us now consider other lines of evidence which converge to this conclusion, and make assurance doubly sure.

1st. All the benefits of redemption secured by Christ are ours only because we are "in him." We are in Christ by birth, just as we are in Adam by birth. The person of Jesus is magnified by the theory of real regeneration. Figurative regeneration magnifies most conspicuously the work of the Spirit in us, changing our dispositions that we may believe; real regeneration avouches that none of the work of Christ can avail us anything unless we be "in him." And if we be in him, it is all righteously ours.

The Scriptures emphasize this—in him we have forgiveness; in him, an inheritance; in him we are complete; he is our all and in all; we are made the righteousness of God in him; in him we are accepted. All this is in perfect harmony with our reflections on the nature of Christ's work. We have seen that the work of Christ was obedience to all the demands which the law makes on the humanity with which he took partnership; that all he did was due from himself as born of a woman. The only conceivable way by which we may share his reward is by sharing the "Spirit in which he was justified"; by having fellowship with him by birth, as he took fellowship with us by birth. Hence, his frequent designation of himself as the "Son of man," while the regenerated man becomes a son of God. Hence, "Ye must be born again," and "of the Spirit." "By this we know that we are in him because he hath given us of his Spirit." Because we live in the Spirit, we are enjoined to walk in the Spirit. "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of Christ dwell in you."

By one Spirit we are baptized into Christ. Thus we are plainly taught that union with Christ is effected by regeneration—by the indwelling of the Spirit.

Most treatises on theology recognize union with Christ and the indwelling of the Spirit as scriptural truths, but fail to consider them in their relations. The doctrine of the indwelling of the Spirit according to these treatises might be omitted without being missed as an essential part of the system of redemption. It articulates with nothing. As being essentially the new birth, it is utterly without recognition.

2nd. The work of effectual calling, which has been misnamed regeneration, retains its place in the scheme of redemption by fellowship. The logical order is, first, effectual calling; second, faith; third, regeneration; fourth, justification. And this scriptural theory relieves Calvinism from apparent contradiction of Scripture. The accepted definition of regeneration which identifies this with effectual calling makes the Bible at variance with itself. That repentance and faith are wrought in us by the Spirit of God is very clearly taught in the Scriptures. For example, we read in Acts xvi. 14 of Lydia, "Whose heart the Lord opened that she attended unto the things that were spoken of Paul." "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." (John vi. 37.) "No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him." "Blessed art thou, Simon-Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. xvi. 17.) "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and remission of sins." (Acts v. 31.) "Unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake." (Phil. i. 29.)

On the other hand, there is a formidable number of passages which plainly make the new birth consequent upon faith, of which the following are examples: "As many as received him, to them gave he power (right) to become the sons of God (regenerated), even to them that believe on his name." (John i. 12.) "Forasmuch as God gave unto them the like gift as he

did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ." (Acts xi. 17.) "In whom also after that ye believed (having believed) ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise" (Eph. i. 13.) "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since (or, did ye receive when) ye believed?" (Acts xii. 2.) "Ye are all the children of God (regenerated) by faith in Christ Jesus." (Gal. iii. 26.) "That ye might receive the promise of the Spirit through *faith*." (Gal. iii. 14.) "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of *faith*." (Gal. iii. 2.)

Now, it must be admitted that the class of passages beginning with Acts xvi. 14, quoted above, clearly teaches that the Spirit of God works in us to receive Christ by faith, and that the other class, beginning with John i. 12, as clearly teaches that the faith which receives Christ preceded regeneration. If this be so, then either the two classes of texts are contradictory, or regeneration and effectual calling are not the same thing. That they are not contradictory we know, for the Bible is the inspired word of God. Therefore, the common identification of regeneration with effectual calling is an error. The Spirit of whom it is written, that he was not yet given because Jesus was not yet glorified; the Spirit who, having been with the disciples, was soon to dwell in them; this Spirit they that believed on Jesus were to receive when Jesus should be glorified. This indwelling of the Spirit, in a way inscrutable for us, effects union with Christ and makes the believer a child of God. It consummates the work of redemption by establishing, as we have seen, the only righteous ground of imputation. And just here we quote Dr. Dabney: "The instrumental bond of the union is evidently faith; *i. e.*, when the believer exercises faith, the union begins. One of the results, or, if you please, forms, of the union, is justification. Of this, faith is the instrument; for Christ purifies our hearts by faith." When we exercise faith through the effectual work of the Spirit in us, then God regenerates by imparting his Holy Spirit to dwell in us, effecting thereby union with Christ and consequent justification.

We can see why God may make faith the condition on which he may graciously establish a relation between the sinner and Christ, by virtue of which relation the sinner's salvation is justi-

fied; but we can see no reason why the sinner's faith in Christ should entitle him to salvation, *i. e.*, no reason in justice why salvation should be given to them who are willing to accept it as a gift.

3rd. It will be contended by some that the passage quoted from John, "This spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive," had reference to the pentecostal gift of power. This enduement-with-power theory has tended to obscure the Bible doctrine of a real regeneration. "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you," is frequently quoted by those who identify the gift of the Spirit with the power received after. People are urged to pray for a pentecostal outpouring, meaning thereby power to preach or work successfully in winning souls. But the word power is *δυναμις*, often rendered miracle, and always meaning a miraculous manifestation, such as believers never now receive. That power had been exercised during the ministry of Jesus; was suspended at his death; and now, when they ask if he is about to restore the kingdom, he answers that it is not for them to know, but, when the promised Spirit is come upon them, they should again receive the power of miracle working.

Again, let it be observed that this power-for-service interpretation of the pentecostal baptism assumes and implies that only some true Christians receive this baptism. On the contrary, the Scriptures unequivocally teach that all believers receive the gift of the ascended Saviour: "This spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive." In perfect accord with this statement are the epistolary references to the Spirit. "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" (Gal. iii. 2.) "If he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received." (2 Cor. xi. 4.)

This power for service, too, was nothing new, but this gift of the Spirit to which Jesus refers was never bestowed prior to Pentecost. Turn again to the passage: "This spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive, for the Spirit was not given because Jesus was not yet glorified." Said

Jesus to his disciple: "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Spirit will not come unto you, but if I go away I will send him unto you." Again, he said: "He is with you and shall dwell in you." The Spirit was with the disciples and with the Old Testament saints for effectual calling and for power, but he was not yet given as an indwelling Spirit. He could not be so given until the resurrection and glorification of Jesus. Why not?

A recurrence of birth, if it were possible, would not of necessity be profitable. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and continues flesh, even if born again—of the flesh. To be born of Adam an hundred times would leave the subject of such a regeneration still united to Adam in nature and destiny. To be a child of God, one must have the fellowship of the divine Spirit, must be a partaker of his nature. But rebellious man, still under penalty of violated law, cannot be in union with God. There is no fellowship possible between sin and holiness.

With the sinless man Jesus it was different. His humanity was the first temple, the first habitation of God through the Spirit. He was immanuel—God with us. His incarnation was the first union of the two natures. The Son of man was the Son of God also. Prior to the perfecting of his work as man, before his work of obedience was finished in death, previous to his justification by resurrection and ascension to glory, birth of the Spirit would have united men to one who as Saviour was not yet perfected by suffering. It is to the risen, living, glorified Saviour that birth of the Spirit unites us, and so the Spirit was not given until the glorification of the Lord. "If Christ be not risen ye are yet in your sins." But "he being ascended and having received of the Father the promise of the Spirit," he hath shed forth the Spirit of which the gift of tongues was the appropriate sign. The obedience of Jesus was his own; its results he shares with us. When his righteousness is said to be imputed, only its fruits are meant. It is the Spirit of the man who has earned glory which we receive.

4th. This, the reader perceives, is tantamount to saying that there was no regeneration prior to Pentecost. Such a statement

sounds horribly heretical, because the ear is so accustomed to associate the word regeneration with the idea of effectual calling, that the mind refuses to associate with it the idea of real birth in the gift of the indwelling Spirit himself. Nor is it easy for the mind so trained to conceive that "new birth" can have any other than a figurative meaning—a change of disposition.

And yet on this point the Scriptures are very explicit. The Old Testament saints who "without us were not made perfect," are spoken of as minors, as heirs, and are sharply contrasted with the New Testament saints who "are no more servants but sons." "When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that ye might receive the adoption of sons." (Gal. iv. 4, 5.) "He was made a curse for us . . . that (in order that) we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." (Gal. iii. 14.)

It is asked, How can one act faith until he has spiritual life? We answer:

1st. Jesus does not seem to think that one must first have "life" in order to believe. "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." "Ye will not come unto me that ye may have life."

2nd. The Scriptures say, we are justified by faith. Then unquestionably we are not justified until we believe. But, protest the advocates of figurative regeneration, the sinner must be spiritually alive before he can believe. Then he is alive in Christ before he is justified; alive in Christ and yet under condemnation.

3rd. What is the character of the new disposition evinced in effectual calling? It determines to faith unquestionably. But is this state of mind wrought by the Spirit something holy? Let every saint recall his own experience. The Spirit "convinced us of our sin and misery," stripped us of all self-esteem and self-righteousness, and made us to see the shame of our nakedness. He showed us the odiousness of sin, and we shrank appalled from our own vileness. He showed us ourselves as lost, and we cried, Lord save, or we perish. He showed us our own loathsomeness

and helplessness, but he showed us also Christ as an all-sufficient Saviour, and to him we fled for succor and acceptance. He showed us nothing good in our life nor disposition, that we might find our all in the holy One, and the Just.

But, if there was no regeneration prior to Pentecost, how, it is asked, were the Old Testament saints saved? The Spirit was with them in the work of effectual calling, working in them, to rely on Jehovah for a salvation, which was yet to be accomplished, and which was predicted in word and type, as a salvation not yet accomplished. The indwelling of the Spirit is, indeed, essential to salvation, but not more so than that obedience of Christ in which regeneration makes us partners. We find no difficulty in the statement, that the death of Christ was anticipated for Old Testament saints; much less need we stumble over the obvious fact, that if Christ himself was anticipated, much more was union with a Christ yet to come anticipated. "He was made a curse for us, that (in order that) we might receive the promise of the Spirit."

In harmony with this view, it will be necessary to reconstruct our ideas as to Nicodemus. The common view is that Nicodemus stood in need of a new heart, that he was an unsaved sinner. The truth is, that Nicodemus was an honest Jew, a sincere worshipper of Jehovah; one who made frank confession of satisfaction with the credentials of Jesus, as of one sent of God, and who actually did place himself as a disciple under the instruction of Jesus. He needed regeneration, precisely as did Peter and John, whom Jesus pronounced "clean," or saved.

When were the dead saints of the old dispensation regenerated? Perhaps on the day of Pentecost. That was the day of first fruits. Then it was, perhaps, that they were translated from the paradise of Hades to be with Jesus, in the presence of God. Certain it is that they without us were not made perfect.

5th. Under the old dispensation the application of redemption was typified in the sprinkling of the sacrificial elements, the ashes of the sacrifice upon the defiled. Living water in which the ashes had been put was the vehicle of communication. That living water symbolized the Spirit by whom the redemption purchased

by Christ is applied to us. Baptism is the application of redemption. "We are washed, we are justified, we are sanctified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by (with) the Spirit of our God." Pentecostal baptism was the gift of the indwelling Spirit, the "washing of regeneration," uniting us to Christ, making all that he is and has ours, and thus applying to us the redemption he by his obedience earned. Regeneration is baptism with the Spirit. (Baptism *of* the Spirit is an unwarranted and unmeaning phrase.) This baptism with the Spirit was predicted by John. It was declared by Jesus and by Peter to be fulfilled at Pentecost. Not, therefore, till Pentecost was the indwelling Spirit given.

When the Scripture says: "There is one baptism," that one baptism can be no other than the baptism with the Spirit, which applies the redemption purchased by Christ. It is by one Spirit that we are all baptized into one body into Christ, and so regenerated. "The washing of regeneration" is unquestionably "the renewing of the Holy Ghost," whereby we are made new creatures in Christ Jesus, accepted in the beloved. To be in Christ is to be saved, and the baptism which puts us into Christ is not only the only baptism, but a baptism which is administered only once. To pray, as many do, that believers may be baptized with the Holy Ghost, is to pray for that which has taken place, and is never to be repeated, nor needs be repeated, because the believer has in Christ eternal life. To pray that we may be filled with the Spirit has scriptural warrant.

As corroborating this view we have the words of Peter: "Baptism doth also now save us, not the washing away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God by the resurrection of Christ." Only one Old Testament ordinance could sanctify to the purifying of the flesh (and it could do nothing more than typically purify). Only the sprinkling of the ashes of a heifer in the water of separation could put away the filth of the flesh. And so Peter, wishing not to be misunderstood as to the nature of the baptism which saves, says, that he means not the Old Testament baptism—the sprinkling of the water of separation—but the answer, or demand, rather, of a good conscience to-

wards God, a conscience void of offence towards God, which is secured by faith in Jesus, who was raised for our justification.

The worshipper once purged hath no more conscience of sins. Since Jesus is justified, we, too, who are in him, are likewise justified. And so baptism saves us, for we are baptized with the Spirit into Christ.

Only one real baptism there is, and one real sacrifice; one typical baptism and one typical sacrifice there was; one symbolic sacrifice and one symbolic baptism there is, in the Lord's supper and the sprinkling of pure water.

6th. Truth, like light, is clear and self-evidencing. By way of contrast, let us note the inevitable confusion of even able men when they attempt to expound Scripture in harmony with the theory of figurative regeneration. Bishop Ryle, of the Church of England, in commenting on John iii. 3, says: "Being born again means that complete change of heart and character which is produced in a man by the Holy Ghost when he repents, believes in Christ, and becomes a true Christian. In Ezekiel it is called, 'Taking away the stony heart and giving a heart of flesh'—giving a new heart and putting within a new spirit. In Acts it is called, 'Repentance and conversion.' (Acts iii 19.) In Romans it is called, 'Being alive from the dead.' In Corinthians it is called, 'Being a new creature.' In Peter it is called, 'Being made a partaker of the divine nature.' I believe that all these expressions come to the same thing in the end. They all mean that mighty inward change of heart which our Lord here calls 'a new birth,' and which John the Baptist foretold would specially characterize Messiah's kingdom. He was to baptize, not with water, but with the Holy Ghost. Jesus tells Nicodemus that he must be born again, or baptized with the Spirit." This extract fairly illustrates the confusion of thought so widely prevalent. In the first place, the eminently evangelical Bishop Ryle heaps up a great variety of passages descriptive of changed relations and gracious experiences, save only that one class which is most pertinent, that, namely, which speaks of Christians as God's sons, God's children. Surely, one who is born of God is a son of God.

Again, Bishop Ryle is certainly correct in identifying regeneration and baptism with the Spirit. He is singularly correct in saying that the new birth was foretold by John as something never before realized, and something which was especially to characterize the Messiah's kingdom; and yet he is inconsistent with himself, for he makes regeneration a synonym for repentance, conversion, and change of heart which most assuredly were experienced by the saints of every preceding age, and certainly not foretold by John the Baptist.

7th. The Scriptural doctrine of fellowship (communion) by real regeneration surrenders nothing of value. Salvation by regeneration and fellowship is purely a work of grace. Dependence on the person of Jesus is absolute. On the other hand, it removes stumbling blocks which the Scriptures have not put in the way of honest doubters. It gives them an intelligible explanation of the "Merits of Christ." It is simple. Best of all, it can be expounded in Bible terms. The fellowship theory enhances our appreciation of God as the Holy One who loves righteousness and hates sin. It removes all suspicion of cruel delight in blood on God's part, and affords a common-sense explanation of typical phraseology which foreshadowed the death of Jesus. It finds a righteous ground for the sinner's justification in the fact of union with Christ by literal regeneration and consequent partnership in his obedience.

8th. Its homiletic value is in proof of its scripturalness. It makes the sinner wholly dependent on Christ alone. It is common for the sinner, when urged to accept Christ, to ransack his consciousness for evidence of a new heart. He pleads he cannot receive Christ by faith till he has experienced a change of heart. He is true to his teaching. The theory of a real regeneration tells him that if he feels his need of salvation he may go to Christ, and that if he would receive the Spirit in regeneration, he must go to Christ who baptizes with the Spirit all who come, and to all who believe on him gives the right to become the sons of God. When Nicodemus asked of Jesus: "How can these things be?" Jesus replied, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up that whosoever

believeth on him should not perish but have eternal life." To be regenerated one must go to Jesus by faith. We are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

9th. While it magnifies law and glorifies obedience manifested perfectly in the person of Jesus for our salvation, for that very reason it effectually crushes legalism. It utterly eradicates every fibre of plausibility in any theory of salvation into which our good works enter as a factor, not only by insisting on man's depravity, but by demonstrating that if any man be in the flesh he cannot please God; that no change of disposition can save him; that he must be really born of the Spirit as a Son of God; that he must be actually saved, as being in Christ a son and heir of God, before he can begin to please God. He must be saved first by baptism into Christ and acceptance in him as righteous before he can do good. A doctrine repugnant to the sinner; to the saint full of comfort and assurance and growth.

10th. Lastly—not to weary the patience of the reader—how is it to be accounted for that a so-called priesthood has for centuries dominated the consciences of millions? It is the function of a priest to offer sacrifice and to make intercession. The efficiency of the intercession depends upon the sufficiency of the sacrifice. We believe that Christ is the only priest, being the antitype of the Aaronic priesthood. His sacrifice once in the end of the world has perfected forever the saints, and his intercession prevails to save all who go to the Father by him. Rome impiously claims to have a real priesthood, and to offer real sacrifice anew of the body of Jesus; and this, too, in the face of the fact that the glorified body of Jesus is not flesh and blood. Flesh and blood, we are clearly told, shall not inherit the kingdom of God, and though the saints who are alive when Christ comes again shall not die, yet their vile bodies shall be changed in a moment like unto Christ's glorified body. Therefore, the glorified body of Jesus is not flesh and blood. Yet Rome claims to offer the real body and blood of Jesus on her altars.

Now, while the chasm between Rome and Protestantism is wide, and their differences radical, they do not differ so much as to the nature of Christ's merit in dying as they do in regard to

the sufficiency of his death. Protestants are scriptural in holding that by one offering he hath perfected forever all his saints. Rome holds that Christ's death is meritorious to procure deliverance from the eternity only of punishment, and that it must be repeated often to shorten the long years of purgatory. But both Romanists and the great body of Protestants shut their eyes to the truth that Christ satisfied the demands of law and justice by his perfect obedience. Long, long ago Jehovah declared that "to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." "I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats. . . . Wash you, make you clean. . . . Learn to do well." "Sacrifice and offerings thou wouldest not, but a body thou hast prepared me." "In burnt offerings and sacrifice for sin thou hast no pleasure. . . . Then said I, Lo, I come . . . to do thy will, O God." The righteous God loveth righteousness, and Jesus fulfilled all righteousness. Only obedience has merit.

Now, the true theory, that the birth of the Spirit initiates fellowship with Jesus in the reward-procuring merit of his obedience unto death, utterly sweeps away the whole fabric of Rome's invention. Jesus rendered the obedience which is required of man. Therefore death hath no more dominion over him, and by his one offering he hath perfected forever them who are in him.

And what of his intercession? His presence in the holy of holies is the guarantee of the present acceptance and future glorification of them who are in him. His bare presence at the right hand of God is our intercession. Our prayers are offered in the name of Jesus, and God sees and hears the Holy One and the Just. Hence the words of Jesus: "I say not that I will pray the Father for you; the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and believed that I came out from him." We are not to conceive of Christ's intercession as the pleading with a reluctant God to have mercy.

While Rome and her imitators have no true priests, there is a sense in which all God's people are a royal priesthood. They present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God, which is their reasonable service. God's people are serving as priests when obedient to his will, though, in the strict use of the

word, he only is priest whose obedience unto death avails to save sinners. And the intercessions of God's saints do not avail because of their own obedience, but, being made in the name of Jesus, they plead his merit solely.

Contrast this with Rome's doctrine of intercession. Saints and angels plead their own merit. Mary is represented as queen of heaven, who commands her Son to grant her behests. Surely, there is not enough truth in Rome to justify her recognition as a church of Jesus Christ. She has fatally corrupted the word of God, and is wholly given over to idolatry.

By one man's disobedience the many who are born of him are made sinners; by one man's obedience the many who are born of his Spirit are made righteous. In both cases birth is real.

JOHN W. PRIMROSE.

Greenville, Mississippi.

II. MATTHEW XXIV. AND PROFESSOR MILLIGAN'S EXEGESIS.

THIS passage is regarded by commentators as a very difficult one, and none of the solutions that have been offered seem to meet these difficulties satisfactorily. It is very plain that there are two separate events predicted, the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world, which is coincident with the second coming of Christ; but how these two events are so associated as to become the subject of one undivided prophecy is not clearly explained. Meyer, recognizing the unity of the passage, has been driven by the word "immediately" in verse 29 to the strange position of holding that the passage asserts that the second advent, the *parousia*, was to take place within the life-time of the apostles, and in immediate connection with the destruction of Jerusalem.

Professor Milligan has given us in his Baird Lectures an entirely new exegesis of the passage. Perceiving that in the verses preceding verse 29 some of the expressions must have a more general application than to the destruction of Jerusalem, he has given us an allegorical interpretation which makes the passage cover the whole history of the church and the world. Professor Milligan sees in the passage a striking parallel to the Book of Revelation, taking the ground that this passage has moulded the conception of the Apocalypse. He adduces this chapter as militating against any proper doctrine of a millennial period for the church, and contends that this passage teaches that the course of the church is to be one of uninterrupted *trouble* down to the end of time. Since this interpretation is given us in support of a very peculiar view of the "thousand years reign" in Rev. xx., a view which would rob the church of one of her most precious hopes, it is worthy of a careful examination.

Our author divides the passage into its three natural divisions as paragraphed in the revision. We find no fault with this division, but the further analysis of the divisions we cannot accept.

The first division, which extends through verse 14, he divides into two parts, making verses 4-6 the answer to the disciples' first question, and what follows the answer to the second.

We cannot appreciate the reason for this division, since we do not think that the passage is a direct answer to either question, except in verse 14, which is clearly a sign with reference to *the end*. Verses 4-6 cannot have any direct reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, for there is no adequate historical basis for such reference. Meyer and Godet, at least, are agreed upon the statement that "we possess no *historical* record of any false messiahs having appeared previous to the destruction of Jerusalem."

Again, if, as Professor Milligan contends, the remark, "the end is not yet," indicates that verses 4-6 are not in answer to the *second* question [in reference to the end], the same would be true of verse 8: "But all these things are the beginning of travail" (or woes).

Again, verse 9 shows that there is no general reference in these verses to the signs of the end, for this refers to the *personal* sufferings of the disciples, as is manifest from the parallel passages in Mark and Luke, which expand this point more fully. Mark's account is the most particular on this point: "But take ye heed to yourselves: for they shall deliver you up to the councils; and in synagogues shall ye be beaten; and before governors and kings shall ye stand for my sake, for a testimony unto them." Then the instruction, not to be anxious under these circumstances, shows that the teaching on this occasion is, on this point, simply a repetition of that which is given more fully in Matthew x.

But while there is an allusion to the personal sufferings of the early Christians, the reference does not stop there. The prophecy, "ye shall be hated of *all nations*," or "all men" (Mark and Luke), shows that the Lord speaks to his disciples as representatives of the church. We think, then, that the Lord, before answering his disciples' question directly, calls their attention to that which is far more practical, the sufferings which the church must undergo before the end shall come. This is coupled with a warning against unfaithfulness and apostasy, because many shall be tried by these things and found wanting. The warning against

apostasy is suggested by the idea of the destruction of Jerusalem, for there would be peculiar temptations at this time; and this is why the answer is prefaced by a warning. The contemplation of this event gave rise also to the question about the end of the world. It is very likely that the two things were associated together in the disciples' minds, for, although the double form of the question appears only in Matthew, the answer in each case is the same, covering both events. This is perfectly natural, and does not argue any confusion in their minds as to the two events; the association arises from the fact that the destruction of Jerusalem was typical of the destruction of the wicked at the end of the world.

The Lord Jesus answers first the question with reference to *the end*, because it was the practical question for the young church. They would not be affected very much by the destruction of the temple, but they were commanded to be ever mindful of Christ's second coming, the preparation for which must terminate with death.

The first sign which he gives of this event is: "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto *all the nations*; and then shall the end come." The last clause shows that this sign is the only one in these verses which has reference to the end. The enumeration of evils in the other verses are all of matters which shall happen along through the course of the ages. The conjunctions introducing verses 9 and 10 raise no question of time or succession between these statements and those preceding, but simply introduce new matter in the enumeration. These are clear instances of the continuative use of *τότε*. (See *Winer*.)

One more point needs notice. When it is said, "he that *endureth to the end*, the same shall be saved," we do not think there is any necessary implication that the troubles of the church are to continue to the end of the world. "Enduring," in such a case, means simply continuing faithful through all the temptations which either the church as a whole, or any individual Christian, shall be called upon to bear. While it is perfectly general, including all, it also individualizes; and any individual Christian

could only be said to "endure to the end" by remaining faithful unto death. Meyer explains the phrase to mean, "till the end, until the troubles will have come to an end." This is all that we could wish, since Meyer thus acknowledges that it does not necessarily mean "till the end of time." If this be true, we should give it a meaning which, while applying to the whole church, is applicable also to the individuals which compose the church. It is precisely of the individuals that the words are spoken. The parallel passage makes this still clearer: "And not a hair of your head shall perish. *In your patience ye shall win your souls.*" This patience is a patience *unto death*, which is the end of troubles for the righteous; and both these clauses find their elucidation in Matthew x. 28: "And be not afraid of them which *kill the body*, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

We think this is the only point in the passage in Matthew which gives any color to the idea that the church is to suffer down to the end of time; and we see that a fair and natural interpretation of the passage is entirely consistent with the millennial period.

VERSES 15-28. Professor Milligan takes this division of our chapter as covering "the whole history of the Christian church, from the moment when she was planted in the world to the moment when her Lord shall come again to introduce her to everlasting blessedness." After this rather surprising statement the passage is divided into two parts, and we are told that verses 15-22 give us the *external* history of the church, while in verses 23-28 we have the *internal* history.

We confess that we are unable to appreciate this analysis, and do not understand how our author arrives at his conclusion. He notes several points from which he concludes that the passage must have a general application, but how he sees in it the whole history of the Christian church is more than we can understand.

We can hardly do justice to the argument without giving it intact. He says in this passage, "we are not dealing with Jewish Christians alone. It is true that the fall of Jerusalem is especially mentioned in these verses, that we read of them that are 'in

Judea' fleeing to the mountains, and that the disciples are instructed to pray that their flight may not be on 'a Sabbath.' But the words of verses 17-19 were words used by our Lord, as we learn from the third Gospel, with a universal application. (Comp. Luke xvii. 30-37.) We cannot confine the words 'no flesh,' of verse 22, to Jews; and the remarkable omission by St. Mark, in his report of the discourse, of the words 'on a Sabbath,' is a clear proof that the exhortation of Jesus was understood by him to apply also to the Gentiles. St. Luke, as might be expected from the object of his Gospel, is still more specific. He not only omits the words, 'on a Sabbath,' but speaks of 'the times of the Gentiles'—those times which were to prevail everywhere and to the end—of distress of nations 'upon the *earth*,' and of the things that were coming 'upon the world' or 'the inhabited earth.' Throughout this second part of the discourse the whole world is before us; and, as is distinctly shown by the word 'immediately' of verse 29, is before us to the end."

In regard to verses 15-22, he tells us that here "we have the external history of the church in the world, and her preservation in the midst of all the trials that surround her there. The 'great tribulation' spoken of bears less immediately upon her than upon those who are opposing and afflicting her. The woes that here come upon the earth are woes occasioned by its own sinfulness; and they would be much greater than they are were it not that for the elect's sake the days shall be shortened. These shortened days must thus, from the very circumstance that their 'shortening' is referred to as it is, be the days that immediately precede 'the end.'"

We confine our attention, at first, to the first part of the passage (vs. 15-22). If we understand our author's argument, it consists of two steps. First, he argues that these verses must have a more general application than to the destruction of Jerusalem, even an application to the *whole world*. Second, he concludes that the troubles spoken of here must be in some way representative of the tribulations of the *whole world*, including the righteous as well as the wicked.

Professor Milligan seems distinctly to recognize in the outset

that there is in the passage a clear reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, but he fails to explain on what principle the general application, which he claims for the passage, consists with the specific application. We do not say that the two things are necessarily inconsistent, but we do say that a rational exegesis of the passage calls for the rationale which constitutes the logical nexus, binding the two things together.

It must be admitted that no interpretation of the passage is satisfactory which does not account for the facts of *all three* of the parallel passages; and we freely admit that the passage as a whole has a general application, as well as a specific one, but we think the general application is entirely different from that which our author draws from it, and we think that his method of arguing from particular clauses in one passage to particular clauses in another passage is entirely inconclusive.

Our author's first argument for the general application is that verses 17 and 18, which give instruction concerning the flight, must be general, because our Lord used them with reference to the last times, or, to use his own words, "with a universal application." We may ask what is meant by the universal application, and what does our author wish to prove by it? Does he mean that this instruction given by our Lord on the two occasions applies to the whole world, including the wicked as well as the righteous? If so, the citation does not seem to bear out the conclusion. Does he mean that because the passage in Luke is spoken in reference to *the end* that it must apply to the church during the whole Christian age? This certainly does not follow, and the "universal application" seems to elude us. We think the application is rather specific than general, applying in the one case to the *true people* at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, and in the other to Christians at the second coming of Christ.

Meyer himself takes this verse in a general application, but he is clearer in his statement. He says it is not merely the *disciples* or *believers* who are ordered to flee, but the summons to do so is *a general one*. What is said with reference to the flight does not assume an *individualizing* character till verse 20. We are unable to see any individualizing in verse 20 which is not found in verses

17-19. Perhaps Meyer thinks it not very likely that the wicked would be exhorted to *pray*; but this is spoken to the same parties as the other verses, the whole discourse being addressed to the *disciples*. This appears clearly in Mark's narrative, where we are told that Peter and James and John and Andrew asked him *privately* about the matter. The idea that the instruction in regard to the flight is intended for the *wicked* is opposed to the nature of the whole passage. The destruction of Jerusalem was a *judgment* sent upon an *apostate church*, that is, upon the *wicked*. Is there any reason, then, in the idea that God designs to tell the wicked to escape this judgment by fleeing from one place to another? Can God's final vengeance be averted in this way? The idea is opposed to all those passages where the wicked are warned that there is no escape from God's sword of vengeance.

Is it any answer to this argument to say that the *terms* are general, "Let them that are in Judea flee"? We think not. The case is similar to that in Jeremiah xxi. 9, where "falling away to the Chaldeans" was made a test of faith. That instruction was also general, but as a matter of fact only those who were God's true people were to avail themselves of this method of escape, and it was *intended only for them*, as is perfectly manifest in the very fact that it was designed of God to be a *test of faith*.

This judgment upon Jerusalem was in a true sense a *final judgment upon the Jewish church*, and we hope to show that as such it was TYPICAL OF THE FINAL JUDGMENT UPON THE WICKED AT THE END OF THE WORLD.

We are not aware that this idea has been advanced by any commentator, but we believe that it is capable of proof, and that it is the complete solution of the difficulties of this chapter.

Professor Milligan says again, "We cannot confine the words 'no flesh' of verse 22 to Jews." Our author apparently forgets that which he at first admitted, that this is a *prophecy* of the destruction of *Jerusalem*. Luke's narrative places this fact beyond all controversy, and if we remember this we can not only confine the words "no flesh" to the Jews, but to *wicked amongst the*

Jews, those who should be left in the city after the Christians, who believed in and acted upon the prophecy and had made their escape. While the destruction of the wicked at this time was not to be absolutely complete, this fact does not prove that the *warning* applied to them.

Again, remembering the historical nature of the event in question, the omission by Mark of the words "on a Sabbath," cannot have any such significance as that placed upon it; and the phrase, "the times of the Gentiles," quoted by our author in favor of the general application of the passage, can be turned against him. The phrase occurs in Luke, who gives us such a vivid picture of the destruction of Jerusalem, and he tells us that this desolation is to continue to a certain time: "And Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Even before deciding upon the precise meaning of this sentence, it is clear that it makes a sharp distinction between the Jews and the balance of the world, and hence it tells against that particular *general application* of the passage which our author adopts, showing that this prophecy does not apply to the whole world. This reference to the "times of the Gentiles" does, however, furnish a proof of the typical nature of the prophecy. The same is true of the other phrases quoted from Luke. Let us now examine this matter.

Of course it will not do to assert the typical character of a prophecy, or the typical nature of a *historical event* which is the subject of prophecy, without warrant from Scripture, but in this case we find our warrant in the passage itself, and it seems to us strange that this fact has not been recognized by any of the commentators which we have at hand. Neither Meyer, nor Godet, nor Jamieson, F. and B., nor Henry, nor Butler, nor even Forman in his work on prophecy, gives us any intimation of the typical character of this prophecy. More than this, we do not find any clear recognition of *typical prophecy* in general.

It is generally recognized that a historic personage may be typical. That historical events may be typical is also recognized by Barrows in his *Companion to the Bible*. Horne does not mention this. He speaks of prophetic types, and historical types,

but under the latter he simply mentions historic personages, while the former, as explained by him, are no more than symbolic prophecy, or prophecy by *vision*. Barrows presents at length one clear case of "a historical type" in the person of Melchizedek, showing that not merely his person, but the circumstances connected with his office—historical matters—were also typical. He tells us also that many things in connection with the history of the Jews, their deliverance from Egypt, their settlement in the land of promise, etc., are typical. "It is undeniable," he says, "that the writer to the Hebrews regards the rest of the covenant people in the land of promise as a type of the rest of heaven." From this he thinks it reasonable to infer that the whole history was typical. Whatever may be said about this broad statement, we believe that the subject is an important one, and that the principle is a correct one in biblical exegesis, and deserves a more extended development than it has yet received. If, then, historical events may be typical, there is no reason why the prophecies of such events should not be typical, and so possess a twofold application.

We think this is the key which unlocks not only our passage in Matthew, but also a number of the Old Testament prophecies which have so perplexed interpreters.

It seems to us clear that in Matthew xxiv., 15–22, we have a prophecy of a definite historical event, together with an instruction intended to secure the safety of Christians. The prophecy was fulfilled to the letter, and we have historical evidence that all the Christians escaped. Since, however, this event is typical of God's judgments at the end of the world, the Lord Jesus passes naturally, and without any special warning, from one event to the other. We have already had evidence that the two things were intimately connected in the apostles' minds. Verses 22–28 give us, we should say, not an "internal history of the church," but a sign with reference to the second coming of Christ at the end of the world. The transition point in both Matthew and Mark is indicated by "then." In Mark it is verse 21 (ch. xiii.). In Luke the transition point is equally as well marked; and in this passage, which is in several particulars the clearest of the three, we have the evidence of the typical character of the prophecy.

In the first place the downfall of Jerusalem is so graphically pictured in Luke that there is no doubt whatever that it is a prophecy of a *particular historical event*. We are even told that it will be in fulfilment of prophecies that have gone before.

Again, we are told that this prophesied judgment upon the Jewish nation is to continue in force "until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." We believe that this clause refers to the time when the dominion of the "nations" shall come to an end, or in other words, that overthrow of the wicked world which shall inaugurate the millennium. It is evident from the preceding clause, which speaks of Jerusalem being "trodden down of the Gentiles," that "Gentiles" is here equivalent to the nations, and that this prophecy is an exact parallel to Revelation xi. 2, which places a limit to the dominance of the nations. Were it not for this, the clause in question might very well mean the time when the "fulness of the Gentiles" shall have come in. The result, in either case, would be practically the same, as the two times very nearly, if not entirely, coincide. The passage then, instead of militating against the doctrine of a millennial period, is an indirect prophecy of such period.

The failure to understand this phrase, and to apprehend the typical nature of this prophecy, has led Meyer into the absurdity of holding that the "times" here spoken of are ended by the *parousia* (or second coming), while the *parousia* itself was to take place during the lifetime of the hearers, and in immediate connection with the destruction of Jerusalem.

We think it is very easy to see how the judgment upon Jerusalem, which was a judgment upon an *apostate* church, naturally typifies the judgment which is to come upon the wicked at the end of the world. On this principle, which is very different from the allegorizing into which Professor Milligan has fallen, we have the complete harmonizing of the three hitherto irreconcilable features of this prophecy, the destruction of Jerusalem, the signs of the end of the world, and the second coming of Christ. On this principle it is easy to explain the transition in the three Gospels from the particular prophecy in reference to the Jewish nation to the signs of the end (verse 25), and the dreadful times

which "are coming on the world" in immediate connection with the end. It also relieves the difficulty of "immediately," in Matthew v. 29, which has proved such a crux to interpreters.

The "tribulations" of verse 29 are the same as the "distress of nations" in Luke xxi. 25, and the reference in Luke to the "roaring of the sea and the billows" is, we think, an indication that the judgment is to affect *only the wicked*, the "sea" being a figurative designation for the wicked, just as it is in Revelation, and in a number of Old Testament prophecies in reference to the times of the end. What connection of thought could there be otherwise between the "roaring of the sea" and the distress of nations in their perplexity on this account? We have light on the question in the varied expression of Matthew, "Then shall all the tribes of *the earth* mourn." Does any one suppose that this expression is universal, including the righteous? The idea is contradicted by verse 31, which speaks of the gathering together of the elect, and also by verse 46, which declares that the righteous who hold themselves in readiness for this time are blessed. "The tribes of the earth," then, in this case must mean the wicked.

Again, the application of the typical idea suggests the meaning of the sentence, "This generation shall not pass away till all these things be accomplished." It seems plain that "this generation" means this spiritual generation, the righteous, *i. e., the church*. This is the antithesis of that meaning of the phrase in Luke xi. 50, where it designates the wicked. The impossibility of reconciling the literal meaning of the phrase with the context is a pretty satisfactory proof that another meaning must be sought, and we think we have found this meaning in several passages. We will examine these passages, because the establishing of such meaning of the word "generation" is another important proof of the typical nature of our prophecy.

We find the word generation applied to the righteous in Psalm xiv. 5: "For God is in the generation of the righteous." Also Psalm xxiv. 6: "This is the generation of them that seek after him," etc. Psalm xxii. 30: "A seed shall serve him; it shall be accounted to the Lord *for a generation*." We quote from the

Authorized Version because we think the translation is superior to that of the revision, which renders the last clause, "It shall be told of the Lord unto the next generation." This psalm is one of the most striking of the Messianic Psalms, and the first clause of the thirtieth verse unquestionably refers to Christ. The second clause, which is, literally, "it shall be counted to the Lord *for the generation*," seems clearly explanatory of the "seed." The margin of the revision gives this idea, translating "for his generation." The meaning would then be that Christ should have "a seed" who shall be *counted out* to him, as it were, so that not one shall fail, and this shall be his "generation," the whole tale of his righteous ones. We think "a seed" is a general designation of his people *as a whole*, because of the intimate connection of thought between this verse and verses 27-29, which are clearly a prophecy of the last times of the church's triumph. "All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee." Now, since the millennial triumph is typical or representative of the complete triumph in heaven, the transition to the idea of the completed redemption is easy. The "seed," then, would naturally mean his seed in general, *i. e.*, all his people, "his generation." We have the same expression in Isaiah liii. 10, as we think, with the same meaning. There the general expression "he shall see seed," is equivalent to saying "he shall have a people."

It seems apparent that the revisers relegated the translation of the Authorized Version to the margin, and added "next" to the sentence, under stress of a supposed connection of thought between verse 30 and verse 31. Since the same addition to the text has been made in Psalm lxxi. 18 (as we suppose on the analogy of this passage), it is the more worthy of our attention. It seems to us that the real connection is very different from that which this translation assumes, and a slight variation in the translation will bring in another thought. We think that the psalmist passes from the idea that the seed is *secured*, and the victory of the church assured, to the idea that the Lord shall never lack through the course of the ages a witnessing seed. Their witness is as to what Christ has done. The prophecy of his sufferings is

contained in the first part of the psalm (verses 1-22), and "his righteousness" refers to this vicarious atonement. We may say that "his righteousness" epitomizes the whole of the first part of the psalm, and that verse 31 is general in idea and broad in its sweep. We would then translate by the present, "They come, and they declare his righteousness unto people that are born, because he hath done this." This the Hebrew will allow, and the idea would be, that the seed which shall be counted unto the Lord for his generation shall *continually come*; that there shall be no break along through the ages, but each generation shall bear witness to the coming generation of this marvellous salvation.

We will quote only one more passage (Isa. liii. 8 in connection with Acts viii. 33): "By oppression and judgment he was taken away; and as for his generation who (among them) considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living? for the transgression of my people was he stricken." We think this is another passage where the revision is less faithful to the Hebrew than the old version. Again, they have given us the narrow sense of "his generation," and in so doing have given a translation entirely out of harmony with the quotation in Acts ("his generation who shall declare"), while it has against it also whatever weight attaches to the Hebrew accents. We suggest a slight variation from both translations, thus: "By oppression and judgment he was taken away; but his generation who shall conceive; because he was cut off from the land of the living for the transgression of my people (as) a curse (a plague) for them." This is not only in conformity to the natural construction of the Hebrew, but the connection of thought also becomes natural and easy. The mind passes at once from the thought of his sufferings to that which these sufferings should produce in the way of fruit. While Christ was to be cut off by this oppression and suffering, it was by this very fact that he was to purchase an innumerable seed. Who shall conceive his seed? The word translated "conceive" means, literally, "to talk to one's self, to think," and thence we get the idea of conceive. We see, then, that the quotation in Acts is practically a literal rendering of the Hebrew, and both these passages are to be added to the number of those which use "generation" in the sense of "the righteous."

Coming back to our passage in Matthew we see that the words, "this generation shall not pass away till all these things be accomplished," are a prophecy that the church would be preserved down to the end of time, and when Jesus addresses his disciples, saying, "even so ye also, when ye see all these things," etc., he addresses them in a representative sense. If, then, we have in the passage, considered as a whole, the doctrine of the destruction of the wicked at the last day, we have also the doctrine of the preservation of the church amid all its trials unto the end. May we not understand, then, that the escape of the faithful in the destruction of Jerusalem is typical of the final exemption of the righteous from the judgment coming upon the wicked at the last great day? This explains the allusion to this passage in Luke xvi. 31, and shows that there the words are not to be understood literally, but that one event is described in terms of the other.

In regard to the signs of the end (which subject is introduced in Matthew at verse 23), it is worthy of note that the false Christs and false prophets, spoken of in this connection, are not the same as those mentioned in verses 5 and 11, but are such as shall appear just before the second coming, seeking to deceive people *with reference to this event*. "If therefore they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the wilderness; go not forth: Behold, he is in the inner chambers; believe it not." Why? Because when the second coming does take place it shall be *known to all*, and there will be no possibility of mistake, any more than there is in reference to the lightning, or the presence of the carcass where "the eagles are gathered together."

There is one other point in connection with our passage in Matthew which serves to illustrate its typical character, and at the same time forms a connecting link with the Old Testament prophecies of the last times. The question is, what is meant by "the abomination of desolation, which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet"? We apprehend that it is neither the image of Jupiter Olympus, nor the Roman army, nor the desolation of the temple area, but something which is equally well adapted to the natural and typical meaning of this prophecy. The abominations alluded to by Daniel in chapter ix. 27, and which brought destruc-

tion to Jerusalem are the same as those so largely dwelt upon by the contemporary prophet Ezekiel. It is an expression for *wickedness in general*, and the sin of idolatry in particular, with all the accompaniments of an idolatrous worship. This is not in reality a double meaning, for by wickedness in general we mean that wickedness which is characteristic of the wicked world, the essence of which consists in the rejection of God's lawful authority and claims. It was exactly this imitation of the heathen nations that brought down desolation, that is, destruction, upon the covenant people. We find this directly asserted in Ezekiel v. 6: "And she hath rebelled against my judgments *in doing wickedness* more than the nations, and against my statutes more than the countries that are round about her; for they have rejected my judgments, and as for my statutes they have not walked in them." Just below we have it plainly stated that this is the cause of God's judgments: "Wherefore, as I live, saith the Lord God, surely, because thou hast defiled my sanctuary with all thy detestable things, and with all thine *abominations*, therefore will I also diminish (thee) (or therefore will I also *withdraw*); neither shall mine eye spare, and I also will have no pity." (Vs. 11.) "Moreover I will make thee a *desolation* and a reproach among the nations that are round about thee." (Vs. 14.) The abominations alluded to were unquestionably the abominations of idolatry, as is clearly implied in chapter vi 4: "And your altars shall become desolate, and your sun-images shall be broken; and I will cast down your slain men *before your idols*." The judgment upon Israel was spoken of as a "bringing upon them of their abominations" (chapter vii. 3), and hence the phrase, the "abomination of desolation"; and the "transgression that maketh desolate," of Daniel viii. 13.

We have an extended description of these abominations in the visions of the temple granted to Ezekiel, which we find in chapter viii. We have also another clear statement in Ezekiel xx. 26, and we need no further proof.

It is easy to see, now, that the sign of the abomination of desolation may apply as well to the antitypical apostasy of the last times, foretold in Revelation xx. 7-10, as to the destruction of

Jerusalem itself, and such apostasy would, in the nature of the case, be an indication that the time of the second coming "draweth nigh."

In Luke xxi. 28 we read: "But when these things *begin to come to pass*, look up, and lift up your heads; because *your redemption draweth nigh*." We strongly suspect that this verse, which is peculiar to Luke, is to be understood in the light of verse 24, which speaks of the downfall of the Jewish church in contradistinction from the balance of the world. That is also peculiar to Luke, and the two things seem to go together. Verse 28 may then very well be understood as a prophecy of the "redemption" of the Jewish nation, which, as we have already seen, is to take place as soon as the "times of the Gentiles" shall have been fulfilled. If this is so, the "kingdom of God," in verse 31, would also very naturally designate the kingdom of God *on earth* to be established in the millennial period. This would be merely the positive side of the other statement, that the judgment is to be limited; and we should then have in our possession a *direct* prophecy of the millennium. If this is so, it suggests the idea that the destruction of Jerusalem is not only typical of the destruction of the wicked at the end of the world, but also of that great judgment and *overthrow of the wicked world* which is to take place at the beginning of the millennial period, a catastrophe graphically foretold in the sixteenth and nineteenth chapters of Revelation. The two things are perfectly consistent, and we feel sure that this latter idea, which is merely suggested by the passage in Luke, is clearly contained in the Old Testament prophecies, especially the prophecies of Ezekiel.

LUTHER LINK.

III. THE CIVIL SABBATH.

QUESTIONS relative to the Sabbath, its institution, perpetuation, and observance must ever command attention. Few subjects demand more thought or suggest greater diversity of opinion. To the earnest Christian, the statesman, reformer, and student of history, the theme is one of profound interest. Attention is invited to the consideration of the Sabbath as a civil institution. There is a decided distinction between the day as an institution of the state, to be observed by authority of legislative enactment, and the Sabbath as the Christian's day of rest, worship, and spiritual growth. The distinction is often misunderstood and by many is not recognized at all. It seems certain that much confusion results from this misunderstanding. To avoid needless repetition, attention is called at the outset to the following propositions:

1. We use Sunday, Sabbath, and the Lord's day as convertible terms, comprehending, so far as this discussion is concerned, essentially the same thing, *i. e.*, the seventh part of a week as the stated period for cessation from labor and for bodily, mental, and spiritual rest and recuperation.

2. The Sabbath is one of four ordinances, instituted of God at the creation of man for the creature's good. These ordinances are as follows: Dominion over the creature in virtue of the dignity of man's nature; labor as a condition of activity and happiness; marriage between one man and one woman, the basis of the family, which in turn becomes the unit of the state, and the Sabbath as a period of time essential for rest and recuperation. In this ordinance it is noted that the institution of the Sabbath day antedates the Mosaic law.

3. It is evident that the active observance of the day antedates, as does its institution, the commandments written upon stone at Sinai. This from the prohibitory commandment relative to the gathering of manna on the seventh day, by which a double portion was to be gathered on the preceding day, and, further, by the special provision for the preservation of the manna so gathered.

4. It is incorporated in the code given on the Mount: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

5. It is true as a historic fact, that one-seventh of the weekly division of time, or thereabout, has been an occasion for rest and worship, not among the Jews only, but with the Egyptians, Assyrians, and other nations. Furthermore, however it may be accounted for, the fact remains that practically all people who have been prominent in the development of civilization have observed a day similar to the Sabbath.

6. While the subject of the specific day is still under discussion, the overwhelming opinion of the Christian world favors the change from the seventh to the first day of the week. Jesus declared that the Sabbath was made for man, man through all the ages, always and everywhere the same. He and his apostles kept the first day of the week as the time of worship. The change of the day relates to the resurrection of Christ, and thus the first day of the week, as the Sabbath, becomes at once a testimony and memorial of the old and new creation.

7. Phariseeism had, at the advent of Jesus, overlaid the Sabbath with so many cumbrous traditions and restrictions that it ceased to answer its design. But the Master uncovered this law, set it forth in bold relief and restored it to its place of authority, as he did in the course of his teaching every other law inscribed upon the tables of stone. The fact, however, that the Pharisee had been at pains to legislate so fully and continuously upon the day at once asserts its great importance. The further fact that Jesus gave so much attention toward the refutation of this legislation does much to honor this day among those institutions upon which society is founded.

8. This command, standing half-way among the command-

ments, seems to serve as a transition point where duties to God and duties to man blend. The two tables hinge here and become one.

The Sabbath after the Reformation was again subject to extreme churchly ordinances under certain laws imposed by the state. These are conceded to be after the spirit of Constantine, who was the author of the unholy alliance of church and state, which has been the prolific source of so much despotism, error, and persecution. The state attempted to legislate men into holiness. They had not learned what we now know, that "heartly conception of the truth can be produced only by evidence, and cannot be the effect of compulsion. Civil rewards and penalties on account of religious belief, therefore, make hypocrites of the unprincipled and rebels of the conscientious, and thus they corrupt the church by filling it with hypocrisy, and weaken the government by alienating from it men of principle who would be its firmest supporters."

Much has been said about "Puritan" Sabbath laws, but in fairness to the men of other days, and worthy of statement as a correction of history, it may be affirmed that the "blue laws" of Connecticut, of which so much has been said, to the intent that a husband could not kiss his wife on Sunday, *et cetera*, are the veriest fiction and never existed in fact. They were written as caricatures of the men of that day. Extreme men they were, we grant, but it is well to recall Gibbon's expression about the early Christians as applicable to these men. "It is a very honorable circumstance for the morals of the primitive Christians that even their faults, or rather errors, were derived from an excess of virtue," and so may we say of men of that day who were blazing the way through the forest for the wide path of civil and religious liberty, "even their faults, or rather errors, were derived from an excess of virtue."

In the further consideration of the subject we are to consider certain qualifying propositions. Under the American view of the separation of the church and state, it is important to remember that the Sabbath of the Jewish economy was neither strictly civil nor strictly churchly. The Jewish system was a theocracy

and comprehended both church and state. In neglecting to consider this, certain lessons from the Scriptures, notably that of Nehemiah with sword in hand at the gates of Jerusalem, will mislead, and at last, as a precedent, place the student in an untenable position. The church is not a Nehemiah with sword in hand standing at the gate of the city to open or close doors; neither is the minister of the gospel of Christ, as such, clothed with police power to enforce Sabbath observances. Whatever he may do as a citizen, his position in this, as in all similar instances, is such that he may, as a minister, only exercise an educational and declarative influence. This is the true and logical position of the church and the Christian ministry. The Jewish church and state were one in Nehemiah's day. They are not one under our system.

The question is further embarrassed, as are others of like kind that are working out results, *de novo*, under the conditions which obtain in the separation of church and state. The public school question is one of these. European law and polity can give us but little light here. Necessarily the opinions, ideas, and laws affecting the Sabbath will, from such a standpoint, be inspired by a theory entirely different from that which ought to control us.

The Christian man is a citizen and subject to both institutes, the church and the state, but bears a very different relation to them. Civil government is designed to protect men in their natural rights and promote their temporal interests. Civil rulers must not legislate beyond the control of this principle in matters touching religious faith and worship. Civil government and religion, however, are often concerned about the same questions; notably, the Sabbath is one of these, but the civil power may not dictate to the citizen as to the character of his worship, as to its mode, its time, or its place. The state legally knows the church as composed of her citizens, to the end that she may protect her in her assemblies and worship; to defend her property rights and yield to her a fair recognition of good will as a friend and not an enemy. The church knows the state to render obedience to her as the power ordained of God for a specific purpose. To this end she is to honor those in authority, because ordained of God;

to give such tribute as is due, and to offer prayer as manifesting her good will and respect, and that she may lead a peaceable life.

The state may not legislate for the church except under these limitations, neither is it within the province of the church to legislate for the state, only so far as her Lord has legislated. The spirit of the civil law affecting religious matters is one of protection, and not that of direction and coercion.

Any Sabbath laws the state may enact must be for the benefit of the citizen, but the citizen as he holds the twofold relation to church and state; these laws may be for his protection in religious matters, and for his temporal good. The proper objects of civil government are the happiness and protection of all men in this present state of existence.

In the consideration of the subject we are met with the radical views of extremists, who demand the acknowledgment of Christ in the constitution as the head of the state. This position is repudiated by the Master. He declared, "My kingdom is not of this world."

On the other hand, there are those who hold that the state cannot legislate upon morals at all, or upon questions directly involving moral issues, or upon issues that are common to church and state.

This at once renders the state incompetent to discuss and legislate upon questions affecting labor, marriage, and the Sabbath. The theory, because of its extreme position, at once declares itself a fallacy. It is not worthy of further answer.

We are at this point reminded that the question as to the competency of the state to legislate upon the Sabbath as a civil institution need not be discussed *ab initio*. Such legislation exists, and the courts, state and federal, when the right has been challenged, have invariably decided it to be constitutional. The issue has been made, and they have held that such laws are not subversive of the principle that forbids religious tests, nor do they deny to any one the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience. It is affirmed with great clearness that such legislation does not, in spirit or in fact, unite church and state, but that it really defines the distinction existing between the two, and there-

fore is in no sense to be classified with what is termed, by way of odium, the "blue laws of Connecticut."

It is not pretended that the instances which follow exhaust the case, but only that they illustrate and define our contention.

1. The legislative powers of the general government or state declare that public offices, legislative halls, and courts of justice shall be closed on Sabbath or Sunday.

2. That there are postal deliveries only at certain hours, or not at all, on that day. That upon certain conditions post-offices may not be open upon that day; that general postal service is had at the option of the people.

3. That contracts entered into on that day shall not be enforced by the courts.

4. That a note of hand shall not be protested on Sunday.

5. That in giving the president ten days to sign bills, the Sabbath is not included.

6. In the command to the army and navy it is ordered that only necessary work shall be engaged in on that day.

7. And in the recent decisions it has not been made a question as to whether Congress had a right to restrict its appropriation, or the State to restrict its appropriation, by enacting a qualifying Sabbath clause. The case of closing on the Sabbath the doors of the Columbian Exposition is recalled.

8. The more recent opinions of Judge Blackley, of Georgia, and of Judge Harlan are pertinent. These quotations are long, but they present the matter under discussion in a clear light. Says the former, in the judgment of the state court against Mr. Hennington for the violation of the law forbidding freight trains on the Sabbath:

"There can be no well-founded doubt of its being a police regulation, considering it merely as ordaining the cessation of ordinary labor and business during one day in every week; for the frequent and total suspension of the toils, care, and strain of mind and muscle incident to pursuing an occupation or common employment is beneficial to every individual, and, incidentally, to the community at large, the general public. Leisure is no less essential than labor to the well-being of man. Short intervals of leisure at stated periods reduce wear and tear, promote health, favor cleanliness, encourage social intercourse, afford opportunity for introspection and retrospection, and tend, in a high degree, to expand the thoughts and sympathies of people, enlarge their information, and elevate their

morals. They learn how to be, and come to realize that being is quite as important as doing. Without frequent leisure, the process of forming character could only be begun; it could never advance or be completed; people would be mere machines of labor or business, nothing more. If a law which, in essential respects, betters for all the people the conditions, sanitary, social, and individual, under which their daily life is carried on, and which contributes to insure for each, even against his own will, his minimum allowance of leisure, cannot be rightfully classed as a police regulation, it would be difficult to imagine any law that could.

“With respect to the selection of the particular day in each week which has been set apart by our statute as the rest-day of the people, religious views and feelings may have had a controlling influence. We doubt not that they did have; and it is probable that the same views and feelings had a very powerful influence in dictating the policy of setting apart any day whatever as a day of enforced rest. But neither of these considerations is destructive of the police nature and character of the statute. If good and sufficient police reasons underlie it, and substantial police purposes are involved in its provisions, these reasons and purposes constitute its civil and legal justification, whether they were or not the direct and immediate motives which induced its passage, and have for so long a time kept it in force. Courts are not concerned with the mere beliefs and sentiments of legislators, or with the motives which influence them in enacting laws which are within legislative competency. That which is properly made a civil duty by statute is none the less so because it is also a real or supposed religious obligation; nor is the statute vitiated, or in anywise weakened, by the chance, or even the certainty, that in passing it the legislative mind was swayed by the religious, rather than by the civil, aspect of the measure. Doubtless, it is a religious duty to pay debts, but no one supposes that this is any obstacle to its being enacted as a civil duty. With few exceptions, the same may be said of the whole catalogue of duties specified in the ten commandments. Those of them which are purely and exclusively religious in their nature cannot be made civil duties, but all the rest of them may be, in so far as they involve conduct, as distinguished from mere operations of mind or states of the affections. Opinions may differ, and they really do differ, as to whether abstaining from labor on Sunday is a religious duty; but whether it is or is not, it is certain that the Legislature of Georgia has prescribed it as a civil duty. The statute can fairly and rationally be treated as a legitimate police regulation; and, thus treated, it is a valid law. There is a wide difference between keeping a day holy as a religious observance and merely forbearing to labor on that day in one's ordinary vocation or business pursuit.”

Judge Harlan, upon the appeal of this case, said: “The Legislature of Georgia, no doubt, acted upon the view that the keeping of one day in seven for rest and relaxation was of admirable service to a state, considered merely as a civil institution.”

The same view was expressed by Mr. Justice Field when, referring to the statute of California relating to the Sabbath-day, he said: “Its requirement is a cessation of labor. In its enactment

the Legislature has given the sanction of law to the rule of conduct which the entire civilized world recognizes as essential to the physical and moral well-being of society. Upon no subject is there such a concurrence of opinion among philosophers, moralists, and statesmen of all nations, as on the necessity of periodical cessation from labor. One day in seven is the rule founded in experience and sustained by science. The prohibition of secular business on Sunday is advocated on the ground that by it the general welfare is advanced, labor protected, and moral and physical well-being in society is promoted."

These strong quotations bring us to the consideration of certain principles which control the legislation upon the Sabbath.

1. The right of every man and of all classes of men to one day in seven for rest and recuperation. This is a natural right, extends to any and all men, and cannot be surrendered without peril to all that man holds dear.

2. The right of assembly and worship on the day which is accepted by an overwhelming majority of the people as the day set apart for this purpose. This is the right of protection in assembly, free from disturbance and unnecessary interruption. It is of that principle for which Bunyan went to prison, and the victims of Claverhouse suffered more than death. This right should be emphasized in every discussion upon the subject, and demand made upon authorities to respect it as sacred. Other rights under liberty, falsely so-called, are asserted, to the end that the day may be converted into a time of gross and shameful pleasure. The individual Christian, the Christian home and congregations of worshippers, have rights as well. Paul's appeal to Cæsar is a safe precedent for action at this point.

3. Decent respect should be paid by the state to the convictions and religious institutions of the people. This is done through all her departments.

This is the very least that can be said. Much more is true. Man is no less religious than he is physical. Provisions are made to preserve the physical nature of the citizen. So should the state be jealous of that part of man's nature which really must dominate all other parts of his being. The state may not

each religion; but the state is under obligation to protect the individual in his religion.

4. We cannot estimate the value to the state of the observance of the Sabbath as a vital means to promote and foster public intelligence and morality, upon which free institutions are conditioned. This is in line with that legislation which determines questions so far as they are consistent with or opposed to the public welfare. The courts are constantly considering this principle in their adjudications.

5. The Sabbath is educational, and legal enactment for its observance is in strict accord with the policy that levies taxes to build school-houses and pay teachers. As long as this does not contravene the right of free worship, does not establish a test act, and the state is assured that the people are through such laws improved in morals and intelligence, she cannot withhold her seal for the preservation of the Sabbath day.

Among the principles which justify and demand of the state legislation for Sabbath observance, I rank as by all means the most important the ordinance of the day by the Creator.

These ordinances have been enumerated. I conceive them to be the four corner-stones of human society; pillars upon which everything that is stable, hopeful and beautiful in the political fabric rests. In antiquity they antedate nations, religions and formulated laws. To destroy one of these, it matters little which, the structure topples; to honor and strengthen them is to perpetuate and glorify government. This ordinance stands in line with marriage, labor and dominion. No amount of logic can legislate marriage out of our laws. No amount of fog upon the distinction between civil and religious legislation can abrogate this institution. This was attempted in the Mormon case. The specious argument was, Mormonism is a religion. To deal with Mormonism is to deal with religion; to deal with religion is against our principles, which declare against the establishment of religious tests. But the law overleaped all special pleading, and in substance declared that no amount of casuistry or logic or argument can legislate out of existence the laws affecting the marriage between one man and one woman.

"Our law considers marriage in no other light than as a civil contract. The holiness of the matrimonial state is left entirely to the ecclesiastical law, the temporal courts not having jurisdiction to consider unlawful marriage a sin, but merely as a civil inconvenience." Just so is our contention about another of these ordinances, the Sabbath. The state may not consider its holiness as to observance, but the state may and must regard the fact of its observance in a cessation of labor as one of the fundamental principles of human society.

In vain it may be claimed that viewed from one point it is a religious ordinance; so is marriage. In vain it may be contended that it will prove an oppression to certain classes who disregard law; so may it be asserted that the laws prohibiting duality of wives interfered with those who care neither for God nor man. Here we stand upon an impregnable principle which is not affected by the Jewish or Christian system, and declare that no man can contend for less without destroying the protection which all wise laws afford. The Sabbath stands upon this foundation, and although certain laws of the continent may antagonize the principle, we could answer, so do they antagonize other rights that we greatly value as being fundamental to society and free government.

The Seventh-Day Adventist in his over-zeal may lose sight of the great principle, and become such a stickler for the letter of the law that he is ready to engulf all the interest involved in the preservation of the day of rest rather than concede that the Sabbath, so far as natural religion determines, is really met in the observance of a seventh part of the week as a time for rest and recuperation.

Atheism denounces all legislation that admits a religious principle in man, or the great Lawgiver above him, but the foundations are sure. The God of nature who made the Sabbath for man has ordained it for all time and for all men.

The institution of a periodical time for rest and worship is not distinctively Jewish or distinctively Christian. As asserted by the eminent jurist, we place ourselves in accord with the profound scholarship of the world and assert that the institution of one day

in seven as a day of rest and worship is of the very core of civil and religious life.

Says Blackstone: "A corruption of morals usually follows a profanation of the Sabbath."

Another: "It is a remarkable appointment for raising the general tenor of moral existence, and is a provision for teaching and enforcing morality."

Macaulay: "If the Sunday had not been observed as a day of rest, but the axe, the spade, the anvil and the loom had been at work every day during the last three centuries, I have not the smallest doubt that we should have been at this moment a poorer people or a less civilized people than we are."

How was it that thousands of years before physiology was known as a science, Moses recognized this law of our nature and his legislation is so perfectly adapted to it? Proudhon, the French socialist, placed Moses, on this account, alone, among the great lawgivers of the world. Such testimonies could be extended without limit.

We appeal to the fact, abundantly proved by experience and observation, that both man and beast require for rest a seventh part of the time during seven days or thereabout, that in the end they may best perform their labor aright. The body, the mind, and the spirit of man weary and tire under unceasing labor.

We refer to the historical fact that those nations which keep a Sabbath are the nations that rule the world. They are, indeed, the exalted nations in the history of mankind. The venture of France is often referred to—we will not speak of it now. Travelers among the Swiss States assert that the distinction between the Sabbath-keeping cantons is at once noticeable. This topic one may pursue with interest at his leisure; explains the difference between the Scotch and Italians; the different American States, aye, communities, come under your own observation.

The law over man is an appointment of God; the rule is ordained of God; the standard of that ruling is before us in the laws given upon Sinai. The law is the law of relationship between a personal God and man, the creature. This law is not

of Jewish origin, and was re-enacted and interpreted by the Son of God.

The law has both a secular and spiritual side. Theft, murder, false-swearing, etc., are criminal. And here men may quibble as they may, so questions of casuistry spring up in the wake of all discussion, but no people can exist without morals. Morals must have a standard, and our standard is not of Mohammedan or pagan origin—it belongs to another system. Disguise it as you may, the state must enact her laws upon some general basis or code of law. This law has been declared by most of the great legal writers to be founded upon the law formulated at Sinai.

The Sabbath may be made a rest day upon the same principle that the state may enact laws under police authority for her own protection. This principle, the highest court of resort has affirmed in questions relating to the liquor traffic. The state may protect her people, and if it be proved, as it abundantly can be, that the Sabbath is a necessity to the welfare of the state, she has a right to enact such laws as she so desires. This is germane to closing saloons, the cessation of work on the Sabbath, or kindred matters.

Besides all this as to fact, the state does legislate upon labor and rest. She declares her citizens shall not be compelled to labor under contract for more than eight hours a day. She assumes to declare what a day is; she declares what a resting time and laboring time is. This is essentially the question about the Sabbath. Indeed, the state goes further, and in her vagrant laws declares very much after this commandment, six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; the seventh day, however, is a day of rest.

The state in fact does, in other affairs, declare what men may do and what they must refrain from doing on certain days. Certain days are holidays, on certain days nothing can be sold and business houses must be closed. The principle accords with the state authority to declare for the opening or closing of anything that materially affects her existence.

Finally, I declare my abhorrence of the idea of this country being a Christian nation in the sense that places the name of Christ in the Constitution and gives us a state religion. But there is a sense in which it is Christian. This grows out of the fact

that all of her traditions are in this direction and that the very large majority of her people are Christian, and when she is compelled to determine law, all else being equal, her heart and voice are with the Christian religion. Mr. Cleveland expressed the idea in a recent address. Said he: "We still profess to be a Christian people. This means that no public officer of high or low degree should be unmindful of the restraints of religious sentiment. It means that the religious teaching of our people should lead them to exact from those who make and execute the laws a recognition of these restraints. It means that rules which a popular religious sense approves should underlie the performance of every public duty, and it means that those who assume to be religious teachers in this land where the people rule are related in responsibility to those in public stations. You therefore will, I hope, permit me to say that though you do well to insist upon the conscientious discharge of official obligation, and though you ought never to shrink from the exposure of official shortcomings, the contribution you owe towards the accomplishing of good government will not be fully met unless you teach the people by precept and example that they will find their safety and welfare in enforcing upon their public servants the observance of the mandates of Christianity and morality."

In our relation to the Sabbath as Christians, pledged to keep the day holy, I can only add in the strong language of another:

"It is useless to exact a higher standard of morals outside of the church than inside. If members of the church will buy newspapers on the Sabbath, the world's people will print them. If Christians will take a train on that day every time it is convenient to them, railroad men who are not Christians will see to it that the trains are kept running. It is for the Lord's people to say what shall be the popular standard in morals in their neighborhood. A good way of promoting good, by living among those outside the church, is by raising the standard of living among church members."

W. L. NOURSE.

Hopkinsville. Ky.

IV. THE LITERATURE AND WORSHIP OF THE EARLY ARYANS.

THE name Aryan is employed by philologists and ethnographers in two senses. In the wider sense it comprehends all the races included in the Indo-European family, embracing Hindus, Persians, Kelts, Germans, Slavonians, Greeks, and Italians, with, of course, all the modern nations that have sprung from these races. Very interesting and instructive it is to pursue the investigation which leads to the full conviction of the original unity of all these peoples. The evidence of language shows that all had a common ancestry. I must be content to assume here a result which no one who has studied the evidence that can be adduced in its favor will feel disposed to call in question.

But there is a more limited and, as I hold, a more correct use of the name Aryan, which confines its application to the Asiatic branches of the great Indo-European family, and so denotes by it only Hindus and Persians.

The old Sanskrit-speaking settlers in the region of the Punjab, in the northwest of India, called themselves Aryans, an honorific name denoting noble, respectable, in distinction from the aboriginal inhabitants of the country, whom they despised. And the old Persians applied to themselves a designation which is only dialectically different, which we can recognize in the alternative name given to Persia, namely, Airyana or Iran. Herodotus relates that the ancient name of the Medes was *Arioi*. Let me add that the ancient Hindus appear, both in their language and religion, more closely related to the ancient Persians than to any other branch of the Indo-European family. The old Indians and Persians, then—these are the Aryan races to whose early literature and worship I will briefly call attention.

The most ancient literary document belonging to the Aryans is the Veda, the oldest of the Hindu scriptures. The Hindu scriptures astonish us by their vastness and variety. The ancient

literature of Greece is meagre and modern when compared with that of India. There are manuscripts extant of about ten thousand separate works in Sanskrit. The question arises, How can we determine the oldest of these works? This can be done by a regard to their language, and by marking references in succeeding writings. The language of the hymns of the Rig-Veda is unmistakably archaic. It can be proved that Buddhism was prevalent in India at the time when Alexander the Great invaded it. Here, then, we have an important chronological limit in Indian archæology. Buddhism presupposes the religion of the Veda, and is, in fact, a protest against it. We can mark several distinct stages of religious development before the rise of Buddhism. Sir F. Max Mueller distinguishes four successive strata of literature that preceded it. There is the period of the Sutras which contain, in the most concise form, beside the rules of sacrifice, treatises on grammar, prosody, and philosophy. These Sutras refer to older writings, the Brahmanas, as their authority. These Brahmanas relate to the sacrificial ritual, and have appended to them the oldest treatises on Hindu philosophy, which are called the Upanishads. But still earlier is the Mantra period, when the ancient Vedic hymns were arranged as a liturgy for the priests. And, as earliest of all, we must place the period of the growth of the hymns of the Rig-Veda. They could not, it is generally conceded, have been composed later than one thousand years B. C., and some of them belong probably to a more remote antiquity. Some scholars will not allow that these hymns could have originated later than two thousand years B. C. There are no compositions in the whole Indo-European world so old as the hymns of the Rig-Veda, and, therefore, the study of them is so important as illustrating the early religion of our race.

There are four Vedas, the Rig-Veda, the Yajur-Veda, the Sama-Veda, and the Atharva-Veda. Of these, the first-named, the Rig-Veda, is by far the most important. The other three are dependent upon it, and consist largely of extracts from it, together with sacrificial rules, charms, and incantations.

When in India I had made sufficient progress in the study of Sanskrit to be able to consult the Rig-Veda, the language of

which differs considerably from what is called classical Sanskrit, the language in which the Mahabharata, the laws of Manu, and the Puranas are written. The Rig-Veda contains one thousand and twenty-eight hymns, each on an average consisting of ten verses. About five or six hundred years before Christ, Hindu scholars took the trouble of counting every verse, word, and syllable of this vast collection of hymns. There is in the Rig-Veda no hymn or prayer addressed to an idol, or to stock or stone; but there are hymns addressed to rivers, mountains, living trees, soma juice, heaven, earth, the sun, fire, the dawn, thunder, the winds, the rain, and the gods of several of the elements. The prevalent worship of the Veda is nature-worship or physiolatry. But this nature-worship is seen intermingled with polytheism, monotheism, and pantheism. The elementary forces of nature are regarded as endowed with reason and power, and are invoked as kings, fathers, protectors, benefactors. Wind, rain, fire, sun, are at times personified, and even vaguely conceived in a comprehensive way as one god. The god to whom more hymns are addressed in the Veda than to any other is Agni, Fire. Agni is the Latin *ignis*. I cannot stay to describe all the properties and works for which he is celebrated. Indra, the god of the region of the clouds, is perhaps next to Agni most frequently invoked in the Veda. Savitra, or Surya, the Sun, is next to Agni and Indra the most conspicuous god of the Veda. The fire-god, the rain-god, and the sun-god are the special objects of worship mentioned in it.

The Vedic hymns are self-contradictory. Sometimes the gods are addressed as the great and the small, the young and the old. Indra, in particular, is described as greater than all. Yet again we read: "Among you, ye gods, is none little, none young; ye are all great." Nay, more, Agni, the god of fire, is said to be Indra and Vishnu, Savitri, Pushan, Rudra, and Aditi. This means that the god of fire is also the rain-giver, the sun-god, under his various aspects, the thunderer and the infinite, the mother of all the gods.

In the worship of the Vedic gods sacrifice was employed. The sacrifice of a horse was regarded as the most important of all. Oxen, sheep, and goats were also offered. Mention is made even

of the sacrifice of a man. The most common oblation was butter, accompanied by the juice of the soma plant. The gods were supposed to be actually nourished by the offerings presented to them. But Sir Monier Williams has shown that even in Vedic times sacrifices were offered to expiate guilt, though he affirms that the earliest form of Vedic sacrifice was not piacular. The most extraordinary of all the offerings of the old Aryan worshipper was that of the juice of the soma plant, or *Asclepias acida*. It was, says Dr. Windischmann, who has written a special treatise on the soma worship of the Aryans, "unquestionably the greatest and holiest offering of the ancient Indian worship." The whole of the ninth book of the Rig-Veda, containing one hundred and fourteen hymns, is addressed to Soma. This soma was an intoxicating beverage. And yet it is worshipped as a god! Yea, Soma is called the king of the world, the king of heaven and earth, the conquerer of all. He can impart the gift of immortality, and place his worshipper in the third heaven, where life is free, where the worlds are radiant, where there is happiness and delight. When in India, I inquired where this wonderful soma juice could now be procured, but I could obtain no information regarding it. Dr. Hang succeeded in bribing a learned Brahman, in Poona, to perform in his presence the soma offering, and was even permitted to partake of the holy beverage, which gives not only health and wisdom, but immortality. Dr. Hang tells us what he found it to be: "The sap of the plant, now used at Poona, appears whitish, has a very stringent taste, bitter, but not sour; it is a very nasty drink, and has some intoxicating effect. I tasted it several times, but it was impossible for me to drink more than some teaspoonfuls." This soma, which Dr. Hang, a good German, accustomed to drink wine and beer, found so nauseous, was actually adored as a god and king of heaven and earth by Hindus in Vedic times! How shall we account for the deification of this inebriating drink? Professor Whitney finds the explanation just in the intoxicating properties which it possessed. "The simple-minded Aryan people, whose whole religion was a worship of the wonderful powers and phenomena of nature, had no sooner perceived that this liquid had power to elevate the spirits and pro-

duce a temporary frenzy, under the influence of which the individual was prompted to, and capable of, deeds beyond his natural powers, than they found in it something divine; it was to their apprehension a god, endowing those into whom it entered with god-like powers."

It is an interesting fact, as establishing the close relation between ancient Parsiism and Vedism, that the veneration of Soma is a marked characteristic of the worship of the Zend Avesta. Under the cognate name of Homa, Zoroaster prays to Soma personified. Repeatedly is he praised as the one "that drives death afar." Among other blessings which the "well-minded Homa" bestows, we are told that he "grants to those tall maidens who sit at home unmarried, good husbands, and that as soon as asked." (*Zend Avesta*, Yasna IX.)

But while the Veda abounds in the most foolish representations, and while its most distinguishing feature is the worship of nature, some of the old Vedic hymns are decidedly monotheistic in tone. They utter language which we could apply to the God whom we Christians adore. There are passages in the Veda which embody the idea of a supreme God above nature, which contrast strangely with its predominant nature-worship, and which may be fairly appealed to as relics of a not quite forgotten primitive monotheism. The hymns addressed to Varuna, the god of the firmament, present him as a holy being, the punisher of sin, and who can mercifully forgive sin. To us it is difficult to conceive how, when men had the idea of a supreme being, and had that idea embodied in a definite name, such as Varuna, they should yet address other gods, as Indra and Agni, in terms of equal praise, and make of each of them, also, the supreme being. But so it is. While the one is invoked, the other is forgotten. This is the manifest fact. The authors of the Vedic hymns had ideas, more or less correct, of a god who had power over them. They had the predicate god, and could, and did, make abusive applications of it. When we thus find in the earliest records of Hindu religious thought, amid the rubbish of nature-worship, the conception of a supreme being, the maker and lord of all, the conclusion that this idea should be looked on as the survival of a primordial revelation is the most reasonable that can be drawn. The Book of Genesis goes on the

supposition that a pure monotheism was the primitive religion, obtained in the way of immediate divine revelation; and the Apostle Paul distinctly teaches that men knew God in the beginning, but fell from this knowledge. A study of the religious ideas of the Veda and of the course of religious development in India confirms this doctrine in a striking manner.

We have now to glance at the early literature and worship of the Iranian or Persian branch of the Aryan family. Its ancient literature that has been preserved to our time is very scanty as compared with the Indian. Its oldest sacred book is called the *Zend Avesta*, or *Avesta Zend*. That word "Zend" is commonly taken to denote the language in which the Avesta is written. It really means the commentary on the Avesta, or sacred text. The Avesta is a collection of fragments, the relics of a much more extensive sacred literature. It contains laws and mythical stories, and prayers and hymns. Its interpretation is exceedingly difficult. By comparing the versions of it made by different scholars, and by the same scholars at different times, we can see the great uncertainty which attaches to the meaning of a large part of the Avesta. Its interpretation is incomparably more difficult than that of the Veda.

There are two leading ideas that lie at the foundation of the religion of both the Hindus and the Iranians. The one is the regular order of nature, its subjection to law. The other idea is that of a conflict and struggle in nature. Destructive as well as beneficent natural forces are apparent to the superficial observer. It was the influence of this latter impression that led to the dualism of the ancient Persians. Again, the consideration of the beneficent order of nature would incline the observer to monotheism. In the *Sacred Books of the East*, edited by Sir F. Max Mueller, we have translations, more or less reliable, of the several parts of the Avesta. These translations you should yourselves consult, if you wish to know the teaching of the Avesta. I venture to say that the impression which you would thus receive of the religion taught in the Avesta would be far more unfavorable than current representations of its character would lead you to expect. The Avesta contains a revelation professedly made by Ahura Mazda or Hormazd to Zarathushtra

or Zoroaster. When Zoroaster lived is a question which is still unsettled. Darmesteter, whose merit as an interpreter of Zend literature is unsurpassed, will not admit that Zoroaster can be regarded as a historical person, and treats him as a purely mythical being. This is probably carrying skepticism too far. But we may be certain that the Avesta belongs to a much later period than the Rig-Veda. Mueller describes the religion of the Avesta as "a curious mixture of monotheism, polytheism, and dualism." A pure monotheism I have not been able to discover in it; but an approach to monotheism it may be allowed to contain. Ahura Mazda, the beneficent deity, is not the creator of all things. Angro Mainyu, or Ahriman, the evil principle, was also, in the beginning, dwelling in uncreated darkness, as Ahura Mazda dwelt in uncreated light, and for every good thing that Ahura Mazda brought into existence, his rival caused a corresponding evil thing to come into being. While the one produced life and health, the other counterworked him by producing disease and death. In the very earliest part of the Avesta we find the doctrine of dualism clearly enunciated. Take the thirtieth Yasna, which belongs to the Gathas, allowed to be the most ancient and purest portion of the Avesta. In it there is solemnly proclaimed the doctrine of two original spirits, a better and a worse, each independent in his action, each finishing his part in creation, and having his separate realm. Between them and their respective followers there is incessant strife. At last the good spirit will triumph. Do not think that the worshippers of Ahura Mazda confine their adoration to him. Sun, moon, and stars, the wind, plants, the waters, the souls of departed men and animals, all good men and women still living, in short, the whole of the good creation, have prayers addressed to them. Fire, which is called Ahura Mazda's son, is especially worshipped. Hence, the disciples of Zoroaster are called fire-worshippers. Modern Parsis are offended by this designation. But they cannot deny that the worship of fire is sanctioned by the Avesta; and it is notorious that to this day the Parsis pay to fire a superstitious reverence. It is owing to this fact that they are the only oriental people who abstain from smoking. Little difference is made in Zoroastrianism between physical and moral evil.

While purity is declared to be the chief thing in religion, this purity relates principally to a physical state of body. Fire, water, and earth are holy, and they must not be polluted by a dead body. Hence, dead bodies must not be burned, or buried, or thrown into rivers. They are exposed to be devoured by birds of prey. To bury or burn a corpse is to commit an unpardonable sin. Wonderful purificatory virtue is attributed to the urine of an ox. Even in the Avesta, its use for rubbing on the body and for drinking is enjoined. Zoroastrianism does not violate the second commandment of the decalogue as it does the first. It forbids the worship of idols as a deadly sin. In the earliest portion of the Avesta it is impossible to perceive any clear teaching of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. The progress of investigation is altogether unfavorable to the notion that the Jews first learned this doctrine from the Persians. Zend scholars, who have no sympathy with Christianity, are agreed that a bungling translation led neological commentators of a past generation to charge plagiarism from Zoroaster of the doctrine of the resurrection on some of the writers of the Old Testament. Since, however, Hormazd is the maker of the body, and Ahriman the cause of death, the final and complete victory of the former over the latter carries with it the restoration of the body. But we must not prolong our paper. In conclusion, I can say that I heartily rejoice that we can now study comparative religion more thoroughly than in any previous age. We can now with a new emphasis repeat the boast of Moses, as we compare the gods of the Gentiles with the God of Israel: "Their rock is not as our Rock." The sacred books of India and Iran reveal to us a purer worship prevailing there in the earliest times than was afterwards evolved in the course of ages. The history of religion in these lands is utterly opposed to the theory of the gradual development of religion from fetichism to monotheism. On the contrary, as Sir Monier Williams puts it, "These non-Christian bibles are all developments in the wrong direction. They all begin with some flashes of true light, and end in utter darkness." It is, I would add, the Christian Bible that has given monotheism a permanent and commanding place and influence in the world.

V. THE PRESBYTERIES' PRACTICAL TREATMENT OF THE STANDARD OF MINISTERIAL EDUCATION.

At his ordination, every minister solemnly affirms that he approves "of the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States."¹ Every ruling elder makes a similar solemn asseveration on occasion of his ordination.² Every elder, of each class, promises, in the same formal and solemn manner, to be diligent and faithful in the exercise of all the duties of his office.³

The *Form of Government*, thus approved, and whose requirements upon him the elder has pledged himself diligently and faithfully to observe, lays down with great clearness the conditions precedent to admission to the ministerial office. Ordinarily, the candidate is to have had so much preliminary training of a given sort prior to his theological training; then so much theological discipline, also, of a given sort. (See paragraphs 129-135, and 116-121, of the *Book of Church Order*.) There is, also, provision made for ordination occasionally upon other conditions. The book says: "No candidate, except in extraordinary cases, shall be licensed unless he shall have completed the usual course of academical studies, and shall also have studied divinity at least two years under some approved teacher of theology; and whenever any presbytery shall see reason to depart from this rule, it shall always make a record of the fact upon its minutes, with the reasons therefor."⁴

It is due to some of our presbyteries to say that they do not perjure themselves. They are careful to secure the conditions in the candidate required in the constitution as precedent to admission to the ministerial office. Their conduct shows that they are not guilty of falsehood when they gravely approve the govern-

¹ *Book of Church Order*, p. 119.

² *Ibid.*, p. 112.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 112, 119.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 134.

ment and discipline of the church. It makes good these presbyters' promise in the ordination vows to be faithful in the discharge of the duties of their office; at least thus far.

But on the other hand, it is a well-known fact that many of our presbyteries are very remiss in this matter. They do not demand in the ministerial candidate what the constitution requires at all. They make the clause of the constitution referring to "extraordinary cases" cover a multitude of cases for which it was never intended; and they treat a great many cases as *ordinary cases* whose conditions put them clear out of the pale referred to by the phrase "ordinary cases" in the standards.

Let us describe some of the extraordinary cases of these presbyteries.

Brother A has never had a good elementary English education. Most of his life has been spent as an employee on railroad trains. While dull in acquisition, he likes to talk and is rather good looking. He is conceited. He does not like to take the position of a pupil. But he has been heard in the Y. M. C. A., in the Sunday school and in prayer-meetings. He is twenty-five years old. His presbytery picks him up and puts him into the seminary for what he can get of the English part of the course during parts of two sessions. It licenses him as an "extraordinary case," and at length ordains him. Now, there is nothing extraordinary about this man. He has not the consecration to duty which most of the ordinary cases of his class in the seminary have. This is evinced by his careless attention to the preparation for class exercises, by frequent absences from the seminary, and by less concern generally for the interests of the kingdom of God. His Christian character is in no respect extraordinarily high. He is inferior distinctly, from this point of view, to many "ordinary cases" in his class. He has, also, less of talent as a thinker, writer, or speaker, and less of industry. In short, he is a very ordinary man and Christian as compared with many of his fellows who must enter the ministry as ordinary cases. And there is no provision for the ordination of such a man, or licensure either, to be found between the lids of our *Book of Church Order*. The presbytery that gives license or ordination in such cases is guilty of breaking the ordi-

nation vows of its own members. It is guilty of covenant breaking with other presbyteries.

Brother B is another extraordinary case in the same class. He is thirty-six years old; has a very imperfect elementary education, can hardly write a legible hand, spells miserably, reads learned works only in a very slow and painful way, having to make frequent use of a dictionary, as he has no acquaintance with polite literature. He has spent his years chiefly among logging camps of West Virginia. He has a wife and children. He is an earnest Christian man. His presbytery sends him to the seminary for a part of two sessions. Soon he is licensed and ordained as an "extraordinary case."

This brother displayed no sense of the importance of acquired knowledge. He lost much time from the institution. He was, perhaps, the most indifferent man in his class to the obligation which he had subscribed when matriculated, which bound him to a faithful performance of his duties as a seminary student. He seemed very full of enthusiasm to be about his work; but he did not have the knowledge which the book requires of the "extraordinary case" as well as the ordinary. And it was a violation of the constitution as well as an infraction of the ordination promises on the part of the presbyters.

Brother C is another extraordinary case. At twenty-five years of age he had tried a great number of occupations. He had been a farmer, a clerk, a transmitter of messages, a retail merchant. His success had not been marked in any of these occupations. He, perhaps, felt, as another "extraordinary case" we have known, that he never would succeed in any other calling than the ministry. He learned that it was possible for him to be educated for the ministry without pecuniary cost to himself. He was taken under care of a presbytery; availed himself of the stipendiary system of ministerial education. He went to college for certain sessions, or rather *parts of sessions*; for he had the extraordinary bent of "*extraordinary cases*" for parts of sessions. Meanwhile he had met a handsome woman. To this "extraordinary" fellow she appeared the most charming woman in the world. They married. They came to the seminary. He got, during the next

pieces of sessions, a rather meagre share of theological knowledge even for an "extraordinary case." For the incidents of matrimony that once excused a man from battle for a year took a good deal of this "extraordinary" fellow's time. His presbytery in due time licensed and ordained him. It had no right to do it. It trampled upon promises in doing it. It trampled the constitution in the dust to do it.¹

From our own personal experience we could multiply many times the instances of the unworthy stretching of the provision in our standards for licensing and ordaining "extraordinary cases." And our experience seems to be in no wise peculiar. In *The Christian Observer*, May, 1891, Dr. Dabney, having asked how we see this provision for extraordinary cases applied said:

"To such cases as these: To some zealous middle-aged man who has no culture, and never will have any in either direction, neither in classical English literature, nor in the ancient classics, nor in the languages of inspiration, nor in sciences, medicine, nor law. Here is a younger man who is said to be a good fellow, but without income, who thinks he cannot get his own consent to go through the long course of studies required by our book, so he claims to be made an 'extraordinary case,' when the only thing 'extraordinary' about him is, that he lacks the pluck and conscientious industry which alone give assurance of permanent usefulness in the ministry, for a person deprived of early education. Here is another young man who, without any thorough culture, has some natural gift of fluent, plausible speech, in whose favor some congregation sends up to presbytery the assurance that he preaches abundantly well enough for them. The soft-hearted presbytery makes him an 'extraordinary case,' when they ought to have foreseen that the most certain and ordinary result would be that this fluency, unchastened by thorough mental discipline, is going to be his snare and his ruin. And here is another uneducated man, a very good fellow, who has a sweetheart, and who thinks he must marry at once, and that he never could stand the postponement required by a thorough course of study. So some kind presbytery makes him an 'extraordinary case,' with the most

¹ The cases given have been disguised ; but they are historical instances.

regular and ordinary result of forever spoiling the career of him and a very amiable young woman.”¹

There is no essential unfairness in this picture. The provision for “extraordinary cases,” wisely made, in the constitution of the church, is grossly misapplied. The provision was intended to meet only the cases of those who had, previous to the ordinary discipline, the necessary qualifications for ruling and formal teaching in the church of God. If Brother H has, in addition to an excellent Christian character, experience, wisdom, prudence, and the aptness to teach and rule which Paul required of Timothy, and such culture and intelligence as may be acquired in the profession of law, medicine, or in a professor’s chair, it is not necessary to put him through a long course of training. The constitution provides for his case under the title of the “extraordinary case.” The standard of the ministry is not lowered by his reception into its ranks. He has been prepared. His preparation, however, has not been made in the ordinary way.

But not alone by the misapplication of the provision for “extraordinary cases” do our presbyteries become guilty of duplicity. Their examinations of ordinary cases are so perfunctory that many men of most imperfect preparation get through. Indeed, the application of the term “extraordinary case” to a rather ordinary set of entrants into the ministry has made the term so distasteful that not a few men take roundabout ways of avoiding the application of the phrase to themselves. But these ways do not result often in more knowledge.

The requirements of our Book cannot be met by a residence of so many years at a college, and so many more at a theological seminary. Some college diplomas are worth nothing as signs of scholarship. Some institutions are great only in pretence. They are not competent to the work of good preparatory schools. They are unable to give the student the secular preparation required in our Book. On the other hand, many of our better colleges have suffered a “fatty degeneration” of their curricula. Once they did teach some things well, and the things which our Book expects in the student prior to his beginning his theological studies.

¹ *Discussions*, by R. L. Dabney, Volume III., p. 553.

Now they try to teach many things. They turn out men without any training in mental and moral philosophy, with imperfect linguistic training, and with only a most superficial knowledge of the natural sciences to compensate for the defects. Their diplomas ought, therefore, not to be taken as a sufficient sign of the requisite scholarship.

Some seminary diplomas, too, are of no account. How can they be? They are given to all students who are characterized by outward good behavior. The discipline of these institutions is so imperfect that thoroughgoing work cannot be exacted.

The church should not relax its examinations because a man has been in attendance on schools for the required time, therefore. Yet, laxity of examinations is so great, that at times an empty-headed fellow can pass creditably. Again, when the questions are more testing, and when they show that the candidate has no scholarship, secular or biblical; when they show that the candidate is either lazy or unspeakably dull, and hence not fit to be a minister, the presbyteries often, nevertheless, license him. The elder who opposes his license commonly finds himself in a small minority, and that he is regarded as himself carnal and "orthodox" in a bad sense. Kind-hearted brethren, forgetting their promises and vows, and their covenant with the church at large, trample upon constitutional requirements. They point to instances of men who have been poorly prepared, and yet turned out to be useful men. They point to the lazy or stupid candidate as a possible Daniel Baker, oblivious of the fact that "Daniel Baker, with his great powers," might have done vastly more with proper preparation. They point to Dwight L. Moody, as if Mr. Moody was not a man of extraordinary natural endowments, as well as of pains-taking preparation, albeit the preparation has not been of the ordinary sort.¹

Our church does not maintain that standard of ministerial education which it is popularly supposed to do. Her constitutional requirements are high, but she lives in daily disregard of that constitution.

It is popularly supposed that most Presbyterian preachers are

¹ See *Central Presbyterian*, July 1, 1896, p. 2.

graduates of reputable colleges. This is a mistake. We have been at some pains to look into the matter. The true state of the case may be illustrated fairly by setting forth the truth about the alumni of Union Theological Seminary in Virginia. It is highly probable that that institution has had among its students its full share of college graduates. Its educational environment—location in a commonwealth which has long given much encouragement to higher education—makes for that view. And its customarily able faculty, throughout most of its past, would attract the higher class of students to its walls. The ratio of college graduates to non-graduates among its past students is probably higher, therefore, than any of the older seminaries. Further, the age of this institution, and the number of its alumni, give a special value to any generalization that may be made concerning its alumni, in application to the whole church.

We have made our study of these alumni by decades, with the following results: During the first eleven years, 1823–1834, there were one hundred and seventeen students, and fifty-eight of them were not college graduates; during the next decade, 1834–1844, there were ninety-four students, and twenty-six were not college graduates; during the next, 1844–1854, there were sixty-three students, and eighteen were not college graduates; during the next, 1854–1864, there were ninety-seven students, and thirty-three were not degree men; during the next, 1864–1874, there were one hundred and fifty-five students, and sixty not degree men; during the next, 1874–1884, there were two hundred and eighteen students, and seventy were not degree men; during the next, 1884–1894, there were about two hundred and sixty-six students, and about one hundred and two men who were not graduates; out of one thousand and ten students, three hundred and sixty-seven were not degree men, therefore.

These figures show further, that in every decade at least one-fourth of the students have not been degree men; that sometimes nearly one-half of them have not been such; that considerably more than one-third of all our alumni have not had college degrees; and that between 1834 and 1864 there seem to have been relatively fewer non-graduates among the seminary students.

Moreover, a study of the alumni shows that among the graduates of colleges and universities attending the institution there were in these same years, 1834-1834, a larger proportion of men of high training. Bearers of the A. M. degree of the university are found mostly in those decades.¹

It is not a matter of wonder that there was so large a proportion of non-graduates during the first decade. In the first years of the life of an institution there is always a strong desire to swell the numbers of the students; and a heterogeneous body is apt to be gathered for various reasons. Nor is it a matter of surprise that during the last three decades the number of non-graduates has been large. During 1864-1874 many men came to the seminary whose college courses had been interrupted and greatly shortened by the war. During 1884-1894 there has been a sturdy stress brought to bear on the church to bring, whether prepared or not, more men into the ministry. The growth of the church has called for an increasing number of ministers. Under stress the church has taken Dick, Tom, and Harry.

True, it must be said that many of the non-graduates were men of very considerable training, some of them of more training than some of the graduates. Yet, in a general way, the above facts show that the training of our ministerial candidates is very inferior to what is commonly supposed.

The constitution of our church does not, indeed, require graduation. It recommends it. It does require, however, an amount of discipline which many graduates do not have. It requires an amount of learning about equal to the popular belief on the subject. There is something wrong in the church that makes a claim so far above the fact.

The consequences of the church's duplicity in respect to ministerial education have been bad. They could not be otherwise. Duplicity is not blessed of God. But aside from a lowered sense of rectitude inevitable on such a course, other bad consequences

¹ This study of the alumni has been made from the General Catalogue of Union Theological Seminary to 1884 in the main, and from the annual catalogues in the main thereafter.

have followed, and may be pointed out. 1. It has made the ministry less attractive to the more brilliant and able of our Christian youth. We shall never forget how our own regard and reverence for the Presbyterian ministry was shaken when we came to Hampden-Sidney as a college boy, and remarked the lazy and inefficient college work which some candidates for the ministry were doing. When we noted the lack of moral earnestness on the part of some candidates, and discovered that they, though doing no thorough work and getting no real preparation for their great calling while in college, were yet received into the seminary, and upon respectable compliance with the rules of that institution were furnished with its then certificate at the end of three sessions and soon formally licensed and ordained, we could not but have diminished respect for the whole church of our inheritance and our choice. We learned by conversation that our experience was no uncommon one. And we have heard professing Christian young men express distaste for a calling in which such conduct and life were tolerated. Such a state of things does not, of course, justify any youth of parts and earnest moral make-up in rejecting a call to the gospel ministry. The call is upon him the more urgent rather. Nevertheless, it is natural that such an one should be the less attracted than if every man in the ranks were a *man* and a *fit one* for the place. 2. It has made the ministry less efficient. In the study of our *alumni* it became evident that the men of the required training were far more generally efficient and able. There are "extraordinary cases" who have done noble work. We would wrong no one. We do not wish to tarry on this point. It is not pleasant to handle. But it is clear that the general average of efficiency is not heightened by the loose way in which our presbyteries ordain men. Besides, it must not be forgotten that, as was shown in the preceding point, in making the ministry unattractive to the more earnest, aspiring and noble of our young men, the church has kept out of her ministry men who would have raised the general average of ministerial efficiency.

When the church can draw to her ministry all the leading minds of the age, one single age may produce a Jerome, a Chry-

sostom, and an Augustine. The church may then command the highest linguistic and historical scholarship, the superbest genius of oratory, and the profoundest philosophy and theology; and, as well, the safest guides and winners of souls. The spread of Christianity is dependent under God on the presence of a pious, able and learned ministry. The spread of Christianity, we say—not the spread of some organization or other more or less Christian—is dependent on such a ministry. This is the teaching of history. The great evangelists, as well as the great exegetes, translators, and theologians, since the day of the Apostle Paul, have commonly been pious, able, and *learned*.

The church that would do the most possible for the spread of Christianity must take care to secure a ministry of this stamp.

If the foregoing positions are, in the main, just, the course which our church should take in getting rid of its duplicity in connection with the ministerial standard of education becomes evident. The constitutional requirements should not be lowered; but the practice of the church should be made to conform to these requirements.

This we believe to be evident from the foregoing remarks, without further argument. But the following considerations reinforce the position:

1. Other denominations are steadily raising their standard. This is true of almost all denominations. The Missionary Baptists have now a considerable percentage of finely-educated ministers. The same is true of the followers of Alexander Campbell. The Methodist Church has undergone a very marked change during the last thirty years in this respect. The Cumberland Presbyterians appear to have a growing conviction that they, too, must have a learned ministry. But why specify further? It is a fact that everybody knows, that other denominations generally are raising their standards of ministerial education. The Presbyterian Church once stood along with the Congregationalists as pre-eminent in our country for the education of the ministry. But they have lost their preëminence of the olden time. In many quarters they are absolutely inferior in their educational efforts to their Methodist brethren.

This will give the Methodists relatively greater power with the people. They are thus preparing for a more genuine and powerful propagandism. They will soon be able to give Methodism a more vital and thorough-going hold. They will reach a class of people such as Presbyterianism and Calvinism in the past have been wont chiefly to attract.

Now, if our system of Christianity is more nearly biblical, as we believe it to be; if it gives more glory to God and makes man a nobler instrument of his praise, we ought not to yield our old-time preëminence. We ought to hold to it and more.

2. The polemic demands on the ministry of our age call for a ministry as highly educated as our Constitution prescribes.

Some will say, let us have some fine scholars of course, but let us also have men who are not capable of defending Christianity from the assaults of its peculiar enemies of our age engaged in preaching the gospel to plain people. To this proposition there are the following objections, however. If you wish a pyramid to pierce the clouds with its apex, you must use a vast deal of material in the building. You rarely find a great painter except in countries where many persons are trying to be great painters. You do not, as a rule, find great orators in a country where oratory is not widely and assiduously cultivated. Nor will you find these great defenders of the faith except where the general level of ministerial education is high. This is the witness of history.

Again, why use poorly-prepared and illy-adapted men when others may be had? In the ministry, as in missions, the church ought to "attempt great things for God," and "expect great things of God." Let the church ask for an able ministry and use all proper measures to get such an one. Let it remember, too, that God can save by few as well as by many. In the days of Gideon, Jehovah chose once to save Israel by three hundred, rather than by thirty thousand. The church of God has not holy daring enough. It is not ready enough to take God at his word and do his work in his way. It is better to commit the formal teaching of the word of God to a few "*faithful men, who shall be able to teach others,*"¹ than to commit it to greater

¹ 2 Timothy ii. 2.

numbers of the inefficient. But this by the way; we do not believe that the ranks of the ministry would be thinned. Let the church call good men. God will answer.

And what a boon to any church now is a really able, pious, and learned ministry! Rationalistic skepticism is rampant. Only such a ministry can meet it. How valuable to a congregation now to know that its pastor is not only pious and well-meaning, but able to teach the truth. And, say what you will about character, no man can be respected as a *teacher* and *preacher* who is not believed by his people *to know what the truth is*. They know that many a Mohammedan dervish is sincere and honest in his intention. They need, and know it, a man who is competent to say, "I know what the historic truth is, and I know that Christianity is the true religion." The truth taught by William Henry Green to his students in recent years has been of incalculable benefit to them and their congregations.

3. For aggressive work of all kinds we need a standard of ministerial education as high as our standards require.

There is ever new need for aggressive teaching. In the past, Presbyterians have, in virtue of their pious, able, and learned ministry, been the teachers of Christendom. They have fought the controversies for truth. They are sometimes scorned for their controversies, but the scorn is from the ignorant. Their controversies have led to much of truth in the common creed of Christendom. If they continue the teachers of Christendom in the future, as in the past, they must not lower the standard of ministerial education. They must raise it.

Presbyterians have the largest following in all Christendom. They have been missionary therefore. Education has not stood in the way of its spread, but helped it.

Paul's education did not make him a less but a greater evangelist and missionary. So of Augustine, of Thomas Aquinas, of Bernard of Clairvaux, of Luther and Calvin, of John Knox and Rutherford, of Wesley and Whitefield, of Edwards, of Palmer, and of Moody.

Let us have a ministry which shall not be despised, which shall not be inefficient, which shall be able to defend the faith, which

shall teach Christendom, which can wield the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, to gather in and to build up the elect, which shall, in the future as it has in the past, march in the forefront of the hosts of the Lord.

Lord, give thy church a pious, able, and learned ministry.
Amen.

THOMAS C. JOHNSON.

Hampden-Sidney.

VI. THE AIMS AND CONDITIONS OF SEMINARY LIFE.

WISDOM is said to consist in the accomplishment of worthy ends by the use of appropriate means. He is not wise who wastes his energies on ignoble aims, no matter how skilfully he pursues them. Nor, on the other hand, is he to be regarded a wise man who seeks to achieve great ends by the use of unworthy means. There is no disposition on the present occasion to question the wisdom of our fathers in adopting the theological seminary as the means of training a ministry for the church. The purpose is noble and the means appropriate. Our purpose is rather to inquire what are the ends to be kept in view during the process of preparatory training, which, when accomplished, give to the church "able ministers of the New Testament, not of the letter, but of the spirit," and what are the conditions under which the means employed will secure these ends?

What, then, are the more important ends to be kept in view in seminary life? We answer without hesitation that the first is growth in grace. It is universally held now that education consists in developing the man, physically, intellectually and morally. The proposition is based upon the assumption that man is an end unto himself. His true glory is to be what his Creator intended him to be. To regard and treat him merely as an instrument to be employed with reference to some other end is to degrade him. Theological seminaries differ in this respect from secular institutions only in that they aim to develop the new man in Christ Jesus. Professors and students are supposed to be Christian men. And the purpose of the association under these relations is first of all to develop that knowledge, righteousness and true holiness which constitute the new man. It is emphatically true here that man's glory is to be what his Maker intended him to be. It is true man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever; but this end is attained in both its features when man becomes perfect in holiness.

It has long been debated what studies are best adapted to the

purpose of secular education, some contending for literature, ancient and modern; others for the exact sciences, and others, again, for metaphysical inquiries. Happily there can be but one opinion as to the means of developing the renewed man. The direction given in the word of God is, "As new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby." Jesus prayed for his disciples, "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth." Two forms of expressions are used in the Scriptures to indicate the suitableness of the word of God for this purpose. The figure of the sower and the seed pervades both Testaments. Our Saviour says, "The seed is the word of God." Milton says of all the utterances of men, "books are not absolutely dead things, but do contain a progeny of life in them to be as active as that soul was whose progeny they are; nay, they do preserve as in a phial the purest efficacy and extraction of that living intellect that bred them." Our Lord said, "So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground, and should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how." Again, we read in the Scriptures of "that form of doctrine" and "the form of sound words." The written word is the type which leaves the impress upon the new heart. From the seed, when quickened by the Holy Spirit, comes the plant of righteousness. The word of God, constituted of law and gospel, moulds the soul under the power of the Holy Ghost to the divine likeness.

This aspect of seminary life contemplates the professors as pastors of the flock. They are to feed the flock of God which is among them, taking the oversight thereof. And it assumes that piety on the part of the students is the most important of their qualifications for entering upon the work of the ministry. In the second place, seminary life has its professional aspect. Young men in such institutions are to be regarded as candidates for the ministry. They are to be trained to preach the word, and to maintain the order of God's house. Professors are instructors, and the drill has reference to the skilful handling of the Scriptures.

Concerning this feature of our subject, we feel constrained to make three practical observations: First, It is serious business

in which seminaries are engaged. Sometimes we are shocked because a careless or incompetent druggist has caused the death of some sufferer. Again, we are pained by seeing the rightful inheritance of orphan children lost to them for the want of learned and skilful counsel. Where great temporal interests are at stake the importance of professional, as well as general, education is generally recognized. Is it not marvellous that lack of preparation on the part of ministers of the gospel could ever have been tolerated by any people? The case does not admit of argument. To say that our seminaries are training instruments that are to affect the eternal destinies of men is enough. In the next place we remark that seminaries have on hand a vast undertaking. The professor, as he runs over in thought the topics embraced in his single department, heaves a sigh of almost despair. What can be done on such a territory in the period of three years! The student, as he hears some accomplished pulpit orator pour forth in eloquent words, and with ease and accuracy, his accumulated treasures, well-nigh concludes that the achievement is beyond his reach. But let us not forget that there is time enough given to seminary life in which to lay a good foundation. Honest effort ought to send out men, at the end of three years, who have settled and intelligent convictions as to the truth of Christianity; as to the integrity of the word of God and the laws of its interpretation; as to the nature of the church; and as to the plan of salvation. We never had much patience with preachers who changed their church relations after they had entered upon the work of life. There are genuine cases of change of opinion under some circumstances, and with such we sympathize; but in the Presbyterian Church there ought to be no reason or excuse for such occurrences. We have time enough allotted to preparation for laying a good foundation on which to build without fear in after life. The third observation we have to make is, that this foundation cannot be laid in three years, nor in twenty years, without patient labor. There is a temptation to think that this is not the case in some of the departments of instruction. Presbyterians are supposed to grow up in intelligent families and under able preachers. When to this is added the

preparatory education in school and college, our candidates have a right to feel when they enter the seminary that they know something about the Bible. But it is one thing to cherish a traditional faith and quite a different thing to be rooted and grounded in the truth. It is also possible to have an intelligent general apprehension of the truth without being able to teach others also.

Again, Seminary life is a period of meditation and prayer in view of the responsibilities of after life. The Apostle Paul tells us that, when it pleased the Lord to reveal in him his Son, that he might preach him among the heathen, "immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood; neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem." (Gal. i. 17.) He does not say to what part of Arabia he went. I am unsophisticated enough to think that he went to Horeb, where God met his ancient people. He does not say distinctly how long he remained there; but the intimation is that he continued there the greater part of three years. He does not say for what purpose he went there; but we can hardly go astray as to the purpose. He passed the time in that solitary place, so full of sacred memories, between the call to preach and the entrance upon the work. Any great undertaking should be preceded by a suitable period of calm reflection. How many questions have to be settled in the course of training for the ministry! Shall I labor at home, or abroad; as an evangelist, or as a pastor? Is my heart in the work? Have I laid aside every weight? Have I the scriptural qualifications?

What, now, are the conditions under which the foregoing ends may be secured by the use of the means employed in our seminary training? We think that they may be embraced under two heads, spiritual-mindedness and consecration. Let us consider them in the order stated.

It may be well to dwell for a moment upon the import of the phrase spiritual mindedness. Paul says, in Romans viii. 6: "To be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace." The original gives simply "the mind of the

flesh" and "the mind of the spirit." If we take the literal rendering, the question will arise, Does "spirit," in the last clause, refer to the spirit of the man, or to the Holy Spirit that dwells in him? We are forced to confine both phrases to what belongs to man, because the phrase "the mind of the flesh" requires this. In the margin of our English Bibles we have the rendering "the minding of the flesh" and "the minding of the spirit." This is instructive so far as it calls attention to the fact that the phrases denote active states of mind; and it is sustained by the context. The apostle is discussing the fruits of justification by faith. One is, that it secures holy living. The inward state of the believer is such that he delights in the law of the Lord. This he manifests outwardly by his daily walk. But our received translation goes further, and brings out the fact that the phrase "to be spiritually minded" is the result of a joint action of the intellect and the affections. We have in common use the phrase "worldly minded." We use it to express the state of soul devoted to worldly objects and pursuits because it finds its chief pleasure in them. In like manner, "spiritually minded" denotes a state of soul devoted to spiritual objects and pursuits because they are relished.

It is possible to handle spiritual things and yet be dead to their spiritual beauty. As Dr. McCosh has shown, the religious history of the race is to be explained by the sense of dependence and responsibility on the one hand, acting as an attracting principle, while, on the other hand, dislike to the holiness of God repels from fellowship with him. The Apostle Paul finds the origin of heathenism in the fact that men did not like to retain God in their knowledge. It is impossible for the world to become atheistic, because the invisible things of God are understood by the things that are made, and because conscience bears witness in every soul. But this may be so while there is no knowledge that leads men to glorify God as God, or to be thankful. And what may be true on this broad sphere may be true also in a sphere as elevated and contracted as a theological seminary. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. It does not help the carnal mind to put it in a school.

of sacred learning. To it every purpose of seminary life is impossible. It is inconsistent with growth in grace; it cannot be fashioned into the temper of a preacher, nor is it capable of either meditation or prayer, such as will favorably influence the life. In the case of such as are spiritually minded, however, seminary life is both useful and pleasant. The capacity to understand the subjects studied is united with a relish for them. It gives the requisite condition for the use of the means employed, and for the attainment of the ends contemplated.

Such is the vital importance of this matter that there should be careful self-examination at the outset of a seminary course. It may be well to suggest some tests by which we can determine whether or not we are spiritually minded. John Owen, in his work on *Spiritual Mindedness*, has gone into this question at large. We will present two of the tests he gives, one for the mind, the other for the affections. He gives spontaneity as the test in the case of our thoughts. A bad man may have thoughts about spiritual things that do not prove that he is spiritually minded, as Agrippa when he heard Paul preach. A good man also may have unworthy thoughts about spiritual things which do not prove that he is not spiritually minded, as David when he saw the prosperity of the wicked. The theological seminary may keep the mind filled with thoughts about holy things, and to all appearances the thoughts may be correct, and yet there may be no relish for them. The decisive question is, What are the subjects that come to us in our solitary moments? When the day's work is done, when recitations are over and books are laid aside, to what topics does the mind turn of its own motion? The test given by Owen for the affections is the supremacy of the love of God. Is there any sin we are unwilling to surrender? Is there any cross we are unwilling to take up? Do we love ease, reputation, family, anything more than we love God? Can we say with Paul, the love of Christ constraineth me?

The other condition now to be presented is consecration. John Foster wrote a book, which he named an *Essay on Decision of Character*. He might as well have called it a "Treatise of Success in Life," for he finds his elements of character by analyz-

ing the lives of successful men. He finds the elements of strong character to be confidence in one's own judgment, vigorous will, and courage. These qualities enable a man to form a decision, to undertake its execution energetically, and to surmount all the difficulties that lie in the way. Foster has looked at the subject from the human side. The Bible always presents the divine side. Believers are strong in the Lord and in the power of his might. It may be well to illustrate this. Let us take first the history of Samson. He is enumerated in Hebrews among the heroes of faith. He is by no means a pattern in all respects; but his life is as instructive in its failures as in its successes. There is no evidence that he was a giant, as some seem to think. The Philistines were at a loss to know wherein his great strength lay. The fact is, his strength consisted in his relation to God under the Nazaritic vow. The long hair was the sign of this vow. God gave him strength as he gave Solomon wisdom. As long as Samson was true to his calling and kept his vow, his strength was firm. He could rend a young lion, carry away the gates of Gaza, and slaughter the Philistines heaps upon heaps with the jawbone of an ass. But when his vow was broken he became as other men. His locks were shorn, for God had forsaken him. But when he repented his locks grew again, so that the dead which he slew at his death were more than they which he slew in his life. Samson was a vacillating character; and so his strength rose and fell with his consecration. The Apostle Paul is an example of steady devotion. If there is any evidence in his history of faltering we have failed to detect it. His ardor never seemed to cool. In all the years of his active ministry he carried the standard of the cross from victory to victory. And when called to wear his chain as the prisoner of the Lord, he illustrated his own strong statement, "in all these things we overcome." And yet his account of his case is, "when I am weak then am I strong"; and his boast was, "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me."

Now, let this discussion be closed with the remark that it has been conducted with a desire to promote the efficiency of our seminaries. The time our candidates have to spend in prepara-

tory training is precious. In view of the situation, it has been the aim of the writer to help them to make a wise use of their opportunities. We would not cast a shadow on the heart of any young servant of Christ by the statements we have made. A great calling demands a faithful preparation. This should be distinctly recognized. But with the full recognition of the fact there is no occasion for discouragement. Seminary life should be bright and happy. Why should it not be? If we relish the things that be of God, the seminary is full of them. The Master, who calls us to the feast, says: "Eat, O friends; drink, yea, drink abundantly, O beloved."

W. T. HALL.

Columbia, S. C.

VII. THE ELDER IN HIS ECCLESIASTICAL RELATIONS.

By the subject, "The Elder in His Ecclesiastical Relations," I understand the ruling elder's relation to the church, and that means the church in all its history. The very statement of the subject authorizes me to claim that the elder is so related to the church that he is not a layman, but is an ecclesiastic.

He is historically an ecclesiastic.

The church began in the patriarchal family, and when Jacob and his sons, driven by famine, accepted the invitation of the lost child and went into Egypt, the church was a patriarchal church, and it went into Egypt as a family. Two hundred years later it came out of that land of captivity and of servitude a nation of more than a million souls, but nevertheless the church as well as a nation.

We read that there were in those times, elders of Egypt, elders of Midian, elders of Moab, elders of Gilead, elders of Gilgal. All men that have yet been born require government for security and good order, and it was reasonable that the church of God, as it then existed, should, by divine direction, have taken for itself a form of government somewhat like that which it found in the peoples about them. So it was that the early Christian church patterned its form after the form of government of the empire in which it found itself placed, and it became a prelatic church. But when the church came out of Egypt, the elders of Israel, were not only those who sat in the gates to hear and decide disputes among the people, but they were veritable ecclesiastics, exercising ecclesiastical functions and duties, and these prerogatives they continued to exercise, in Canaan in the time of the judges, who were less real judges than were the elders, and in the time of the kings, until the church went into Babylonian captivity, and beside the rivers of Babylon, the ecclesiastical relation of the elders continued to be, and when the seventy years of exile had passed, the

elder came back with the church into Canaan to continue his functions. In post-exilic and pre-Christian times he had his place in the synagogue and in its service. Then came the missionary period, when the apostles carried the new gospel into other lands, destined to become the most fruitful soil in which to plant the new religion, and they took this officer, in name and churchly character as old as the Jewish nation itself, and placed him conspicuously in the front as the one officer mentioned in the Scripture by whom the church existed, and so he continued in the period of the early Christian church, as he had been in the Jewish, an ecclesiastic. I am not prepared to admit that in the dark period when the apostolic church became so generally prelatie, he wholly disappeared, but this thing I do aver, that when the Reformation swept Switzerland, as it swept Germany and also Britain, one of the first thoughts in the organization of a church in Geneva was of the elder. The Book of Order of the English Church in Geneva, being that from which John Knox took his pattern for the church of Scotland, had its bench of elders, and the idea then was, as it now is, that the church could exist without the minister, but never without the elder, and that is in law and in fact the Presbyterian idea. It has seemed strange to me that the fact has been so overlooked in what has been said and written of the coming of the Puritan settlement of New England, that it was the Presbyterian exodus. I have seen in many an unpublished church record in old New England towns, as well as in the local histories of those small colonies, the fact, most interesting to me, that those churches had their elders. It may be asked why then call them Presbyterians, since they had no presbyteries, but it must be remembered that every session of a church is a small presbytery, and as those little colonies into which the early New England settlers came, almost always were at odds with each other, we find each colony so jealous of its civil status, and so unwilling to acknowledge any civil authority outside its bounds, that it was not strange they recognized the words of the Lord, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," as not meaning simply the payment of tribute money, but as teaching patriotism, complete loyalty to civil authority. Congregationalism or the government

of the masses by the mass was the accident of those civil relations.

The elder is also by ordination and by vows an ecclesiastic.

Although often called a layman, he certainly in nothing resembles a layman, save that he lives, not by the gospel, but lives as a layman lives. The same vows are required of the elder as are required of the minister. The same spirit and character is the scriptural description of what each should be. Each is ordained by the presbytery. Keep in mind that the session is a small presbytery. In the elder's ordination all members of the presbytery, as the Scripture prescribes, take part, while in these later times, by several strange and illogical and unscriptural decisions of the higher church courts in this country, the minister is ordained by only a part of the presbytery instead of by the whole.

The elder is also by the nature of the office an ecclesiastic.

Temporal officers of almost every name and kind are elected and set apart for a term, and when the term has ended they cease to be such officers. Not so with this churchly officer, the elder. He is ordained and set apart like other church officers, for life. That innovations have sometimes been permitted, as to the exercising of the functions of the office and providing for what is called the rotary system or the term service, proves nothing. The church suffers this as God did another wretched practice, because of the hardness of the hearts of those who practice it. It is unscriptural and offends our sense of the rightness of the thing. How would it sound to you Presbyterians to hire your minister by the year as you do your clerks and your cooks, and as the rotary system sometimes does with your elders? Does it make you respect the office when some thus strip it of its character?

If the minister is an ecclesiastic, so, also, the elder.

There are those who draw a distinction between what is called the ruling elder and what is called the teaching elder. I understand that many claim that Princeton, for the last fifty years, has always held this distinction, though there are some graduates of Princeton, not within the recent past, who will not concede that even Princeton has always so taught, but we may offset against Princeton and its Hodge, Columbia and its Thornwell, who

always held, with many other scholars, that there was no such distinction, and that the ruling elder and teaching elder were both the same officer, each assigned to the performance of a different function in the church, each function belonging alike to both. I fail to find in my reading of the Scripture, or my digging in the original, any scriptural authority for any such distinction. It seems to me that the ruling elder and the teaching elder are one officer. We are accustomed to prepare by special education different men for the discharge of different functions, different branches of one profession, different specialties. Some men train the muscles and some the intellect. No one questions but that either man, all other things being equal, is competent to the work of the other, if he were trained or exercised for it. So it seems to me the only difference in this matter of the elder, is that the teaching elder is a specialist in his line, educated and exercised to it, and hence not a different man, a different officer, but by his training better qualified to exercise that function of teaching, and that fact is the fact recognized by the church.

The ruling elder is necessary to our church system.

Other churches than ours are Calvinistic in doctrine, so that not doctrine alone distinguishes our church from others, but among all the churches this one great distinguishing feature marks us, we must have the eldership, or we are not a church. He most surely is an ecclesiastic. His relation to the church is that of a spiritual officer, an ecclesiastic, not a layman. Without the ruling elder there cannot be a Presbyterian Church. As I have said before, that church may be without a minister, but cannot be a church without an elder. That he is called a ruling elder, and that he is a ruler within the church, does not militate against his ecclesiastical character. No organization can exist without cohesion, and to have cohesion, in the nature of things, there must be government, and what more natural than that the government of the Presbyterian Church should be committed to those spiritual officers, who distinguish it in fact from every other church on earth. That the elder is a ruler does not make him a lord over God's heritage. He is a ruler for the purpose for which the church was established.

God governs all he has created. We never think ourselves deprived of any of our liberty by reason of any of God's laws. Nothing conduces as much to actual liberty as the liberty, the power, to do the right. We are taught that a state of sin is a state of servitude, and not of liberty. The truth shall make you free. What greater liberty is there than in the obedience to the law which you love, and the liberty to do that which you love to do. We all love the Presbyterian Church. We all love, or ought to love, its laws. If we do, we shall find the rule of a Presbyterian elder designed to secure harmony in the church and holiness of life to the church members, and appointed and exercised to bring us into the liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free.

Some will ask if he be an ecclesiastic, how is it that he is not placed in the public service of the sanctuary? And I ask, why not? One rainy night in Glasgow I entered into the Old Barony church. The pastor, Marshall Lang, was in the accustomed place within the railing in one corner of the church. There was a reading desk in the centre aisle. The exercises were opened and conducted by the pastor to the Scripture lesson, when without invitation or notice, and as if according to the regular order of things in that place, an aged, white-haired elder arose from his place in the pew, proceeded to the reading desk, opened the holy volume to an Old Testament passage, read it as a first lesson with a voice so sweet and tender that it took my heart. He closed the book, a psalm was sung, again he went to the desk, and again opened the book and read a passage from the New Testament with an unction that told me that he knew and felt and loved the words he read.

If God has given to one in our congregation a voice that is music, an unction that comes of acquaintance with the Scripture, and of love for it, the use of which man and which voice will adorn our sanctuary service, and make it attractive, and popular, and helpful, and worshipful, and that voice and that unction belong to an ordained elder, he is not out of place taking part in that service with his gifts.

The elder as an ecclesiastic, also is in the church a representative.

He is a presbyter, and as such he represents the people. By

a peculiarity of our Presbyterian system as it is modified in America, the minister sitting in presbytery represents the minister only. No voice of his, no vote of his, represents the people he serves. He was on the church roll a member of the church, and when ordained to the ministry you dropped him from the roll and wrote the word "ordained" against his name, and he no longer belonged to your church, but became a member of presbytery. He goes to presbytery because he is a member of presbytery, and not because he is the pastor. But not so the elder, for he represents the church. He performs, as presbyter, a high duty, greater than any minister who sits beside him. The elder not being present, the interests he represents must go without its representative.

It is said that the elder is not made more of at presbytery because his attendance is not to be relied on. If you appreciate the fact that you are the only representative of your church, will you not attend on every occasion and devote yourself as thoroughly to the interests of the church you represent as in other matters you devote yourself to temporal interests which you represent? Do you honor God by making light or little of these duties as a presbyter?

There is sometimes more talk in the church about rotation in office than there is in Cæsar's service. The man who serves Cæsar best and most faithfully and most efficiently is generally the man who has the largest experience in Cæsar's business. It is all very well to rotate elders in sending them to presbytery, that, as they say, each man may get his hand in, but the minister is there, and he does not rotate, and his influence and power are measured by the regularity of his attendance and his acquaintance with all the things which presbytery does. Brethren, leave the inexperienced, to learn the way of things, until the time comes to require his services as such, but learn wisdom from Cæsar; when you have a presbyter who faithfully represents your church, whose experience makes him more valuable than his fellows, keep him there at that particular work, where he can serve better than his fellows.

And this elder of whom we speak is also a bishop.

A bishop is an overseer and overlooker wherever you find that name in any church. It always was one of the functions of the elder wherever he is found, early or late in history. The modern elder is, or ought to be, a bishop in fact, not with priestly robes or any regalia to be a badge of office, but with the description of the Scripture to be his password and his commission; not to open gates and pay bills, but to have a real oversight over the flock, to know them all by name and by feature, and where they live, so that the reserved roll of absentees and the unknown shall be small indeed; to comfort in trouble those who need comfort, and their names are many; not to put off supervision upon the pastor, but to do a share himself of the bishop's office, and each to know himself that which, when a church becomes pastorless, has gone away with the ministerial bishop. The consecrating to office is not the episcopal function. The episcopal office and function is, and always was, oversight. I think I remember an Episcopal brother, perhaps a bishop, who saw the point and advanced the idea, till then unheard of by his church, that the Episcopal bishop was not so by apostolic succession only, but by succession from those who exercised episcopal authority in the Jewish church prior to the Christian era. After a discussion of the Historic Episcopate, extending over nearly ten years past, we have gotten no nearer church unity than we were before, but the ecclesiastical flirtation has happily been brought to a close, and we may, in our church, pursue the work God has given us to do, and we may follow the light our good Episcopal brother saw and found, that the Historic Episcopate is not in succession from the apostles only, but also from a more venerable source, from elders who have exercised their ecclesiastical relations and function in the church of God ever since it came out of Egypt.

Brethren, you of the eldership are the true Historic Episcopate. You solve the quadrilateral riddle.

RALPH E. PRIME.

Yonkers, New York.

VIII. THE VROOMAN CASE.

ON the 6th of last April Rev. F. B. Vrooman appeared before the Presbytery of Chicago, presented credentials from the Salem-street Congregational Church, Worcester, Mass., and asked to be admitted to membership in the presbytery. His motive was not a deliberate preference of Presbyterianism over Congregationalism. He had received a call from the Kenwood Church, Chicago, and for the sake of accepting this call he was willing to change his denominational label. He evidently looked upon the step which he proposed to take as involving nothing more than a change of name.

The presbytery proceeded to the usual examination preliminary to enrolling his name. It soon became apparent that he had not thought it necessary to acquaint himself with the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church. His tastes did not lie in the direction of dogmatic theology, and a knowledge of this science was not deemed of sufficient importance to make it worth while to cross his taste. His answers to the questions put by the examining committee were of such an unusual and startling nature as to suggest that he had never had any idea of subscribing to the *Confession of Faith*. When some one asked if he had counted on subscribing to the *Confession*, he replied, "when I came here, I did not expect to find a rational being who believed in every article of the *Confession of Faith*." This terminated the examination. Mr. Vrooman was asked to retire while the presbytery considered his case. Some thought the examination was satisfactory, and were willing on the basis of it to entrust him with the honor of the Presbyterian name, and the interests of the Kenwood Church. Others thought that it would be more consistent with the traditional policy of the church to require a man seeking admission to the ranks of the Presbyterian ministry to know something about the *Confession*, and to have some respect for its teachings. In deference to their views, another meeting was appointed for April 13th,

and Mr. Vrooman was given a week in which "to read the *Confession* and see whether or not he could subscribe thereto."

At the meeting on the 13th of April the examination was resumed. It then developed that the applicant for admission to the presbytery, instead of preparing for an examination on the *Confession*, had prepared a statement of his views, which he read to presbytery. His paper was well written, contained many beautiful, and some pious sentiments, but did not reveal very clearly his attitude toward the church's historic standards. As might have been expected, the brethren who were ready to admit him on the ground that "he did not expect to find any rational being who believed in every article of the *Confession of Faith*" were in haste to admit him on this statement. But there were some brethren so unreasonable as to insist that an applicant's orthodoxy should be measured by the church's creed, and not by his own individual creed. So they asserted their right to catechise, and very easily made it appear that a week's time for deliberation had not brought Mr. Vrooman into any closer agreement with the standards than he was at first. But, despite this fact, a motion to admit him was carried by a vote of sixty-nine to twenty-nine. The minority, however, were not to be driven from the field. They rightly judged that the matter was sufficiently grave to warrant a complaint to the Synod of Illinois. They filed their complaint in due form, and assigned the following reasons:

First. That in the aforesaid examination before the said presbytery he failed to present satisfactory views concerning the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, contrary to the teachings of the standards of the Presbyterian Church. They offer as proof of his want of harmony with the standards the following answers, which he gave in his examination:

"His offering was vicarious, but in no sense has he taken the punishment, because we bear the punishment to-day, and we always will, for our sins, and I do not believe the time will ever come in the universe when we won't be ashamed of the sin we have committed, and that will be a punishment for us." In answer to the question, "Will you explain those passages where it is declared that we have redemption through his blood, where it is declared that he is the propitiation for our sins?" he said: "I am free to say, brother, that so far as the idea of an angry God requiring blood to be satisfied, that whole idea I reject absolutely." On being further questioned touching those, and like passages of Scripture, he said: "I like the word which the Revised Version substitutes for it (atonement), reconciliation. And I have taken pains to look at every shade of meaning that I have been able

to find in the ecclesiastic, or in the New Testament Greek, to find an idea to help me in this matter, and I do not find one but will show me that reconciliation is always reconciling man to God, and not God to man."

Second. That in his statement and examination he denied in effect the justification of the believer by the imputed righteousness of Christ, thereby contravening the teaching of Scripture as interpreted in the *Confession of Faith*. To prove this second charge, an extract is submitted from Mr. Vrooman's written statement which he read before the presbytery, as follows: "To be more specific about some particular doctrinal points, I believe God is the creator of all things, and is, therefore, the universal and absolute sovereign; that he rules in wisdom, truth, justice, and love; that there is nothing good in man but what was first in God, and that all men are righteous in so far as they confess a calling from God, and yield to it; that all false religion proceeds from the notion that man is to make his way up to God by certain acts, or by a certain faith of his, instead of receiving God's witness of himself and yielding to his government." They also submitted in confirmation of this charge an extract from his examination:

QUESTION. "In what sense do you regard Christ's righteousness as instrumental in salvation?" ANSWER. "I think that he imparts it."

QUEST. "Is it imputed to man for his credit?" ANS. "Do you mean that a man—that a tag is put on a man whether he is righteous or not?"

QUEST. "I would not put it that way." ANS. "Well, that is the idea."

QUEST. "You were asked a moment ago the difference between justification and sanctification, and you began to tell us what justification was. Now, you have not answered the question as to sanctification." ANS. "I do not know the difference between the two."

Third. That in the said statement and said examination of the said Vrooman, he denied the everlasting punishment of the ungodly, thereby contravening the doctrine of Scripture as taught in the *Confession of Faith*. *Proof:* Extract from written statement, "I do not see how a man can be out of torment while in sin, for sin is hell, and hell is sin. Just how long sin will exist in a world which is God's, which he made and controls in love and wisdom, I do not pretend to know."

Extract from examination:

QUEST. "Do you believe in the possible eternity of sin?" ANS. "I do not believe in the eternity of sin. I do not know but what it might be eternal."

QUEST. "Do you believe that any are ceaselessly and endlessly punished?" ANS. "No sir; I do not."

QUEST. "Do you believe in the future repentance and restoration of the wicked after death?" ANS. "I cannot say that I do, sir. If there is anything which relieves my mind of the possibility of everlasting and endless torment, it would be that death is simply death."

QUEST. "Annihilation?" ANS. "I cannot say that I believe in that. I do not know what I believe in in that regard."

Fourth. Because in said statement and examination said Vrooman did not sincerely receive and adopt the *Confession of Faith* of the said church, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures, without equivocation, evasion or mental reservations, as required in Chapter xv., Section 12. *Proof:* Extract from written statement, "I claim the Scriptures as my open book. I deny the right of any man, or men, to introduce any infallible popery of human standards

between my open soul and my open Bible. I claim liberty of conscience and liberty of intellect as two inalienable rights which I surrender to none. Now it is for you to say whether you find here Calvinism. As herein defined and interpreted I can sign the standards. I do not know much about dogmatic theology. My studies and activities have been in other directions more congenial to my inclinations and my convictions."

Proof from responses to constitutional questions:

THE MODERATOR: "Do you sincerely receive and adopt the *Confession of Faith* of this church as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures?"

MR. VROOMAN: "In the light of the interpretation of this morning, I do most sincerely answer, yes."

THE MODERATOR: "Give an unequivocal answer."

MR. VROOMAN: "The answer is, I do."

THE MODERATOR: "Do you approve?"

MR. VROOMAN: "Yes, sir."

(Cries of "What is the answer?" "We did not hear it." "Repeat it.")

MR. VROOMAN: "I wish to say right here —"

THE MODERATOR: "The Moderator will conduct this business. The question not having been heard, will be reread and the answer given. Do you sincerely receive and adopt the *Confession of Faith* of this church as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures?"

MR. VROOMAN: "I do."

DR. ———: "That question was answered a moment ago, and it is only fair that I should have heard that answer, and the answer should have gone on record."

MR. VROOMAN: "Mr. Moderator, I do not want any possible doubt or hesitancy in the mind of one single brother here this morning. I do not believe in the verbal inspiration of the standards of the Presbyterian Church, but I do believe the substantial outlines as interpreted by all that I have said here to-day and a week ago to-day; I accept them wholly and without a doubt."

For the aforesaid reasons your complainants humbly pray that you reverse so much of this action of the Presbytery of Chicago as sustained his examination as satisfactory, and that the steps following thereupon, namely, his reception into this body and the arrangements for his installation as pastor of Kenwood Church, you declare null and void.

When the complaint came before the Synod of Illinois, it was referred to the Judicial Committee. The committee brought in two reports. The majority was as follows:

"In the matter of the complaint of the Rev. W. S. P. Bryan and others *vs.* the Presbytery of Chicago, the undersigned members of the Judicial Committee, to whom the said complaint was referred, would respectfully report that the right of complainants to have the complaint entertained depends upon the question of a presbytery's being the judge of the qualifications of its own members, and, believing that presbytery does possess this power, would recommend that the complaint in this cause be not entertained by the synod."

This report was signed by the chairman of the committee, Dr. John W. Pugh, Rev. T. A. Robinson, and three ruling elders,

W. B. Metcalf, C. C. Lines, and George K. Ingham. We have here an illustration of the fact that one may grow old in the ministry, and become eminent in the church, and never learn the primary lessons in parliamentary procedure. The writer recalls one of his own early exploits. He was moderating a presbytery. A motion was made calling for action which was plainly unconstitutional. The young moderator promptly ruled the motion out of order, and silently felicitated the presbytery on having one to preside over its deliberations who could guide it safely within constitutional limits. His sweet complacency was soon interrupted by one of the venerated church fathers, who informed him that it was not expected of the moderator to bear the responsibility of deciding questions of constitutional law. The young moderator's loss of self-conceit was compensated by a permanent gain of self-distrust. He has never since been appointed to a duty by a church court that he has not carefully considered, with timid caution, the limits of his prerogative. Evidently the majority of the synod's committee had never enjoyed the benefit of such salutary training. They mistook the duties of a judicial committee for those of a judicial commission. They proposed to relieve the synod of the trouble of adjudicating the matter in dispute between the complainants and defendants. If a judicial committee may pass on questions of law involved in a case, they may with equal propriety pass on the evidence submitted. But granting that they are empowered with such prerogative, no case could ever get before a court. The judicial committee would decide each case on its merits, and if they decided adversely, they would recommend to the court to throw it out; if they decided favorably, they would simply ask the court to ratify their finding.

The minority report was as follows:

"We, the undersigned members of the Judicial Committee, beg leave to present a minority report in the case of the complaint of W. S. P. Bryan and others against the Presbytery of Chicago, believing the complaint in order would recommend that it be entertained, and that the case be issued by a commission of Synod."

This report was signed by two ministers, G. A. Pollock and C. T. Phillips. They recognized that their duty was simply to

find whether or not the complaint was in order, and then recommend the best method of procedure. No matter what a committee's views about the constitutionality of a question involved in a complaint, the Presbyterian Church gives to its humblest member the right to have, not the committee of a court, but the court itself pass judgment on the question.

The parties in the case offered the following agreement as a substitute for the minority report:

"We, the respondents, agree to submit the whole question to a commission of Synod, and agree to consider their finding as completely final in consideration of a similar agreement on the part of the complainants. Both agree also that the complaint is in order in form, and that the number of the commission be twenty-five, and the commission to be appointed by the Moderator."

The majority of the Judicial Committee, upon request of its chairman, were granted leave to withdraw their report, and the agreement was adopted as a substitute for the minority report. The commission appointed under this motion organized with Rev. T. D. Logan, D. D., as moderator, and Rev. Ambrose S. Wright as clerk.

Dr. W. S. P. Bryan, in behalf of complainants, and Dr. Thomas Hall, in behalf of respondents, appeared before the commission by its request and explained that they agreed that the papers were technically correct, and that they submitted to the commission: (1), The entertainment of the complaint; (2), The method of procedure; (3), The merits of the case.

After argument on the first point by representatives of both parties in the case, the commission voted nineteen to four in favor of entertaining the complaint.

The next thing was to decide the method of procedure. Both parties agreed that the case be submitted to the commission on the printed evidence as substantially accurate except in regard to specification fourth, in reference to the adoption of the standards, concerning which the respondents were permitted to present evidence as to impressions made upon them by Mr. Vrooman. The evidence which they introduced was a written statement signed by Thomas C. Hall and C. A. Lippencott:

"We hereby solemnly aver as our best knowledge and belief concerning the allegation of a qualified acceptance of the standards, that the last paragraph of the

evidence must be inserted in or about the third line, and that there is omitted a solemn repetition by the Moderator of the constitutional questions, and amidst a great stillness there was given an unqualified assent."

Supposing this to be a correct version of what took place, it only strengthens the case of the complainants. For Mr. Vrooman to give an unqualified assent to the standards, after having contravened their teachings on several of the fundamental doctrines, could hardly inspire confidence in his soundness in the faith, but must inspire distrust of his perfect moral honesty. One member of the presbytery said that "he would rather cut off his right hand than subscribe to the *Confession of Faith* after making such a statement as that of Mr. Vrooman." We are not surprised that he should have said this if Mr. Vrooman subscribed with an unqualified assent. One of the most interesting points suggested by this trial is the meaning of the question, "Do you sincerely receive and adopt the *Confession of Faith* as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures?" We hear constantly about two classes, those who hold to a strict construction of this language, and those who construe it loosely. Is it not in order to suggest that the only honest construction to put on language is that which permits it to speak for itself? If it says a certain thing, it should be taken for granted that it was designed to say that thing. Putting this construction on the aforesaid question, it means, do you accept the Calvinistic system of doctrine as the system taught in Scripture? Do you accept sincerely, without qualification or mental reservation, all the doctrines which constitute that system? There can be no doubt in a candid mind that this is what is involved in the question, and when one answers "I do," to this question, there ought to be no doubt that he is a Calvinist pure and simple. The writer once asked a minister in the Episcopal Church (now a bishop), how one holding Arminian views could subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles? He said, "Our subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles is not understood to bind the conscience." When a man has adopted a principle of casuistry that will permit him without a twinge of conscience to say one thing and mean the opposite, is he not in training for successful competition with Ananias and Sapphira his

wife? What shall we say of a performance which goes under the name of religion, in which one party asks a question and another answers it, and both parties understand that conscience plays no part? The performance is merely paying respect to traditional ritual, and question and answer are to be understood in a Pickwickian sense.

It is to be noticed, however, that Mr. Vrooman diverges from the Calvinistic system, not only at the points where that system differs from other schools of theology, but at those vital points in which all evangelical churches agree. Take from the *Confession of Faith* the doctrines of Christ's propitiatory sacrifice, the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and the endlessness of the punishment of sin, and you leave no system of doctrine; not only is the integrity of the Calvinistic system impaired, but the very keystone in the arch of evangelical truth is knocked out, and the whole structure tumbles into ruin.

On the merits of the case, one and a quarter hours were allotted to each party. At the conclusion of the arguments, the commission went into private session for deliberation, the result of which was to sustain the complaint by a vote of fifteen to eight. The judgment of the commission reported to synod to be spread on its minutes as the final judgment in the case was as follows:

"In the case of the complaint of Rev. W. S. P. Bryan, D. D., and others against the action of the Chicago Presbytery in receiving the Rev. Frank B. Vrooman on presentation of a letter from a Congregational Church, and his examination in reference to his doctrinal views submitted to a commission of the Synod of Illinois, the said commission recognizes the due care recognized by the presbytery in Mr. Vrooman's examination, and the honesty of the majority who voted to sustain that examination; nevertheless, without impugning the loyalty of that presbytery to the accepted doctrines of our church, we judge that the evidence presented to us proves plainly that Mr. Vrooman expresses his belief in language too sharply conflicting with our doctrinal standards to entitle him to admission to our ministry, and that the presbytery erred in receiving him.

"We, therefore, direct the said Presbytery of Chicago to reconsider and reverse its action on the question of sustaining the examination of said Rev. Frank B. Vrooman, and to return him his credentials."

This result gives pleasure to all those who are interested in the preservation of the Westminster Standards. Had synod given its sanction to the proceedings of Chicago Presbytery, it would have

added the weight of its authority to sink out of sight these standards as the test of orthodoxy and as the safeguard of truth. Emphasis is given to the decision of synod by the following considerations:

1. Rev. F. B. Vrooman is a man of parts and power. He is not the kind of man that a church can bar from its ministry without a pang of regret. For a young man, his culture is broad and varied, his tastes are literary, his thought fresh and vigorous, his style polished and attractive, and his influence over his audience most marked.

2. The church that asked for him as pastor is an influential church. While young, it contains wealth and social position, and is capable of speaking with a voice that cannot be lightly disregarded. It threatened to go into independency rather than suffer its pastor to be taken from it.

3. The sixty-nine members of the Chicago Presbytery who voted to receive Mr. Vrooman were men of prominence. To demand of them that they should reverse their action was to put on them an unpleasant task. The commission did all it could by sweet and gracious language to so sugar-coat the rebuke as to make it palatable, but it was too bitter to be disguised. It could not be swallowed without a wry face.

4. The thing complained of was a thing already done, and time enough had elapsed for excited feelings to abate. In such case, there is a strong temptation to leave things in *statu quo*, even though the judgment might wish them otherwise. "He that meddleth with strife is like one that taketh a dog by the ears." Sensible and peaceable men do not fancy taking a dog by the ears, especially an ecclesiastical dog.

All these considerations favored the defendants and give additional weight to the adverse decisions of synod. Two things favored the cause of the complainants, and account for their victory:

1. The ability and thoroughness of their prosecution. Dr. Bryan and his coadjutors left nothing to the hap-hazard of the occasion. They trusted not to any impromptu work, nor did they rely upon memory to recall on the spur of the moment such con-

siderations as the exigencies of the case might demand. They carried up to synod a printed brief, containing (1), A history of the case; (2), The complaint, with the grounds and the proof; (3), A statement of facts showing the complaint to be in order; (4), Reasons for proceeding to trial; (5), An elaborate argument on the jurisdiction of synod; (6), An exposition of the method of procedure, and (7), Twenty pages of compact and exhaustive argument on the merits of the case. The whole brief covers forty pages, and suggests the irony which every child recognizes in the title of our "*Shorter*" *Catechism*. The complainants looked at the case, with keen eyes, from every conceivable point of view, and were prepared to place it before synod with all its intricacies laid bare. They had won their case before synod met. *The Michigan Presbyterian* describes the situation happily: "It was like General Grant's siege of Vicksburg, everything slowly, deliberately, but invincibly concentrated upon a certain point, which made final surrender as inevitable as a logical syllogism."

2. The one other consideration that helped the complainants to win their case was the honest adherence of the synod, as a body, to those venerable confessional documents on which the denominational structure of Presbyterianism rests. We are constantly informed, by pulpit, press and platform, that our progressive age is not standing still in theology; that the churches are outgrowing their creeds and leaving them behind; that the nineteenth century cannot be anchored to the seventeenth century. There are some of us who exult whenever such information is discredited by facts. We rejoice when we see a great church paying homage still to that "form of sound words" which braced the hearts of a martyr ancestry. We rejoice that others beside ourselves believe that all true progress in theology is a progress backward. The goal of highest possible attainment was reached when the Apostle John said, "Even so come, Lord Jesus," and laid down his pen. Nothing is left to the church but to study the book, and to formulate its teachings into a logical system.

It is not a violent presumption to suppose that sixteen hundred years allows time enough for the great and good of successive

generations to cull out and put in proper relation the leading doctrines of the book. We do not, therefore, offer any apology for regarding with profound veneration the Westminster Standards, especially since the ripest scholarship and devoutest piety of the intervening two hundred years have compared them carefully, over and over again, with the inspired oracles, and pronounced the harmony perfect. We agree with Mr. Vrooman in that we "do not believe in the verbal inspiration of the standards of the Presbyterian Church"; we differ with him in that we believe they are far more nearly in accord with inspiration than his divergencies are. But let the standards of the church be what they may in respect of their conformity with the word of God, it is perfectly evident that they cease to be standards when the church ceases to use them as the measure of orthodoxy for her teachers. Let not the church go through the farce of demanding subscription to them, if she is going to admit one who subscribes to the ranks of her ministry on the ground of his own private creed. Let her not have it understood that subscription does not bind the conscience, but leaves the subscriber free to hold and teach doctrines fundamentally hostile. Above all things, the church should be honest, and should demand honesty. There are plenty of pulpits and platforms in other communions for those who cannot subscribe *ex animo* to each and all the doctrines which together make up the system contained in her standards.

R. C. REED.

Nashville, Tenn.

IX. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

BEATTIE'S PRESBYTERIAN STANDARDS.

THE PRESBYTERIAN STANDARDS: AN EXPOSITION OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION OF FAITH AND CATECHISMS. *By Rev. Francis R. Beattie, B. D., Ph. D., D. D.* Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1896. Pp. 431. \$2.00.

Dr. Beattie belongs to the Southern Presbyterian Church by adoption. He is a native of Canada. In 1888 he left his pastorate at Brantford, Canada, and removed to Columbia, South Carolina, where he occupied the chair of Natural Science in Connection with Revelation and Christian Apologetics, discharging the duties of that professorship for five years with great ability, and to the satisfaction of his brethren. In 1893 he resigned his place in Columbia, and became the occupant of the chair of systematic theology and apologetics in the Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, the duties of which he is now performing. He is growing in the favor and love of the church he serves. An able and godly man; ripe and rich in scholarship; strong and courageous, while cautious and tactful, in his defences of the faith; clear and conservative in his expositions of evangelical truth; skilful and successful in his labors as an educator; thoroughly and conscientiously out of sympathy with all radicalism in criticism, in science, in philosophy, in theology, in apologetics—our church is proud of him, and has placed him at the front, given to him its confidence, and believes that he will guard his trust with fidelity and ability of no ordinary degree.

Dr. Beattie is the author of *An Examination of Utilitarianism*, *The Methods of Theism*, and *Radical Criticism*. To this list he has now added the work which is before us. In these books he stands squarely against rationalism, and for conservative and traditional orthodoxy. He is a Calvinist of the school of the Hodges. His theological alignment is with the federalists, and the covenant is, with him, a ruling factor in anthropology and soteriology. He stands in with our own matchless Thornwell.

The book on our desk is what it professes to be—an exposition. It is not a speculation; it is not an attempt to evolve a system of theology from the Westminster Standards as a genetic base; it is an interpretation of those venerable formularies. True exposition devotes itself to the definition of terms, or, rather, more broadly and accurately, to the definition and explication of ideas and generalizations. It is not concerned, at least primarily, with establishing either the falsity or the truth of its subject-matter; still, incidentally, good, clear-cut exposition is often the most conclusive form of argument. Disputants would often come to agreement if they would stop to define their terms. This form of composition underlies the whole field of serious and didactic writing. The attributes of good exposition are plainness, clearness, and simplicity. These qualities are found in this book in an eminent degree. We desire at this point to express two or three specific judgments upon Dr. Beattie's work.

1. It is a singularly plain piece of expository work. The author's thoughts lie clearly defined in his own mind, and every trace of foginess is dissipated from about the crystal idea. He has observed, with painstaking fidelity, the laws of division, and thereby secured almost perfect methodicalness and orderliness of elaboration. He has resorted to the mechanical art of notating the points, heads, and sub-heads, and to the literary device of repetition, until it is impossible for the reader to ever "lose himself," or fail to recognize all the time the precise stage of the development to which the reading has brought him. The author has eschewed with relentlessness all abstrusities of language and all involved forms of sentence. Technicalities appear where they are necessary, but the context always defines the technicality. In handling abstruse topics—and there are abstruse topics in Calvinism—Dr. Beattie has successfully labored to be clear and simple. We do not see how it is possible for the grammar-school boy to miss the meaning of these sentences, through which daylight shines all the time.

2. This is a singularly cautious piece of exposition. We are struck by the fewness of the understatements, of the overstatements, and of the partial statements. Our author's object has been to set forth the contents of these Westminster Standards. Calmness of mind, fairness of treatment, prudence of statement, were necessary at every point. It was not his purpose to say what he would like for these standards to contain; it was not his object to tone them down at some points, and to tone them up at other points, and to gently warp them at still other points; he has been careful to stay within safe bounds, and to represent the standards as teaching what only great prudence and conservatism would readily concede. At no point has he brought undue pressure to bear upon these authoritative statements of doctrine, but has always let them yield their easy and natural meaning to his pen. Indeed, there is nothing reckless, dashing, daring, startling about this author; his ruling ambition seems to be to say only what is safely true. We are delighted with the self-denial here exhibited—the denial of all temptation to make some striking, original, and racy use of these great formulae. It shows that our author loves truth better than brilliant dash, sensational departure, or flashy speculation. There is not a purple adjective in the book.

3. It is a singularly faithful piece of exposition. True interpretation is not merely mechanical, but creative, only regulating the new creation by the constructive lines of the original. This sort of work requires a severe analytical judgment in order to answer the primary question, "What does this document mean?" It also demands a vivid imagination in order that the interpreter may put himself by the side of the original author, to see as he saw, and to think as he thought. But the supreme temptation of the interpreter is to read into the original his own ideas, or to throw upon it some colors of his own mind. The ideal of the interpreter is to be a perfectly transparent, unrefracting medium for the transmission of the thoughts of the original. We believe that Dr. Beattie has approximated the realization of this ideal. There is almost no personal colorization of the ideas.

4. It is strikingly comprehensive. The author's aim was to give a connected exposition of the entire Westminster Standards. The Shorter Catechism is made the basis of the treatise, but the contents of the Larger Catechism and The Confession of Faith are carefully incorporated at every point. In this feature his book is differentiated from the commentaries of Hodge, Mitchell, Paterson, Fisher, Steel, and others. Two introductory chapters are given, the one on "The Great

Christian Creeds," and the other on "The Nature and Uses of Religious Creeds." The last chapter is a "Summary and Conclusion," in which the author gives his personal estimate of the Westminster Standards. There are thirty-four chapters in all. Each is headed with a reference to the source where the ideas sought to be exhibited may be found. A good index is added for speedy reference.

Dr. Beattie has no sympathy with the modern insane crusade against creeds and confessional theology. He does not look upon such formularies as hampering the spirit of free inquiry, nor as biasing research concerning religious problems. On the contrary, creeds are, in his opinion, good vantage-ground from which to prosecute investigations. He holds that they are necessary as a bond of unity in doctrine, worship, and polity for those who belong to the same communion; that they supply the best basis from which to deal with heresy; that they are the best declaration of faith and conduct to those who are outside of the particular communion; that they are the very best compend for religious instruction. Of late years, in some quarters of the theological world, it has been a fascinating idea to prosecute investigation into religious truth without reference to traditionalism and confessionalism, the attraction being in the liberty and originality which were supposed to belong to such a method. We are of opinion that that tide is beginning to turn back to the theology of creeds and confessions. The untrammelled experiment has brought the reverent and biblical thinkers back to the conclusions which they found set up for them in the ecclesiastical formularies of faith. The feeling is, that the method is really backward and not forward; that such a student simply works over old ground; whereas, if he had begun at the point where the creeds have left off, he could have carried theology a step forward, instead of merely expending his time and life in bringing it to the point it reached at Westminster two hundred and fifty years ago. The feeling is beginning to steal over such students that they have simply cheated themselves, and thrown away their opportunity to make some advanced contribution to theological science. All hail to the decline of this foolish and egotistical experiment to wipe out the thought of the past!

This is the fifth jubilee of the Westminster Standards! Many things ought to be said about Dr. Beattie's celebration of it by the issuance of this comprehensive and satisfactory book. Our limits will not permit us to say all that we want to say in praise of this volume. The reader, however, will be interested in a word or two from the last chapter, which will show him the view-point from which the distinguished and able professor has considered the authoritative standards of his church.

He regards these standards as very comprehensive in their scope making a full exhibit of doctrine, of ethics, and of polity. They are a definite creed with a catholic spirit. Their contents, when applied, yield the highest and most beneficent results in individual, in social, in domestic, in national life. Their ruling type of doctrine is historic Calvinism, but their statements are not so rigid as to require but one special type of Calvinism, and to exclude all others as heretical. For example, while these standards are sublapsarian, they do not condemn supralapsarianism as heretical; while they are for immediate imputation, they are not so rigid as to exclude mediate imputation, generic unity, or concurrence, as possible theories as to the relation between Adam and his posterity; while they strongly assert that the atonement is a vicarious, sacrificial satisfaction, they leave some

room for diversity of opinion as to the precise nature of the atonement; while they are distinctly post-millennial in their teaching, they yet leave the pre-millennarian unbranded of heresy; while their ethics are pronounced, they are not severely Puritanic; while their polity is decidedly Presbyterian, they admit some variations of type in this sphere. As to their constructive principles, the standards, in a general way, are theocentric; but in a specific way they were evolved with the covenants as the genetic principle; they are pronouncedly federalistic. They give great prominence to the law and to Christian ethics. They are a finality, not in a primary sense, but only in a secondary way; primarily, the Bible is a final authority, but the standards are final to those who voluntarily live under them. Dr. Beattie's final opinion is, that the Calvinism of the Westminster Standards must become the basis of any closer union of Protestants.

Dr. Beattie's book is a great success. It is bound to be a potent and potential factor in Christian enlightenment, a powerful commendation of our peculiar system of doctrine. We feel sure that it will have a wide influence and a long life. We congratulate him, the Louisville Seminary, and the entire Southern Presbyterian Church upon the issuance of this volume of such soundness and force.

Clarksville, Tenn.

R. A. WEBB.

JOHNSTON'S SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

AN OUTLINE OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY. *By E. H. Johnston, D. D., Professor in Crozier Theological Seminary;* and AN ECCLESIOLOGY. *By Henry G. Weston, D. D., President of Crozier Seminary.* Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1895. 8vo, pp. 383. Price, \$2.50.

This is a compact and readable treatise. It comes from two esteemed instructors in Crozier Seminary. The outline of theology is a moderate type of Calvinism; the ecclesiology is that phase of independency which the Baptist churches in America maintain. The type of Calvinism is not so clear and decided as that set forth in Boyce's *Abstract of Theology*. This may be taken to indicate the fact that the Southern Baptists are more decidedly Calvinistic than their brethren at the North.

In Professor Johnston's outline of theology the usual topics of the system are expounded. The first part is introductory; the second deals with theology proper; the third explains soteriology; and the fourth considers eschatology. This part of the book covers 309 pages. In Professor Weston's ecclesiology the constitution and polity of the New Testament church is expounded. Though this part consists of less than 80 pages it is very condensed and suggestive. The whole covers the main topics of the theological system.

In the introduction of over thirty pages there are some valuable expositions regarding the sources of theology, and concerning inspiration. In the second part, of fully eighty pages, there is a very good summary and exposition of the proofs for the existence of God. This exposition indicates that the author is familiar with the speculations upon this great theme, and that he is competent to give a sound judgment as to the merits of the main proofs for the divine existence. The discussion of the attributes of God is rather brief, and the exposition of the Trinity is very strangely postponed to the department of soteriology. The doctrine of the decrees and their execution in creation and providence is discussed in this

part, and the view of our author may be described as moderate Calvinism. Prayer, miracles, and angels are the concluding topics of the part which deals with theology proper.

In the third part, the main questions of anthropology are considered with considerable completeness and care. In regard to the origin of souls, traducianism is the doctrine held by our author. In many respects he agrees with the views set forth by Shedd in his *Dogmatic Theology*. The law of God and the fact of sin are fully considered. In regard to the relation of the race and its sin to the sin and fall of Adam, our author denies the *federal* headship of Adam, and seeks to maintain that his *natural* headship is all we should assert. With our author we would take issue at this point, and would hold to both the *natural rootship* and *federal headship* of Adam. The former is the basis for the latter, and the latter completes the former. Both are needed to explain all the facts of the sin, guilt, and depravity of the race. The exposition of the will and moral freedom, and of inability has in it a great deal that is valuable, though we might not agree with our author in all details of statement. His main positions, however, are entirely sound.

In the fourth part, which deals with the vital problems of soteriology, there is first a pretty full treatment of the person of Christ. The proofs for his divinity are well presented, the theories as to the relation of the two natures in his person are ably sketched, and our author accepts what he calls the physiological theory. By this he means that the divine and human natures in Christ were perfect and complete, but not numerically distinct. There is one species in Christ, one soul, and one will. But space forbids further statement or criticism of an interesting point.

The person and offices of the Holy Spirit are next taken up under this head, and these offices are very well set forth as they appear in the Scriptures. Then follows the exposition of the Trinity. Our author criticises the creed statement in regard to *essential* trinity, and seems to think that *economic* trinity is all that the Scriptures warrant us in holding. This part of his exposition is rather hesitating in the doctrine it unfolds.

Then there follows a very full discussion of the atonement, covering nearly forty pages. He gives first some history of the doctrine, then a statement of various theories, and follows this with what he calls a biblical and a theoretical outline of the doctrine. He holds by the sacrificial and vicarious nature of the atonement which Christ made, but denies the idea of immediate imputation. This, of course, follows from what we have seen in regard to the denial of the federal relation of Adam to his race. The federal relation is denied in the case of the second Adam also, and our author comes perilously near the realistic theory in some of the positions he takes, both in regard to the relation of the race to Adam, and of the elect to Christ. It is not easy to classify his own idea of the atonement. He speaks of it as morally efficacious, and yet he is far from holding any phase of the moral influence theory. He regards it as expiatory, and at the same time says that the expiation regenerates. But we cannot follow our author further here than to say that he has some very good remarks in regard to the necessity and extent of the atonement.

At this stage election is stated in connection with the application of redemption. In some respects the doctrine of election is so toned down by our author as to resemble not a little the hypothetical redemptionist scheme, though we

scarcely believe that he would formally accept this scheme. In regard to the order of salvation (*ordo salutis*), the most striking thing is, that justification is put before regeneration. This is done on the ground that the legal obstacles to the bestowment of divine grace and favor in regeneration must be first removed by justification. Hence, the order of the facts according to our author is: Effectual calling, faith and repentance, justification including adoption, regeneration, and sanctification.

The confusion evident in this order would be removed if the idea of the *virtual* justification of the elect who shall in due season believe upon Christ is given a proper place. This ideal of virtual justification lays the ground for the bestowment of grace and favor on the part of God. This grace, in the case of each soul, first renews it in connection with effectual calling and union with Christ. Then comes faith and repentance, to be followed by actual justification and adoption on the legal side, and sanctification on the ethical side. This, we take it, provides the true order of salvation, according to consistent Calvinism.

In regard to the nature of regeneration and sanctification, our author has some excellent statements. Here the views of the Plymouth Brethren and of the Perfectionists are criticised in a very fair and satisfactory way. The doctrine of perseverance is also very well stated and confirmed.

In the last part, which deals with eschatology, the usual topics are discussed with brevity in most cases. In regard to the second advent of Christ, judgment is suspended between the claims of post and premillennial views. The resurrection is very well expounded, and the various theories of second probation are criticised in a satisfactory manner. There are several points here which suggest remark and discussion at some length, but we are compelled to forbear.

It will be seen that the views of our author at several points justify what was said at the outset, to the effect that the treatise before us represents moderate Calvinism. The doctrine of election is toned down, the federal principle is not recognized, immediate imputation is not accepted, the significance of the atonement is modified, and the precedence of regeneration in the order of salvation is not fully recognized. Still, the book is one of real value. It is clear and simple in its style, orderly in its treatment of topics, generally scriptural in its views, and uniformly devout in its spirit. We have read and reread it with much profit.

In regard to the *Ecclesiology*, which forms the concluding part of the volume, we have only space to say that it proposes to give the New Testament idea of the church and its polity. This gives that type of independency held by our Baptist brethren. For Presbyterians this discussion has little value, and to enter the controversy which is here opened up is not our purpose at present, though we firmly believe in the scriptural foundation of the Presbyterian system.

Louisville, Ky.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

WHITSITT'S QUESTION IN BAPTIST HISTORY.

A QUESTION IN BAPTIST HISTORY: Whether the Anabaptists in England Practiced Immersion Before the Year 1641? With an Appendix on the Baptism of Roger Williams, at Providence, R. I., in 1639. By William H. Whitsitt, President of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Louisville, Ky.: Charles T. Dearing. 1896. \$1.00.

This monograph is the outcome of raging controversy among Southern Bap-

tists. The occasion of the controversy was the publication of Dr. Whitsitt, in Johnson's *Encyclopædia*, of an article on "Baptists," in which he expressed the opinion that immersion was not introduced among English Baptists prior to A. D. 1641, and the view, almost equally offensive, that the baptism of Roger Williams was not by immersion. In this article Dr. Whitsitt was far from denying, or even hinting, that apostolic baptism was immersion. But his article was supposed to give some comfort to pedobaptists who were accustomed to charge that immersion was a vulgar invention. The article looked like an acknowledgment, and that by the president of their theological seminary, that there was a real historic break in the apostolic succession of immersion. Hence the feeling in Baptist circles; and polemic zeal, being once aroused, knew no bounds. Several denominational papers have sought to stir the masses in the Baptist Church to such a pitch of resentment as would force the offending professor from his chair. To the outsider, the furor is a vivid illustration of the unreasoning prejudice of immersionists. If Dr. Whitsitt denied, either consciously or logically, the apostolicity of immersion, we should say that the Baptists ought not to endure his presence at the head of their seminary twenty-four hours. He does neither; and this painful opposition to him verges upon persecution.

The work under our pen is Dr. Whitsitt's exposition and defence of the view for which he is called into contempt by some of his brethren. It is an admirable and conclusive presentation of the facts which support his so-called historical heresy. It must convince every intelligent reader whose mind is not hermetically sealed by prejudice and alarm for immersion. The author is entitled to great praise for his faithful, patient, diligent, scholarly, expensive, and original research. He has hunted out primary sources; he has examined them with scholarly care; he has let these documents teach him fairly; he has set the truth above opposition and narrow abuse.

Dr. Whitsitt, in company with several persons, "undertook original investigation at the British Museum to decide where the truth may lie in reference to this question." The question was as to the *date* of the introduction of immersion into the practice of English Baptists. The researches were made in 1880, and resulted in a body of manuscript, out of which this little volume has been made. Dr. Whitsitt refers to his present "painful and unfortunate" circumstances as his justification of his offending his own modesty in citing, in the pages of his own book, the high opinion of his labors held by the eminent Dutch professor, De Hoop Scheffer. In that work this Dutch historian says, and truly, that Dr. Whitsitt is "a man whose breadth of view, acute understanding and exceptional skill in historic studies lead me to hope that, vigorously supported by his brethren in the faith, he shall one day execute a task which, up to this time, has never been satisfactorily performed, and which apparently could be entrusted to no better person, the writing of a history of the Baptists." Presbyterian though we be, we, too, hope that our distinguished and capable and honest neighbor will heed this call of his brother beyond the seas.

Dr. Whitsitt is not weak and doubtful in giving in his adherence to immersion. He opens his book with this positive and even extreme language: "Immersion as a religious rite was practiced by John the Baptist about the year 3 of our era, and was solemnly enjoined by our Saviour upon all his ministers to the end of time. No other observance was in use for baptism in New Testament times. As I under-

stand the Scriptures, immersion is essential to Christian baptism. The question as to the origin and essential character of immersion is, therefore, not in issue. That is a closed question; it does not admit of being opened among Baptist people." Such extravagant declarations of faith in immersion ought to quiet the mind of his Baptist brethren, and insure with them Dr. Whitsitt's orthodoxy concerning this ruling tenet of their creed.

The only question raised and discussed by Dr. Whitsitt is, "Whether the immersion of adult believers was practiced in England by the Anabaptists before the year 1641?" Upon this narrow question of history, he takes the negative, and supports his position by the following historical considerations:

1. Anabaptists, or the Rebaptizers, first appeared in England in the earlier portion of the sixteenth century. They came from Holland. English Anabaptism was propagated from Holland. "But none of the Anabaptists of Holland or of the adjacent sections of Germany were immersionists. So far as any account of them has come to light, they were uniformly in the practice of pouring or sprinkling for baptism, excepting the Collegiants, who, at Rhynsburg, began to immerse in 1620. In fact, few Anabaptists anywhere were immersionists." This conclusion is carefully supported by an array of facts. It fixes the date of immersion in Holland in 1620. English immersion was propagated from that source, being established in Great Britain in 1641.

2. The followers of John Smyth and Thomas Helwys were the progenitors of English, or General, Baptists. Smyth was a preacher in the Established Church at Lincoln. In 1603 he laid down his office in the state Church, and became the pastor of a Brownist, or Independent, Church. In 1606 he got away from England with a company of his brethren to Amsterdam. He left a part of his people behind him in the care of John Robinson, from whose ecclesiastical loins came the Pilgrim Fathers of New England. At Amsterdam, John Smyth sought admission into the fold of the Mennonites, a body of Christians who did not practice immersion. Thomas Helwys, one of Smyth's flock, protested against this movement towards the Mennonites. The struggle between these two led to the drawing up of four confessions of faith—two by the party of Smyth and two by the party of Helwys. We get at the mode of baptism by examining the historical setting of these four confessions. (a), The Mennonites, into whose fold admission was sought, were not immersionists, but sprinkled or poured the water in baptism. (b), The Mennonite ministers examined the English applicants, and there on the spot said with respect to the foundation and form of their baptism, "We have not found that there was any difference at all." (c), There was no immersion practiced anywhere in Holland prior to 1620, and these negotiations were going on in 1606. (d), Finally, the four confessions themselves settle the matter by the very terms in which they teach their doctrine of baptism, denying infant baptism, but not the lawfulness of sprinkling or pouring.

Here, then, is the very first congregation of Anabaptists composed of English people exclusively, and this congregation is not on English soil, but is at Amsterdam, and did not practice immersion as a mode of baptism, and did not insist upon immersion as a condition of fellowship with the Mennonites.

This unimmersed and unimmersing congregation of English people at Amsterdam was the mother of the Post-Reformation Baptist Church in Great Britain.

That congregation practiced sprinkling or pouring. The modern Baptist certainly has an unimmersed, or, in their language, an unbaptized, mother.

To avoid this conclusion, three things are commonly referred to: (1), A certain record, 1606, mentioning the immersion of John Smyth in the river Don by John Murton; (2), A certain statement, 1646, in the work of Leonard Busher; (3), Certain statements in the work of Dr. Featley, 1644. Dr. Whitsitt, with confessions of denominational mortification, proves the first of these to have been a pure fabrication; the second he shows too meagre and too vague to justify the inferences drawn from it; the third, he says, is one of the books of the period which proves that "immersion was a splinter new practice in England in 1644, when it first came from the press."

3. Dr. Whitsitt's third appeal is to the "Jessey Church Records." This manuscript is known in Baptist history as the "Kiffin Manuscript," but our author has found an earlier copy of this instrument, which stands high in the opinion of this denomination. One item in this document concerning immersion, and made under date of 1640, reads, "None having then so practiced in England to professed believers." Our author lays stress upon this point. He says: "In the earlier account we have the unqualified assertion of the most important document in the history of Particular Baptists, that prior to the year 1640 nobody at all had practiced in England the immersion of professed believers. The Anabaptists had not practiced it, who came over from Holland in the sixteenth century. The followers of Helwys and Murton had not practiced it. Spilsbury and his people, who seceded in 1633, had not practiced it. Nobody else had practiced it." These Jessey Records show that "Mr. Blunt was sent to Holland in 1640 to obtain immersion; that he went to John Batten, well known as a teacher among the Collegiants, and, receiving the rite from his hands, returned to England." "In the year 1641 immersion was fetched out of Holland and a new epoch was introduced. There is no chance anywhere to evade that plain conclusion."

4. Dr. Whitsitt, in his seventh chapter, sets up "eight monuments of the introduction of immersion into England in the year 1641." (1), The first confession to prescribe immersion was made in 1644; (2), The name "Baptist" first came into use in 1641, and did not become a denominational designation until 1644; (3), The present controversy over the mode of baptism began in 1641; (4), Until that year, or later, no congregations were divided on the immersion issue; (5), Separation between the Anabaptists and the Dippers was not completed until 1660; (6), After this year the long-pending negotiations for union between the followers of Helwys and the Mennonites were finally broken off; (7), About this time public alarm for the health of candidates for immersion first became publicly excited; (8), At that time the word "rhantize" first came into use as a designation of that mode of baptizing which was antithetical to immersion.

5. In the remaining chapters Dr. Whitsitt paroles other witnesses. He quotes Praisegod Barebones, who, some say, was a Baptist preacher, while this fact is denied by others, who wrote in 1642. Then he enumerates seven Baptist witnesses, as nearly contemporaneous with the period as possible. He then cites from the works of writers outside the Baptist circle. Finally, for good measure, he culls from the history of Dr. H. M. Dexter, of Boston, "one of the foremost authorities for original research in the department of church history."

Dr. Whitsitt may serenely leave his cause in the hands of the candid reader. He has proved his point. He has won the debate.

Dr. Whitsitt makes an appendix of twenty pages on the baptism of Roger Williams, in which he expresses the firm opinion, and presents very cogent arguments in support of it, that Roger Williams was not immersed in 1639. Our limits will not permit us to outline the argument. Immersion, according to our author, was brought to America in 1648 by Mr. Lucar, who was immersed in England by Blunt, after he returned from Holland in 1641.

Dr. Whitsitt proves three things; to do it is acutely painful to him.

1. That Baptists have not always denied, nor declined to practice, infant baptism.

2. That Baptists have not always held and practiced immersion as essential to church membership and to the validity of this ordinance.

3. That Baptists have not always been indifferent to the fellowship of unimmersed believers, but that they once were Anabaptists, and begged for fellowship with the Mennonites, who did not believe and practice immersion, and who never fully accorded to them the fellowship which they sought.

Clarksville, Tenn.

R. A. WEBB.

CARUS' RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE. *By Dr. Paul Carus.* Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1896. Pp. vi., 125. Paper, 50 cts.; cloth, \$1.25.

This treatise is one of a campaign series now being issued by The Open Court Publishing Company, with headquarters at Chicago. Dr. Carus is the ruling spirit in the movement. Fifteen tractates have been issued, and others are in press. Great progress in the circulation of the peculiar tenets of these propagandists is claimed. Adherents, it is alleged, are multiplying at a gratifying rate.

The object of the movement is the reconciliation of science and religion. Its doctrine is called "Monism, or the New Positivism, or the Philosophy of Science, or the New Realism."

Religion is formally defined as "conviction that regulates man's conduct, affords comfort in affliction, and consecrates all the purposes of life."

Science is "the methodical search for truth."

Combining the two ideas, the religion of science is "that religion wherein man aspires to find the truth by the most reliable and truly scientific methods." It recognizes no authority, not even supernatural revelation, which it characterizes as only "human," and receives no truth except that which is proved by "methodical research." The scheme is one of cheap and egotistical rationalism.

There is no authority for "faith," but there is an authority for "conduct." The authority for conduct is truth scientifically ascertained. The name adopted for authoritative ethical truth is "the everlasting in existence." Religion calls it "God."

"But science does not speak of God." Dr. Carus rejects theism, atheism, polytheism, monotheism, anthropotheism, pantheism, and deism. He accepts

"entheism, or the view that regards God as inseparable from the world, the eternal in nature." God, he says, is neither "personal nor impersonal, but superpersonal." Theism, atheism, pantheism, polytheism, and so forth, he would reconcile with the idea of superpersonality—they are all so many branches of a tap-root, entheism.

The soul "consists of impulses, dispositions, and ideas." Impulses are "tendencies to act"; dispositions are "inherited habits"; ideas are "representations of things." The soul is not a substance, but a compound of tendencies to act, inherited habits, and representations of things. Ideas develop exclusively "out of feelings," and so-called reasoning is the "interaction of ideas." Instead of saying "I have an idea," we ought to say, "I am an idea."

This idea (the soul) "neither begins with our birth, nor ends with our death." We have great difficulty, it is confessed, in feeling that our soul is not our self, "but God in us." Of course a doctrine of immortality is taught. The soul is said to be "the immortalized precipitate of the sentiments of past years." When we die, the soul is "embodied as a living element into the ever-growing organism of mankind." The doctrine of the resurrection of the body is but a crude and inappropriate allegory of this scheme of absorptive immortality.

But there is a yet more astounding truth which has been discovered by the pure and unfettered science of Dr. Carus. He draws a distinction between "Jesus and Christ." Jesus is an alleged historic person; whether mythological in reality, he is not enough interested in so small a question even to make inquiry. But he is enthusiastically certain of the reality of "Christ." Jesus may be a myth, but "Christ is an invisible and superpersonal influence in human society." Christ, this superpersonal influence, taught that Christians were "a clog on the feet of mankind," abolished prayer, and taught that every professed virtue of Christians is a vice.

"If ever the name of Christ be dimmed in its glory, it will be done by the vices of his followers in his name, and the freethinker will have to be called upon to restore the lost halo."

A freethinker characterizes the *Religion of Science* as a "conglomeration of self-contradictory ideas," and Dr. Carus as a "freethinker in disguise." The freethinkers repudiate the book, but claim the author. The author excommunicates both the Christians and the freethinkers, and, clad in his own idealistic vestments, himself an immortalized precipitate of the sentiment of past years, burns the incense of science upon the altar of supersensible, superpersonal, invisible influence, in a temple dedicated to the reconciliation of Christianity and agnosticism, and known as the Church of the Congregation of Entheists. To this congregation, Dr. Carus preaches that God is "not a person," that the soul of man is "an empty symbol," that it is the duty of man to become an "incarnation of God," that death is the "final dissolution of his individuality," but that "his soul will form part of the souls of the generations to come" and be immortalized as "an ever-living presence in the souls of the living," that Christians are "idolaters" and "pagans," that freethinkers are "barren" and "behind the times," that the religion of science, as expounded in *The Open Court*, reconciles "the most radical freethought" with "the most rigorous orthodoxy."

R. A. WEBB.

SCHURMAN'S AGNOSTICISM AND RELIGION.

AGNOSTICISM AND RELIGION. *By Jacob Gould Schurman, President of Cornell University.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1896. 12mo, pp. 181. Price, \$1.00.

This little book, from the pen of the brilliant president of Cornell University, consists of three lectures of a somewhat popular nature, delivered on three different occasions.

The first deals with "Huxley and Scientific Agnosticism"; the second considers "Philosophical Agnosticism"; and the third expounds "Spiritual Religion: Its Evolution and Essence."

These lectures exhibit, in a marked degree, the author's well-known qualities of vigorous and original thought, and of a clear and expressive style. At every turn the philosopher appears, and an elevated rationalism of an idealistic type breathes in all these lectures. In each of them there is much of interest and value, if for no other reason than to show the direction of much of the best philosophical thinking of the present day, and the attitude of this thinking towards the churches of the age in which we are living.

It is to be regretted that the general tone of the author, as it appears in these lectures, should be so much opposed to the views of religion which have been historically regarded as evangelical. This appears in the concessions made to Huxley in the first lecture, in the inferences which appear in the second, and in the assault upon creeds found in the third. We seriously doubt if a defence like this really defends the Christian faith; and we are inclined to think that, if these views prevail, there will really be little in the Christian religion worth defending. It is a defence which consists largely in capitulation. We regret to have to say this of such an able and brilliant author.

Louisville, Ky.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

ELY'S SOCIAL LAW OF SERVICE.

THE SOCIAL LAW OF SERVICE. *By Richard T. Ely, Ph. D., LL. D., Professor of Political Economy and Director of the School of Economics, Political Science and History in the University of Wisconsin.* New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Curts & Jennings. 1896.

This modest volume will add to the fame of Dr. Ely as a thinker on social and economic questions. Its chief merit consists not in the proposal of a new view of social service, but in the hearty acceptance and vindication of the position that present-day social problems must find their solution in evangelical principles and their evangelical application. Addressed to "those who accept Christ and his gospel," it is admirably adapted to stimulate the Christian conscience to a better performance of admitted social duties and to the practical recognition of new obligations ever emerging from the growing complexities of modern social life. As a stimulus to serious thought touching many of the perplexing social questions of the day, it might well be placed in the hands of under-graduates in our colleges, serving them as an introduction to the nascent science of sociology. Popular in style of treatment yet rich in thought and elevated sentiment, this little manual manifests at once the truly Christian and the truly scientific spirit.

Social science forfeits all claim to scientific method by ignoring the supreme

social fact. The title, *The Social Law of Service*, is thus significant. It implies the essential social nature both of the subject of the law and of the authority from whom the law proceeds, and finds the bond of union between the two in the divine image impressed upon the subject at his making. Social law finds thus its ultimate basis, not in any abstract principle, but in the vital relations implicated in the eternal fellowship of holy love of the Tripersonal Jehovah.

Our author finds the only "firm foundation" of social service in the altruism of Jesus, supreme love to the Supreme Other, and self-equal love for all others in him. The law of service is the "categorical imperative," not of abstract reason, but of incarnate love, love fulfilling the law for us, before us, and in us. This supplies what all merely rational theories lack, authority, practical potency, and promise of attainment. Here we have absolute certainty, comfort, and steadfast hope. The religion of Jesus alone makes true self-sacrifice possible and rational; alone renders reforms and reformers safe by furnishing on the one hand an enduring hope, and on the other restraints against resort to methods of force and the propaganda of anarchy.

Our author next vindicates the absolute superiority of "our point of view," thus attained by a brief yet incisive criticism of certain rival claimants. Christ is the first genuine philanthropist, stands without a rival as the full and efficient revealer of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. His teaching touching the infinite worth of every human individual, and our endless mutual obligation to reciprocal and universal benevolence stand in sharp contrast to the inhumanity of the most humane of the ancients; to the purely individualistic, self-centered, morality-destroying ethics of Brahmanism, Buddhism, and Stoicism.

"Without philanthropy there never would have been a Christian Church, and without Christ we would have had no philanthropy." The partial anticipations of Hebrew ethics form no exception; their social laws being derived from pre-incarnate disclosures of the law of love on the part of the eternal Word. The incarnate Christ realizes, universalizes, intensifies and elevates the social law of the effete dispensation. "The whole spirit of the Old and New Testament teaches us that we must strive for national righteousness and help to carry out God's purpose, which is to make the kingdoms of this world God's kingdom. But how does Christ's law of service stand related to individual happiness? The great ethical law of indirection applies here. Our desire for happiness is natural and legitimate; yet we lose it, if we seek it directly. Self-sacrifice itself when viewed as end and not merely as a means of service, issues in unloving and self-hurtful asceticism. Self-forgetting love is the secret of Christ-like self-denial and also of true individual well-being.

The self-indulging tendency of our day is a rebound from the excesses of asceticism, a change from bad to worse. Dr. Ely thinks that "it is better for men to be called upon even by superstition and false religion to make self-sacrifice than to lead a life of self-indulgence." He exhorts us to see to it that at any rate religion is for us something more than "a graceful and pleasing appendix to life."

Our attention is now directed to the sacraments of Christ's church as embodiments and illustrations of social law. The social significance of baptism and the Lord's supper is most marked, and yet it has lost its due relative importance for us. Their Godward and manward sides are inseparable; neither must be neglected; and on their manward side they mean the solidarity of the family and the

fraternity of all believers. "The Godward side of the Lord's supper draws us to heaven, and bids us contemplate in humility the infinite, yearning love of our Father, revealed to us in our blessed Lord and Saviour. The manward side draws us to our fellows, and bids us love men as Christ loved men."

The fact that the social import of these ordinances is well-nigh lost to many finds explanation in a low and inadequate appreciation of the fundamental fact of "social solidarity." What is solidarity? Dr. Ely tells us that its import has not yet been fully grasped, though the fact is most patent to every observant mind, and its recognition forms one of the most remarkable features of the Bible. It means the common weal of man, oneness of human interest, dependence of man upon man, both in things good and evil. "It implies not only fellowship in interests and responsibilities, but that unity in nature which is brought before us by the expression 'human brotherhood.'" Their reciprocal dependence is traced into every department of our common life, physiological, intellectual, political, economic. At the same time our author escapes the snare of Mr. Benjamin Kidd by properly accentuating the supra-organic character of the social organism. While the fact of solidarity relieves the weak and erring of part of their individual guilt, on the whole, it increases individual responsibility immensely. We are responsible, to a certain extent, for all the poverty and sin and suffering about us. Who, then, from this point of view, is "our neighbor"? Theoretically, every man; practically, every one who needs our help. Our author indicates that it was an age of materialism that asserted the all-sufficiency of unrestrained self-interest, and attempted to restrict economic inquiries to the one question, how to produce the greatest amount of wealth. But the wisest of the ancients asked, How may such economic and social relations be established among citizens as to render them good and happy? And we, in wider range of ethical obligations, are beginning to ask similar questions.

The present widening and deepening of the range of ethical obligation rests on a basis of solid facts, such as the extension of international connections, the free movement of capital, the growing feeling of brotherhood among wage-earners. The favored classes are, to some extent, trying to atone for the shortcomings of past centuries; but they should also seek to quicken the conscience of wage-earners. "The downward movement in the extension of the range of ethical obligations has, in recent years, been stronger than the upward one. Like all others, working people have been thinking too much about rights, and too little about duties."

By an easy transition we are led to consider the vast importance, in relation to the betterment of our fellows, of the state, wise legal enactment, and organized effort. Our political life in the United States is deemed so unworthy because the true idea of the state, as a divine institution having its basis in human nature, has been to so large an extent obscured. It is the duty of the church to instil Christian principles into our entire public as well as private life. "Let all Christians see to it that they put as much as possible, not of doctrine or creed into the state constitution, but of Christian life and practice into the activity of the state. The nation must be recognized fully as a Christian nation."

Then follows a well-deserved scoring of certain modern thinkers, who, in opposing remedial legislation, prate about "making men good by law." The efficiency of the method of indirection employed in such legislation is fully vin-

dedicated by reference to the conditions of social and family life, the security afforded to person and property, the regulation of industrial life, the basis of successful popular education. "The universal and compulsory education established by law renders the Bible accessible to all, and thus the law becomes indirectly a means of grace."

Laws should be not only negative and repressive, but also attractive and persuasive. We have followed too exclusively the Roman method, to the neglect of the Greek and Teutonic, and especially the Mosaic system.

"The inadequacy of private philanthropy," in relation to social reform, is here insisted on and illustrated. It "plays an essential rôle in all higher civilization, and when it is modest and unassuming, and deprecates all sounding of trumpets, it is truly a glorious thing." But reform must be accomplished by established, regularly-working, responsible institutions, served by individual effort and strengthened by private philanthropy. Education, sanitary reform, industrial improvement, Sunday rest, belong to this category. Private effort finds its chief field in individual cases requiring individual treatment; in ministering to the temporarily needy and distressed; in assisting in improving the action of public agencies; it must precede legislation and make it possible, and enlighten public opinion with a view to the enforcement of good laws.

The three concluding chapters relate to individual economics.

"Our Earnings." The ancient praise of moderation is repeated. As an ideal, it means the avoidance of hurtful desires for large acquisitions and those many practices which spring out of bad dispositions, together with all diligence, thrift, and right effort to acquire a competence. Making money at the expense of life and health of ourselves or others, by unjust competitive methods, by withholding taxes, by selling injurious commodities, are specifically noted and condemned.

But individual responsibility seems more pronounced in "Our Spendings." Our earnings are, to a great extent, limited by the established social system; but our spendings are largely within our individual control. The law of mutual love applies here also. Provision for self and family comes first, and includes at times large expenditures in training our powers and maintaining our strength. This is no violation of the law, if our powers, developed and maintained at their best, are used in social service. But our circle must expand until the whole world is included. "All the nations of the world are our concern. It is a shortsighted and selfish policy of social reformers to denounce foreign missions."

It is helpful to classify our wants—expenditures for necessities, conveniences, comforts, ostentation. "Other things being equal, we must place upon a higher plane the necessities of others than those things which are to us merely conveniences and comforts. Yet the latter may help us in our work, and thus find justification. When we come, however, to expenditures for mere show and display, we must draw a sharp line; they are absolutely interdicted by the law of love."

The plea that luxury gives employment to many is met by the laconic remark that the same expenditures made in behalf of others would give equal employment to labor.

We find, however, indefinite variation of needs in inequalities of capacities and faculties and positions occupied; nor can we place upon the same plane private and public expenditures. "The purpose is to show that while we must

draw a line and condemn most strongly the wanton luxury of our period, we must make discriminations; above all things, we must never be animated by petty envy and jealousy."

The Doctor thinks that altogether too much has been said about the difficulties of giving, and suggests several methods of relief to those who are under pressure in this regard. "If one is a believer in foreign and domestic missions—and no one can fail to believe in both who accepts Christianity—a way at once is opened to him for the expenditure of millions of money. Especially must one remember that theological training is exclusively committed to private efforts, and the endowments of our theological schools are sadly inadequate. At a time like the present, when the demands on the pulpit are becoming so vast, training schools for pastors and preachers must especially appeal to the thoughtful Christian of means."

Finally: "What to Do."

Only helpful suggestions of a general character can be given. First of all, bring yourself into right relations with God. The beginning of social righteousness is personal salvation. "Apart from Christ, the natural tendency is to come back to the standpoint of the Greeks and despise the masses." We need to keep close to Christ to avoid dangers besetting all, rich and poor. Then comes fruit-bearing. Believers must be givers. Helpful words in practical acting are: "Do the next thing." "Every improvement in your character and surroundings is an improvement for every circle, large or small, of which you form a part. Every helpful word, every kind deed, is a contribution to the perfection of society."

Do your best in your own particular line. Seek light as to the what and how of your doing. Read your Bible; read good biographies. Apply the law of love in each of the various social circles.

A parting word to the church: She must hold before herself her ideal as a transforming power for righteousness.

"We may, in short, study in common how to apply the moral truths and principles of Christianity to the social and economic difficulties of the present time; and we may present Christ in practical life as the living Master and King, the enemy of wrong and selfishness, the power of righteousness and love."

Clarksville, Tenn.

J. E. FOGARTIE.

STERRETT'S THE POWER OF THOUGHT.

THE POWER OF THOUGHT. *By Jno. D. Sterrett.* New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons.

This book comes from the pen of an elder in one of the country churches in the Scotch-Irish section of the Valley of Virginia; a lawyer by study and profession, but not by practice; for years a farmer at the homestead where his father died. The book comes from the county which produced Archibald Alexander, Sam. Houston, C. H. McCormick, and Bishop Taylor, all of them farmers' sons. It is worthy of such distinguished associations. It is one of the most original and striking contributions to philosophic psychology ever produced in this country.

Washington and Lee University.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

X. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE PERMANENT VALUE OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION. Being the Paddock Lectures for 1894. By C. W. E. Boddy, M. A., D. C. L., Professor of Old Testament Literature and Interpretation in the General Theological Seminary, New York. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 12mo, pp. 230 Cloth. \$1.25.

This volume is made up of five lectures, the topics being "The Critical Problem in General"; "The Literary Analysis Critically and Historically Considered"; "The Creation and Paradise"; "The Fall and its Immediate Results"; "The Deluge and the Patriarchs." The author is, in the main, conservative in his views. He does not accept the conclusions of the critics, and yet seems to incline to a suspension of judgment and reserve of opinion upon many of the mooted points until certainty can be more assured. He lays special stress upon the enlightened consciousness of the church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit as a factor in the decision of these questions, and maintains that the divine inspiration of the word, as well as reverent regard for what it reveals, will not yield to the demands of modern criticism.

PEOPLE'S COMMENTARY ON THE ACTS. Giving the Common Version, 1611, the Revised Version, 1881 (American Readings and Renderings), with Critical, Exegetical, and Applicative Notes, and Illustrations from Life and History in the East. By Edwin W. Rice, D. D., Author of "People's Commentaries" on *Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John*; "People's Dictionary of the Bible"; "Our Sixty-six Sacred Books," etc. Maps, Engravings from Photographs by Bonfils, Good, Jordan, and others, and from Original Sketches. Cloth, pp. 371, 8vo. Price, \$1.25, postage paid. The American Sunday-School Union, Philadelphia; New York Branch, 111 Fifth Avenue. 1896.

The work of the author of this volume has won for him deserved honor and praise. As a member of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, as the assistant of the late Dr. Philip Schaff in the preparation of his *Dictionary of the Bible*, as a commentator upon the Gospels, and as the author of that admirable volume, *Our Sixty-six Sacred Books*, he has been one of the largest contributors, as well as one of the ablest, to the department of literature to which he has devoted himself.

Both the "Authorized" and the "Revised" English versions of The Acts are given in parallel columns at the bottom of the page. The comments are grouped under topical divisions of the text, with a concise analysis of the topics at the beginning of each chapter. The explanations under each clause and verse can be quickly found, since the number of the verse and the words of the clause are printed in full faced type to catch the eye.

The controverted questions in The Acts are discussed with candor; the differ-

ent views of leading scholars are presented, and the arguments in favor of each view, with the objections to them, are concisely stated, and the one which the weight of scholarship favors is indicated by the author. Thus, he shows that the ancient title was simply "Acts," or "Doings," and maintains the unity of authorship of The Acts, and that the design of the writer was to give a narration of the "beginnings" only of Christianity. He regards the sources of The Acts as threefold: (1), The writer's observation; (2), Testimony of eye-witnesses; (3), Written documents. The credibility of the book is ably sustained by arguments acutely drawn from recent investigations relating to the Roman empire in apostolic times. This has led to material modifications of the hitherto-accepted maps of Asia Minor and of Paul's journeys. The relation of The Acts to the epistles is thoughtfully considered in the Introduction, and often in the body of the work. The author favors the earlier date of The Acts, in common with Salmon, Howson, Schaff, and others. The discussions on Christian Unity, The Community of Goods, Magians, Languages of Asia Minor, and Elders and Bishops, are discriminating, and vigorous enough to carry the reader to the end.

The maps differ widely from those given by Conybeare & Howson, and by Lewin, being based on more recent explorations, and are good specimens of cartography. The engravings are likewise fresh, accurate, and helpful to the reader. The index is fairly full. The paper is of fine finish, which admits of writing notes in ink on the margin, and the binding is in best silk cloth, strong and serviceable. The price is remarkably low.

The book is issued under the Green Fund, which provides that the public shall have the benefit of the copyright in a reduced price. As an indication of how large a reduction has been made by the publishers on this account, it may be noted that a volume on one of the Gospels, lately issued in the "International Commentary Series," is about the same size, 375 pages, has no illustrations, but costs \$2.50 *net*, while this volume on The Acts has eighteen pages of engravings, and in all 389 pages, and costs only \$1.25. It will be the book wanted in studying the International Sunday-School Lessons for 1897.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES. *By William Campbell Scofield.* 12mo, pp. 302. \$1.00. New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896.

It is the author's effort in this book to bring together the whole body of New Testament Scriptures relating to the person and office work of the Holy Spirit, with a view to deriving from it practical results in impression, instruction, guidance, sanctification. He enumerates and classifies something more than two hundred such recognitions of the Spirit. The system of classification is to give first, those things which were said of the Spirit preliminary to what Christ said of him; secondly, what Christ said of the Spirit during his personal ministry; and thirdly, what was said of the Spirit in the supplementary writings of the New Testament. By "supplementary" the author means subsequent to the life of Christ on earth. The author has not given much of interpretation to the passages cited, but what he does give is sound and evangelical, and shows special care in avoiding the mysticism to which some writers upon the subject are strongly tempted. The book will be of value chiefly as a collation of passages.

STUDIES OF THE MAN CHRIST JESUS. By Robert E. Speer, *Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions*; Author of "*Studies in the Gospel of Luke*"; "*Studies in the Book of Acts*." Long 18mo, pp. 249. Cloth. 75 cents. New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896.

Under the subjects of The Early life of Jesus; His Plans and Methods of Work; Some Active and Passive Traits of His Character; The Testimony Borne to Him by the Different Relations into which He Came; Other Extraordinary Characteristics of Christ Most Easily Explicable by the Belief in His Divinity; His Bearing at His Trial and Death; and The Significance of the Man Christ Jesus, the young secretary seeks to attract his reader's attention to the human side of the Redeemer, and to show how that life has incorporated itself into the best life of the world. Christ's humanity as a pattern and guide for us is drawn out by the studies of all those works and relations which he performed and filled while in the world. It is a book full of spiritual fervor and unction, and, withal, able and scholarly.

THE GOSPEL FOR AN AGE OF DOUBT. The Yale Lectures on Preaching, 1896. By Henry Van Dyke, D. D., *Pastor of the Brick Church in New York*. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1896.

The Lyman Beecher Yale Lectureship on Preaching has brought out a large amount of the best material on this subject. It would seem that the theme might be exhausted. Each year, however, develops something new and fresh. Dr. Van Dyke's lectures are more upon the subject than the method of preaching. In dealing with it he assumes a very modern and advanced position. An Age of Doubt; The Unveiling of the Father; The Human Life of God; The Source of Authority; Liberty; Sovereignty; Service, are some of the topics treated. Dr. Van Dyke is a master of the purest and best English. His reading is wide and careful. In style and diction few surpass him. But we would pronounce him a poet rather than a theologian.

HISTORY OF THE WARFARE OF SCIENCE WITH THEOLOGY IN CHRISTENDOM. By Andrew Dickson White, LL. D. (Yale), L. H. D. (Columbia), Ph. D. (Jena), *Late President and Professor of History at Cornell University*. Two Volumes. 8vo. \$5.00. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1895.

One needs to read but a little way into these handsome volumes to see that President White has allowed prejudices and superficiality to control the entire treatment of his theme. It is an elaborate indictment of theology in general and a piece of special pleading to rid the world of the influence of the church and its ministry in the great work of education. He dislikes theology and theologians. He wilfully misunderstands the nature of theology as the queen of sciences, and forgets his place as a student and teacher of history, which shows that theology and theologians have been foremost in the encouragement and development of other sciences. He forgets that the assertions and absurdities of science so-called have ever been greater and more misleading than the vagaries of those who have posed as theologians, and that even the best theories of science have more frequently changed and been recast than the doctrinal structure of the church. There has been a conflict, it is true; but it has been a conflict at most between science and certain

false interpreters of the Scriptures, or between unproved hypotheses and the established and well-ascertained meaning of the Bible. The word of God is to-day more clearly understood and interpreted than the works of God. Or, if there is any real conflict, it is one between tendencies in the intellectual life of man; and to draw from historical instances illustrating this the conclusion that theology has always or ever really made war upon science is a generalization as hasty and prejudiced as it is unwarranted.

ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES. A Guide to the Study of the International Sunday-School Lessons. With Original and Selected Comments, Methods of Teaching, Illustrative Stories, Practical Applications, Notes on Eastern Life, Library References, Maps, Tables, Pictures, and Diagrams. *By Jesse Lyman Hurlbut and Robert Remington Doherty.* 8vo, pp. 376. \$1.25. New York: Eaton & Mains. 1896.

After so full a sub-title as that given above, we need add but little as to the nature, purpose and methods of this book. The studies for next year lying chiefly in the Book of Acts, there is unusual opportunity for illustrations, notes, maps, accounts of eastern life, etc. The authors have embraced their opportunity most fully. The maps are ample and clear. The descriptions of natural scenery and of the scenes of events recorded are vivid and full of interest. Both the Authorized and Revised Texts are given. The types are skilfully used to designate the different parts of the notes and comments, their order and object, and the print is clear and distinct, while the volume is neatly and substantially bound. Altogether it is one of the best of all the publications on the International Lessons for the new year.

A GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. Revised and Enlarged. *By Thomas Sheldon Green, M. A.* With a Preface by H. L. Hastings, Editor of *The Christian*, Boston, and a Supplement by J. H. Thayer, D. D., Litt. D., Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in the Divinity School of Harvard University. *Thirty-third thousand.* 16mo, pp. xii., 216. Boston: H. L. Hastings. 1896.

The large number of editions of this handy little Lexicon indicates its popularity. One cannot expect it to embrace, in so short a compass, all that the thorough student of the New Testament should wish, especially in the way of exhaustive citations of passages illustrating the various meanings, and in the tracing of the history of words. Both of these are necessary to a thorough understanding of the language and meaning of the New Testament, written, as the latter was, in a language derived from a country foreign to its writers, and so tinged and even saturated with the ideas and customs of other lands as to have almost wholly lost, in many cases, its original meaning. This applies, notably, to all the Greek words used to express Jewish ordinances, as the purifications, washings, baptisms, etc., and is a fact which the compiler, while acknowledging it in the preface, has singularly ignored, in some instances, in the pages which follow.

IN PARADISE ; OR, THE STATE OF THE FAITHFUL DEAD. A Study from Scripture on Death and After Death. *By Charles H. Strong, A. M., Rector of St. John's Church, Savannah.* \$1.00. New York: Thomas Whittaker.

Of the devoutness and earnestness of the author of this book one can have

no question. Of the use he makes of Scripture, however, and of the conclusions he reaches, one may most seriously doubt. The position held is that those who die in the Lord neither lie in "dreamless slumber," awaiting the resurrection, nor yet enter into perfect glory, but that they dwell together in Paradise, in a state of activity and service and development, subject still to the prayers of those whom they have left behind, and no less praying for and ministering to them. These and kindred theories the author thinks he derives from the Scriptures which he compares, and from the beliefs and teachings of the church in her early ages.

THE WORLD FOR CHRIST. *By A. J. F. Behrends, D. D.* 16mo, pp. 167. 90 cents. New York: Eaton & Mains. 1896.

This volume comprises the series of six lectures or addresses on Missions delivered by the author this year at Syracuse University, on the Graves Foundation. They deal with the fundamental principles of missions and of the right method of conducting them, and are the utterances of one who not only as a pastor, but as one for many years prominently connected with one of the great missionary Boards of our land, is thoroughly familiar with his subject. The subjects of the several addresses are, The Authority to be Recognized, The Field to be Won, The Result to be Achieved, The Resistance to be Overcome, The Leaders to be Appointed, and The Agencies to be Employed. The delivery of these addresses and their publication signally illustrate the unity of God's people in the great work of extending his kingdom. The preacher is a Congregationalist, the University before which he speaks is Methodist, and the lecture foundation is the gift of a member of one of the Reformed churches.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR MINISTERIAL POWER. The Carew Lectures for 1895, Hartford Theological Seminary. *By Charles Cuthbert Hall, D. D.* \$1.50. Hartford, Conn.: Hartford Seminary Press. 1895.

A series of six lectures by the well-known Brooklyn pastor, himself a successful minister of the word. His subjects are The Power of a Qualified Ministry, and the Qualifications, physical and intellectual, experiential and devotional, social and pastoral, liturgical and homiletical, theological and ecclesiastical. Illustrations and suggestions abound, and the book is of interest and should be read, despite many positions with which some of us will not agree.

MISCELLANIES OF REV. THOMAS E. PECK, D. D., LL. D., PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN VIRGINIA. Complete in Three Volumes. Vol. II. *Selected and Arranged by Rev. T. C. Johnson, D. D.* 8vo, pp. 405. Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1896. \$2.00.

This collection of the miscellaneous writings of Dr. Peck embraces nine papers which he prepared on subjects of a theological and evangelical nature, nine on historical and expository themes, and four on ecclesiology. Almost all of them have appeared before, or are familiar to students whom he instructed from the notes which they received. It is difficult to pass a judgment upon the volume as a whole, so varied and unrelated in many ways are the themes. It may be remarked, however, that no treatise from Dr. Peck's pen could be unworthy of a

place in the permanent literature of the church. In these papers, as in everything else that came from his hand, there are the modesty, clearness, strength and soundness which characterized all his utterances and productions. In calmness and deliberation, in the unerring certainty with which he moved towards all the positions which he held, and in the strength and dignity with which he maintained them, Dr. Peck ever stood foremost in the ranks of the great preachers and teachers of the church. We cannot forbear expressing a regret, which we have reason to believe is largely shared throughout our church, that so small a proportion of the mighty thought of our giants, Thornwell, Dabney, and Peck, has been left to us in systematic treatises, and that we are so largely dependent upon mere "Discussions" or "Miscellanies" for tracing the power of these men. It should suggest to the younger men who are taking their places that they should not put off until too late a day the duty of preparing such permanent and finished work as their abilities and duty to the church both justify and make possible.

THE CREED AND THE PRAYER. *By J. Wesley Johnston, D. D.* Introduction by William V. Kelley, D. D. 12mo, pp. 284. \$1.20. New York: Eaton & Mains. 1896.

Twenty-one evening sermons, delivered by an active and successful pastor, on the several articles of "The Apostles' Creed," and the several parts and petitions of the Lord's Prayer. The sermons are delightful to read, and are full of interest and attractiveness, as well as spirituality and evangelical tone. We commend them as excellent specimens of homiletic work, as well as for the truth which they contain and enforce.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN PULPIT. A Collection of Sermons by Ministers of the Southern Presbyterian Church. 8vo, pp. 407. \$1.00. Richmond, Virginia: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1896.

An inspection of the thirty-three sermons brought together and published in this book will readily show that the double purpose of the publishers, as set forth in the Preface, is fully accomplished. That purpose is to meet the demand in the church represented by the preachers whose discourses are given for a book of practical sermons, suitable for reading in the public worship of God when conducted by ruling elders, and also to put in permanent form some examples of the work of the Southern Presbyterian pulpit as to its eloquence, doctrinal purity, persuasiveness, and practical power. A careful examination of the several discourses reveals their strength, beauty, fervor, and wonderfully evangelical spirit and soundness. After reading them, and knowing something of the character of the ministry which they represent, we do not wonder that a Northern pastor, who frequently sought supplies for his pulpit, remarked, when asked why he so often sought his supplies from among the Southern brethren, that he did so because he was always so sure of them before they entered his pulpit, because he knew that they would give forth no uncertain sound. The type of Southern theology may be scholastic, as Dr. Briggs declares, and the character of its pulpit may be evangelical rather than simply ethical, or sociological; but when both the theology and the preaching are so saturated with the word of God as well as founded upon it, one need not be afraid of its ultimate results.

A mere mention of the names of the preachers of this book will suffice to commend it. Palmer, Hoge, Smith, Armstrong, Lupton, Girardeau, Stratton, Dabney, Rosebro, Woods, Murkland, Pitzer, Bryson, Davies, Brackett, Burgett, Strickler, Scott, Preston, Kerr, Smoot, Moore, Cannon, Hoge, Vance, Howerton, Petrie, King, Hemphill, Wilson, Witherspoon, Bartlett, and Hall are the men whose work is here reproduced. The volume receives additional interest from the fact that it is embellished by excellent half-tone engravings of all these preachers.

BIBLE CHARACTERS. Adam to Achan. *By Alexander Whyte, D. D., Author of "Bunyan Characters"; "Lancelot Andrewees and his Private Devotions"; etc., etc.* 12mo, pp. 301. \$1.25. New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896.

In twenty-six popular discourses, the well-known Edinburgh pastor presents the life and characters and relations of as many of the best-known Old Testament personages, down to the time of Joshua and Achan. As character studies the discourses are admirable in every way, and incidentally bring out much of the times and circumstances under which each lived. The style is clear and simple. The lessons drawn from each are natural and full of force.

TORCHBEARERS OF CHRISTENDOM. The Light They Shed, and the Shadows They Cast. *By Robert Remington Doherty.* 12mo, pp. 288. 90 cents. New York: Eaton & Mains. 1896.

This book opens with a chapter or part which reads like a discourse, on Jesus, the Light of the World. Then follows a short chapter giving the great historical periods or divisions of Christian times. Following this are chapters on Paul and the Primitive Church; Constantine, the Church Controlled by the State; Gregory the Great and the Early Middle Ages; Hildebrand, the State Controlled by the Church; Martin Luther and the Reformation; John Wesley and the Modern Evangelical Church. The whole forms a not very scientific, but interesting, treatise on church history, and one which will furnish the reader with much that is worthy of note. It is specially adapted to young people of the Epworth League.

THE LIFE OF JAMES McCOSH. A Record Chiefly Autobiographical. Edited by William Milligan Sloane. With Portraits. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1896.

The recent sesqui-centennial of Princeton, and the conversion of the college into the university, make this volume timely and interesting. It traces the life and effort of the man to whom, more than to any other, indebtedness is due for all that Princeton is to-day. Dr. McCosh had a career long before he reached old Nassau, and it was that which gave him so much power in the development of the institution. The present volume traces that career, and shows how intimately he was connected with some of the mightiest movements in his native Scotland and his adopted Ireland, in affairs no less than in thought. The author's preface fitly gathers up the facts of his life in these words:

"To have seen a century rise and wane; to have spent threescore years of active, influential life in its very noon; to have moulded, in some degree, the thought of two generations in three lands; to have shared in Scotland's latest

struggle for religious liberty; to have wrought in the great enterprise of Ireland's intellectual emancipation; to have led a powerful educational movement in America, and to have regenerated one of her most ancient universities—these are the titles of James McCosh to public distinction."

ROBERT WHITAKER McALL, Founder of the McAll Mission, Paris. A Fragment by Himself; a Souvenir by his Wife. With Portraits, Facsimiles, and Illustrations. 8vo, pp. 252. \$1.50. New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896.

This biography is written chiefly by the subject's wife. It fitly opens with a chapter written by McAll at the age of seventy-two years, and entitled "The Joy of Active Service," and found on his study table at Auteuil some weeks after his death. The book gives in full the life of McAll in his childhood and youth; as a student, first of architecture, and afterwards of theology; as a pastor in England for twenty-three years, and then as the noted worker in France for the remaining twenty-two years of his life. It is the life of a man whose career was prepared in the generations which preceded him, for he was born in the covenant, and of a Levitical line. Many letters, extracts from diaries, etc., enrich the book and show the spirit which animated the man.

A HISTORY OF THE HEBREW PEOPLE. From the Settlement in Canaan to the Division of the Kingdom. *By Charles Foster Kent, Ph. D., Associate Professor of Biblical Literature and History in Brown University.* With Maps and Plans. \$1.25. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

A history, suggestive and helpful in many ways, but written from the standpoint of modern criticism, depreciatory of the Old Testament and of the scholarship and testimony of other days. The reader who will carefully guard against these features of the volume will find it valuable and interesting.

ARMENIA AND HER PEOPLE; or, The Story of Armenia by an Armenian. *By the Rev. George H. Filian.* \$1.50. Hartford, Conn.: American Publishing Company.

THE PURPLE EAST; a Series of Sonnets on England's Desertion of Armenia. *By William Watson.* With an Explanatory Preface by the Author. 75 cents. Chicago: Stone & Kimball.

TURKEY AND THE ARMENIAN ATROCITIES. *By Rev. E. M. Bliss, D. D.* Philadelphia: Hubbard Publishing Company.

THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN TURKEY. *By Everett P. Wheeler, of the New York Bar, and Author of the Modern Law of Carriers.* New York, Chicago and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896.

In the profound interest attaching to "the Armenian questions," these books or booklets will be found very useful. With them one will be able to understand fully all the problems involved in the present crisis, as well as the duty they demand. The first is by a native pastor, who had to flee for safety. It tells of the country, its people and rulers, the political relations of the great Powers to Turkey in the Armenian question, and of the cause and progress of the recent atrocities. The second is a series of verses, full of both pathos and indignation,

suggested by the present crisis and its causes. The third is from one who is practically familiar with Turkey, and who sees all that is involved in the political aspects of the case. He treats with special fulness and fairness the subject of the partition of Turkey and all that it involves. The fourth is an address delivered last month before the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, at Toledo, Ohio, and shows what part our own government should and might take in the matter of protecting its citizens from the Turks and those who, like the Kurds, are but carrying out more brutally the spirit and wish of the masters.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE NATIONS AND OF THEIR PROGRESS IN CIVILIZATION. *By George Park Fisher, D. D., LL. D., Professor in Yale University.* Cloth. 12mo, pp. 613. \$1.50. New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: American Book Company. 1896.

This work is based upon the author's larger and well-known work, the *Outlines of Universal History*—not as an abridgment merely, but with a recasting of a considerable portion of the matter. It is specially designed for high-schools and all introductory works in history. It is fresh and vigorous, and observes a better proportion between the several epochs than one is accustomed to find in writings of this class. The author's aim is to trace the progress of men in civilization, rather than the simple facts of dynastic and military history. This renders the work more philosophical than most histories, and shows its author to be a true student of history, and one believing that the mere facts of history are only its "philosophy teaching by example." A special feature of the book is its parallel treatment of contemporary events in different nations, as the Empire and the Papacy; the long interwoven fortunes of England and France, etc. The volume is embellished with many unusually beautiful illustrations, maps, reproductions of bas-reliefs and paintings. In paper and type and arrangement it is also unsurpassed.

PRIMITIVE BUDDHISM: Its Origin and Teachings. *By Elizabeth A. Reed, A. M., Member of the Philosophical Society of Great Britain; Member of the International Congress of Orientalists; Author of "Hindu Literature," "Persian Literature," etc.* 12mo, pp. 218. \$1.00. Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co. 1896.

For one who wishes to know something of the teachings of Gautama Buddha, and of the early faith and practices of Buddhism, but who cannot have access to original documents, we suppose that this book is about as good an one as can be had. Its accomplished author is quite a scholar, and wields a graceful as well as vigorous pen.

THE REVIEW OF REVIEWS for December is full of interesting articles on national, international, educational, social, and religious subjects. The results of the recent national election, the happy ending of the Venezuelan incident, the relations of France and Russia, the results of the kindergarten, the training of teachers, the "polychrome Bible," new methods in Sunday-school work, and many other such studies, make the number one of exceptional and practical interest.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 40.—APRIL, 1897.

I. THE OLD TESTAMENT CANON.

“WHATSOEVER is spoken of God, or things pertaining to God, otherwise than the truth is, though it seem an honor, it is an injury. And as incredible praises given unto men do often abate and impair the credit of their deserved commendation, so we must likewise take great heed, lest, in attributing unto Scripture more than it can have, the incredibility of that do cause even those things which it hath most abundantly to be less reverently esteemed.”¹

Thus wrote wise old Richard Hooker some three hundred years ago. And multiplied experience since his day has fully endorsed his observations. Nothing has ever been gained by the friends of the Bible by the assumption of false or unnecessary positions, and at the present critical stage of the battle for and against the supremacy of God's word, much, very much, is to be lost by such manœuvering. History abundantly shows how bad tactics, the deep and continuous error of Christian apologetics, has once and again compelled retreat before the sharp onslaughts of the foe, with confusion, and doubt, and dismay as the results. Inexcusably, often, has the Bible been put in a false place by “attributing to it more than it can have.” Subsequent defenders have always felt the serious disadvantage of the well-meant but ruinous policy. Finding themselves at the very outset in an untenable position, their first move was necessarily a retreat, to their own discomfiture and the jubilation of their opponents. We are even now learning something of the risk involved in relying upon argu-

¹ *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book II., Section 8.

ments which cannot stand the test of close investigation. And it is because I am convinced of the hopelessness of making a stand for the integrity and authority of the sacred canon upon the grounds so often assumed by the "defenders of the faith" that I venture to publish what I have here written. I am convinced that the argument on this subject must be rescued from the baneful uncertainties of all *a priori* reasoning, to be fixed where it belongs, upon realities, and realities only. And if, in the attainment of this purpose, the result shall appear to many of my readers somewhat discouragingly negative in its character, I beg them to reflect that such result is in strictest harmony with present known historical truth, and, therefore, of far more value than any amount of purely presumptive reasoning can be, even "though it seem an honor." The truth alone is mighty and will prevail.

The function of Scripture as the vehicle of revelation demands a canon of Scripture. That is to say, it seems logical to expect that if God has a message for mankind in what we term the Bible, it is of vital importance that there should be no dubiety as to the several documents that ought to be included in the Bible. But, once more demonstrating the fond fallacy of *a priori* reasoning about "the ways of God to men," we find that among the many "interesting questions concerning the Scripture that are not yet answered," none is more interesting or more important than this very question of what, since the days of Irenæus, has been called the canon of Scripture. The whole subject of the canon—its origin, its development, its integrity and authority—is still enveloped in a haze of doubt, even in the minds of scholars. Is it, perhaps, too much to say that not one minister in ten, even in the Presbyterian Church, could give an approximately intelligent account of what is really known about it? Why were precisely the books with which we are now acquainted included in the sacred list, while other respectable candidates for this signal distinction were rejected? Was each individual book now included in the list divinely authenticated as inspired, with a view to its adoption by the church? If so, what was the form of such authentication? And upon the completion of the list, did that list itself receive inspired sanction? If so, when and how? It is somewhat trite

to suggest that if these and similar questions "could be answered in a satisfactory way it would greatly simplify Christian apologetics and supersede much hostile criticism." Just so. But can they, in the light of modern historical research, be answered in a satisfactory way? The answer, even though it seem a dangerous surrender, must be an emphatic No. The hard fact is that the whole history of the origin and formation of what we now call the canon is distinctly disappointing. This is true of the Old and New Testaments alike. Both the Jewish and Christian churches for centuries had their antilegomena, or controverted books, as over against the homologoumena, or universally accepted ones. Several of the former received a final classification with the latter only after generations had discussed their claims.

But there are those who do not admit the necessity for a negative reply to the questions suggested above. They have, as they believe, something positive to offer. Their argument, as stated in an admirably concrete article in a prior number of this review by one of my former honored instructors, Dr. J. B. Shearer,¹ is, for substance, the following: Christ and his apostles "found the canon in existence as an authorized canon," accepted by "the Jews the world over" as complete and authoritative. There is no denying that this canon was "settled during the intermediate period between Malachi and Christ." During this period the Jews were not, as commonly supposed, without prophet, or oracle, or miracle. The members of the Great Synagogue, who were sometimes prophets and high priests, assisted by some unheard-of oracle or miracle, collected the twenty-four books of the Old Testament and authoritatively closed the list against all further additions. Now, this is, of course, what must be termed, and not invidiously, the traditional theory of the canon. We learned it from the earnest scholarly men who went before in the paths of biblical research,

¹ "The Canon of Scripture; Is it Divinely Authenticated?" *The Presbyterian Quarterly*, April, 1893. It is proper to say just here that, although the views I champion differ radically from Dr. Shearer's well-known position, it is to the stimulus of his admirable "Bible Course," first fully elaborated by him during my residence at Southwestern Presbyterian University, I owe my ever-growing interest in biblical studies. If ever it should be my privilege to add anything to the defence or elucidation of God's word, the merit must largely revert to him.

and who stood almost instinctively, and certainly most valiantly, for the truth. Colored as it is by their piety and fictitiously strengthened by their fame, it was for a long time accepted as sufficient. Naturally, it is hard to cure the prejudices time has gendered in its favor, especially when those prejudices are still reinforced by the earnest championship of men who deservedly stand high in the councils of the church. But when providence brings us face to face with new facts, it is our plain duty to readjust our theories accordingly. Conservatism has gone to seed when it clings to the old simply because it is old.

It is a still widely-current assertion that the Old Testament canon was settled during the period between Malachi and Christ. Just why Malachi is fixed upon as the *terminus a quo* it is difficult to understand, but presumably upon the supposition that Malachi was in the order of time the last of the inspired writers, which he certainly was not. The act of settling was performed, it is added by this class of theorists, by the men of the Great Synagogue.

But for the existence of this Synagogue, there is absolutely no historical evidence whatever. It is not once mentioned either by Philo or Josephus, or any one of the many apocryphal or pseudepigraphical writers before the second century, A. D. The wide and varied extent of the writings of these men makes it inconceivable that they should have omitted all mention of such a body had it existed and performed so important a function as the settlement of the limits of that sacred literature upon which the Jewish religion and Jewish life depended. The writers of the New Testament, as is well known, give no intimation that they ever heard of such a venerable and important body. "There is no evidence from any literary source whatever nearer to the historical period to which the Great Synagogue is assigned than *Pirke Aboth*, the well-known Mishnic treatise of the third century, A. D., and all the testimony of *Pirke Aboth* amounts to is this: that in the chain of tradition from Moses to the scribes of the second century, B. C., the Great Synagogue intervened between the prophets and 'the Pairs' of Scribes, and that Simon the Just, ranked as its last surviving member."¹ On the other hand,

¹ *The Canon of the Old Testament*, H. E. Ryle, 1895, p. 278.

Kuenen, following Krochmal's lead concerning the identity of the Great Synagogue with the Great Convocation of Neh. viii. 10, has conclusively proved that the former is simply a mirage of the latter seen by Jewish writers of the earlier Christian centuries, writers whose views of the history of their people were both inverted and perverted. Their references to the **כנסת הגדולה** **אנשי** are manifold, but confusing. They usually account them a kind of college of eighty-five or one hundred persons, sometimes regarding it as a permanent body, sometimes as a temporary gathering. Among the members mentioned are Zerubbabel, Haggai, Zechariah, Daniel, and the three Hebrew children, thus antedating Ezra, by others claimed as its founder, by some eighty years. But Nehemiah, Malachi, and Simon the Just, are also named. The latter lived about 300 B. C. The Synagogue's period of activity would really date, therefore, from Zerubbabel to the times of Alexander the Great, a period of at least two hundred years. But these two centuries have dwindled, in Talmudic tradition, to the brevity of one generation. Hence the assumption of that tradition that the worthies above named all flourished at the same time.

As to the activity of these "men," we are told, among other things, that they wrote (**כתבו**) "Ezekiel's book, the Twelve Prophets, Daniel, and Esther"; that the so-called eighteen *Tiqqune Sopherim*, or improved passages, are their handiwork; that they drew up certain prayers; that they established the feast of Purim, and that they allayed the doubts that some felt about the inspiration of Ecclesiastes and the Song. But nowhere is it asserted that they fixed the limits of the Old Testament as a whole, once for all closing the canon. That they, or any of them, did so, was a bold invention of Elias Levita, a Jewish scholar of the sixteenth century, reinforced in the next by the weighty authority of the two Buxtorfs. It was an entirely unhistorical and unsupported guess, which owed its immediate and long popularity alike to the exigencies of controversy and the difficulty of its refutation by reason of the poverty of historical criticism.

We have justly disdained the story in 2 Esdras, so popular

with the early Fathers, according to which Ezra, by divine inspiration, re-wrote the books of the Old Testament in full after their destruction in the fall of Jerusalem, thereby supplying the returned exiles at once with an authoritative canon. Why should we not discard, as equally unfounded and unsatisfactory, the legend of the "Men of the Great Synagogue," and their activity in fixing the canon? "The whole story is so ridiculous and absurd as to carry the stamp of falsehood upon its face."¹

But, even though the Great Synagogue is a myth, it is still possible that the canon was closed during the period of its supposed activity, or later, but before the time of Christ, by some prophet, oracle, or miracle; for such supernatural agencies were not, according to this view, quiescent during this period. The argument is this: the government of the Hebrews was a theocracy; a means of inter-communication between governor and governed is an essential feature of such a system; hence the canon must have been fixed by some such prophet, or oracle, or miracle. But this is palpably fallacious reasoning in the order known to logicians as the *ignoratio elenchi*. Granting, of course, the correctness of the premises, I point out the stealthy assumption lurking in the inferior conclusion, that prophets, oracles, and miracles were a continuously uninterrupted necessity in a theocratic government such as the Hebrews enjoyed. Would the failure of these supernatural agencies for one hundred years vitiate the theocracy? If so, would a like failure for ten years destroy it? And, if so, would their absence for twenty-four hours be incompatible with its existence? It would surely be a very difficult thing to prove an absolutely uninterrupted succession of prophets in Israel from Sinai to the cross. Nor is that, of course, attempted, except in a very inconsequential way. In the effort to make good this position, Dr. Shearer, for instance, is compelled to content himself by citing from the New Testament the extraordinary visions of Zecharias and the two Marys, the case of Simeon and Anna, the prophecy of Caiaphas, and the story of the pool of Siloam (disdaining in the latter case the overwhelming testimony of textual criticism); and, from Josephus, that worthy's ever-ready testimony

¹ Thornwell's *Collected Writings*, Vol. III., p. 580.

to the unusual, the story of Pollio and Sameas, who flourished just before the time of Christ. Why the list was not made to include the dreams of Pilate's wife and the Jewish historian's assertions about the prophetic powers of John Hyrcanus¹ seems passing strange. The argument might as well have been rounded out to the *reductio ad absurdum*. As it is, the effort to establish the proposition that there was prophecy, etc., in Israel "down to the time of Christ," results in the establishment of what we all knew full well before: that these strange phenomena occurred between 5 B. C. and 30 A. D., and in immediate connection with the incarnation of the Son of God.

The Jews of this intervening and subsequent periods were themselves conscious that they had lost the privilege of direct divine guidance. They took it for granted that with the death of Ezra the age of inspiration ceased. This is abundantly evidenced in 1 Maccabees, a product of this middle period. In iv. 46 of that book, we are told that certain polluted altar-stones were laid aside till a prophet should arise in Israel to tell what should be done with them. In ix. 27 we read of a "great sorrow in Israel, such as there had not been since the days that prophets ceased to appear among them." And in xiv. 41 it is said that "Simon was constituted high priest and leader until some faithful prophet should arise." Canonical Zechariah xiii. 3 seems to predict such a non-prophetic age. Malachi iv. 5, 6 no longer looks forward to the constant succession of prophets foretold in Deut. xviii. 18. To quote Josephus, the strict procession of prophets came to an end during the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, who reigned during 464-425 B. C. The rabbinic author of *Seder Olam* Zuther records the tradition that when Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi died, "at the same time prophecy ceased in Israel." Jerome expresses the opinion of his day when he tells us that "Post Aggaeum, Zachariam, et Malachiam, nullos alios prophetas usque ad Johannem Baptistam videram." Augustine voices the same conviction when he says that the Jews, after Malachi "non habuerunt prophetas usque ad Salvatoris adventum." Finally and conclusively, we read in Psalm lxxiv. 9, beyond all controversy a production of

¹ Josephus, *Jewish Wars*, Book I., chapter 2.

the Maccabean era: "We see not our signs (*i. e.*, once well-known miraculous intimations); there is no more any prophet, neither is there among us any that knoweth how long."

On this point it remains only to be said that even if such divine communication be granted during this period, the all-important point must still be proved, that the sacred list of books was really fixed by such means. The prophet, oracle, and miracle must still be identified, and must be connected with the settling of the canon in "such a way as to find a divine authentication." And this, it goes without saying, cannot be done. And lacking the historic fact, it is not an argument calmly to assume that it was done. The reply is easy, that from what we know of the subsequent history of the sacred text and canon, the presumption is strongly against the probability of a miraculous definition of the sacred list, either as to its individual members, or as a whole upon its completion.

But even if the Great Synagogue fails them, and the prophet, oracle, and miracle turn out to be most unreliable props, an argument may yet be built upon the claimed fact that at the time of Christ the Jews the world over accepted the present known canon as complete and authoritative. That is to say, it is asserted that the Old Testament canon at the time of Christ was a fixed and final fact of twenty-four books as we now have it. Since, now, Christ and his apostles brought all their "claims and teachings to the test" of this sharply defined rule, it results that we of to-day have a "divine authority itself divinely attested." This, if in accord with the facts, would be irrefragable. What are the facts? Did the Jews, at the time of Christ, recognize a "complete and authoritative canon"? Were the limits of the Old Testament precisely fixed at that time the world over? Let it be noted that the question is not whether the canon was practically, to all intents and purposes, among the masses, made up of the books we now have; but that it is whether it was *precisely* and *authoritatively* what it is to-day. Can we be positive that exactly our modern Old Testament was our Lord's Bible? An affirmative answer is often easily taken for granted. But an impartial examination of such testimony of antiquity as can be gathered makes it abun-

dantly clear that for the purposes of strict scholarly inquiry a negative reply is more in harmony with the facts.

It is well known that we are not in possession of anything like a "complete and authoritative" list of the sacred books of either before or during the time of Christ. "The nearest approach to a catalogue is the panegyric on the famous men of Israel in Ecclesiasticus," or, according to the LXX., The Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach. "The writer takes up the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets in order. He also mentions the Psalms of David, and the songs, proverbs, and parables of Solomon. Daniel and Esther are passed over in silence, and Nehemiah is mentioned without Ezra."¹ Philo, contemporary with the apostles, and a voluminous writer, omits all mention of Ruth, Chronicles, Esther, Nehemiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Ecclesiastes, the Song, and Lamentations. The New Testament also fails us on this important point. Its writers employ a number of general terms for the Old, such as law, prophets, law and prophets, and sacred writings; and Jesus refers on one occasion to "the law, the prophets, and the Psalms"; but the several attempts that have been made to find in these references a completed technical three-fold division of the books have been barren. Granted that such a technical division existed, who can define the contents and limits of each separate division? Was it ever defined? It is very significant that no New Testament writer ever builds a doctrine on, or even quotes from, a single book which was in dispute at that time. The following from Professor Charteris very fairly states the case. Says he:

"It may be a mere coincidence, but it is at least noteworthy, that the only books of the Old Testament not quoted in the New are the three books of the writings of Solomon, Esther, Ezra, and Nehemiah. Ezra and Nehemiah are historical books, which there was probably no occasion to quote; but the other four unquoted books, Esther, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, are those books which were not accepted by all at the time of our Lord."²

Dr. Shearer claims that there is no "question that Christ and

¹ *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church.* W. R. Smith, 1892, p. 152.

² *The New Testament Scriptures: their Claims, History, and Authority.* A. H. Charteris, 1882, p. 88.

his apostles give the most abundant and satisfying testimony to the exact canon as it stands to-day." But there is a doubt that will not down, for he admits, nevertheless, that "it does not seem final and sufficient to rest the Old Testament on the references of Christ and his apostles." That statement, from such a source, is surely enough to make one rub his eyes. If Christ's references to a subject are "abundant and satisfying," why are they not "final and sufficient"?

Flavius Josephus, who wrote towards the very end of the first century, A. D., supplies us with the earliest list of so-called accredited books, but unfortunately fails to tell us upon what authority or why they were "accredited as divine." Either by omission, or by means of now unknown combination, he makes their number to be twenty-two, in fanciful harmony with the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet. The Talmud gives the number as twenty-four. The Essenes and Zealots extended the canon to the so-called esoteric writings. Of these the apocalypse of Ezra mentions seventy.

The first historical attempt to settle the canon authoritatively is given by the so-called Synod of Jamnia, or Jabne, held about 90 A. D. Before this gathering of the learned rabbins took place, the rival schools of Hillel and Shammai had found abundant room for differences, among other things, in their judgments of the Book of Ecclesiastes, the former denying, the latter affirming, its canonicity. But this Jamnia Synod, after considerable wrangling, by a majority vote, and with acts of violence towards the dissenters, fixed the number of books "which defiled the hands," the well-known halachic circumlocution for sacred, and in this instance, canonical. Three books especially seem to have come within the scope of their discussion: Ecclesiastes, the Song, and Esther. The result was in favor of their right to a place in the sacred list, but the grounds of the decision are not on record. But even this authoritative (?) utterance did not prevent a continuation of the heated discussion of the rabbins. In 125 A. D. a certain R. Judah admitted that Ecclesiastes was still in dispute in his day. In the Talmud we are told that a R. Samuel, who flourished in the third century, taught concerning Esther that it

did not "defile the hands." In the oriental Christian church the canons of Melito, who died after 170 A. D., of Gregory of Nazianzus (A. D. 391), of Athanasius (A. D. 373), and of Amphilochius (A. D. 380), omit Esther. In the occidental church the canon of Origen (A. D. 254) adds Baruch after Lamentations, and mentions Esther last. Jerome (A. D. 420), in his commentary on Ecclesiastes, shows a familiarity with the doubts of the Jewish doctors concerning this book.¹

Very much more of a similar nature might be added. What has been said is itself sufficient to show that there is no ground for the assertion that the Jews of the time of Christ, "the world over," accepted precisely our present Old Testament canon as "complete and authoritative." But to clinch the proof, we turn for a moment to the LXX. for its contribution to the argument.

Although it is somewhat hazardous to take even the simplest things in the realm of sacred bibliology for granted, it would, doubtless, be a work of supererogation to go into the origin of this well-known version in an article written for the readers of THE QUARTERLY. Suffice it to say, that beginning with the translation of the Torah, about 250 B. C., other books being added from time to time, at least until 114 B. C., it soon became, to all intents and purposes, the Bible of a vast number of Jews, and attained sufficient authority to be quoted by the New Testament.

What are the phenomena, pertinent to this discussion, which it presents? It exhibits at least three important points in which it differs from the Palestinian canon. Briefly summed up they are: (1), It knows no division into law, prophets, and hagiographa. The Palestinian distinction between the prophetic writings and the hagiographa is entirely unknown, the books being grouped rather according to subjects than upon any other principle; (2), It contains many important variations from the Massoretic text, omitting, adding and transposing matter in the very freest fashion. Sometimes this is evidently the result of ignorance on the part of

¹ For elaborate citations upon this and the other points discussed, see *Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments*. F. Buhl, 1891; and, especially, *Die Entstehung des Alttestamentlichen Kanons*. G. Wildeboer, 1891.

the translators, but often showing very clearly the traces of editorial redaction; (3), There are found in it, indiscriminately mingled with "the canonical" writings, other books, now known as the Apocrypha, which the Palestinian Jews looked upon as purely profane productions.

Now, the only legitimate deduction to be made from these phenomena is, certainly, that the Hellenistic Jews—a large and intelligent and influential class—did not much trouble themselves with the idea of a sharply defined canon, such as prevailed among their Palestinian brethren; and that, consequently, the line of demarcation between canonical and uncanonical books had not, at the time this translation was made, and during its subsequent long popularity, been fixed among them, unless, indeed, the very popularity of the translation fixed the contents of it into canonical frigidity. That the Alexandrians looked upon all the Apocrypha as of the same importance as the law and prophets is not only not probable, but certainly not true. But if they knew of and acknowledged an authoritative canon, would they admit into its sacred precincts books that, in their judgment, had no claim to such honor? Certainly not. It results, then, either that they had no notion of a canon in the rigid Palestinian sense, or that, having a canon, they looked upon the books referred to (Maccabees, Judith, Susanna, etc.) as standing on an equal footing with the regular hagiographa. Whichever solution is adopted goes to show that a strictly defined and universally acknowledged canon at the time of Christ was not within the realm of the actual. It is not an answer to this to point to the use made of the Apocrypha in Luther's version and in other editions of the Bible. The character and place of these books is now sufficiently defined. They have been sifted out from the others as chaff is sifted from the wheat with which it is at first indiscriminately mingled. The question is, Did the Jews and early Christians discriminate? From the position of the apocryphal books in the manuscripts, their inclusion in the earliest canons, and the use made of them by the Fathers, we conclude that they did not.

Having thus, upon purely historical grounds, shown the futility of the effort to find an ultimate test of canonicity in some special

external divine attestation, and having thereby, in the opinion of some who read these lines, doubtless dealt a blow at confidence in the authenticity and authority of the literature of revelation, it now becomes necessary to add something constructively to what has been said above apparently so destructively.

It will materially assist to a clear conception of a difficult matter if it is borne in mind that *canonicity is not a circumstantial, but an intrinsic, quality of a given writing*. That is to say, in other words, that the canonical books of Scripture are such, not, necessarily, by reason of their authorship, or because their production and promulgation was accompanied by miraculous signs, but because God, having determined that their specific contents should be for his people a rule of faith and practice, to that end invested them with those distinguishing, even though indefinable, attributes that have stamped them with authority and made them dynamic with influence for good the world around. He put into them, evidently, that which he did not put into other books written by prophets and apostles—a something which, somehow, perpetuates them and compels recognition from the world, and certifies them to his “elect.” “All Scripture inspired of God is profitable,” is the way Paul puts the matter. For example: the prophecies of Isaiah, the entire sixty-six chapters of the book, have always been looked upon as canonical, doubtless, ever since the idea of canonicity became regnant; and they are still so regarded, but not because Isaiah was their author, for it is possible to conceive that doubts may have existed on that point in ancient, just as they now exist in many modern, minds; nor yet because the oracles they contain were, either one by one as delivered, or all together, attested as divine by some external means, for of this we do not and cannot know anything, *but because they are intrinsically so, were intended by God to perform what might be termed their canonical functions*. The same remarks apply in both particulars to the Epistle to the Hebrews, to the Gospel of Mark (for that writer was not an apostle), and to many other books of the Bible; and, in respect to an external divine attestation of their mission, to one and all of them.

It is, moreover, certain that Isaiah was the author of a book

about the "acts of Uzziah," and it is altogether probable that Paul wrote an epistle to the Laodiceans (Col. iv. 16), and possible that he addressed another to the Corinthians, written before the two which have been preserved (1 Cor. v. 9). Now, were these ever looked upon as canonical by the church? They certainly never attained to canonicity in the same sense as Genesis or Romans, although it is quite conceivable that they were written with the self-same human intent and purpose that produced the last two named. Why did not such books secure the honor and perpetuity of canonicity? "If Paul's name as an inspired apostle was a sufficient guarantee of the canonicity of the epistle in the first instance, then how can the mere lapse of time have affected its sufficiency as a guarantee to us?"¹ Well, overlooking in this query the manifest confusion of canonicity with authenticity, the sufficient reply is, that not all that an apostle wrote always applied for edification to all future time as well as to any given "first instance" that called his pen into exercise. It is almost an impossibility; but suppose that from among the moldering parchments of an oriental monastery the lost epistle to the Laodiceans should be recovered by modern industrious scholarship. Suppose its authenticity should be established, say, as conclusively as any of Paul's writings now in the canon. Would such a recovery *eo ipso* put the epistle into the canon? Who would decide the momentous issue? Now-a-days the mere revising of the text of the canon by the very quintessence of the Christian scholarship of the world seems to meet the disapprobation of God's people. What would be the result of an effort to introduce an entire new book into their Bibles? No, since we of to-day are now utterly unable to tell whether or no the books above referred to were inspired, whether a prophet or apostle ever wrote anything that was not inspired, the only possible solution of their fate is that, inspired or not, there was evidently no *raison d'être* for their preservation. There was for them no purpose to serve over and above the purposes served by the books we now have. They contained no new revelation; they certified to no further facts;

¹ *A Recently Proposed Test of Canonicity.* W. M. McPheeters, THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, Jan. 1891, p. 51.

they did not point the sinner to any additional truth; they did not lead the saint into any deeper consciousness of salvation in Christ; and so, by the simple law of survival of the fittest, they passed out of sight forever, after serving a local and temporary end.

But, it may be asked, how can we, then, ruling the question of authorship and external miraculous *imprimatur* out of court, arrive at a sufficient recognition of this inherent and subtle quality of canonicity, call it inspiration or anything else. To this question we will now address ourselves, necessarily with the greatest brevity.

There are several lines along which the evidences for the canonicity of a given book may be found, neither of which, independently pursued, would lead to certainty, but all together supplying such cumulative proof as to put the matter of the canon practically out of the way as one of the so-called "burning questions" of the day. The evidences are external and internal, objective and subjective.

There is, first, by way of preliminary assurance, the general result of historical criticism to the genuineness and authenticity of the Bible as a whole, as well as the satisfactory issue of the special investigations into the merits of certain parts of it, such as the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel. Recent "destructive criticism" has not been able to destroy the "impregnable rock of Holy Scripture," but has done invaluable service in removing from it the accumulated and rank moss of centuries of human tradition.

There is, second, as subsidiary proof, looking at the Bible as a whole, the argument from its organic unity, in spite of its diversity of authorship and the origin of the several parts at centuries of time and continents of space removed from each other. The Bible is a continuous whole, a completed design, its perfectly co-ordinated parts supplied by workmen often ignorant of their mutual labors. This is an old and now unappreciated, but, when understood, most convincing, suggestion.

There is, third, as further evidence, the twofold witness of the church and history throughout the world and centuries, back to the most primitive times, the former always recognizing the Bible

which we now have as divine, and testifying to its satisfaction of the religious feelings and deepest needs of mankind; the other unequivocally affirming its uniform and unmatched influence for good upon the individual and society.

There is, fourthly and conclusively, the testimony of the Spirit of God to the intelligence and heart of the individual believer and to the mind of the organized body of believers, in all countries and ages, removing doubts, illuminating saving truth, and assuring the soul and the church of their possession of the "word of God" written. This is the argument from experience so suggestively illustrated by R. W. Dale.¹ "True faith sees in the letter of the documents of Revelation the religious content brought to an immutable objectivity, which is able to attest itself as truth by the divine Spirit, which can at once warm and quicken the letter in order to place the living God-man before the eyes of the believer." "Thus the canon explains and judges itself; it needs no foreign standard."² This is not weak, nerveless mysticism. It is simply confidently claiming the ascension promise of the great Head of the church of that Agent who should lead his people into all truth.

It may be objected that whilst all this may be true of the Bible as a whole, it does not apply to the individual books. What, it may be asked, is there in the Books of Esther or 2 John to commend them to the Christian church of to-day? A detailed technical discussion of this and similar particular problems being impossible here, it is sufficient to reply with a simple but effective illustration, the idea of an organism:

"The Bible may be conceived of as an organic body of writings, in which every particular book has its proper place and function. But in every living organism some organs are vital and some are not. There are parts of the body which to lose is to die; there are others which we may lose without dying, or even materially suffering in health. 'Some members of the body,' writes Dr. Hodge, 'are more important than others, and some books of the Bible could be better spared than others. There may be as great a difference between John's Gospel and the Book of Chronicles as between a man's brain and the hair of his head; nevertheless, the life of the body is as truly in the hair as in the brain.' Dr. Hodge's point is that even unimportant books may be inspired. But the observa-

¹ *The Living Christ and the Four Gospels.* 1890.

² *System of Christian Doctrine.* Dorner, II., p. 229.

tion quoted serves our purpose equally well, which is to show that there may be doubts about certain books of the Bible without vital consequence to the faith ensuing. The hair of the head is a part of the body, yet a man can live comfortably enough without it. In like manner it may happen to a man to be in doubt about this or the other book of Scripture, yet he may derive from the sacred writings the benefit they were designed to confer. It is not insinuated that all the books of the Bible whose canonicity has been doubted are as unimportant to the organism of Scripture as the hair of the head is to the body. Who would say this of the Epistle to the Hebrews, concerning which the early church for a season stood in doubt? The purpose is merely to throw out a general reflection that may be helpful in perplexity, not to pronounce invidious judgments on individual books.”¹

Our space utterly forbids the elaboration of the propositions above named, but it must be evident, from all that has been said, that along the lines indicated in them can we alone approximate certainty about this problem of the canon. We have had no miraculous attestation of the New Testament, either in whole or in part. None, indeed, is needed, nor can we put our finger upon the birthplace and time of its completed authoritative canon. The same must be said of the Old Testament. But there need not, therefore, be any doubt whether or no the church is now in possession of the will of God. If God ever revealed himself to his creatures, the record of such revelation is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, or it does not now exist at all. We may confidently continue to abide in the things which we have learned, knowing that the sacred writings are able to make us wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

WILLIAM W. ELWANG.

Orlando, Fla.

¹ *Apologetics*. A. B. Bruce, 1892, p. 314.

II. THE SPECULATIVE VIEW OF FAITH.

THE defects of our uncritical thought result mainly from our slowness and unwillingness to leave the sphere and influence of mere external and finite relations. The methods of the logical understanding and categories of thought, on the other hand, have the advantage of discovering to us those latent contradictions which frequently pass without suspicion in popular language and exposition. But even these methods, when applied to religious ideas, in order to permanent results, require a regulative principle which is not contained in them. Otherwise, a movement which promised well, and was begun hopefully with the purpose of giving greater clearness to our conceptions, ends, more likely, in the confusion of simple faith, and fails also to satisfy reason itself. There is no other way to prove our knowledge than to bring it to the test of the category of necessity. Propositions which borrow nothing from the contingent contain this *a priori* element. Without this element they must await the slow process of empirical testimony, or be acted upon without verification as untried experiments. In the ordinary affairs of life no such standard is possible. Probability, not necessity, is the rule of life. But in morality and religion the empirical standard is a needless, fallible, and offensive thing. In presenting the speculative or discursive view of faith, we must not forget to provide some unconditional test of validity, else we shall be apt to share the fate of the man who hastily sets to work without foundation for his opinions, only to see his structure displaced by other opinions, and those, perhaps, equally groundless. We might suppose that the understanding, wearied with its unsuccessful efforts, would confess its incompetence and leave the field. Such is by no means the case. Refusing an unconditional *prius*, it continues its Sisyphus-like labors with unabated zeal and with a sublimity of confidence bordering on the grotesque. Between the arrogance of reason on the one hand, and utter skepticism on the other, may there not be a middle course—a view not wholly independent of the common organon

of knowledge, nor wholly dependent upon its common methods? Let us assume that there is such a course, and let us attempt within this sphere to exhibit the grounds and function of faith. As to the grounds, we shall decide in advance that faith is intelligible only on the presupposition of knowledge. The composite view seems to be held by many eminent authorities, as Rothe, Jacobi, Dorner, and others, apparently defending the scholastic maxim, *crede ut intelligas*. But the discussion has really hung upon the use and meaning of terms rather than the psychological fact. Both Abelard and Anselm would agree that faith must be rational. This is all that is necessary to settle. Faith must somehow legitimate itself. It must obtain authority from some source. Then, in turn, the source itself must be rationalized. This authority must be settled by reason, and the reason, it would appear, must have the last word. But this is not the meaning of rationality. If it were, no place could be found for faith, though we sought for it with tears. Reason believes in itself, but reason neither comprehends itself as an absolute whole, nor its own concepts. To demand a comprehension of all the objects of faith would, therefore, be itself irrational. Faith may accept what has been demonstrated, and if it possessed no wider field, then faith and knowledge would embrace each other. But faith does not stop with positivism. Faith is wider. It comprehends its own instruments—the very ground of its existence—much that reason cannot demonstrate. But it must not attempt to embrace contradictories. Here is the principal function of philosophy, both in pure reason and in religion. It is to try the doctrines, to see whether they be of reason or of themselves, comparing doctrine with doctrine. Neither should doctrines collide with the laws of thought as universally recognized, and the accepted laws of evidence. So we say again, whatever is not rational is not of faith, and where there is no ground for faith there is no faith.

As to the function of faith and the obligation of faith in God there is much to be said, or rather much that ought to be said, by teachers of ethics in opposition to the inveterate tendency of the times to construct a morality independent of religion. There is great de-

mand for faith, but it is for the most part, in philosophy, limited to phenomena. Philosophic speculation, both in morals and in religion, makes less and less demand upon our faith in God, while scientific inquiry in the physical world makes a bold demand for faith in a great multitude of abstractions, such as law, order, system, adjustment, and many other impersonal objects, in increasing numbers.

The Psychology of Faith.—Something should be said about the psychology of faith. On this point authorities have been unable to agree. Some have made faith to depend upon the intellect, others upon the sensibilities, others upon the will, while still others have invented a faith-faculty. The consensus of opinion would probably be expressed by the late Professor T. H. Green, of Oxford: "In different relations reason is the source alike of faith and knowledge. God is not wisely trusted when declared unintelligible." If we turn to the New Testament many passages seem to predicate faith of the reason as its source, while an equal number may be found which seem to posit faith in the will, but never in mere feeling. Faith is truly a mighty stimulus to feeling, but it follows rather than precedes it. I am persuaded that faith is capable of a deeper psychological treatment than has hitherto been accorded to it. It is unnecessary here to point out the proposed course of thought, but only to indicate a few results which it seems quite easy to establish, viz., (*a*), Faith is the synthetic unity of rational perceptions concerning the attributes of God; (*b*), Faith is the substance and evidence of that knowledge which is most intimately connected with human happiness; (*c*), It is not philosophical to divorce faith from knowledge.

Belief and Knowledge.—A cloud of obscurities has at times rested upon the relation of faith and knowledge. A schism between reason and belief seemed at one time inevitable on philosophical grounds. For more than a decade the doctrine of the Unknowable, as proclaimed by Hamilton, followed by Mansel, seemed supreme. Speculative thought was brought to a standstill or became fatally misleading. We were taught that the Infinite is the Unknowable, and yet that the "Infinite is, must, and ought to be believed in." When reason began to recover itself it was seen

that the key to the difficulty lay in the conclusion "the Infinite must be believed in." For this conclusion must be either mediate or immediate. By hypothesis it is not mediate, it is therefore immediate; and since it is immediate, and yet forms no part of our knowledge, this curious result is reached, that our intuitive or immediate belief in the axioms of geometry, and therefore of geometry itself, forms no part of our knowledge! But this doctrine of Hamilton has long since crumbled under criticism.

No close observer of the trend of thought in morals and in religion can fail to observe the naturalistic tendency. The impatience with which recent writers on morals treat the ideals of Christian ethics is amazing. And this tendency seems to have grown to a passion since the theory of evolution came to be a factor in the explanation of man in his moral consciousness. Since it has been discovered, under the stress of the evolutionary hypothesis, that morality has no absolute *a priori* principle, and that man is simply the product of material conditions shared alike with the brute, ethical writers have vied with each other in their efforts to reduce morality to the methods of natural science. Before proceeding further, I desire to call attention to two outstanding facts verifiable in history: that every form of morality independent of God has degenerated into (*a*), gloomy pessimism; (*b*), or philosophical egoism:

1. In reference to the first fact I am concerned with what philosophers call intuitional, or formal, or idealistic, ethics. Here it is not necessary to trace the ethical spirit in the ancient Greeks, or the later Platonists, or the Brahman, or the Buddhist, in the view that life is an illusion and burdensome, or to dwell upon the stoical philosophy, or to follow the reasoning of Hume, that from the consolidated good and evil of this world no beneficent First Cause can be predicated; but it will be sufficient to take a classical example from modern philosophy to show that the whole ethical process, even under the inspiration of one of the most wonderful of men, is but a continuous repetition, and forever remains essentially the same. I refer to Kant. I am greatly disinclined to attempt any criticism of his great work on the *Practical Reason*; but it is well known that he falls into antinomy. He confesses it.

There is no thoroughfare in absolute formalism. Perpetual self-legislation ends in perpetual and useless conflict. Logical symmetry must be marred, or moral autonomy without content must be surrendered. The absolute opposition between reason and nature, virtue and happiness, with which he set out, can be overcome by no further dialectic, but only by invoking the datum, God; and hence, when he advances the postulate that virtue is a form of causality in the sensible world, the dualism between virtue and happiness is reconciled, the attainment is no longer impossible, and his system is carried over into the domain of Christian ethics; but the inner harmony of his metaphysic has so far lost tone that no hand has been able to restore it. Kant founds by his postulate a causal connection between virtue and happiness through the Author of nature. This assumption, which liberates his system from the category of infidel ethics, condemns it at once in the eyes of those who are content to follow him only to the extent of his rigorous formalism. With such, the conflict of reason and nature could not be compromised. To such, also, the postulate with which Kant had resolved his antinomy was but a weak concession to the endæmonistic spirit which at first, they said, he had put out at the door only to bring back again at last at the window. Among those who took offence at Kant's final position, Schopenhauer, the misanthropic philosopher of Frankfurt, easily stands first. The apparently logical consequence of this man's doctrine would be universal suicide. To him the world was the worst possible—an unmitigated horror. He claimed that the idea of duty should be eliminated from ethics. How far Hartmann, Frauenstädt and others have relieved or promoted this doctrine, or how far their influence has extended among English-speaking people, are questions which must end only in pure conjecture. Suffice it to say, the repulsive features of their pessimism do not appear to lessen its popularity.

2. The other fact referred to is no less saddening. Objective or empirical ethics is naturalistic, and finds its logical expression in a bald egoism, and is itself a tacit declaration of war between the species, *bellum omnium contra omnes*. Of this evil tendency in ethics, Ludwig Feuerbach may be taken as the classic repre-

sentative. While claiming fellowship with Fichte and Schleiermacher in theology and philosophy, he inconsistently taught that the individual man, in his sense-intuitions, is the only absolute; that pleasure is the *summum bonum*, and can be attained alone in society. His writings have given the principal material to all nihilistic and communistic literature. J. S. Mill, in accord with Bentham and other utilitarians, shows that happiness as the ethical principle of morality must resolve itself at last into the supreme desire for one's own happiness. Thus, with Comte and Spencer, while professing altruism, they have become egoists. A comprehensive application of their principles would result in nothing less than systematic and scientific individual selfishness. There are those now living who can remember when these writers first began to break with Christian ethics and to develop their purely naturalistic systems; and this rapid descent into Avernus has been immensely facilitated by the application of the theory of evolution. Ethical writers have run greedily, and with almost one accord, to this superior fountain of knowledge. All *a priori* principles were, one by one, discarded. The brutal conditions from which man was evolved would not admit the transcendental authority of duty. The whole conception must be abolished as immoral. Man under the illusion of duty might commit immoral acts. Hence, the average hedonistic writer, while feebly calling for self-renunciation, logically excludes the ideal whose authority he invokes. His humanitarianism has no commanding ground. His appeals for the progressive emancipation of society have no logical basis. Granted that the ideal good makes for righteousness, why should it be recognized if it does not rule the world? If duty is only a fetic, why may I not cast it off? If duty is but the creation of my own thought, why should it rule my conduct? If I have voluntarily adopted it, I may as freely renounce it. If duty is simply an invention of others as selfish as myself, why should I obey it? My own interests are best known to myself. Why should they be overborne by those of other persons equally selfish with myself? If conscience is but the voice of organized society, or the growth of habit, why should I obey it when it opposes itself to my selfishness? What is the inference from

these two facts? If we see that idealistic ethics, unsupported by the eternal good, falls by its own gravity into degrading pessimism, and if empirical ethics finds itself only in naturalism and unrestrained egoism, what is the moral obligation of seeking some transcendental and immutable Standard? Rather, perhaps, I should ask, What is the moral obliquity of that man who rejects at his very door the good which is able to reconcile his natural opposition of reason and will, virtue and happiness?

But it may be said that this good is a mere assumption of Christian ethics, and is based upon it. With the societies for ethical culture, and with many writers, this flimsy answer seems to possess all the virtue of a conclusive argument against the religio-ethical idea. The only duty known to man, it is said, is to be happy, and to keep one's self "healthfully moral."

Leaving the negative view, let us now turn to the positive argument.

What is the human ideal of God? If we could remove from our consideration such terms as the Absolute, the Unconditioned, and the term in which the agnostic finds his favorite refuge, we could simplify our answer. Let us summarily seek to dispose of these terms. For what is the Absolute? An Absolute which does not include humanity self-evidently is no absolute. An Unconditioned which stands in no relations with man possesses no interest for us—does not and never can, with our present faculties, enter the sphere of human knowledge. And to affirm something of the Unknowable is a deceptive contradiction. For if I declare God to be the Unknowable, I covertly contradict myself. The man who affirms that God is the UNKNOWNABLE is in the same position as the one who denies that there is a God, for in each case there must be an *a priori* idea of God; each stands self-convicted of his folly. There is then in every rational soul an imperishable ideal of God. Nor is this ideal *form* only, it has definite content. This content has been delivered to us once for all in the person of Jesus Christ. He is simultaneously our ideal man and our ideal God. There are three ways in which the reason of man exhausts itself in the effort to define concrete reality: 1. In positing a being who can master every form of nature and its mani-

festations. 2. In positing a being who never fails to master his own spirit. 3. In positing a being who instantly masters all other spirits; but this reality finds itself efficiently in the person of Jesus Christ, and leaves nothing to be added, nothing to be desired. If in the perilous opposition of reason and nature, virtue and happiness, in our daily life, we wish to supply further material to the content of our ideal, we find inexhaustible resources in his wonderful life. The history which perpetuates his character is so simple, and yet so profoundly wise and wholesome, that the child, as well as the scholar, delightedly adds some new touch—finds some new perspective, as the picture which he is forming grows in unity and completeness. But it is just here men make two difficulties: 1, Is there an infallible record of Jesus Christ; and 2, If the record be true, is Jesus Christ absolute God? These difficulties, whether honest or not, become stones of stumbling and rocks of offence; here men take occasion to avoid the obligation of faith. They exclaim against the coercion of their reason. They desire to see in advance how the opposition of reason and will, virtue and happiness, is to be overcome; and this in turn opens up afresh the whole controversy: 1. Can man know God? 2. Does man know God? The first question is wholly theistic, the second wholly apologetic. As to the former question we may dispose of it quite summarily, after the Anselmic or Cartesian methods, concluding from concept to existence, or we may treat it more discursively, taking a vast array of subjective and objective facts, and thus exhausting the whole theistic field as it is understood to-day. No man can take this course without a feeling of obligation rising like a tide within him; he will feel the will of God unconditionally binding upon him. This is no prophecy. It is abundantly borne out in the experiences of multitudes of individuals. Compare the earlier writings of many of the disciples and opponents of Kant, Fichte and Schiller, Jacobi and Hamann, and we find a growing conviction of the need of a religious morality, of a Divine ideal in humanity. While their faith was by no means churchly, and while they held themselves apart from creed, they were in all essentials at one with Christian ethics.

The latter question is answered at once affirmatively, and then

treated defensively and intensively. The synoptic account of Christ is assumed to be true. And this assumption is no proof of weakness. The long chain of historical reasoning has been so long under the hammer that its links are conceded to be of indestructible strength. No Christian should blush at this assumption. The Tübingen school has disbanded. Let us see what is the nature of this postulate. It can be shown beyond dispute, that prior to the close of the second century the Christians of that time were in possession of a body of facts respecting their Lord which were substantially the same as those now contained in the the synoptic Gospels; and further, it is true that nearly every educated man, believer or unbeliever, who has looked into the evidences of Christianity, admits the genuineness and authenticity of four Pauline epistles, viz.: the two Corinthians, Romans, and Galatians. In dealing, then, with the synoptics and these epistles, we are dealing with instruments of historical precision. With these in hand, we have to determine the true character of the historical Christ. A unique personality at once emerges, which forces the attention of all men, and concerning whom moral indifference is impossible. A man might conceivably pass into the ranks of morality who should confess his indifference to honesty or virtue, but it is inconceivable that man can stand in no moral relation to Jesus Christ. Each rational being must be for him or against him. For in dealing with him there is no neutral ground between sincerity and hypocrisy, simplicity and duplicity, humility and absurd self-conceit. He is always the former and never the latter. He never falls below the ideal of God. He is always the divine-human. Now, how does this being treat all men—men without any true conception of his mission or character—men gross, ignorant, defiant in unbelief?

It has not escaped the notice of critical readers of the New Testament that Christ does not demand knowledge in order to volition, but conversely, volition in order to knowledge. Preceptively and practically this is the order of faith. Thus, "if any man will do his will, he shall know," etc. "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me." Faith was not primarily a question of the under-

standing, but ultimately became such. "Do ye now believe?" was spoken after a long period of voluntary discipleship, and yet the question seems to have antedated their faith. What, then, is the divine procedure in the order of faith? It proceeds on the postulate of the freedom of the will. It is first, "hear ye the word of the Lord," and then, "faith cometh by hearing." The case of Naaman, the Syrian, is a case in point. If he was a man of a philosophic turn, he must have seen that his volition had been a determinative factor in his healing. He had external and inward testimony to the knowledge of his cure. He knew, also, that there had been the play of some efficiency, and that his will had somehow founded a relation between his condition and that efficiency. He knew what he had willed to do, and he knows that he is healed. Hence, his belief has a foundation of knowledge. In a similar manner may be traced the causal operation of the will in the faith of the Apostle Paul. He declares of his conversion that he was not disobedient to the heavenly vision. Astonished and overpowered, he willed to do the Lord's bidding. He was commanded to go into the city and it should be told him what he must do. His meeting with Ananias, and the strange revelation which followed, were calculated to convince his understanding. He was not called unto faith without knowledge, nor faith without works. From these and other illustrations which the reader of Scripture will readily recall, it will be seen that in the order of faith it is not a blind coercion of the reason which is attempted, but rather a free activity of the will is demanded as a condition of knowledge and the precondition of belief.

Now, it is by such induction we reach at once two, at least, of the cardinal postulates of the *Practical Reason*: (1), The postulate of freedom; (2), The postulate of will as a form of causality.

Writers upon empirical, utilitarian, and evolutionary ethics take offence at the first postulate, and make haste to show how the will is constrained by environment, habit, and training, and are apt to liken it to a physical molecule borne along in the general uniformity of nature. Under the cover of this speculation, they proceed to liberate themselves from all obligation which is not empirically discovered in society. Hence, the vast

majority of ethical writers of to-day, and the societies for ethical culture, have determined upon the absolute divorce of ethics from religion. In the light of scientific culture, it is said, a higher, a more humanitarian, morality has been discovered. Further, it is declared that religion, when injected into morality, subjects man to an objective standard of action, in which he has no rational interest. Hence, his freedom is sacrificed, without compensation, to a law which he cannot apply to his environment. In the narrow confines of the law of God he loses active self-determination and the widest development of his powers. It introduces into his life a mean spirit of abasement in the presence of his fellows, and involves him in actions which abstract from his self-respect. Self-reliant and courageous acts are discouraged. In fine, it unfits him for the world in which he must live, and handicaps him in the race for the prizes of life for which he must run.

To all these apologies for pure secular morality we may reply, If God is an illusion, virtue is an illusion also. It is impossible for me to maintain the supreme principle of moral dignity and excellence if no such principle is sovereign in the universe. If the world is not directed to the good, and is not destined to attain it, why should I identify myself with it? why labor for a falling cause? Hence, Kant is right in making the existence of God the postulate of morality. He argues well that the honest man necessarily recognizes the existence of a moral cause in the world, and he is unable to repress the spontaneous volition of his soul, "I will the being of God."

Having considered some of the grounds contained in the idea of freedom and in the fact of revelation why men should seek faith in God, let us proceed to examine some of the grounds which lie perdue in his nature, but which, later on, fill the whole field of his consciousness.

I. Man knows himself as a psychological unity, but he also knows himself as a unity in diversity. He finds his spirit a scene of endless conflicts. He is not a peaceful animal, which, unencumbered with ideals, passes the rounds of his limitations without reflection and without aspiration. He awakes to discords in his

nature, which he must heal if he can. The plant, the mere animal, mechanically and habitually transforms its surroundings into materials for its own self-progressive existence, without knowledge of its attainments, and without the consciousness of choice in its future self-development. Man finds his nature divided against itself. Reason is condemned to strange vicissitudes, since it is troubled by questions which cannot be declined. They are forced upon us by our very nature, but to them we can give no answer, because they transcend all our faculties. Man finds himself an animal possessed of appetites and passions which he can neither eliminate nor renounce, and he also finds himself a personal being, a restless, spiritual consciousness, which nothing short of the perfect can satisfy. But this perfection comes by no avenue of the sense. It comes only as the fruit of self-conquest.

Hence, the opposition of reason and nature, virtue and happiness, is a radical and conscious one. As such struggle is inevitable, development and perfection are possible. If man were nothing more than a crude animal nature, there would be no antagonism to compose, no unity and harmony to seek. If it could be shown that this struggle was confined to a few sensitive souls with rare ideals, no universal remedy would be demanded. But reason is everywhere the polar opposite of natural inclination and desire. The former seems to traverse the infinite in pursuit of its ideals; the latter loses itself in the moment of gratification. The satisfaction of the sensuous appetency is always a self-limited experience, and revives only to repeat and then exhaust itself. But the consciousness of a spiritual self defies all limitations, and transcends all efforts at satisfaction. The narrow limitations which sense throws around the spirit are impatiently burst asunder in the presence of the ideals of reason. Our sensuous intuitions find themselves and find their end in no conscious purpose. They fulfil their mission by a blind necessity; but self-conscious spirit knows no rest till it has quieted itself in some intelligible end which fulfils it and comprehends it. There must be discovered some unity which embraces man's^s past and future, and which is their ground and reality. Here there is a being who is the ser-

vant of two natures; on the one side is reason, seeking by an in-born necessity to find itself in the universal Reason; on the other, the inclinations of sense in blind opposition, seeking expression and satisfaction in space and time. While overborne by the one, he finds himself, nevertheless, in bondage to the other. In themselves considered, the merely animal activities are neither moral nor immoral; but as instruments of self-consciousness they acquire a significance apart from themselves. They are no longer the neutral forces of an organism moved from without. In their wayward and illegitimate exercise they assume a *quasi* personality and become the vicious agencies of the self-conscious spirit. The worldly mind serves itself in them, and borrows an abnormal self-development from them. A reality and universality is thus imported into them which render them easily mistaken for the good. To invest sensible objects with an ideal character, which the reason can alone furnish, is the destructive tendency of our nature. The conflict, therefore, deepens with experience, or till the reason, overmastered in the struggle, becomes the passive slave of its own self-created illusions. Still further does the antagonism of reason and inclination intensify when the spirit seeks inordinately to connect itself with such super-sensible objects as the love of money, the love of admiration and the love of power. Here human life finds ample stimulus for all its powers, and seems to find an end worthy of its pursuit. Here reason is confronted by a simulant of itself—a false reflection which possesses all the charms of reality. Here the human spirit is apt to identify itself with its secret foe, or to awake to the consciousness of a more intensive and lasting struggle.

The question then returns, how is the opposition of reason and will to be composed? According to Schiller, the reconciliation is to be effected by adopting the good as the regulative principle of life. But this is to return to the scholastic inquiry, What is the good? Far more simply and more concretely the answer may be given as self-surrender to God. This is just the converse of self-conflict. It means unconditional capitulation to the supreme ideal, the glory of God and his enjoyment forever. It means a faith which is more than belief, more than intellectual assent. It

is now a soul-resting and soul-trusting in a person. Does now the struggle, so graphically described by the apostle in the seventh of Romans as the conflict of the law of the members and the law of the mind, fall away? Certainly not, but the scene changes. The law of harmony has been discovered. The conflict is no longer a war of ideals. The soul is no longer combating the illusions of its own creation. The blind and purposeless strife is ended. The good has been defined. The motive is the self-appropriation of this good. The impulses which resist and cramp the soul are already reconciled in a Person who has reconciled the antagonism of spirit and nature unto himself. Now the warfare of the soul is the effort to realize the fruit of an accomplished victory. The antagonistic elements, both from within and without, are not to be destroyed but to be transformed. Conflict is the principle of self-development. Discord is the presupposition of realization. Hence, self-surrender is not the goal. It is but means to an end. It is the active and persistent recognition of an ideal—a City, a King, a developed spiritual self, without which development the City and King would be only illusions. For the reason, though clothed with the power of self-legislation, cannot will itself into a state of perfection. Self-determination is no unmeaning endowment. It must express itself in particular acts. It cannot proceed at once from the particular to the universal. It can advance only by particular volitions; but these imply opposition. The ideal and perfect self can only find itself through the antagonisms of a lower self, and by successive volitions to surrender the lower to the higher. Without this surrender there is no freedom, and no attainment is possible. A mere moral life fixes its eye upon a distant goal as the end of achievement, an end which vanishes farther and farther with every approach; and thus the victory of the higher over the lower self is never realized and never can be. Infinite additions do not make an infinite. Here if the moral ideal were actually reached it would be but the realization of a potential self; such a life could only mean crude and unrelieved antagonisms. I may live a life of absolute self-sacrifice and seek to identify myself with every true interest of family and state, and yet, as that interest itself is a progressive life, I, as one

of its members, have identified myself with a definite but not infinite quantity.

This, of course, is not the religious conception. Here the ideal is not reached by progressive steps. In the idea of religion as self-surrender to God, the Infinite Spirit is realized as the first term of the series. The native discord between soul and will vanishes with the first step in the divine life. The Infinite is no longer the inaccessible horizon. "God is a very present help." The soul does not attain to some attribute of God by painful progression, and address itself to the hopeless task of rising ultimately to the consciousness of the Infinite Whole, but in the moment of self-surrender joins the children of faith in the acclaim, "now are we the sons of God." Still the question remains, are there no foes to fight, no differences to compose, no mistakes to cancel? Can the life of faith be conceived otherwise than as a progression from grace to grace, from old to new obedience? Is not approximation the only way of advance? Here in answer to such questions we must confront a maze of apparent contradictions. The Christian paradoxes of Bacon set forth the conflict with striking significance. The writer of these paradoxes was at one time supposed to view them with a divided mind; but what was insuperable to the father of the Inductive Philosophy offers no difficulty to the spiritually-instructed child of faith. He understands that he must put on the whole armor, but he understands also that the victory has been won; there is antagonism, but there is also reconciliation—discord and yet harmony. The attainments of the believer, if viewed as successive increments in his spiritual life, preclude forever the Christian ideal. He could never conceive and could never realize it. As an infinite whole, he could never approach it nor participate in it. To conceive of religion as the hope of a prospective union with the divine mind is the complete negation of the idea. This union is the necessary pre-condition from the first of its reality and enjoyment. "We have the mind of Christ" was the assertion of the apostle when defining the subjective difference between the natural and spiritual man. As we cannot reach the infinite by successive additions to the finite, so we cannot reach the divine mind by adding to our attainments.

We do not become religious by super-imposing the divine intelligence upon our minds, but by making that intelligence our own. "Let that mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus" is not an external law foreign to our natures, but is the necessary condition of knowing anything beyond the veil of sense. Once within the sphere of the Infinite Spirit the true philosophy of growth is to appropriate what implicitly we have received. As the whole oak is potentially in the acorn, so the whole spiritual life is contained in form in the very rise of religion in the soul. It is not the development of the old nature with its false ideals, but the unfolding of the new life hid with Christ in God. The external evil and inward imperfection belong to the fleeting life of sense which has been renounced. Even these work together for good by exciting the soul to claim the whole of its birthright and to seek revenue from its entire inheritance. This life is by faith, and as it is a life divinely derived, it is divinely moved. As such it is an infinite and eternal whole.

II. The speculative view of faith must lead to the feeling of obligation, because faith cannot be conceived otherwise than as rational, and, as such, finds itself in rational acts. Self-surrender and renunciation of worldly ideals are not the all of a life of faith. They are rather the preliminary and necessary volitions, and, as such, constitute the pre-conditions of such a life. Now, if faith is rational, its ground, as has already been pointed out, must be rational also. That is to say, the faith which determines the ground of obligation is in turn determined by it. This is a circle, but not a vicious circle. It is an ultimate psychological fact in the constitution of our nature. Its analogue is found in the autonomy of the will, where the will determines the law, and the law determines the will. Man is thus represented both as lawgiver and subject. Kant conceived this law as immanent in man, and was followed at this point by Fichte, who argued that "no law, no commandment, though divine, is unconditionally obligatory; it is obligatory only on condition that it is confirmed by our conscience, and only because our conscience does confirm it." This may be construed in the language of more modern ethics as the well-known postulate, that law, to be obligatory, must possess both

subjective validity and objective authority. In other words, the law as expressing the nature of the lawgiver must be immanent, while it is also recognized as transcendent. Now it is certainly true that such a faith rests both on a logical and a theistic basis. On the one hand, the law which is of faith is seen not as the arbitrary will of the lawmaker, but as the transcript of his own nature. On the other hand, obedience to the law is but the dictum of the subject's own conscience. The law written in the heart then becomes the logical unity in which all differences are harmonized. Human and divine interests no longer conflict. The same object is common to both. Satisfied that the law of the kingdom is the law to which his conscience bears witness, man sees that his rational life is a contribution to the establishment of that kingdom. While the subject sees the will of God as the unconditional principle of his life, he does not see it as an alien force. Rational acts then become voluntary acts. They are neither derogatory to God nor foreign to man.

There are two great dangers which lie in wait for the man who would do the will of God. In the early and mediæval church these errors took the names of mysticism and asceticism. They pass by other and different names in our day. They have a common origin. They took their departure from the supra-rational spirit. Cutting loose from the categories of Aristotle, they began to transform and to interpret the *ideas* of Plato. The sentimental, and not the rational, side of man's nature was cultivated. From mysticism came superstition; from asceticism came fanaticism. These twin evils plagued the church for many centuries. Their hideous and grotesque manifestations are not much seen in the highways of our civilization, but they survive plainly enough in the less sensational form of church institutions and dogmas. Inferences from Scripture which have no authority to bind the conscience are exalted to the high dignity of principles. Dogmas of the church are confounded with the dogmas of the Scriptures. Rational testimony is neglected or repudiated. Stillingfleet, in the seventeenth century, expressed the true doctrine—a doctrine which long before had been approved by the Reformers after they had rejected the text of *Divina Fides* in the settlement of

the canon of Scripture: "Where there is an infallible testimony, sufficient rational testimony goes along with it to make it evident that it came from God."¹

We must distinguish between the rational and rationalism, and we must remember also that a theoretical knowledge, which ends in philosophical skepticism, is not necessarily averse to religion. To show the limits of demonstrative knowledge is not to discredit faith. Thus, theistic arguments, though often exposing the Achilles heel, are of great benefit, not because they afford demonstration of the existence of God, but because they exercise the already existing feeling of his presence. Thus, also, Kant, while defining the limits of theoretical knowledge, and despairing of a valid argument for the divine existence, affirmed, "It is indeed necessary to be convinced of the existence of God, but it is not equally necessary to demonstrate it." He expressed his willingness to destroy the harmony of his dialectic rather than sacrifice faith. His three ideals, God, freedom, and immortality, could be established by means of postulates in the practical reason as distinguished from the theoretical, and thus he invoked a divine reason as a rational necessity to account for reason itself.

It may be objected that sin has so deformed our reason that it is no longer competent to test the truth, and, consequently, that no object of faith can be reliably determined; but this objection is self-contradictory, for, if it is true, how does the objector know it to be true? And how is it that he has faith in his own objection?

In conclusion, it is evident that the reflective reason can have no purpose, no end, if it is not to give unity to itself and to objects of its knowledge; but this is impossible apart from the fact of God. If reason regards itself as alone in the world, or as the only absolute, it must come back at last from its weary wanderings with the melancholy confession of Hume—the last word of skepticism, and a monumental warning to all who would travel his way: "I have already shown," said he, "that the understanding, when it acts according to its most general principles, entirely subverts

¹ Stillingfleet, *Origines Sacrae*, Vol. II., p. 8.

itself, and leaves not the lowest degree of evidence in any proposition, either in philosophy or in common life." For the empirical knowledge which Hume would vainly supply to the understanding to give it content and make it intelligible, we would substitute the idea of a First Cause as the primitive impulse of consciousness, as the only secure datum of knowledge and refuge of faith.

W. J. WRIGHT.

Westminster College, Missouri.

III. THE DECLINE OF MINISTERIAL SCHOLARSHIP.

It has been often and justly said that next to our scriptural creed and the spiritual energy diffused among us by the Holy Ghost, the chief glory and power of the Presbyterian Church are in its educated ministry.

This prestige we are losing. One general cause of this deterioration is an unwise eagerness to increase mere numbers, and thus to overtake our destitutions. As to this increase, our presbyteries look too much at the *quantum* and too little to the *quale*.

This weakness appears in two ways, of which one is too much facility in adopting unfit candidates; and the other is the frequent licensure and ordination of men without the education required by our laws, under a supposed provision for "extraordinary cases."

I. The prevalence of this illegal practice cannot be better described than in a recent essay in this *QUARTERLY* by the Rev. Prof. T. C. Johnson, of Union Theological Seminary, in Virginia. His portraiture of the abuse is equally trenchant and just. It asserts that the instances disapproved by him are becoming numerous, and are illegal and causeless. Their general aspect may be thus stated: That the brief provision for extraordinary cases in our constitution is perverted to cases which are not extraordinary in either native talent, mental culture, or Christian devotion, for remitting to them nearly all requirements of the law as to general education, knowledge of the classics and knowledge of the original languages of Scripture. The conception on which the presbyteries are acting is this: That our constitution means to provide for introducing into our ministry any men of zeal and fair Christian character without requiring of them the education and mental culture demanded of our other ministers by the law, because such candidates deem it difficult or impracticable for them to acquire such scholarship; and all this upon the supposition that diligence, zeal, practical good sense, and some gift of fluent speech are to supply lack of learning in this class of ministers, most distinctly not ex-

traordinary. It is the purpose of this essay to give an absolute denial to this conception. We assert that it has no place whatever in the meaning and intent of our constitution, but is a sheer perversion of it.

A very brief and simple, but sufficient, proof of this position appears in this fact: that all "extraordinary" things must be rare in their several classes. Julius Cæsar, Napoleon Bonaparte, and Stonewall Jackson were extraordinary commanders; but there were very few Cæsars, Napoleons, or Jacksons. King David, Homer, Shakespeare and Milton were extraordinary poets; there has been but one of each. Now, it is manifest, that upon the system our presbyteries are pursuing in these licensures, this class of ministers will be numerous, and therefore not extraordinary. The path into our ministry opened by this perversion of the law is easier than the legal path; and there is nothing to prevent its being more numerously trodden than the right, strict way. But since the provision found in our law is for "extraordinary cases," it can be properly applied only to a few.

The usage of our church at and after the days of its great law-givers condemns the present abuse. The men licensed and ordained by them under this clause were totally different from those in whose favor it is now extended. A fair instance may be found in that eminent pastor, Dr. James Wilson, who was a cotemporary of Dr. Archibald Alexander, in the early part of this century, in one of the city churches of Philadelphia. He had been an eminent and learned lawyer in that city. When a married man, and approaching middle life, he forsook his lucrative profession to preach the gospel. Here was an extraordinary case. He was already a man of liberal, classical education. He had also gained special mental culture in the study and mastery of another great science, the law, very analogous to the science of divinity as an organ of mental discipline. In the practice of this profession he had acquired practical wisdom, knowledge of men, and the talent of command. His trained intellect speedily added to his acquirements the special learning of the theologian, by a course of private study. Therefore, the Presbytery of Philadelphia properly made his an extraordinary case, because he already had either the

identical acquirements of the educated pastor, or the full virtual equivalent thereof, not because they would have entrusted the ministry to any common man, devoid at once of those acquirements and of every fair equivalent for them.

But let us examine this provision, as it lies in our constitution. I shall proceed upon that principle of exposition which all jurists admit, that each article of a law must be interpreted in accordance with that purpose and scope which the law announces for itself. The only allusion to extraordinary cases is found in our *Book of Church Order*, Chapter VI., Section VI., Article VI. It is in these words: "No candidate, except in extraordinary cases, shall be licensed unless he shall have completed the usual course of academical studies, and shall also have studied divinity at least two years under some approved teacher of theology; and whenever any presbytery shall see reason to depart from this rule, it shall always make a record of the fact upon its minutes, with the reason therefor." And this little exception is absolutely all which our constitution contains giving seeming authority to the present licentious usage! Here is an inverted pyramid with a vengeance, a large practice resting upon a very narrow apex. It lies upon the face of these whole fifth and sixth sections (for the trial and ordaining of ministers, and for the trial and licensure of probationers) that their design is to exact of all Presbyterian ministers thorough education both in classical and academic literature, and in the special dead languages and sciences of biblical theology. No particular article, therefore, should be so interpreted as to exempt any minister from these requirements. Particulars are designed to *define* the general scope of the law; they cannot, with honesty, be so interpreted as to *contradict* it. But let us look at Article IV. of Section VI.: "The presbytery shall try *each* candidate as to his knowledge of the Latin language and the original languages of the Holy Scriptures. It shall *examine* him on mental philosophy, logic and rhetoric; on ethics; on the natural and exact sciences; on theology, natural and revealed; and on ecclesiastical history, the sacraments, and church government." The law is imperative, and its application universal—to "each candidate."

Now, let us add another principle of our constitution, the parity

of the ministry. This is, perhaps, our most fundamental trait. We recognize three orders of scriptural church officers, ministers or preaching elders, ruling elders, and deacons; but between different ministers we jealously deny distinctions of orders. Must not this equality of powers and functions imply substantial equality of qualifications? Does it bear telling that such a constitution designs to provide for two different orders of qualifications; and, worse than this, to provide the greater privilege for the less qualified? Another fatal objection to such a construction is found in Section V., which provides for the trying and ordaining of ministers. According to our constitution, a licentiate is not a minister, nor even a presbyter, he is but a layman, on whom the presbytery has seen fit to bestow, in the exercise of its discretion, a temporary probation in the sacred art of preaching, which probation is not a franchise, but a mere privilege, vesting no right in the candidate, which the presbytery may not withdraw without judicial process at its own discretion. Such licensure is but a preparatory step of a humbler and inferior grade, leading towards ordination, which is the high and all-important process creating the presbyter and minister, and solemnly vesting in him the franchises and rights of the offices. Surely, if our constitution designs to make two classes of ministers, equal in right but created by two different processes, a higher and a lower, it must have introduced this provision into this supreme place in its laws, its rules for ordination. But in the whole section there is neither jot nor tittle of such provision. All reference to the extraordinary cases has dropped absolutely out! Presbyteries are not advised, but commanded, to examine all applicants for ordination upon the same list of qualifications. And this list is substantially the same with that required of fully qualified licentiates in Section VI. It is to be noted that the rules of ordination expressly require of all applicants a knowledge of the Latin, New Testament-Greek and Hebrew, which are the very branches of learning which our presbyteries now remit, under their abusive construction, to their "extraordinary cases."

We claim that this exposition of the law is conclusive against the present usage. What, then, is the amount of privilege which

the law really designs to extend to the extraordinary cases in Section VI., Article VI.? We strenuously affirm that it is only this: The candidate who possesses the extraordinary intellectual and spiritual qualifications, acquired in a secular career, is allowed to stand his examination, and if qualified, to receive immediate licensure, without being required to study divinity two whole years under some approved divine. But the presbytery is commanded to examine him upon all the studies which are required of inferior and younger students. Such is the whole extent of the provision. Its *rationale* is simply this: If a godly man has already gotten all the qualifications which are required of younger and inferior men by reason of extraordinary talents, diligence and mental culture; *i. e.*, if he already has the classical knowledge, the philosophy and logic, the ethics, the sciences, physical and exact, the New Testament-Greek and Hebrew, the didactic theology, the church history, sacraments and church government, which ordinary men can only acquire in college and seminary, then to this gifted man presbytery shall remit the requirement of spending these years over again in college and seminary to acquire what he already possesses, lest it should make a useless waste of precious years out of an already matured life. Because the law aims at the substance, and ceases to demand the form after this form has become useless. That is all! And even this small concession is so jealously guarded that the presbytery is required to make a special record of that small concession and of the grounds which justified it.

That the present usage is erroneous will be equally proved by the argument from experience. This evidence will be found in larger part, in the future, because the usage has grown so much in recent years that the full harvest of its bad effects has not yet had time to ripen; but an honest examination of the cases will show that the usage is lowering the credit of our ministry. It is partially spoiling the career of good men as pastors, who, if firmly and kindly required to make full preparation, might have had a life-long tenure of good credit and usefulness. But as it is, these are half spoiled. Their popularity and influence speedily fail, because based upon superficial foundations; they pass frequently

from charge to charge until some of them become virtually "dead heads" and others drop back out of the ministry.

Here I wish to bear the emphatic testimony of a long experience to that result which Dr. Johnson's sagacity foresees from this and all our other relaxations of strict and honest trials for office. The spectacle of all this looseness discourages, disgusts, and alienates from the ministry young men of high aspiration and principle and honest purpose; but this is precisely the kind of young men we need in our ministry. To those who do not know human nature it may seem paradoxical that the prize whose winning is arduous should excite and attract many aspirants, and these of the noblest mettle, while the prize which is too easily won appears to them valueless and paltry. But facts prove that this is a fixed law. Archbishop Whately held for a number of years a professorship of logic in the University of Oxford. There were annual examinations upon logic, to which a university honor was attached. For a long time this examination was so loosely held that nearly all who stood it won the honor. What was the result? The honor became contemptible in the eyes of the Oxford students, until scarcely anybody cared to stand for it. Then, under Dr. Whately's impulse, the University senate reversed its plan; the examinations were made thorough, and the grade was fixed so high that only a few of the best logicians could win the honor. At once the number of applicants began to increase! When I was a young college student, the University of Virginia had this just reputation, that its courses of instruction were thorough, its examinations full and long, and their grades so strict and high that only the best scholars won through. The consequence was, that the students of the college who cared anything for scholarship cherished the most eager desire to get into that University and to win its degree; and I do know that the fact that its honors were so hard to win was the very thing which piqued this aspiration in us. The year I took my degree of M. A., four out of two hundred and fifty students won this distinction; some years there was only one. When I was elected professor of church history in Union Seminary (May, 1853), it had eleven students. In 1860-'61 it had thirty-eight students; and

some years after the war it had more than seventy. The improvement in the grade of students was almost equal to that of the numbers. These were the years which put into the field that body of ministers which has given the splendid impulse to the synods of Virginia and North Carolina which they still enjoy. This powerful attraction of better material into our ministry was synchronous with the following well-known change in the Seminary, that its courses of instruction were made more extensive and difficult, that a system of strict examinations was enforced, that a seminary certificate meant more, and that most of the presbyteries became more exacting in their trials for licensure. What does this coincidence mean? Let the seminaries and the presbyteries have but the nerve and integrity to practice on this principle, and they will see the ranks of their candidates filled by young men as much better as they will be more numerous.

II. The second means now fashionable for deteriorating the true education of Presbyterian ministers is the multiplication of courses and professors in some of our theological seminaries. This will strike many of our readers as paradoxical. They will exclaim, Surely more workers will give us a more finished work! Surely, when the professors are multiplied there is more division of labor, each professor is able to specialize and enrich his course more than when there were fewer laborers, the *curriculum* of studies must be extended and improved, and the result must be better and wider scholarship in the students. This hope is plausible, but it is fallacious. The general scholarship and true mental culture of ministers is declining just in proportion as seminary endowments and faculties are growing. We assert that we have here a true case under the old adage: "Too many cooks spoil the broth." Seminary education is expanded upon the surface; but it becomes correspondingly superficial. Its result is an ostentatious smattering of many specialties, with a temper more conceited and less humble and manly, without any deep acquaintance with the great masters of theological thought of previous generations and the great problems of theological science. The church's board is seemingly decked for the intellectual feast with a larger array of plate, in broader and more glittering pieces; but there is

little solid silver; they are mainly cheap German silver electrotyped with a thin film of the precious metal. The motives which have prompted Presbyterian millionaires to give huge endowments to seminaries, and boards of trustees to multiply professorships, are plausible and pious. They say to themselves: It must be right to serve Christ with our most precious things. His providence has given us this large wealth; we dedicate large parts of it to these schools for training his ministers. The great schools of secular learning in this and other countries are receiving huge endowments, have numerous faculties and numerous and specialized courses. Our schools of sacred learning shall keep pace with them; our Lord's spiritual commonwealth shall be adorned with all the same glories which magnify the secular sphere. These men forget there is a reason which partly justifies large endowments and numerous professorships in a university which has no application to a theological school; the university (*universitas*) by its very name engages to give instruction in all the varied branches of mental culture requisite for a highly civilized society; the theological seminary undertakes to instruct only in one sharply-defined department of the general culture. They make a mischievous mistake just parallel to that which they make in ostentatious church architecture. They exclaim, Surely Christ deserves to be served with our richest gifts! So they build a city church at the cost of a quarter of a million of dollars, overloaded with pretentious ornamentation, entailing after a little, very expensive repairs, loading the congregation with a debt which is a millstone around its neck for a generation; while their building is found to be really in very bad taste, as soon as the vulgar craze of the day has gone by. Whereas, if that company of Christians really had the quarter of a million for the Lord, this is the thing they should have done: They should have given the two hundred thousand to missions and church extensions, where money is so sorely needed; and with the remaining twenty-five thousand they should have done what the Tabb-street Church of Petersburg, Va., did, viz.: built themselves a large, solid, seemly, tasteful church, with the best acoustic properties of any auditorium in America. This admirable sanctuary cost just twenty-three thousand dollars. Surely

it ought to be good enough for any true followers of the "carpenter's son," however rich.

I have said there is a close analogy between the professional preparation of the lawyer and the theologian. Both courses of study are special and professional, being supposed to follow the acquisition of a good general education. Law and theology are both high, moral sciences. The thorough mastery of them requires also classical learning and a good acquaintance with history, logic, and ethics. Now, the greatest law schools in America have never thought that they needed more than two or three professors; many of them have only one. The law school of Harvard had perhaps two, when, under Justice Storey, its reputation was greatest. The law school of the University of Virginia had for thirty years one professor, but those were the days when, under John A. G. Davis and John B. Minor, it won its grand reputation, and gave to the South its profound jurists and statesmen. It now has two law professors and an adjunct. The law school of the University of Texas has the same number; but this institution is projected upon the most pretentious scale of any in the South. Let the reader make the just application.

We have indicated that this new fashion of seminary education is an attempt to imitate the great secular universities in their divisions of labor and specialization of courses. The model which the new seminary professes to follow is a bad one. Its fruits are bad in secular education. We have admitted that a school which professes to teach all things has a fair pretext for multiplying its courses, which a theological seminary has not, seeing it professes to teach one definite thing. But in the secular universities, also, this multiplication of courses is bearing bad fruits. It is true that some dexterities in the arts and applied sciences are promoted; but it is at the expense of thorough general education. The minds of so-called educated young men are one-sided and given to some hobby. A knowledge of superficial details in some narrow quarter of the field banishes a profound knowledge of the field as a whole; sound judgment is weakened, and extravagance and puerility are as prevalent in the discussions of these so-called educated men as among the ignorant. We presume that most

observing men have concluded, with us, that as modern education is specialized, true and deep culture is diminished.

We proceed to a more practical and convincing view of the matter. The seminary at Princeton has had the most enviable reputation among Presbyterians. We believe that its faculty now contains about eight professors and instructors. Its full course of study occupies three years of eight months each, giving a total of twenty-four months. These professors are official equals; each one claims that he is both entitled and expected to magnify his own office. If the new one asks, Why were we put here? the church replies, In order that you may extend and enrich the courses of instruction assigned to you. Then, they rejoin, we claim our fair and equal share of the student's time and labor. Is not this the tendency in the enlarged faculties? We challenge their members to deny it. But twenty four months divided into eight parts give three months to each professor. Take now the important department of didactic theology. The result now to which division of labor tends is to give the learned and orthodox professor but three months of the student's time (say six weeks in the middle and six in the senior year) in which to go over the whole of that all-important field! What can he do? Will he have the time to take his classes in regular and thorough recitation over any one, not to say two or more, of the great masters, older or more recent; over Augustine, or Calvin, or Turretinus, or Witsius, or John Howe, or Dick, or Hill, or Cunningham, or Hodge, or Shedd, or the Arminian Watson? The hope is absurd. We learned from a publication of Bishop McIlvaine, and from the personal statements of Dr. Samuel Beach Jones and others of the older alumni, that this is the way didactic theology was taught by Archibald Alexander, in the days when Princeton had three professors and one tutor: twice a week, at least, lessons of thirty pages each in the Latin text, quarto, of Turretin's elenctic theology were assigned, on which close recitations were held; and once in two or four weeks an English theological thesis was required of each student, upon a topic selected for him by the professor, with a list of leading authorities which the student was required to study, digest, and discuss. Dr. Beach Jones told us that, for instance, "As I was

leaving his lecture-room one day, Dr. Alexander thrust into my hand a slip of paper, saying, 'Mr. Jones, you must write upon that.' When I opened the slip, it contained these words: '*An sit justitia vindicatrix essentialis in Deo?*' with a list of authorities." Dr. Jones added, "Sir, I worked upon that question for a fortnight, like a beaver, and that work made me a Calvinist for life." Is such text-book work done in Princeton now? Can it be done now? Does the six weeks' time of the middle or senior year allow it? It seems obvious that the only method possible for the professor is this: he must prepare and read to his classes a comprehensive, but brief course of lectures upon the heads of divinity. He, on his part, may put large and faithful labor upon these lectures; they may be crowded with what would, to a learned eye, be marks of learned research and deep thought. A few of the students who listen, who have capital memories, or are good note-takers, may get part of these lectures. The major part will get slim glimpses and smatterings of them, and that will be all. The learned professor may recommend large parallel readings in the best authors; his students will not have time to read them, because there are seven other professors, each claiming his one-eighth of their time, "after them with a sharp stick," urging that they must not rob them to favor a rival professor. It is the fixed conclusion of able teachers that the best method of instruction for adult and educated minds is a judicious combination of extensive and laborious reading and recitation in the most thorough text-books, followed by well-matured lectures which give a resumé and summation of the various arguments. The student who has not done the reading and recitation is not fitted to profit by the lectures. He does not know enough of the wide range of previous discussions, and of the deep questions mooted, to be aware of what his professor is aiming to say and decide, when he hears his resumé. Precious truths, so often and so strongly controverted, can only be established by controversy. Those who are to instruct God's people should have access to the best arsenals for defence, the works of the great masters of the Reformation theology and exposition. But the candidates in the seminaries described are likely to receive some weak, homœopathic dilution of the strong logic of these masters, through the so-

lution of some German lecturer into those of some Scotch or Yankee imitator, and thence into his professor's lectures, "fresh, and abreast with the progress of the most recent thought." The most recent is usually the most diluted. In short, if we are to have seminaries with eight professors, we should have theological courses of not less than six or seven years.

Some Presbyterians have reasoned that it would be best for our church to have only one or, at most, two large and richly endowed seminaries; and that one would be better than two. They argue that the rich and large seminary could give to all our candidates more extensive instruction by more eminent scholars, and that our ministers, being all educated in one place and under one set of influences, would have more harmony and homogeneity. The first part of this reasoning is already refuted. What more homogeneity does the Presbyterian Church need than that which will result when the different faculties at different places all have that thorough orthodoxy which it is the first duty of our church courts to enforce on all her ministers? Under this orthodox unity slight variations will appear in the mental idiosyncrasies of leading professors and the social phases of different localities. This will not lead to disunion, but to better adaptations of young ministers to their different fields of labor. Has the church ever found any friction between the *alumni* of Union Seminary under the saintly Peck, and those of Columbia Seminary under a godly Girardeau?

But there is in every overgrown seminary a deadly probability that the church will have to lament a fatal homogeneity in its numerous alumni; namely, a unity in rationalism and heresy. Well may we imitate the prudence of the Scotch woman who said that "when she went to market she never put all her eggs into one basket," for if one basket fell many of her eggs were still unbroken. If church history teaches anything, it is that large and rich schools of theology show an innate tendency to heresy. Where is that of Geneva, founded by Farel and Calvin themselves; that of Lausanne, once graced by the saintly Vinet; that of Göttingen; that of Jena; that of Tübingen; that of Leipzig; that of Tholuck's Halle; that of Berlin; of Utrecht; of Leyden;

of Oxford; of Cambridge? What is to-day the state of the Free Church College of Edinburgh, in which the grand voices of Chalmers and Cunningham have scarcely ceased to echo? Where are Cambridge, Yale, and Andover, each founded in the interest of the strictest orthodoxy? Where is Union, New York? This fated list shows us that the dangers of inflation by too much wealth, power, and fame are too strong even for converted human nature. It seems to be the destiny of such institutions when too much enriched to get the "big head." But the Holy Spirit tells us "that with the lowly is wisdom," and "that pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall." Now, this specializing, multiplying and pretended enriching of courses is a distinct and direct provocation to rationalism and heresy. Thus: the new professor of the subdivision is young in office; he is ambitious; he is eager to make a reputation for himself and his chair; but how shall he do this when his sphere of instruction is relatively restricted and unimportant? He must make a sensation! To do this he must ventilate some novelty; but all the important tracts of divine science have been so thoroughly trodden that the thing which is new can scarcely be true. Here enters the poisonous temptation to the young aspirant. Just here will be Satan's entering wedge, whenever he begins to cleave a theological seminary from the old body of orthodoxy. The theological vagaries of the German universities have become the poison and plague of Christianity. The main causes of their unfaithfulness have been this over-specializing of studies and this demand upon their teachers to "do new work."¹ Let us take warning!

Hence, our policy for our beloved church should be, not to seek any overgrown or over-endowed school of theology; not to suppress any that now exist; but to add prudently to the number as our church expands. Our students do not need overgrown faculties, rich endowments, or huge libraries. They need, for each school, three or four able and faithful professors, enough good books for practical use, and thorough-going sources of deep read-

¹ See the essay in my collected *Discussions* upon the theological tendencies of the German University system.

ing, strict recitation, frequent writing, and well-considered lectures upon the leading lines of sacred science. Then, the specialties will take care of themselves, and such students will find that this plan will give them abundance of hard work for three scholastic years. And when they come to preach, they will find this work unspeakably better for them than the building upon a flimsy foundation of a cluster of pretentious specialties. We would say to men of Christian wealth, your Presbyterian colleges need your help far more than your seminaries need great endowments. Your colleges are struggling with poverty, meantime your seminaries tell us that an increasing number of our candidates seek admission at their doors with most defective collegiate preparation. The sons of our church are enticed away from our struggling, impoverished colleges by the free tuition and the pomp and glitter of the large secular institutions. Under their godless influences they forget the religion of their fathers and are lost to the pulpits of your church. Provide, then, decently for your seminaries, and do not forget your poor colleges, without which your rich seminaries would be costly mills without grist to grind.

R. L. DABNEY.

Victoria, Texas.

IV. THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL: ITS PRESENT PERIL.

IN the issue of the *Review of Reviews* for December, 1896, appears an article from the pen of President Walter E. Hervey, of the Teachers' College, New York, entitled "The Sunday-schools: Their Shortcomings and their Great Opportunity." The eminent position of the writer; his prominence as a leader in the movement known as the "new education" in the secular schools; the timeliness of the topic selected, and the conspicuousness of advertisement of the article in advance, calling attention to it as one of the leading attractions of the forthcoming number of the *Review*, all combined to awaken expectation and to excite the hope that we should have an unusually valuable contribution to the question of efficient Sabbath-school instruction.

If any conscientious Sunday-school superintendent or teacher, full of soul-hunger for the spiritual edification and salvation of the children and youth committed to his charge, has had recourse to this article, hoping to have some new light thrown upon his path, he must have come away with a painful sense of disappointment.

He must have been disappointed, in the first place, with the air of extreme pessimism with which, in the very first paragraph, the whole work of the church and the Christian family in the training of children is discredited, and the lofty superciliousness with which the whole work of the Sunday-school up to the present time is ridiculed as a "clear case of *parturiunt montes*." Certainly the "view-point," as he calls it, of this writer is so intensely pessimistic that if we sympathized with him we should be ready to throw up our hands in despair and quit.

A second element of disappointment will be found in the writer's manifest want of acquaintance with the subject he proposes to discuss. No man can be expected to be at home on all subjects. President Hervey is, no doubt, an authority on the subject of pedagogy and of the "new education" in the secular

schools. When he speaks on these subjects we are ready to listen to him with docility. All that he says in this article on the subject of the study of child-life, and on the adaptation of instruction to the developing faculties of childhood, deserves at the hand of our Sunday-school teachers and others the most considerate and thoughtful attention. Lest he should apply to me the same proverb that I am soon to apply to him, I will venture no criticism upon this part of his article further than modestly to suggest that the "new education" is scarcely yet out of its kilts. The results of its new methods are yet to be tested. When, for instance, President Hervey tells us, as one of the great advances made by the new methods over the old, that "the old *dogma* [when one of these 'advanced theory' men wants to damn a thing, he always labels it *dogma*] of formal discipline, whereby the child's mind was conceived of as composed of distinct powers, each of which must be whetted, and the curriculum was conceived of as composed of studies, each one of which would serve as a whetstone for a special power, has been discredited"; when he tells us that "the function of the curriculum is primarily to furnish nutrition, and secondarily to provide formal discipline"; when he tells us that the "new education" "relegates the three R's to a subordinate place," giving the chief place to "the fresh, interesting human study of literature," and when he proposes to substitute for the time-honored birch-rod, with its demand of "instant and unquestioning obedience," the milder forms of moral suasion, we, of the laity in these matters of pedagogy, must be excused if we are a little skeptical as to whether the result of this homœopathic educational treatment will be the production of minds of a higher order than those of Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, Chief Justice Marshall and others who were trained under the old *régime*.

But we may say of these matters of pedagogy, as a celebrated English critic represents old John Owen as saying in his commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews whenever he reaches a knotty point of exegesis in which his reader specially needs his help, "however, this is not our concernment." We are not concerned with pedagogical training, but with Sabbath-school instruction,

which is a very different thing. It is on this subject, and in view of the fact that President Hervey has made it his pleasure to subject its methods to such indiscriminate and withering criticism, that we feel constrained to meet the eminent critic with the memorable words of Apelles to the shoemaker: "*Ne sutor ultra crepidam.*"

Our first criticism upon the article of President Hervey is that he has not been at pains to inform himself as he should have done before making such a tirade upon our present Sunday-school men and methods. He has not made a study of the genesis of the Sunday-school movement. Let us hear him on this point. Under the caption "Sunday-school Pioneering," he says: "Just when the Sunday-school idea originated is not known, but we have the record of an interesting school of Bible study which was held at Jerusalem not far from two thousand three hundred and forty-two years ago. The superintendent was a minister named Ezra, and he had a staff of thirteen assistant superintendents and thirteen trained teachers, all of whom were paid, besides other teachers, regarding whom we do not know whether they were trained and paid or not. The pupils were 'all the people,' both men and women, and all that could hear with understanding. On the occasion described, the school lasted from daylight to midday, and notwithstanding the long session, and the fact that the people stood from the beginning to the end, we are told that the ears of all the people were attentive. The reason of this attention is not far to seek: 'The teachers read in the book of the law of God distinctly, and they gave the sense so that they (the pupils) understood the reading.'"

Now, if it were some enthusiastic Sunday-school worker, or some popular lecturer on the Sunday-school, who thus spoke of Ezra as a Sunday-school superintendent, and of the congregation assembled to listen to the reading and exposition of the Scriptures as a Bible school, we could readily pardon the rhetorical liberty taken. But for a teacher like President Hervey to speak of that as a school in which there was no text-book, except the copy of the Scriptures in the hands of Ezra, and where, as is plain from the face of the record, no questions were propounded either

by the teachers to the pupils, or by the pupils to the teachers, is certainly remarkable. The plain facts of the case are that the "Book of the Law" was in Hebrew; the people, whose vernacular tongue was the Chaldee, the language of their captivity, were not familiar with the Hebrew, and so, as Ezra read distinctly the words of the Hebrew original, the Levites who assisted him gave the people the meaning in a language with which they were familiar, no doubt accompanying the translation with such expository remarks as might enable them to understand fully what was to them practically a foreign tongue. Ezra's work that day was, therefore, that of an interpreter, and to some extent that of an expository preacher, but very far from that of a superintendent of a Bible school. President Hervey has evidently followed blindly in the lead of one of those Sunday-school enthusiasts who go to make up the *ridiculus mus* of his trenchant criticism.

Still more at sea is he in reference to the history of the modern Sunday-school. I quote from him again. Under the caption, "Birth of the Modern Sunday-school," he says: "The modern Sunday-school was born a little more than a century ago. Familiar to most of us is the story of Robert Raikes, of Gloucester; how, moved by the wretched ignorance of the poor children of his own city, he organized a mission Sunday-school for them, having a staff of paid teachers, and a curriculum which included reading (not a bad idea for many Sunday-schools to-day) as well as the elementary truths of religion; how, as Mr. A. Caswell Ellis points out (Pedagogical Seminary, June, 1896), within four years there were a quarter of a million of pupils in the Sunday-schools of the United Kingdom alone, and how, within twenty years after the announcement of Raikes' school, Bible and tract societies had been organized, and a powerful impulse given even to the work in foreign fields. So much vitality is there in the spirit of social service applied in the work of religious instruction.

"In due process of time, however, there came about the old transition from interest to habit. The question book laid its dead hand on teachers and pupils, and the rivalries of denominations and of publishers produced so intense a system of local option as

to destroy the little warmth that might have come from coöperation."

We have not called attention to this paragraph for the purpose of detracting from the well-deserved eulogium on Robert Raikes, although it is very questionable whether the work of Raikes was not simply one development of a great and widespread movement which found expression in the various societies for the publication of the Scriptures, the dissemination of tracts and the establishment of missions in foreign fields, rather than, as Mr. Ellis would claim, the direct incentive to them. But that to which we call attention is the ignorance of the history of the Sunday-school work as implied in the statement that "the question book laid its dead hand on teachers and pupils." Reading this in its connection, one naturally infers that the Sunday-school, as established by Robert Raikes, and as maintained by those who received their inspiration from him, was entirely free from what President Hervey calls "the dead hand of the question book," and that only at a later period, when the "old transition from interest to habit" had taken place, did the question book, as a blighting influence, come in, along with the contention for orthodoxy, which, as he tells us in another place, "becomes, rather than pure and undefiled religion, the end of instruction, and the memorizing of dogmas and the catechism the chief means of instruction."

It is quite amusing after reading this to turn to any authentic account of the work of Robert Raikes, and find that almost the only religious instruction given by his teachers was by means of the catechism for which President Hervey seems to have about the same affinities that a certain individual is said to have for holy water. Thus, in the article on Raikes in the *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia*, we are told that "his work consisted partly of secular teaching and partly of the teaching of the catechism," whilst in the article under the same caption in the *McClintock and Strong Encyclopædia* is quoted a letter from Raikes, explaining fully his methods, from which we make the following extract: "The children were to come soon after ten in the morning and stay till twelve; they were then to go home and return at one, and after reading a lesson they were to be conducted to church.

After church they were to be employed [oh! horrors!] in repeating the catechism till half-past five, and then to be dismissed with an injunction to go home without making a noise, and by no means to play in the street."

That the question book, so far from laying its dead hand on any one, was a prime factor in promoting the distinctive study of Scripture, rather than catechisms and other formularies of doctrine, will readily appear from the following extract from a well-digested article on the Sunday-school in the *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia*, by Rev. Edwin W. Rice, editor of the *American Sunday-school Union*: "The schools founded by Raikes were chiefly for the lower classes in the community, who were ignorant, and hence were taught the elementary branches of reading and writing, with oral instruction in the catechism. Reading and memorizing texts in the Bible followed; cramming the memory with large portions of Scripture and the catechism seems to have been a hobby in Scotland, England and America for some time. . . . James Gall by his *End and Essence of Sabbath-school Teaching*, and his *Nature's Normal School*, aimed to introduce a more sensible lesson system into Scotland, which was also used in some schools in America as early as 1820. Stowe's training system, giving prominence to pictorial methods of instruction, also aided in reforming this excessive use of memory. The reform in America was completed by the introduction of the Uniform Limited Lessons, prepared in 1825, and adopted by the American Sunday-school Union and its three or four hundred auxiliaries in 1826. This scheme contemplated a five-years' course of study for the whole Bible, one and the same lesson for all, of from seven to fifteen verses, questions and comments in at least three grades, and reviews."

It is evident, therefore, that the question book, so far from laying a dead hand on teacher or scholar, was the exponent of a truly forward movement in the development of the Sunday-school idea. No one familiar with the history of these times can fail to recognize the value of the question books of the Sunday-school Union, of the Mimpriess Graded Lessons and many others. Indeed, the question book in some form is a necessity, and it is quite

amusing to hear our critic, a little further on, speak so approvingly of the lesson sheets of the "Blakeslee Course," an "integral part of the plan of which," as he tells us, "is the opportunity afforded for writing down the answers to set questions." If that is not the question book, what is it?

Another evidence of the inaccuracy of the writer of the article we are reviewing is found in his attempt to glorify Bishop Vincent as the originator and prime mover of the scheme of International Lessons. When we read in this article of the extreme admiration of President Hervey for "men of scholarship who are in sympathy with President Harper's spirit and method," and then recall recent events in connection with Bishop Vincent and the Higher Criticism, it is easy to understand why President Hervey should desire to do him honor; but much as we may be disposed to recognize the invaluable service rendered by Bishop Vincent to the work of Sunday-school instruction, it would be impossible to render him honestly any such meed of praise as that implied in saying that "he and those whom he inspired, devised, elaborated, fought for, and finally carried triumphantly into the schools the uniform lessons of the International system." Some of us remember those days very distinctly, and we have no recollection of any such great battle to be fought. Our recollection is that, the American Sunday-school Union having used uniform lessons since 1826, it was only necessary to show the superiority of the selections made by the International Committee, and the system was gladly welcomed. And it is a significant fact that in the article to which we have referred, written by the secretary of the union before there were any criticisms of Bishop Vincent, the credit of suggesting the International Lesson system is given to Mr. B. F. Jacobs, of Chicago, and there is not the slightest reference to any leadership of Bishop Vincent. Before us also is a report of the Indianapolis Convention of 1872, when the International Lesson system was proposed. The statement is made, that after a speech by Mr. B. F. Jacobs the system was adopted by a practically unanimous vote, and with the greatest enthusiasm. There is no reference to Bishop Vincent.

Before passing from the consideration of that period when the

Sunday-school was under the dead hand of the question book, we cannot refrain from alluding to a most remarkable instance of the deadening influence of this educational incubus to which President Hervey refers. Your "advanced theory" and "progressive theology" men are very much given to presenting us with specimens from that fossiliferous era that preceded the new age of which they are the morning stars. Henry Ward Beecher was never so happy as when he had Plymouth Church in a titter as he caricatured the Puritan Sabbath and the catechism drill. We were prepared to expect something of this kind, but not anything so remarkable. We give President Hervey's exact words: "The legitimate fruit of this era may be not too unfairly indicated by this confession of one who is now a brilliant and devout woman, but who as a child was too brilliant to be devout [how very brilliant she must have been], though she was regular in attendance on Sunday-school: namely, that she reached the ripe age of thirteen years before it was revealed to her that the scene of the Bible narrative was not laid in heaven."

Now, considering that the "scene of the Bible narrative" is laid partly in Armenia, partly in Chaldea, partly in Egypt, and partly in Palestine, what a brilliant, not to say heavenly-minded girl of thirteen years that must have been, who either in or out of a Sunday-school had not yet learned that these familiar places of our geography were not in heaven! If she could be caught, she ought to be labelled and put in some educational museum as one of the curiosities of the nineteenth century.

But it is time to pass to that which is the chief aim of this article, namely, to point out the imminent peril to the Sabbath-school from what is known as the "new education in the church," for which we are, to a considerable extent, indebted to Bishop Vincent and "those whom he inspired." The peril from this movement is threefold.

In the first place, the acceptance of this "reform," as its advocates are pleased to call it, would involve the giving up of our International system of lessons, with all the literature that has grown about it, and the substitution of the system of the "Bible Study Union." The lessons of the International Committee are

now used in nearly all the Sabbath-schools on this continent, and in many thousands of schools abroad. It is safe to say that twenty millions of scholars study them every Sabbath. A change to the lessons of the Bible Study Union would involve many serious consequences. First of all, the uniform study of the same lesson on the same day all over the world must be abandoned. President Hervey reckons it one of the superiorities of the new system over the old that "The lessons are not dated, and one may begin the school-year in September or in January without feeling that he is out of step with anybody. Why it should ever have been supposed that Mr. Brown's class of girls, aged fourteen, should be able to proceed as rapidly as Miss Green's class of boys of the same age, has always been a mystery to the present writer. There are cases on record of classes which failed to finish the lesson for the day, but felt impelled to proceed next time to the lesson of the day."

Of course, no system can have all possible advantages combined; but the matchless advantage of the International system—that for the loss of which nothing to which President Hervey refers could begin to compensate—is that the same lesson is taught in every school from Maine to California on the same day. A teacher or scholar thrown providentially in any strange city to spend Sunday can prepare the lesson, and go and take his place, and teach or recite just as if he were at home. Then, too, comes the inspiration of the thought of the millions that are, at the same time with ourselves, engaged in the prayerful study of the same portion of God's word, and the ability to provide lesson helps so much more perfectly where all can concentrate for the time being on a single passage of Scripture. Not only is there the loss of the inspiration from keeping step with the great body of Bible students all over the world, but there is a Babel in each particular school. What is to become of the superintendent's review and drill in the lesson, if as many different lessons have been taught as there are classes in the school? In this respect the loss through the proposed change would be grievous.

But this is as nothing when compared with the second sacrifice we must make. The International Lesson Committee consists of

fifteen members, chosen from the leading evangelical denominations of the country, the number from each denomination being governed by the size of the denomination, the Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians having three each; the Congregationalists, Disciples, Episcopalians, Lutherans, the Reformed churches, and United Brethren having one each. The new Lesson Committee, appointed at the last International Convention, contains the names of men in whose scholarship, conservatism, and spirituality the friends of the Sunday-school have implicit confidence. As to the Bible Study Union, Professor Hervey tells us all that we need to know, in the following paragraph, under the caption, "The Bible Study Union: Its History."

"The beginnings of this movement seem to be fairly traceable to the work of President (then Professor), W. R. Harper, about ten years ago, whose splendid campaign for improved methods of Bible study so powerfully affected the country at large. Dr. Harper was also the supervising editor of the first published lessons of the series, and ever since the lessons have been edited by men of scholarship who are in sympathy with President Harper's spirit and method. The father of the movement itself is Rev. Erastus Blakeslee, who, after some preliminary experimenting, issued the first course of lessons in the year 1891. The circulation increased in the first three years from ten thousand to one hundred thousand, and then to one hundred and fifty thousand. The lessons were translated and printed in several foreign languages for use in the missionary field. New courses were continually added, and finally, in 1893, the corporation known as the Bible Study Union was formed, being an organization of about five hundred distinguished college presidents and professors, clergymen, Sunday-school superintendents, and teachers, etc., representing a dozen different denominations."

As President Harper is recognized as one of the leading representatives in this country of that rationalistic school of the Higher Criticism, whose views of inspiration are so radical as virtually to exclude the supernatural as an element of Scripture, it will be seen at once that if the lesson helps of this course are to be furnished by men who "are in sympathy with President Harper's spirit and

method" we shall soon have our Sunday-school children taught that the Pentateuch is a composite, the work of a dozen or more writers, none of whom lived as early as the days of Solomon; that the tabernacle was a myth to account for the temple; that there were two Isaiahs, etc., etc. When we reflect for a moment on the cheek and push of the men of this school; when we remember that behind the "five hundred distinguished college presidents," etc., is all the prestige of the University of Chicago, with its millions of endowment, its vast printing presses, its multitudinous publications, etc., this proposal to substitute the Bible Study Union for the International Sunday-school Union is one to call for most serious consideration.

The second element of peril to the Sunday-school in this "new education" movement, one which is but another outgrowth of the same rationalistic spirit which finds utterance in the proposed change of lesson systems, is that of the utter secularization of the teaching in the schools. Our old system proceeded upon the idea that the Bible was a supernatural revelation from God; that it differed in this respect from all other books; that its truths were autopic; that when it entered the mind and heart, a special and supernatural agency of the Holy Spirit accompanied it, engrafting it as a living germ, an "incorruptible seed that liveth and abideth forever." One of the first and most important works of the Sunday-school teacher, therefore, was to store the mind of the pupil with Scripture truth as far as practicable in Scripture language, looking to the Holy Spirit to take his own word and make it effectual to salvation.

The theory of the "new education," which looks upon the Bible as a beautiful literature, full of wise sayings, but with endless scientific, historical, and philosophical errors, is, as President Hervey says in his strictures upon the present system of teaching in the primary class, to make "each lesson a complex, involving literature, music, art, science and industry," so that one wonders where religion comes in. The fundamental principle of the old school, that of storing the child's mind with Scripture,—and it has been the fundamental principle from the days of the early Jewish "schools of the law" until now,—is the one which President

Hervey most strongly antagonizes. He gives, for instance, as one of the most atrocious of all the vicious types of questions and answers the following:

“How did the people dwell?—Safely.” “What did Solomon have for his chariots?—Horses and horsemen.” “What for his heart?—Largeness of heart.” “What was it like?—Even as the sand that is on the seashore.”

He makes himself very merry over these questions for the little ones. But, as will be seen at a glance, they are intended to fix in the mind of the child before coming to the class the exact words of Scripture, with the expectation that all explanation, illustration, and spiritual application of the scriptural text will be made by the teacher in the class-room.

The same thing is true of a second set of questions which President Hervey mercilessly criticises, which are intended also for the little ones, but to which the answers are not given. The lesson is on the crucifixion, and the questions are as follows:

“What had happened to Jesus on Thursday night?” “What did the soldiers do with Jesus Friday morning?” “Why did they get Simon to carry his cross for him?” “What prayer did Jesus make for the soldiers?” “How did the people standing about the cross treat Jesus?” “What did one of the thieves ask Jesus?” “What did Jesus say to his mother and to John?” etc.

Now, you will notice that, with the exception possibly of the third question, every one of these calls for an answer in the exact words of the Scripture lesson. Of course, if the Bible is only like Shakespeare, or Homer, or Milton's *Paradise Lost*, all this would be as time thrown away; but if the Scripture is the inspired word of God; if the first object of the teacher is to see that this word is by the work of the parent at home lodged in the child's mind, and then that by suitable exercises in the class-room its lessons are impressed, the method becomes rational and suited to its purpose.

The same viewing of Scripture as mere literature appears in the criticism of the plan of having the primary class study the same Scripture lesson with the older scholars. What are we to think of the qualifications of a man for giving advice to Sunday-

school teachers who speaks of the difficulty of "justifying, on any ground whatever, the teaching of a child of kindergarten age of the betrayal, condemnation, and crucifixion of Christ," as "doing violence to the child's spirit," and "doing so absolutely unnecessarily"; who asks, "Is there not, in this wide world, to be found material for forty-eight lessons to young children on the heavenly Father's love and care, and on the Lord Jesus' life of helpfulness and beauty, without bringing in that which at best is ill-adapted to the scriptural needs of children?"

If there is anything in the world that is adapted to the spiritual needs of children, as well as grown people, it is the story of Christ's sacrificial death for the sins of the world. To President Hervey it may be only a story of "the depraved performances of Judas and Pilate." To those who believe in the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, it is one of those sweet mysteries which our Saviour says that the Father has "hid from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes."

The third element of peril to the Sabbath-school in this new movement we find in the employment, by its advocates, of methods entirely unsuited to the Sabbath-day. The "Sunday-school kindergarten," as it is called, is a transfer to the Lord's house and the Sabbath-day of the purely secular methods of the week-day school. The Sabbath-school hour is occupied alternately with kindergarten work and kindergarten play. Here a little group is engaged with scissors, cutting out pictures; there another, with needle and cardboard, working pictures; here with pencil and slate, or brushes and paint; here with knives carving Scripture emblems in wood. One enterprising young kindergartner sets up an imitation door, and has a procession of virgins to come and knock, etc. Another makes sheep of the girls and goats of the boys, and goes through an imitation of the judgment scene.

What are we to do with all this, and where is it to end? We may rest, we trust, in the assurance that the International Lesson system is too firmly entrenched in the hearts of the people to be displaced; but the same literary methods and the same secularization of the teaching may go on with the International Lessons as a basis. If the presses that are imbued with the spirit and methods

of the rationalistic criticism shall be employed for the circulation of a Sunday-school literature in the interests of the "new education," they will exert a wide-spread influence. The men who will edit the lesson leaves, the journals, and the lesson commentaries will be men of great ability, for we cheerfully concede the high scholarship and wide research of President Harper and his collaborators, although we resent the lofty claim which they make to a monopoly of the biblical scholarship of the age.

There are, as it seems to us, two things that are necessary if we are to hold our Sabbath-schools firmly to the course of spiritual instruction for which they were originated. The first is to secure, as far as practicable, teachers for the Sabbath-schools who have had normal courses of training either in Bible schools or in schools of secular learning. There is incalculable advantage in knowing, not only as the result of our own experience, but as the result of training under those who have had larger experience and longer training, how to adapt the truth to the minds and hearts of children in Sabbath-school classes. Where it is impossible to get trained teachers, there should be normal courses for teachers in the school itself, and the teachers should be urged to take advantage of every opportunity to hear lectures on pedagogy, and to study the best manuals of instruction in the art of teaching. It is unquestionably true that much of the teaching in the Sabbath-school is defective. If President Hervey's ridicule and sarcasm, instead of depressing and discouraging, shall put our consecrated Christian teachers on their mettle, and rouse them to equip themselves for better work, a great deal of good will result from an article which, in other respects, is calculated to do great harm.

The other thing that is necessary is to put our denominational Sunday-school literature upon the very highest possible basis of biblical scholarship, literary culture, and perfection of mechanical work. Our only safety is in supplying our schools with lesson helps prepared for them under the editorial supervision of men in whose orthodoxy and conservatism we can have implicit confidence. But it will be impossible to secure general patronage of these helps if they fail to come up to the standard in scholarship and adaptation of other helps offered at the same price. For the

capital invested, it is remarkable that our Committee of Publication can produce lesson helps of as high a quality as those with which they now supply the churches. But they ought to have money with which to pay, and to pay liberally, for the very best work that our very best exegetes can do in the interpretation of the weekly lessons. They ought to have money with which to pay liberally for the very best work of the most experienced and successful teachers in the illustration of the lessons, and in helps and hints for teachers. President Hervey's plan for chairs of pedagogy in theological seminaries, and for training schools in pedagogy for Sunday-school teachers, is utopian and visionary. His own figure of the *parturiunt montes* was never more clearly illustrated than in the winding up of an article so rampant with destructive criticism of anything and everything that came in his way, by suggesting a plan as impracticable as that of building a bridge to the moon. But there is one thing that we can do, and that we ought to do. We can give to our publishing houses sufficient capital to enable them to issue lesson helps and Sunday-school papers equal in scientific and literary merit to those of any of the great publishing houses of the land. We have men of scholarship equal to that of the promoters of the Bible Study Union. We should avail ourselves of their services. When once the church came to the realization of the fact that it possessed such a literature, its patronage would be secured; and the patronage by our whole church of the literature of the committee would give an income that would make its Sunday-school publications, even with liberal payment for all contributions, entirely self-sustaining. Our Committee of Publication would then be in truth, as far as our church is concerned, what President Hervey so much craves to see, a "society for the prevention of cruelty to children." It would protect from the cruelty of men who would take all the spirituality out of the Sabbath-school, and all the sanctity out of the Sabbath-day. I fully agree with President Hervey that there should be such a society, and I think that President Hervey is the very first man whom it ought to put under arrest.

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

Louisville, Kentucky.

V. "THE MIND OF THE MASTER."

By IAN MACLAREN.

AMONG the distinguished foreigners who have visited America during the past few months, none have received a more cordial welcome in literary and religious circles than Rev. John Maclaren Watson, D. D., pastor of Sefton Park Presbyterian Church, Liverpool. His manager claims that he was more in demand than any other lecturer from abroad has ever been. Although born on English soil, Dr. Watson is of Scotch parentage, and received his education in Scotland, being a graduate of Edinburgh University, where he is said to have been a diligent and successful student. Belonging to the Free Church, he took his theological course at New College, Edinburgh, where he had among his intimate friends such men as Dr. George Adam Smith, Dr. James Stalker, Rev. D. M. Ross, and Prof. Henry Drummond. His first ministerial work was in connection with Barclay Church, Edinburgh, where he served for a term as assistant pastor. He then received a call to the Free Church of Logiealmond, Perthshire, better known by the fictitious name he has conferred upon it, Drumtochty, a church consisting of only about one hundred members. From this place he was called by an influential Glasgow church, St. Matthews, to be colleague to the venerable Dr. Samuel Miller. There he did excellent work, and his reputation as a preacher steadily grew. Then came the call from the congregation over which he now presides. Dr. Watson's reputation, however, has not been made so much through the pulpit as through his pen. The surest and shortest cut to literary fame in our day is offered by fiction. Ours is distinctly a fiction-loving age. The author who puts his message on almost any subject in the form of an attractive story is sure of a wide circle of readers. The appearance of his book, *Beside the Bonnie Brier Bush*, introduced the provincial Scotch preacher to the English-speaking world, and gave him an assured place in literature. While living in Logiealmond he studied the sturdy residents of the Glen with keen in-

sight and kindly sympathy, and with the hand of a true artist he has delineated their peculiarities. The character of the rural Scotchman has rarely had so true or so pleasing an interpreter. His quaint mingling of humor and pathos, of worldliness and other-worldliness, of stoicism and tenderness, has been set forth in a way that shows a master-hand. In *Auld Lang Syne* the Drumtochty people appear again, and they have a place in the affections of an ever-widening circle of readers.

The interest excited by these books has been rather quickened by the suspicion that they have in them what the Scotchman called "a dash o' heeresy." Some sober readers detected in them, as they thought, ominous omissions and suggestions of error. One of the vices of the religious novel is that it allows an author to conceal himself behind his characters. Through them he utters sentiments for which he need not assume responsibility. He may or may not endorse them. Ostensibly his attitude is that of the historian, and he is simply chronicling phases of belief; but in reality he may be a teacher in mask, seeking in this way to inculcate his own views. Another vice of the religious novel is that it may, and often does, make connections which are not true to life. In real life men do not "gather grapes of thorns nor figs of thistles," but in fiction they often do. The connection between creed and character, between character and conduct, is often purely arbitrary and widely different from what we find in living men and women. It must be confessed that Dr. Watson's stories are not altogether free from these faults, yet the charitable reader is disposed to allow some license to the novelist as to the poet, and to pardon an occasional divergence from strict orthodoxy, provided the story be a good one. But his late work, *The Mind of the Master*, is a purely didactic one, in which the author appears and speaks "in *propria persona*." We turn to it, therefore, with more assurance to find out his real position as a religious teacher.

The book is composed of fifteen essays upon the following topics: 1, Jesus, our Supreme Teacher; 2, The Development of Truth; 3, The Sovereignty of Character; 4, Ageless Life; 5, Sin an Act of Self-will; 6, The Culture of the Cross; 7, Faith the

Sixth Sense; 8, The Law of Spiritual Gravitation; 9, Devotion to a Person the Dynamic of Religion; 10, Judgment According to Type; 11, Optimism the Attitude of Faith; 12, Fatherhood the Final Idea of God; 13, The Foresight of Faith; 14, The Continuity of Life; 15, The Kingdom of God. The literary quality of these essays is high. The author shows that he is as much a master of pure English as of colloquial Scotch. Probably his most marked characteristic as a writer is his fondness for antithesis, which he often uses with fine effect. Take this, for example, from his chapter on the Sovereignty of Character, p. 51:

"Originality in literature is called discovery in science, and the lonely supremacy of Jesus rests not on what he said, but on what he did. Jesus is absolute Master in the sphere of religion, which is a science dealing not with intellectual conceptions but with spiritual facts. His ideas are not words, they are laws; they are not thoughts, they are forces. He did not suggest; he asserted what he had seen by direct vision. He did not propose; he commanded as one who knew there was no other way. One of his chief discoveries was a new type of character; his greatest achievement its creation."

Or take the following contrast between Buddha and Christ, page 90:

"Buddha identified evil with the material influences of the body, as if a disembodied spirit could not be proud and envious. Jesus traced evil to the will, and ignored the body. Buddha proposes to train the soul by a life of meditation, as if inaction could be the nursery of character. Jesus insists on action, the most unremitting and intense. Finally, the great eastern sage held out the hope of escape from individual existence, as if that were the last reward for the tried soul. Our Master promised perfection in the kingdom of heaven. Both systems recognize the supreme need of the race, which is a favorable omen; they differ in the means of its relief. Buddhism amounts to the destruction of the disease and the extinction of the patient. Christianity compasses the destruction of the disease and the salvation of the soul. Tried by the severest test of a religion, Jesus alone out of all masters remains; he saves 'his people from their sins.'"

Dr. Watson's thinking is equal to his style. It is always vigorous, suggestive, and fresh, even though it may be lacking in accuracy. His spiritual tone, too, is exalted, and wins one's sympathy even where there may be dissent from his reasoning.

The leading idea of the book, as might be inferred from its title, is set forth in the opening chapter on "Jesus, our Supreme Teacher." In substance, it is an appeal from the creeds and confessions of the church, and even from the prophets and apostles to

Jesus as the one great, infallible teacher—“the one Judge of truth.” He amends Chillingworth’s famous definition of Protestantism after this wise: (P. 14.)

The religion of Protestants, or let us say Christians, is not the Bible in all its parts, but, first of all, that portion which is its soul, by which the teaching of prophets and apostles must itself be judged, the very words of Jesus.”

He claims that “we are living in a second Reformation,” which takes us back a step farther than the first. It has been discovered that “the water of life is clearer and sweeter from the spring than in a cistern,” and “the grass-grown path to the spring has been shown.” (P. 11.)

The same position he repeats in these words :

“What has to be laid down in the strongest terms and held in perpetual remembrance is that Jesus gave in substance final truth, and that no one, apostle or saint, could, or did add anything to the original deposit, however much he might expound or enforce it. . . . When any person imagines revelation in Holy Scripture as a level plain, wherein Abraham or St. Paul stands as high as Jesus, he gives one pause; when any person conceives of revelation as an ascending scale wherein the apostles stand above Jesus, he astounds one. If it be not an impiety, it is surely an extravagance.” (Pp. 30, 31.)

The Sermon on the Mount he regards as a complete summary of Christ’s teachings. Nothing essential has been omitted from it. He says: (P. 14.)

“When Jesus founded that unique society which he called the kingdom of God, and which we prefer to call the church, it was necessary he should lay down its basis, and this is what he did in the Sermon on the Mount. It was Christ’s manifesto and the constitution of Christianity. When Jesus opened his mouth his new society was in the air; when he ceased, every one knew its nature, and also on what terms a man might belong to it. . . . Among all the creeds of Christendom, the only one which has the authority of Christ himself is the Sermon on the Mount. When one reads the creed which was given by Jesus, and the creeds which have been made by Christians, he cannot fail to detect an immense difference, and it does not matter whether he selects the Nicene Creed or the Westminster Confession. They all have a family likeness to each other, and a family unlikeness to the Sermon on the Mount. They deal with different subjects; they move in a different atmosphere.”

He holds that they give different answers to the question, “What is a Christian?” Christ’s creed is ethical; those of the church metaphysical. His is concerned with the duties men owe to him and to each other; their’s with theories of his person, the na-

ture of his work, the condition of man, etc. Many persons who would pass as good Christians by the sermon are cast out by the creeds, and *vice versa*. He desiderates the time when a body of Christians will take their stand on the sermon of Jesus, and conceive their creed on his lines. He imagines it would run thus: "I believe in the Fatherhood of God; I believe in the words of Jesus; I believe in the clean heart; I believe in the service of love; I believe in the unworldly life; I believe in the beatitudes; I promise to trust God and follow Christ, to forgive mine enemies, and seek after the righteousness of God" "Who," he asks, "would refuse to sign this creed? They would come from the east and the west, and the north and the south, to its call." (P. 21.) In like manner in his chapter on the "Development of Truth" (pp. 35, etc.), he exalts the teaching of Christ above that of the apostles. "The relation of the apostles to Jesus," he admits, "is a question of great difficulty, which deserves careful treatment." He declines to class the apostles with the early Christian fathers, yet he is unwilling to admit them to the same plane of authority with Christ. He says: (P. 37.)

It must surely strike any one passing from the Gospels into the Epistles, and comparing the words of Jesus with the writings of St. Paul, that the apostle is less than his Master. It seems almost profanity to criticise St. Paul, but one may not make him equal to Jesus without removing Jesus from his judgment seat, and destroying the proportion of Holy Scripture. If one may be pardoned his presumption in hinting at any imperfections in the Apostle of the Gentiles, is not his style at times overwrought by feeling? Are not some of his illustrations forced? Is not his doctrine often rabbinical, rather than Christian? Does not one feel his treatment of certain subjects—say, marriage and asceticism—as somewhat wanting in sweetness? One only makes this rebate from the apostle's excellency in order to magnify the divinity of Jesus' evangel, which is never local, never narrow, never unintelligible; which is ever calm, convincing, human."

Again, in his chapter on The Kingdom of God, he says:

"The kingdom-idea flourishes in every corner of the three Gospels, and languishes in the Acts and Epistles, while the church-idea is practically non-existent in Jesus' sermons, but saturates the letters of St. Paul. . . . With all respect to the ablest Apostle of Jesus, one may be allowed to express his regret that St. Paul had not said less about the church and more about the kingdom." (P. 321.)

Such passages occur here and there throughout the book, and set forth what is really its underlying idea.

Now, in all this has our author correctly interpreted the mind of the Master?

1. First, as a preliminary suggestion, we question the conception which he has of the Sermon on the Mount, and the place which he assigns it in the teaching of our Lord. We surely do not disparage its divine wisdom and beauty when we insist upon confining it to the place in which the Master has put it, and using it only for the purpose for which he gave it. That sermon, as we understand it, was never intended to be the full and final evangel of Jesus—his gospel of grace for a world of sinners. It was spoken originally, not to a promiscuous multitude, but to the disciples. Matthew tells us (v. 1, 2) that "seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain: and when he was set, his *disciples* came unto him: and he opened his mouth and taught *them*." His object was to explain to those who had already given him their allegiance the nature of the kingdom which he had come to set up, the principles upon which it is founded, its relations, its privileges and duties. As such it is perfect. But where is the hint that it contained all that guilty and ignorant sinners need to know in order to be saved? Did he not make a real addition to the sermon when, in his interview with Nicodemus, he taught the doctrine of the new birth as the great naturalization law of the kingdom of heaven; when he taught the necessity of his death in order that men might have life; and declared faith in himself as the one condition of eternal life? Our author is by no means the first who has sought to magnify the Sermon on the Mount out of the proportion of faith. Others have done so avowedly because the Pauline doctrine of the cross was an offence to them. But whatever the motive of the attempt, the result is to make the ground of our salvation ethical, instead of evangelical, a matter of works, not of grace.

2. Again, we cannot agree with much that Dr. Watson has to say as to the proper character and use of religious creeds. Indeed, his views on this subject seem confused and contradictory. He commands our fullest sympathy when he says (pp. 249-50), "What one thinks to-day he will do to-morrow; and the first equipment for living is a creed. No one is so simple that he

does not hold some article firmly he must have a belief as he must have a home. History proves the necessity of a creed; experience proves its effect. As the light of the sun colors the tiniest blade of grass, so the idea in the background of the mind tinges every detail of life. . . . The whole energy of a human life, however it may have been fed on the way, and whatever common wheels it may turn, arises from the spring among the hills. Belief gives the trend to politics, constitutes the rule of business, composes the atmosphere of the home, and creates the horizon of the soul. It becomes the sovereign arbiter of our destinies, for character itself is the precipitate of belief."

But he is not always true to this conception, either when criticising existing creeds or proposing ideals of his own. He seems at times to forget that creeds from their very nature are human productions. They are not handed down ready-made from heaven. Such is not God's way. He has revealed his truth in Scripture, as in nature, unsystematized—"by divers portions and in divers manners." It is left for us to search it out and set it in order. A man's creed is his interpretation of divine revelation; the response which his mind and heart make to what God has spoken. To speak of the Sermon on the Mount as a creed is to mistake the character both of the sermon and of a creed.

Again, creeds may properly differ from each other according as they are framed for different purposes. One may be intended to set forth the terms of salvation on the basis of Christian fellowship. Such a creed ought certainly to be short and simple, although we cannot agree that it may be purely ethical. Our Lord certainly was not indifferent to the views which men held as to his person. On one occasion he asked his disciples: "Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?" And when he had heard their answer, he asked again: "But whom say ye that I am?" Simon Peter answered, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Then he said to Peter: "Blessed art thou Simon Barjona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Again, he said to

the Jews: "If ye believe not that I am he ye shall die in your sins." Neither did he hold it of small moment what views men held as to their own condition. A difference of view on this point made the fundamental distinction between the Pharisee and Publican who went up to the temple to pray. A purely ethical creed might, indeed, be popular, and attract men from the east and west and north and south; but surely the value of a creed is not to be estimated by the number of signatures that may be obtained to it. Again, a creed may very properly have a much wider scope than to define the way of salvation or the basis of Christian communion. It may set forth the sum of Christian testimony—the whole body of truth which the church holds and teaches in her Master's name. Such a creed must necessarily be elaborate, covering the whole range of revealed truth. Nothing that God has revealed is unimportant. Every truth is not essential to salvation, yet it is essential to some good end, and may not be omitted from a man's belief without loss. In this sense a man's creed will expand as he is more and more "filled with the knowledge of God's will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding"; and with such expansion of his creed there will be a corresponding growth in grace and enrichment of character.

3. But our gravest contention with Dr. Watson is when he disparages the teaching of prophets and apostles under the plea of exalting that of the Master himself. Here, let it be noted, the question is not as to the supremacy of Jesus as a teacher. This we contend for as earnestly as our author. But the question is as to the scope and methods of his teaching. Are we to confine the teaching of Jesus to the words which he spoke during his three years' ministry, as they are recorded in the four Gospels? Such seems to be the mind of Dr. Watson, but such, if we have understood him aright, is not the mind of the Master. In that memorable interview with his disciples in the upper room, on the night before his passion, he said (John xiv. 25, 26): "*These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you.* But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." There is a

plain promise that in addition to the personal instruction that he had given them they should be further taught, after his departure, by the Holy Spirit. Again, he says (John xvi. 12-15): "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you." One marvels how, in the face of such a declaration, the claim can be made that Christ during his ministry in the flesh gave "final truth" to which no addition could be made. He expressly tells his disciples that because of their spiritual incapacity he was obliged to withhold many things which it was needful for them to know. Not a few things, but many; not things of secondary importance, but of highest moment. They were not yet in position to receive them. As Bernard says in his *Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament*, p. 95: "The presence of Christ in the flesh had been a help to what they had already learned; it was a hindrance to what they had now to learn. While he sat there before them in the body, it was hard to understand the mystery of a spiritual union. That hindrance is to be removed: 'It is expedient for you that I go away.'" They must cease to know him after the flesh in order that they might know him after the spirit. The meaning of the cross could only be fully unfolded after the Son of man had been lifted up. His priestly work of atonement and intercession, his spiritual union with his people, the Christian life of faith in the energy of the Holy Spirit, and a whole circle of related truths, could only be intelligibly expounded after Calvary and Pentecost had passed into history. These were the things which they could not bear while he was present with them. But they were not to be left in ignorance of them. He promises to continue their instruction through the agency of the Holy Spirit. His personal teaching must close; but another teaching was to be substituted which would also be his, and which would be better "suited to the new relations which he would bear to them in his glorified state." "When he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth," "he will teach

you all things;" "he shall receive of mine and shall shew it unto you" These promises were not empty words; they were fulfilled in the preaching and writings of the apostles.

Accordingly, in his introduction to the "Acts of the Apostles," Luke refers back to his Gospel narrative as a record "of all that Jesus *began*, both to do and teach," plainly implying that the present treatise was to record what Jesus *continued* to do and teach. The worker, the teacher, is still the same, only his method has changed. He who spake on earth now speaks from heaven. He who wrought with his own hands and spake through his own lips is now to act and teach by his Spirit, though the hands, the hearts, and lips of chosen ambassadors. In perfect harmony with this is the claim which the apostles always make for themselves. In his speech before Agrippa, Paul states the commission which he received from Christ as an apostle in these significant words: "I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, *and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee.*" (Acts xxvi. 16.) To the Ephesians he says: "Ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God given to me to you-ward; how that *by revelation he made known* unto me the mystery." To the Galatians he says (chap. i. 11, 12): "I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man; for *I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.*" And he does not hesitate to pronounce any man or angel accursed who should preach another gospel. In other of his epistles we find such expressions as these: "This we say unto you by the word of the Lord" (1 Thess. iv. 15.) "*I have received of the Lord* that which also I delivered unto you," etc. (1 Cor. xi. 23.) "For I delivered unto you first of all *that which I also received.*" (1 Cor. xv. 1, etc.) Plainly he asserts the claim that he stood, in respect to the source of his information, on the same footing with the evangelists who walked with the Lord during his personal ministry, and recorded his words. In like manner John says in the beginning of his first epistle (chap. i. 3): "That which *we have seen and heard* declare we unto you." And in the opening chapter of the Apoc-

alypse he tells us that the glorified Jesus appeared to him and laid his right hand upon him, and told him what to write. (Rev. i. 17) One is puzzled to understand why the beloved disciple should be a less trustworthy witness when he records what Jesus said in his hearing on the Isle of Patmos, than when he records the words of the same Jesus spoken in the upper room in Jerusalem.

To represent then, as our author does, that the teaching of the apostolic epistles is less authoritative than that of the four Gospels, is, we are constrained to say, a contradiction of the apostles themselves, and a palpable misinterpretation of the mind of the master. A sounder conclusion is that of Bernard in his comment on the Scripture: "Ye are built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." "The corner-stone," he says, "is but part of the foundation, though it be the first and the chief part; and this consolidation of the corner-stone with the adjacent foundations, as one basement to sustain the building, exhibits in the plainest manner the fact that the church, *in respect of its faith*, rests upon a testimony which was delivered partly by Jesus Christ in person, and partly by the agents whom, for that purpose, he ordained. Their inspiration as believers associates them with the whole church; their inspiration as teachers unites them only with their Lord."

There are other things in Dr. Watson's book from which we strongly dissent, but to notice them would extend this critique beyond its proper limits. One lays down the volume with a high estimate of the author's gifts, and with gratitude to him for many fresh and suggestive views of religious truth; but with the conviction that, along with much that is precious and true, he teaches subtle and dangerous error; and with the hope that, like the gifted Apollos, he may, by some means, be taught "the way of God more perfectly."

J. F. CANNON.

St. Louis, Mo.

VI. SOME DECADENT TENDENCIES IN CITY LIFE.

It is not my purpose to contrast city and rural life. No doubt each has its advantages, and each its defects.

I think, as perhaps many others do, that the truest and best living combines the advantages of both country and city. This method has saved the aristocracy of England from a decay that would otherwise have been inevitable.

Nor is it my purpose to deal with the social and industrial problems that arise in connection with the development of these great civic centres. We must all be more or less weary of this obtrusive subject; and while we have no disposition to belittle its commanding importance, yet one should not be blamed for thinking that it is fast becoming a hobby with many.

The particular aspect of metropolitan life which I have in mind is, it seems to me, of more fundamental importance than the municipal problems that are claiming so much public attention. These are, in many cases, only symptoms of a morbid social condition that has its origin further back.

There are many eulogists of the city as a factor in the development of our civilization, and I would fully agree in the claims that exalt the great cities of the world as the centre and source of much that is most valuable and most permanent in contemporary history; but the truth of such claims cannot blind us to the existence of facts that offset many of the city's benefits, and sadden our contemplation of its power and influence. Certain conspicuous tendencies of city life are anything but humane and elevating, and it is to these that I wish to call attention.

In the development of this theme we will not lose sight of the fact that human nature is essentially the same under all circumstances. There is no difference between men, as men, whether they live in the city or in the country; and the tendencies to be noted are not peculiar in all respects to the city. In a broad sense, and in some degree, they are to be seen in every aspect of society. They are, in a word, the universal and inherent degen-

erative tendencies of human nature. The problem of life is to counteract and destroy them. The prime object of social effort is to produce such conditions as will reduce them to a minimum of influence, or eradicate them from amongst the determinative factors of human progress. The point to be emphasized in this connection is that city life in the present day, while it may not be charged with creating these tendencies, does aggravate and intensify them in a very alarming and portentous manner; and in so far as this effect obtains, it would indicate that there is something radically wrong in the conditions of city life; and, moreover, the query is awakened, whether there is power in the social organism, as represented in the city, to expel these noxious elements that are breeding disease and decay, and to produce at last a purified and healthy structure. That is a question upon which there must, necessarily, be a great contrariety of opinion amongst sociologists; and it is quite possible that our preconceptions, together with the difficulties inherent in the situation, would prevent our arriving at an unbiased and trustworthy conclusion. Whether one be an optimist or a pessimist, one need not look far for facts to sustain his thesis.

But the important consideration is that we should not overlook the perils that menace our civilization. Disease is not so bad as neglect. All of us deprecate the spirit of pessimism, but is it not just as important to avoid a foolish optimism? The worst deception is to make one's self believe that the truth is a lie. I have heard of a woman who nursed an infant at her breast for months, under the belief that it was her own. But one day she learned that it was another's, and that her own was dead. There is something dreadful in the thought of hugging a lie to the bosom under the delusion that it is a truth.

The city tends to become more and more artificial. Its dwellers live in artificial shadows by day, and in artificial light by night. They never tread upon the earth's native soil, or drink from nature's streams. We trim our parks until our children do not know how grass grows uncut, or the sweet wildness of a road winding amidst unpruned forest trees. The city's population, to a large extent, is acquainted only with the works of man. It sees God's works

only after they have been changed by the hand of man. A common domestic animal, such as the cow, a meadow with its waving harvest, is unknown to many a city child. It is not far-fetched to infer that this must result gradually in an enormous exaggeration of man's importance and power, and in an increasing diminution of man's sense of the presence and working of God in nature and history. A silent change is going on in human thought, in which all emphasis is being put upon the phenomena of nature's great forces, such as electricity, gravity, water, while the thing itself and the Creator of the thing slip out of knowledge. But this is the process that leads to atheism. In many a heart it already pushes itself to that extreme, while in the social organism as a whole the sense of God grows dim and uncertain. I feel it in my own experience, and I think that every one who has had experience of the country must feel it likewise. It is necessary for me to tear myself away from city associations often and to seek contact with nature, in order to maintain the naturalness of my own being; and sometimes I am amazed at the blessed force with which God returns to me when I walk his woods and look into his unstained sky.

The force of this tendency may be mitigated somewhat by the habit of taking a vacation and by the numerous charitable excursions which are becoming a feature of our benevolent work; but, after all, how many there are who must submit to it in all its secularizing and dehumanizing influence. And then, too, mere momentary touch with nature can never take the place of intimate communion with and knowledge of it. The important fact remains to confront us, that there are thousands dwelling within the walls of the great cities whose lives are wholly moulded by artificial influences, and who, for that reason, can never realize the highest possibilities of our human nature.

It is my conviction, borne out by facts, that human nature cannot last long under such conditions. It will soon run its course and lose its vitality. Deny to these people the resources of wealth, which enable us somewhat to counteract the evil effects of such an environment, and within two or three generations human nature will lose its vigor and its power. What are called

the city's slums are largely made up of people who have been unmade by the artificial surroundings of the city, the children, in many instances, of vigorous sires. It is a fact of common remark that the important posts in city activities are filled with men who are country bred and reared. There may be some exceptions to this rule, but they are so infrequent as to give the more emphasis to it as the expression of a truth. I think it would hardly be too much to say that it is impossible for the city alone to produce a great man of the first order. The city may have a very decided influence in heightening the power and enlarging the influence of a great man, but it is not capable of producing him.

Lying in close connection with the preceding tendency is that to licentiousness which is so pronounced a feature of city life. He is a strong man naturally, and stronger by the grace of God, who does not feel the power of this influence. The city aggravates all the innate predisposition of human nature to impurity and sensuality. It gives unlimited opportunity to those who may be viciously inclined to indulge their predilections, and it thrusts innumerable and all but irresistible temptations in the way of those who would live for the higher self.

Take the saloon as an expression of this tendency. The larger the city the more numerous the saloon. In the largest metropolitan centres we find the relative ratio of this institution increased, in some instances, to the dreadful proportion of a saloon to every one hundred of the population. This provision, recognized by the state, for supplying men with an article that inflames every passion, encourages every crime, dulls every useful faculty, and aggravates every disease. We find, not only that this tendency is characteristic of the city, but that it is intensified in those districts where the population is most congested. The implications of this fact are too alarming to contemplate. They justify the zeal and resentment of the prohibitionist, only that his anger leaves us without a remedy still.

Beside this, and just as horrible in its effects upon society, is the city phenomenon, the brothel. It does not exist in the country, because it is not needed there. The city produces the brothel because it inflames the passions to which the brothel ministers.

Our sons and daughters are not safe in the country from the perversion of nature's gifts; but they are much less safe in the city. The city streets, the street-cars, the great stores, the theatres, furnish an opportunity to the libertine and the harlot that must make every father tremble for the welfare of his children. Young men grow up in the country without knowing the rouge of the strumpet's cheek, or the leer of her eyes; but city boys can have no such immunity from impure suggestions. A discrowned and dishonored womanhood is one of the most common sights that meets the eyes of the city girl.

The result of this atmosphere is seen in the innumerable disrupted homes, and the ever-increasing divorce dockets of the city. Evidences of infidelity to the marriage vow meet one on every hand, and are appalling in their revelation of widespread demoralization. There is hardly a doubt that the absence of men from the churches is to be attributed to licentious living more than to any other cause. There are many noble and devoted Christian wives who have to struggle in an agony of prayer in order to safeguard children whose happiness and character are threatened by unfaithful husbands and fathers. Certainly it is putting the case mildly to say that the manhood of the city tends ever to become more lax in its sentiments of male purity.

What will the future be? Our great American cities are of recent date. The moral deterioration which is manifest happens amidst the fresh elements which have been contributed by the various sources from which the city has been filled. What are we going to see with the lapse of time, when habit, heredity, and public sentiment have all contributed their quota of power and impulse to this dreadful tide whose destructive waves sweep with their slime over the world's purity? Must not the virus spread until it has poisoned many an area that is still uncontaminated with its pollution?

The foregoing considerations prepare the way for a glance at that enormous waste of human life that is constantly taking place in the city's maelstrom. The old story of the Carthaginian Tanit, to whom annually a mighty sacrifice of the nation's children was done, is far surpassed in the history of a modern metrop-

olis. Thousands yearly die, wrecked in body and soul, and destined to whatsoever eternal loss and ruin await human beings in the blackness beyond. The great majority of these began life fairly. They were, perhaps, the children of Christian nurture. They once left home with the tears of a praying mother staining their cheeks. In many cases they were members of the church. But the city's temptations were too strong for them; they fell and kept on falling. The ruined humanity of a great city must wring tears from the eyes of angels. And the tramp, tramp of the swelling host whose footsteps lay hold on hell grows ever louder, comes ever nearer. Each moment some new home is drawn into this deadly vortex. As we walk the streets our ears are assailed by the prattle of children whose first word was an oath, and who will march straight to hell without ever knowing that there is a heaven. And this is part of the city which men laud and call the crown of civilization. This is part of that city life which you and I cannot retard or correct; one of the fructive pistils in the blossom which we hold to our nose for the sweetness and the fragrance of Christian civilization.

There are many remedies proposed for this unspeakable waste. There are some who even deny it in their bizarre optimism. I cannot say that I am much enamored of any of the proposed remedies. Even the gospel, could we get men to believe in it, is at a disadvantage here. The situation looks like a deliberate violation of the petition, Lead us not into temptation. There is a point beyond which the gospel does not ordinarily save men. That point has been reached in the human slaughter-house of the city, where men's bodies and souls are both sacrificed on the altar of lust and riot. More souls are shrieking "the pain of the world" than crazy Peg of Zangwill's *Master*. The pain of the world culminates and becomes fiendishly intense in this human sacrifice whose blood stains the city pavements, and whose smoke blurs the city sky. I do not set myself to propose a remedy. The baffled Psalmist's cry: "How long, O Lord, how long!" is the soul's only easement in such a study; or, perhaps, the millennialist's prayer as in his fright he exclaims, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly."

We cannot shut our eyes to these facts. And it will not do to thrust them aside with the sneer that such statements presuppose a philosophy of despair. They do not necessarily imply any philosophy, and one's conclusions may be entirely aside from the truth. But we do not settle things by philosophical predilections. Whether these currents are bearing us on to final and irrecoverable world-disaster I am not in a position to say; I may even believe otherwise. But that does not change the melancholy truth that this mill grinds daily its grist of our sons and daughters; nor that it all indicates a trend that must inevitably become worse under present conditions. Whatever the future may have in store in the way of betterment, lies, to say the best, in dim shadow, and one can only hope that it will come soon and come strong.

The city is greatly accentuating and aggravating the ambition for wealth and power that is so dangerous an element of human nature. If there is any truth in the apostolic warning that the love of money is the root of all evil, then it goes without argument that the city is a menace to the very foundations of society. It is a question whether the greed for wealth is not the very greatest peril of modern institutions. That greed has destroyed, either directly or indirectly, all governments that ever perished in the world's history. It is the one masterful passion that will tolerate no opposition and brook no argument in the name of righteousness. It rushes towards its goal with un pitying feet, grinding protestants into the mire and cloaking its hypocrisies in the guise of philanthropy and of religion. It maddens the mightiest brain; twists the stoutest conscience; masters the most stalwart convictions.

We wonder at the far-reaching influence of combinations, trusts and syndicates; we stand aghast before the wild threatenings of social revolution; we are appalled at the manifest possibilities of class hatred and bitterness fast approaching some nameless crisis. But do we trace these dangers to their true origin? If so, we find that they spring almost entirely from the inflamed condition of men's desire to be rich. Quietly, but irresistibly, the natural law of competition which God designed to regulate the development

of the world is being obliterated by various influences from human activities. If it were being replaced by some humane socialistic device we might, at least, be patient and wait; but it is not. This effect is not the result of any philosophical attitude, but the working of brutal forces. Here, again, the purely artificial is being thrust into the place of the natural.

Trusts may cheapen products, which is not, however, a defensible proposition, but they also cheapen men. What is gained when the quality of clothing is raised by lowering the quality of manhood? Give me the homespun of our sires with their sturdy uprightness and solemn sense of humanity. It no longer answers to say that men live better, and to marshal statistics to show that the rate of wages has risen. That may satisfy the trust-maker, and the professional statistician, but it fails the philosopher. Indeed, it is only another symptom of deep-seated disease. For let us note, always, that the ambition to be rich is not a desire for money in the absolute, but for the relative power and position it gives. The Rothschilds will never cease, not because they have not enough for all uses, but because each added dollar heightens their superiority to their fellow-men. The working-man is more dissatisfied with his increased wages because they fail still more to bridge the widening chasm between him and his more fortunate fellows. Let no one make the mistake of supposing that the passion for wealth is augmented by need, or that poverty is the cause of the bitterness in our civilization. It is never the man who suffers from want who is avaricious of wealth, but it is he who is already well provided for.

This tendency of city life is producing many of the evils that disturb and menace the business and political worlds of the day. It gives rise to most of the political policies that mar the nation's growth, not always by retarding it, perhaps more disastrously by forcing it. It grafts upon our business activity the semi-gambling schemes by which one is robbed to enrich another. It gives birth to the class sentiments that, articulate or unspoken, are gathering strength for the future's tempests. It is helping always to fill the slums, and what is more melancholy still, it is creating the so-called "four hundred."

In all political movements the line is being more and more distinctly drawn between city and country. It is shallow to say that the farmer has no ground for his complaint. He but little understands the situation who fancies that the discontent of the agricultural population is a causeless and wicked manifestation of class hatred. The farmer is not ignorant, but he is simple-minded, honest, and devoid of avarice. He wants only what he earns by the sweat of his brow. He is unused to the tricks of trade by which some enrich themselves at the expense of others. He does not want to learn them; but he is being driven to the wall. Not only do the cities control the markets of the world, but they dominate them in a large degree by these very tricks. The overreaching greed of the city forces him into antagonism. In no other country than France, where the agricultural population is of the peasant class, and habituated by long centuries of submission to yield its rights, would the tyrannous domination of Paris be tolerated for an instant. Never can that be the case in a land where all, from the beginning, have been free, and where all stand on an equality of political power and authority. But the signs all indicate that the city tendency to avarice is continually growing. It has already reached the point where it controls the political and social development; and even now it declines to yield one iota to any sentiment of opposition.

We are, of course, always asking ourselves what influence religion will have in restraining and modifying such tendencies in the future; or, in other words, whether there is power in religion to save society from the inevitable destruction which such a spirit must work if its advance is unchecked. That will depend much on whether religion maintains its integrity. The religion of the Bible in its purity would operate as a safeguard; but there is always the doubt whether we have the religion of the Bible; whether we have not ourselves been drawn unconsciously into this broad current that is bearing so many interests far from the safe moorings of the past. "Ye cannot serve God and mammon" was our Lord's word of warning; and yet the modern city is trying hard to effect that reconciliation. It does not require a very keen penetration to perceive that mammon is already getting the

best of the bargain, or to see that the trend is altogether in its favor.

Coming in the train of this evil and closely related to it is another that is largely characteristic of the city and hardly less hurtful in its influence upon character. I refer to the disposition to live beyond our means. Next to being rich is the desire to seem rich. Again and again have I heard it said by thoughtful persons since the hard times began, that they have been caused to a great extent by this disposition. It cannot be denied that very many, a number that is quite astonishing and startling when one stops to think, of city people are living more luxuriously than their means will justify.

As a first result of this we find an alarming loss of the sense of honor. Men rush headlong into debt until they lose the idea of the "pay as you go" policy which is so essential to the preservation of an acute sense of honor and the business probity upon which society depends. I am amazed at the utter indifference I sometimes discover in men who handle much money and live high to the demands of their creditors, even for small amounts. They allow their accounts at the grocer's, the butcher's, the tailor's, and their dues to the church, to run for months, and seem entirely unable and unwilling to pay them. The church is full of dead-heads who are not such from choice, but because the pressure upon them leaves them nothing for religion. The richer the person, indeed, the more intense this strain. There are many facts that indicate that the richer we grow the more intolerable becomes the weight of living upon us. The rich of our congregations do not give anything like their relative proportion to the church and the causes it represents. An analysis of the annual missionary collection, or any other collection, will show an absurd disproportion between the gifts of the rich and of the poor.

Another result is, that life is losing its repose. Nervous diseases are increasing at an alarming rate. Men break down in early life. Women are becoming hysterical. Our children are being weakened by heredity. We are not ready to subscribe to the theory of Dr. Max Nordau, but there are many facts that point to a sad degeneration in the fibre of human nature, both

physical and mental. Look at the intense strain of the last election. How long will it take that kind of work to leave an indelible impression upon the whole being of the nation? Nor is this an isolated phenomenon in our social life except in the depth of its intensity. We have come to the point where every important social issue seems to us to involve the happiness and life of the people. The mere statement of the fact ought to warn us that we are living under an artificial strain. What folly to contend that the election of either candidate meant the life of the nation, or its honor. What unspeakable misconception for one-half of the brethren to charge the other half with a purpose to crush American manhood and institutions. And yet that is the state of the case as it looks to us in these times of ours. Our social strabismus is grown so great that we cannot see an issue clearly any more. Our repose is gone. It is no longer possible for us to be calm and to keep the faculties of thought in proper balance. We have reached the point of hysteria where epithets are mistaken for arguments.

Furthermore, this loss of repose has gone so far that restlessness has become a second nature and a cult with us. We no sooner get rid of one sensation than we begin the search for another. It will have to come, even if it becomes necessary to twist some innocent matter until it assumes monstrous features. Our newspaper press will give us all the assistance we need. Something to keep up the strain, which has now become normal, we must have. We are like a man whose system has become habituated to the use of a stimulant or a narcotic. A moment's relaxation entails insufferable misery. Transplant us into the conditions of a decade ago and we would forthwith die of ennui. The church of the apostles is too tame for our city generation; the pulpit must drag in the political and social sensations of the day. The Shakspearean drama no longer goes. Who could bear the intolerable repose of those mighty characters? Anthony and Cleopatra must be rewritten by Sardou according to the latest taste of Parisian realism. Give us the spice and the mince and the rush of the modern naturalistic stage.

And still another effect of this overwrought civilization is seen

in the reduction of families. The ethical code of the day justifies child murder, under certain conditions, and woman murder also. I said justifies, let us rather say demands. The one unpardonable social crime is to have a large family. Nature's law is defied, and the law of revelation is violated. Given a healthy man and a healthy woman, bound in wedlock, and it looks to me as if there is much perversion of God's order in our city domestic life in the number of families that have none, or but one or two children. And this observation would appear to be reinforced by the widespread prevalence of female invalidism in the city's homes. To my thinking there is no more dreadful feature of the social condition than the fact that an incredibly large proportion of city women are the victims of diseases peculiar to the sex; while the increase of surgical operations upon women is one of the most enormous of the developments of the times.

It is a subject which I do not care to pursue. There is no doubt in my mind that it is one of the signs of the unhappy influence which city life is having upon society, and that it is one of the fatal tendencies with which the future will have to reckon. Luxurious living demands it, and our moral code must accommodate itself to it. Decay of the nation, decay of morals, decay of genius, cannot be allowed to stand in the way where modern demands for high living put their irresistible emphasis.

And then, when trouble comes, we are not prepared to meet it. A bubble on the current of the nation's financial and industrial life precipitates indescribable terror and alarm. The instantaneous loss of confidence which has characterized the panic situation of these last years would not be possible in a society that was conservative in its business activities and in its methods of living. The circumstances that precipitated the panic and have continued it now during four years have been largely fictitious.

The city is doing much to delay the growth of the sense of human brotherhood. I do not forget that we see now and then in city life a splendid manifestation of sympathy for the afflicted and the sorrowing. In some directions the city seems to stimulate benevolence and philanthropy. But, on the whole, I think it is indisputable that city life tends to individualize men and insulate

them from their fellows. And many of the influences around city people cultivate in them a distrust of their fellows. Class distinctions among the free people of this country have an entirely different basis from those of former days and of differing governments. These distinctions are growing amongst us with the growth of cities. But they are just as real and just as divisive, and portend as much evil. It may be said that they are a sign of the progress of civilization. But that supposition raises the query, of course, with thoughtful people, whether civilization is not a failure.

It seems right queer to a city man to go into the country and sleep with first-story doors and windows wide open, without fear and without molestation. And the experience suggests some interesting queries upon the relative merits of the city and the country as promoters of good feeling amongst men. There are certain rude lawlessnesses, such as lynchings and feuds, which are preëminently characteristic of the country. But aside from these, it can hardly be denied that the city is by far the more prolific breeder of all those criminal acts which are the result of an individualizing selfishness. Many of the most notorious and diabolical crimes attach almost wholly to the city. We live as truly in castles and behind moats in the city as did the lords of feudal times. The only difference is that our defences are a systematic and far-reaching provision of the social organism. But, let us take away our police and the expensive machinery of the law, and we would instantly find ourselves the prey of vultures as ferocious and rapacious as ever fed upon fellow-baron in the old fierce days of embattled fortresses. In a very alarming sense the sentiment of human brotherhood has deteriorated in comparison. Then men preyed upon each other for the glory of arms, and there was an element of chivalry in it, very useful factors to a developing society; but now it is for the gratification of purely devilish instincts.

Look at the growth of the crime of murder. General attention has been called to the statistics gathered by the *Chicago Tribune* with regard to the increase in this crime. These figures have recently been criticised by the *Independent*, but even the *Independent's* showing proves them to be no exaggeration. There were during 1895 in the country the incredible number of ten

thousand five hundred murders. That is to say, if all the murders committed in that year were localized in one place they would depopulate a city of the third class. We are not so very much behind the Turks, without their motives. We cannot read our daily papers without being alarmed at the rapidly increasing contempt for human life as seen in the city's history. And along with this goes a process of judicial corruption and defeat of the ends of law that makes it all but impossible to punish the most heinous murderers. The highly aggravated cases of this crime excite a mawkish sentiment of curiosity, and even sympathy, which exalts and lionizes the fiend. The sense of stern social justice, which subordinates the individual to the all, so essential to the preservation of organized society, is being, or has already been, weakened into a morbid opposition to capital punishment, which magnifies the claims of the murderer at the expense of the fundamental right of all his fellows to life and the pursuit of happiness. And it is one of the ironies of providence that this wild waste of life, fast assuming the proportions of riot, is augmented by what men misconceive as a sentiment of the sacredness of life.

If we look at the crime of embezzlement, one of the most destructive in the category of crime of all humane sentiments, we find that the showing is equally as discouraging. In 1890 the total of embezzlements in the country was \$8,622,956; in 1894 it had risen to \$25,254,112. Taking the three years 1892-'95 the average was \$18,500,000 per year. This is one of the most startling exhibits ever made in the annals of crime. Nearly twice as much money embezzled in the United States as the whole of Christendom contributed for Foreign Missions! Who can doubt that this vast enlargement of the area of crime is due almost entirely to the conditions of metropolitan life? Within one month four banks, with estimated assets of several millions of dollars, went down in one city as the result of this crime. What a suggestion of the corruption that may lie hidden under the fair exterior of the city's business activities.

The crime of suicide has increased from 3,860 in 1892 to 5,759 in 1895, or at a ratio of more than forty per cent. in three years.

It is become so common in the city that it fails to excite comment. Only the cases that happen in the country are telegraphed to the great dailies, unless they are of exceptional importance. We hardly notice the instances, running from one to five, that are daily chronicled in the local papers of any large city. The first twenty years of my life were spent in the country, and in that time I knew of but one case of self-destruction, and that the case of a lunatic. To this day I know of no other instance in the whole county where I was brought up. In the city even children seem ambitious to affect this melancholy way of exit from the world. I mention this crime in this connection because it illustrates what I have said about the tendency of city life to weaken the sense of brotherhood amongst men. The suicide is, perhaps, the supreme protest against the world's inhumanity. He not only chooses this ultimate way of registering his contempt for the divine providence, but by the same act he declares that humanity fails of all kindly attributes and of all high ethical ideals.

At least a word should be said here upon gambling. It has always and everywhere been one of the most tenacious and at the same time one of the most hurtful instincts of human nature. Society has recognized it as such, and has ordinarily thrown upon it all the restraints that were possible without unduly abridging the freedom of the individual. The passion is but little indulged outside the large cities in the present day; but in such cities gambling is assuming a magnitude that makes it one of the most destructive of the influences that threaten the welfare of society. It seems impossible to restrain the disposition to gamble under the present conditions of city life. Every circumstance operates to aggravate it and to afford it opportunity. Many of the city's business transactions may justly be charged with partaking of the nature of gambling. The "you win I lose" trade of the exchange can hardly be defended on the ground of Christian morals, whatever respectability the associated business interests of the city may give it.

It is not necessary to go into the sickening details of the innumerable bucket shops, saloon-gambling adjuncts, pool rooms

and race courses that are blighting the city's life with withering effect; nor to dwell upon the same tendency as it manifests itself in the habits of fashionable society. Every thoughtful person knows that these influences are damning their thousands every year, and poisoning with their venom the whole business and social life of the community. Their unholy influence is making defaulters, embezzlers, robbers, of a great army of young men who ought to be contributing to the upbuilding and purification of the world. They honeycomb the business world with dishonesty and the social world with impurity.

I will continue this somewhat melancholy line of thought only to point out one other tendency which appears to me to receive a most dangerous impulse from the conditions of the large city. It is probably as important as any when we take into consideration the character and purpose of our political institutions, and the nature of the social fabric we are trying to rear on them. I refer to the aggravation of political corruption which takes place in these centres. Here are gathered all those forces which contribute to this corruption and which feed upon its carrion.

Two things would seem to be indispensable in our system to the very life of a municipality. These are, an honest and fearless judiciary, unhampered by party obligations and unfettered by party ties; and a school-board entirely detached from party fealty. And yet no great American city has either. We have already reached the point of corruption where either is an impossibility; but the influence of the city's corrupt politics extends much further than to this local circumstance. It affects national issues and the destiny of the nation. It was, no doubt, depended on in the last presidential contest to determine state and national results as well as more local ones.

Every great city is convulsed now and then with a spasm of reform. It is, perhaps, the best we can do; but it is pitifully little. It is only cutting away local tissue, while the virus is left in the blood.

It will be said that all this is very cheerless and depressing. Will not the people become educated at last? But is it education the people need? Do we not know better? Does not every son

of Adam know that this trend means death and destruction to the social organism? And has not every son of Adam deliberately determined that he will let the social organism go to the devil, provided only he can join in the carnival? But one may say, we will at last convince every one of this selfish race that it is not to his interest personally in the long run to be corrupt. Yes, but the trouble is that the average man will recognize no "long run"; nor the man who is more than average.

The claim really means that we will make Christians of all, and very good Christians, too; for, in truth, political corruption seems to have more influence upon the character of Christians than Christians have upon the character of political corruption. There are not many in the churches who can pass through these fires and not get burnt; and this is only one of the aspects of the weakening of Christian character which is effected by the operation of the influences of city life, but of which we have not time to speak at any length.

Centralization has ever been a danger in social movements. It is being made manifest again in the building of great cities. The aggregation of men in these large centres acts, inevitably, with deteriorating effect upon character. There has been found no human remedy to counteract this influence. The future is to be determined. He is a bold prophet who undertakes to define its course. Are we going to reject the gospel again, as did the Jews of old, when the Christ wept over their city? Are we daily rejecting the gospel and its Founder in these, the most pretentious and ambitious movements of the modern world? These are questions that I leave each to answer to his own satisfaction. However this may be, the supreme danger of modern civilization, to my thinking, is the centralization of humanity, and of social power and resources, in cities of metropolitan size and influence.

FRANCIS L. FERGUSON.

St. Louis, Missouri.

VII. PROBATION—DEATH—JUDGMENT.

IN his admirable and recently published work on the *Presbyterian Standards*, the Rev. Dr. F. R. Beattie calls attention to the fact that "at the time the Standards were drawn up, the great questions of eschatology were not clearly raised and fully discussed except as between Romanism and Protestantism. This, in part, accounts for the somewhat inadequate treatment which the whole subject receives in the Standards. Since that time new and important phases of these questions have emerged, especially in regard to the nature and duration of future punishment, and the second advent of Christ; and even at the present day this department of Christian doctrine has not yet attained to that definite and complete form which has been reached in most of the other departments of it. There is room and need for special attention being given to questions of eschatology." (As above, p. 385.)

This admission, by itself, from so judicious and competent a theologian and teacher, is sufficient to justify the following attempt to discuss certain phases of several eschatological questions. It is proper to add that the limits of the discussion have been determined by Dr. Beattie's courteous reply to a criticism of mine on a statement of his in his exposition of the Standards. His statement was to the effect that the destiny of men is fixed at death. The accuracy of this statement was challenged. In his reply, Dr. Beattie quoted the views of several orthodox and distinguished divines to sustain and justify his statement. These divines and others hold views as to probation and related subjects which are open to question as well as that concerning the determination of destiny at death. Hence there is need for a more elaborate discussion than the columns of a newspaper could well sustain. Besides, it was deemed best to allow the personal element of the discussion to disappear. Dr. Beattie has very clearly shown that in no sense is he personally responsible for the current opinions concerning the determination of destiny at death. It is commonly held and taught by many distinguished and orthodox

theologians. The present contention is with the doctrine, and not with its upholders.

There are three notions logically connected which are specially involved in this discussion. These are, individual probation of men in this life, a determination of eternal destiny at death, by a private judgment upon each person immediately after death.

A little reflection will serve to show that these three notions are logically connected with each other. If men are now in a state of probation, which is to end at death, then it is clear that their destiny will be fixed at death. But God alone is fully competent to decide what is the issue of the probation in any case. This calls for some declaration or judicial sentence from him, public or private. Inasmuch as there is no Scripture testimony to a public declaration at death, this judicial sentence, if declared at all, must be private.

Again: If the destiny of men is fixed at death, then there must be something that fixes it; some crisis met and passed, some goal reached. This involves a probation of some sort, and a judicial sentence of God concerning it.

Again: If there is a judicial sentence passed by God on men immediately after death, based on their conduct in this life, the only reason for it seems to be that men may know what their destiny is; in other words, the object of the judicial sentence is to fix destiny in view of a probation.

It is interesting to observe, in confirmation of this view, the tendency manifested by orthodox theologians to accept all three notions whenever they accept either one. Thus Dr. Timothy Dwight in his *Theology* distinctly teaches all three. He says: "Death terminates the probation of man." (Vol. II., p. 580.) "The soul, after death, returns immediately to God, to give an account of its conduct in the present life." (*Ibid.*, p. 588.) "The sentence of God will be pronounced, in perfect righteousness, on all that it (the soul) has done. . . . In consequence of this sentence, the soul will immediately enter upon a state of reward." (*Ibid.*, p. 589.)

Dr. Charles Hodge, who teaches that "the destiny of the soul is decided at death," in the same paragraph asserts that, "according to the Scriptures and the faith of the church, the proba-

tion of man ends at death." (*Systematic Theology*, Vol. III., p. 725.) He also teaches that the final judgment does not take place at death (*Ibid.*, p. 847), but evidently he believes in a judgment immediately after death, for in the paragraph just cited (p. 725) he refers to Scriptures which distinctly assert, or imply, a judicial sentence, viz.: Rev. xxii. 10, 11; Matt. xxv. 10-12; Luke xvi. 19-31; Heb. ix. 27. This last passage is cited by Turretin to prove a particular, secret and partial judgment which every man shall experience after death as to his soul; which he carefully distinguishes from the universal judgment of the whole human race at the last day. (L. XX., Q. VI., II.)

Dr. W. G. T. Shedd believes that this private judgment immediately after death coincides with the public judgment of the last day. (*Dogmatic Theology*, Vol. II., p. 660.) Consequently, he holds that "the destiny of the penitent is known and determined at death. Penitence or impenitence at death is, therefore, the state of mind that settles the everlasting condition of the individual." (*Ibid.*, p. 661.) A tyro in logic can see that this statement involves the doctrine that the individual man is in a state of probation until death.

Dr. R. L. Dabney asserts that "the general drift of Scriptures certainly teaches that at death man's probation ends." (*Syllabus and Notes*, p. 824.) He also teaches that "the state of man after death is changeless, and when the state is fixed at death, nothing can be done to modify it." (*Ibid.*, p. 856.) He also teaches a judgment immediately after death. (*Ibid.*, p. 280, part second, edition printed by the students.)

Even a cursory reading of the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church serves to show that they assert nothing concerning a judgment of any sort immediately after death. So far as this judgment is concerned, the Scriptures are as silent as the Confession. It is reasonable to suppose that this notion was originally adopted by a Pelagianizing church from the heathen religions. These religions had no just conceptions of a primitive judgment on the race, nor of a final judgment, such as the New Testament predicts; hence, their doctrine concerning a private judgment of the individual at death. It has been retained by

our orthodox divines as a logical consequence of their views concerning a probation in this life and the determination of men's destiny at death.

The only passage in the New Testament which even in appearance seems to sustain this doctrine is the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. (Luke xvi. 19–31.) This parable unquestionably teaches that there is no salvation for the reprobate after death. It is equally plain that this truth had not been authoritatively and finally taught to the rich man. His conversation with Abraham is transparently absurd if God had passed upon him a judicial sentence of condemnation announcing his final destiny. At the beginning of the interview he is, apparently, uncertain of his ultimate fate—as uncertain as he was when he was on earth.

Dr. Dwight preaches from Eccl. xii. 7 to show that souls return to God at death to render an account of their deeds; and he quotes Matt. xxv. 21, 30 as the sentences pronounced. A glance at this last passage in its connection will serve to show that it has no reference whatever to a sentence of judgment pronounced by the Lord on the individual just after death, but rather to the judgment of the last day. This, be it noted, is according to the confessional view of these passages, and not according to the pre-millennial gloss.

Turretin's text (Heb. ix. 27), and those cited by Dr. Charles Hodge, are equally inept. In every case the connection shows that if a final judgment be referred to, it is the final judgment rendered at the Lord's return.

It is perfectly clear that this notion impugns the confessional doctrines of original sin, and of God's primitive condemnation of the race. "The fall brought upon mankind the loss of communion with God, his displeasure and curse; so as we are by nature children of wrath, bond-slaves to Satan, and justly liable to all punishments in this world and that which is to come." (*Larger Catechism*, Question 27.) What need is there for a private judgment just after death, or at any other time, in the case of a man already under such a condemnation as that, and from which he has not been delivered?

Again: The Scriptures and the Confession alike teach that be-

lievers are no longer under condemnation. They are justified, adopted, sanctified, and will be glorified. What need has such a man for a private judgment of acquittal at death? The Pelagian, the semi-Pelagian, the Arminian, who underestimate the guilt of original sin, who make man's salvation depend on the use he makes of a probation accorded him in this life, may believe that there is a judgment immediately after death—one fixing every man's destiny; but the Calvinist, if he be consistent with his own doctrinal system, must repudiate this private judgment, this probation, and this determination of destiny. For him all alike are contra-confessional and contra-scriptural.

The same conclusion may be reached when we start from the notion of a probation in this life. This notion is likewise contra-confessional and contra-scriptural. Dr. Charles Hodge is in error when he says it is "the faith of the church."

The word probation is used here in this sense, viz.: as describing a state or condition in which individual men are placed, so that their eternal destiny for weal or woe is determined by the use they make of their present opportunities for salvation. It is not denied that all men, elect and non-elect alike, are in a state of probation thus far, viz.: the *measure* of their reward and punishment, respectively, is to be determined by their conduct during this life. But in this sense the term does not enter into this discussion, because it is agreed on all sides that the issue of this probation will not be fixed nor made known until the final judgment.

Furthermore, it is not denied that many Scriptures on their face apparently teach or imply that men are now in a state of probation, in the sense that their eternal destiny depends on the use they make of the opportunities afforded them in this life. Here, especially, belong all those passages which assert that if men repent of their sins, and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, they shall be saved; if they refuse to do these things, they shall be damned. To these must be added many others which assert or imply that men must obey God's law; they must be pure in heart, they must persevere to the end, or they cannot be saved.

If this discussion were addressed to Pelagians, semi-Pelagians, and Arminians, it might be necessary, or desirable, to explain

how these passages are to be interpreted according to the confessional view. It would not be difficult to do this. But such a discussion is just now and here unnecessary and undesirable. This article is addressed to Presbyterians, to those who accept the Standards of our church, who are familiar with the explanations just referred to.

It is enough now to say, that from our point of view the utmost that these passages can mean is this: They are addressed to men ignorant of God's decrees respecting their destiny, save as their own faith, repentance and good works evince that they are of the number of the elect. Hence, the possibility of a failure is presented in order to secure their predestined perseverance. Hence, also, they might teach that a man could not be certain as to his final destiny until the end of his life. But this last conclusion is negatived by the doctrine of assurance in the case of believers, and by certain premonitions of their doom often felt by the reprobate before death. Hence, the doctrine as stated can have no place in the Calvinistic system. In proof, I urge—

1. That it was not taught by the Reformers nor by the Westminster divines. Its prevalence among us is due largely to the use of Butler's *Analogy* as a text-book in our colleges, and to the influence exerted by Methodist teaching and the post-millennarian view of the Lord's return, both of which we owe to the Arminian writer, Daniel Whitby.

Our Standards teach that the race had its probation in Adam; that it sinned and fell into a lost state when Adam sinned and fell; that it is now, including every individual (except Jesus of Nazareth), under condemnation of law, under God's wrath and curse; that all men so remain until they are redeemed and saved by Jesus Christ.

2. This doctrine is contradicted by human observation and experience. What probation have infants dying in infancy? What probation worth the name have the unevangelized heathen, unless, indeed, all men, according to the Arminian view, get "common sufficient grace," upon the use of which their eternal destiny depends? As for this kind of grace, it is only necessary to say with all Calvinists, that it is neither common nor sufficient; it is a dream

of the theologians who try to find some *via media* between the deadly Pelagian errors and the truth as it is revealed in God's word.

3. This doctrine of probation is to be repudiated because it involves the doctrine of a probation after death, which the Scriptures distinctly contradict. It is one of the most striking illustrations of the folly of seeking to be wise above that which is written, that this doctrine of individual probation, upon which the notion of a private judgment at death depends, logically carries with it a doctrine which asserts that, in regard to the vast majority of men, their destiny is not determined at death.

We have just seen that infants dying in infancy and unevangelized persons have no probation such as is alleged. They have heard no gospel; they have had no chance to believe in Jesus; they have had no opportunity to be saved through the fulfilment of evangelical conditions. Manifestly, if the everlasting destiny of men depends upon the use they make of a probation accorded to them as individuals, this probation, whether it be of debt or of grace, must be complete and fair to each and all alike. Those who do not have a fair chance in this life may righteously claim such a chance in a future life. The unevangelized heathen certainly have had no such probation. Are we to conclude that they will have it hereafter? Is it not notorious that this is the chief ground upon which the advocates of a probation in a future life sustain their opinions? It seems to me to be logically impossible to admit a probation of individuals in this life, in any true sense of the word, and yet deny it in a future life in the case of those who manifestly have not enjoyed it in this life. The only safe and reliable position is that of the Scriptures as interpreted by the Standards.

It is impossible to evade the force of this conclusion by asserting that this individual probation is accorded to some, but not to all; to the elect and other evangelized persons, but not to men universally. For, first, the elect have no need for a probation. What can a probation do for them that is not otherwise done for them? They are elected to eternal life, they are redeemed, regenerated, justified, sanctified, in this life. Secondly, what can a

probation do for an evangelized reprobate? Does it put him in a salvable state? No Calvinist will admit that it does. On the contrary, Paul asserts that the hearing of the gospel is to such a savor of death. (2 Cor. ii. 15, 16.) Hence, the only people whom this individual probation can apply to are those who do not have it. All that it amounts to is a chance to hear the gospel. Inasmuch as multitudes have not this chance in this life, we must conclude that they will have it in a future life. But this the Scriptures do not sustain.

For these reasons the men who framed our Standards justly repudiated this doctrine of a probation in this life, and with it the other notions of a private judgment at death, and of the determination of destiny at death. Neither of these three notions can properly be held by any Calvinist, unless he is prepared to hold to a probation of some men in the middle state, which necessarily involves the abandonment of the notion that the destiny of all is fixed at death, and of the notion that there is a private judgment of every individual immediately after death. All these notions belong to an Arminian theology, and to the post-millennial theory of the second advent, neither of which is scriptural. The Arminian theology is certainly contra-confessional, and the post-millennial theory of the second advent is certainly extra-confessional.

The most that can be said for this third notion, viz., that destiny is fixed at death, is that both the unbeliever and the believer are *more* certain as to their destiny after death than before. But this need not be the case in the believer's experience, and ought not to be. He may have certainty, which is "an infallible assurance of faith, founded upon the divine truth of the promises of salvation, the inward evidence of those graces unto which these promises are made, the testimony of the Spirit of adoption witnessing with our spirits that we are the children of God." (*Confession of Faith*, Chap. XVIII., II.) In the case of the unbeliever, if he be a heathen, it is not denied that he may know something after death that he did not know before. On this point the Scriptures are silent, except as to the revelations of the final judgment, and it becomes us to preserve a like reticence. In the case of the evan-

gelized reprobate, he can know, if he will, and does know, if he accepts the Scriptures as the word of God, that he is a lost sinner. He can know no more than this, *quoad hoc*, after death.

It may be said that the reprobate can have no assurance that he is a reprobate until his death. It is always possible for him to hope that he is one of the elect as long as he is in this life and hears the gospel. It may be doubted whether even this is true. Certainly, to tell it to the sinner, is neither scriptural nor wise. Observation teaches us that men may be assured before their death that they are reprobates. Observation further teaches that when men come to believe that they may be saved at any time before their death which they may select, they will procrastinate. Hence, it is wise as well as scriptural to urge all men to repent at once and to lead holy lives without any sort of regard to death and to what is to occur at death.

If the believer is told that he cannot be assured of his salvation before death, he will fail to seek assurance and the graces that give it; he will turn away from the word, the sacraments and prayer, from the Holy Spirit with his testimony, to that which is the sign of the curse and wrath of God—to death and its horrors, which have, and can have, nothing which is sanctifying or edifying. He will wait for death to do for him what he falsely supposes that neither Christ nor the Spirit can do. This surely is a foolish, if not a fatal, error.

If the unbeliever is told that his final destiny will not be fixed until death, he will at once infer that he has a good chance to be saved as long as he lives. He will gamble on the chance of a death-bed repentance, likely enough to his own eternal ruin. Even though he be saved at the eleventh hour, he will enter the perfected kingdom as an infant of days, without any record of good works to show, for which he may be rewarded.

A striking confirmation of the justice of this protest against the teaching by Presbyterian theologians and preachers of these notions of probation in this life, of a private judgment immediately after death, of a determination of men's destiny at death, is to be found in this, that there is not a passage in the New Testament in which any Christian duty, including faith and re-

penitance, is enforced by the consideration that men must die. Have we become wiser than the apostles, inspired of the Holy Spirit? They do not urge death either as certain to occur, or as uncertain in respect to the time of its occurrence, as a reason why anybody should do anything. The coming of the Lord to judgment is the event constantly presented by them as the one which should move men to faith, to repentance, to holy living.

There is another false notion closely allied to these we have been considering. It is that believers enter upon their reward at death; that death is the goal of their expectations, prayers, and labors. This notion is extra-confessional and contra-scriptural. On this point the Scriptures are much clearer than the Confession. The Westminster divines were polemic. They waged war against the deadly errors of Rome. They assert against Rome the precious doctrine that the souls of believers at death become sinlessly perfect, and pass to Christ in glory. As he is in the highest heaven, so they are in the highest heaven, where they enjoy a vision of God. They state this truth in terms so strong that their successors in their preaching have added to it, and the people have come to believe still more; much, indeed, that is contradicted by the Standards and by the Scriptures. The truths stated in the answers to the *Larger Catechism*, Questions 85, 86, are constantly emphasized, and those stated in the answers to Questions 87, 88, 90, are constantly neglected.

As a result, the people cease to care for the second advent, the resurrection and the glory then to be manifested. They are content to die and go to heaven. The New Testament is more emphatic and explicit than the Catechism. It does not present the middle state as one specially to be desired. It places the bestowment of reward at the time of the Lord's return, the resurrection and the judgment. (Matt. xvi. 27; xix. 28; Luke xiv. 13, 14; Rom. viii. 23; Col. iii. 4; 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8; 1 Pet. v. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 9-14; 1 John iii. 2, 3; Rev. xxii. 12.) There is not a passage in the New Testament which asserts that any reward is bestowed upon any one at his death.

The only possible evasion of these and scores of other passages is that of Dr. Shedd, in the reference given above. It is

that the individual judgment at death coincides with the final judgment. But this, in the light of the New Testament doctrine of the second advent, is transparently absurd, except to a man who has accepted the post-millennial theory of the second advent, with its implications. But this theory is neither scriptural nor confessional. On this point Calvin's testimony is most impressive. He says in his noble chapter on the resurrection: "I have observed that the advantage of Christ's benefits is solely enjoyed by those who elevate their minds to the resurrection." He quotes and aptly comments on the few passages that refer to death, and adds: "In the meanwhile, as the Scriptures uniformly command us to look forward with eager expectation to the coming of Christ, and defer the crown of glory which awaits us till that period, let us be content within these limits which God prescribes us, that the souls of pious men, after finishing their laborious warfare, depart into a state of blessed rest, where they wait with joy and pleasure for the fruition of the promised glory; and so, that all things remain in suspense till Christ appears as the Redeemer." (*Institutes*, Book III., Chapter XXV., pp. 200, 208.)

My note-book testifies that the late Dr. Thomas E. Peck held this view, and was accustomed to say that the Christian must in imagination overleap death, and fix his thought on the resurrection and the judgment.

Many honored brethren grow impatient when these views are presented. They see no peril to the Calvinistic faith, no danger ahead for the church. They forget that the doctrine of the resurrection is the keystone in the arch of the Christian evidences, and always the direct object of the infidel's attack, both by argument and sneer. They forget that the best way to abandon a doctrinal position is to begin by belittling its importance. We are doing this in regard to the resurrection, and the eschatological doctrines with which it is closely connected. If believers are to die, be judged, and get their reward immediately after death, what concern have they with the second advent, the resurrection and the glories of the kingdom of God?

More than this: We all admit that we have fallen on evil times. There is plenty of money, but all our church enterprises are suf-

fering for the lack of it. Our strongest men find themselves unable to resist the flood-tide of worldliness that threatens to overwhelm our church life in the great cities. Our village and country churches are growing feebler in all the elements of spiritual power.

There must be some cause or causes for this. Is it not reasonable to suppose that one of the causes is the substitution of this "gospel of death" for the glorious gospel of the blessed God? Our people no longer look for, work for, or pray for the Lord's return. They are to be perfectly sanctified at death, and they need expect to be nothing but poor, wretched, miserable sinners until death comes to their relief. When they die, their destiny will be fixed, they will go to heaven and be made perfectly blessed. What personal interest need they take in the evangelization of the world, in the salvation of the elect, in the return of the Lord, in the coronation of the saints?

Is it strange that, with such views, they neglect the means of grace, and care nothing for present assurance; are content with a vague hope that they are, or that they will be saved; give themselves up to the acquisition of money and the enjoyments its possession brings; dole out a scant pittance for the support of the gospel at home, and for the evangelization of the world abroad?

May it not be worth while for us to return, not to the pre-millennial view of Scripture and of eschatology, but to the confessional view? This knows nothing of a millennium, especially the doctrine that the world is to be converted by present gospel agencies; it magnifies the resurrection, and directs the believer's attention, his hopes, his prayers, his efforts, to the Lord's return, and the glory then to be revealed.

If the words of a humble contemporary may be passed by as unworthy of attention, surely the noble testimony of Calvin will be heard. He says: "The cross of Christ triumphs, in the hearts of believers, over the devil and the flesh, over sin and impious men, only when they are directed to the power of the resurrection." "Notwithstanding the opposition of the blind and stupid cupidity of the flesh, let us not hesitate ardently to desire the

advent of the Lord, as of all events the most auspicious. For he shall come to us as a Redeemer to deliver us from this bottomless gulf of all evil miseries, and introduce us into that blessed inheritance of his life and glory." (*Institutes*, Book III., Chapter IX., VI., and V.) What a commentary on our modern church life is this word: "He alone, therefore, has made a solid proficiency in the gospel who has been accustomed to continual meditation on the blessed resurrection!" (*Ibid.*, Chapter XXV., I.)

E. C. GORDON.

Westminster College, Fulton, Mo.

VIII. THE NORMATIVE CHURCH POLITY AND SOME ABNORMAL OUTGROWTHS.

TRULY has it been said, "The very *raison d'être* of the church visible is the gathering and perfecting of God's saints in what part soever of the world they happen to be (the Saviour's parting command in Matt. xxviii. 19, 20). The church is the universal recruiting agency for the eternal armies of the Lord of hosts, and human efficiency in drawing in recruits is greatly affected by her *organization*."—*Dr. T. C. Johnson*. And "the diverse theories respecting the *government* of the church are mainly grounded in different principles of interpretation of the word of God. In opposition to the Rationalist we (Presbyterian Christians) deny the supremacy of human reason; her jurisdiction is purely negative. In opposition to the Romanist we deny the authority of the church and human tradition; the testimony of the church and the traditions of men command our respectful consideration, but they have no independent value. In opposition to the 'inward light' of the Quakers we deny any special illumination of the Holy Spirit but such as is promised to all true believers. In opposition to other Protestant denominations we reject the principle that what is not forbidden in the word of God is allowable, and accept as our rule of faith and practice only what is 'either expressly laid down therein or deduced by good and necessary consequence therefrom.' In opposition to those who hold that the New Testament is a sufficient rule in all matters of creed and conduct we adopt as our watchword 'the whole Bible (the Old as well as the New Testament) is the religion of Protestants,' and the New Testament is not a sufficient guide when separated from the Old Testament."—*Dr. G. R. Brackett*. The import of these truths will appear as we proceed.

As seekers after truth, and nothing but the truth, as Christians, we are ever willing to submit ourselves to the infallible teachings of God's word in all things; and, as on other points of faith and duty, so in this, the matter of church polity, we admit as the

normative principle for the best being of the church only that form of government which finds its authoritative sanctions in the inerrant volume of divine inspiration.

Coming to this ultimate standard of human appeal, we immediately observe that in all ages since the establishment of the church as an externally organized body in the family of Abraham, the manifestation of what hitherto had existed in an embryonic state, there has subsisted a church, a people chosen of God, called out from the mass of mankind, and called together into an holy organization by authority of Jehovah; separate from, and yet in touch with, the world for religious remedial ends; at one time having the Jewish form, at another the Christian, so far as external appearance is concerned. (Cf. Romans xi.) Indeed, it may be said that there is no such thing as a Jewish church, nor such a thing as a Gentile church, but the one church of the elect Jews and Gentiles in Christ, the root and the head thereof; and, though manifold and variegated its visible representatives among the children of men, yet, even there—certainly till the end of the apostolic age—the church was a continuous unity.

Now, if there be a church of God in the earth, it must needs be the subject of government; and if the church be substantially one throughout every Scripture dispensation, then it is but just, natural, and reasonable that the same substantial government prevail within the church through all dispensations. This, indeed, is exactly what we find, as a matter of fact, in the scripture records of the church of God, so far as revealed. From the earliest ages of mankind we find a certain church polity actually adopted, practiced, and authorized—a form of ecclesiastical government existing peculiar to itself, distinct from the ceremonial system in the Old Testament dispensation, and remaining essentially untouched, though more completely wrought out, in the incipency of the New Testament economy.

The church is a society of divine warrant; and as no society, especially one of the Lord's appointment, can exist without law and order, it must of necessity have laws and ordinances and ministers best suited to its holy mission, sanctioned by the divine approbation, spiritual in nature, and sufficient to admit to or ex-

clude from church fellowship, to preserve order and harmony, to warrant the admonition, suspension, or excommunication of the disobedient, and to sustain, encourage, and edify the saints of God. In a word, it must have an authoritative system of principles binding the whole church body together, and governing it as a unit; and the wise conduct of this government by representative office-bearers elected by, and acting for, the whole body, as the system demands. This it has, being, not a monarchy, nor an oligarchy, nor a democracy pure and simple, but a spiritual or ecclesiastical republic, subject unto the Triune God, having an inerrant system of laws enjoined of the Lord in his holy word of truth for man's faith and duty, its government being elective, representative, and presbyterial. All reputable scholars now admit that, if the Scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments be accepted as the sole rule of faith and practice, then, beginning with the earliest external organization of the church of God on earth, the representative principle of government by elders (Greek, presbyters) runs through the whole of the Old and New Testament history until the consummation is reached in John's great apocalyptic scene of the four-and-twenty elders (Greek, presbyters) sitting round about the throne of the Lord God Almighty, with crowns upon their heads, in the celestial forum; a view of the same presbyterial principle in operation in the government of the redeemed in heaven. (Rev. iv. 4, etc.)

For lack of space, what has been said as to the normative character of the presbyterial, elective, and representative system of church polity, because biblical, must suffice for the present. This being the biblical church polity, it follows that other forms, the products of human devising, because departures from the scriptural norm, are so far abnormal outgrowths. And this, indeed, the records of history do show most conclusively, that all other forms of ecclesiastical polity now in existence are but so many erroneous developments from the original scriptural government of the church by equal and associated presbyters (elders); the two extremes being represented by a lax independency on the one hand, and an arrogant episcopacy on the other, the latter of which calls for a more extended examination, because of its un-

warranted assumptions. This may be exhibited within a small yet sufficient compass, in the following summary manner:

At the beginning, there were but two classes of ordinary and permanent representative officers in the Christian (as in the Jewish form of the) church, to-wit: Presbyters (elders) and deacons; the one order of presbyters being divided into "the teaching presbyter" (or minister of the word) and "the ruling presbyter" (or ruling elder simpliciter), as in 1 Tim. v. 17; the words presbyter (Greek, *presbuteros*, literally, elder) and bishop (Greek, *episcopos*, literally, overseer) being used as interchangeable terms for one and the same office-bearer, as in Acts xx. 17, 28 (R. V.), the first name being expressive of his age, or rather of his gravity and wisdom, the second term indicating the function of charge with and oversight of the faith and practice of the Christian flock committed to the pastoral care of this class of office-bearers. And naturally enough, in a parliamentary assembly of elders (*i. e.*, in a presbytery), from the outset, that all things might be done decently and in order, it was absolutely necessary that they have some presiding officer; and that, starting with this equality, which the Saviour himself enjoined, amongst these presbyterial representatives of his church, they should each preside in turn over the sittings of the court. That this was the real state of the case is manifest from the chronicles of history. The presiding presbyter was elected from the body of presbyters constituting the presbytery, and acted only as chief presbyter among his fellow presbyters, *primus inter pares*.

Just when came the first aberration from true apostolic Presbyterianism, it is difficult to ascertain, for the change was not sudden, but so gradual and slight as to appear almost trivial at the outset, till time showed it to be quite otherwise, utter defection from the truth only showing itself after a long period had passed. For at least two centuries the early Christian church in general continued to enjoy the original form of presbyterial church polity unalloyed. Did time and space permit, I might quote such authorities as Clemens Romanus (A. D. 96); Ignatius (?); Polycarp (A. D. 148); Justin Martyr (A. D. 165); Irenæus (A. D. 202); Clemens Alexandrinus (A. D. 218); Tertullian (A. D.

220); Fermilian to Cyprian (A. D. 256); Hyppolitus (A. D. 237); Origen (A. D. 200); Eusebius (A. D. 270); Optatus (?); Ambrose or Hilary (A. D. 384); Jerome (A. D. 426); Augustine (fifth century); Chrysostom (A. D. 407); Theodoret (a few years later); Salmasius (a later date); Gregory Nazianzen (fifth century); Elias, Archbishop of Crete (A. D. 787); Isidorus Hispalensis, Bishop of Spanish Seville (seventh century); Eutychius, of Alexandria (tenth century); Bernaldus Constantiensis (about A. D. 1088); Urban II. (A. D. 1091); Gratian (a century later); Nicholas Tudeschus, Archbishop of Panorma (A. D. 1428); even the papal canonist Jo. Paul Launcelot (A. D. 1570); and many more, as the learned Whitaker, of Cambridge; Archbishop Usher; Bishops Jewel, Morton, Stillingfleet, Forbes; Sir Peter King; the great Bishop Lightfoot; Dean Stanley, *et al.*, as voicing the same truths, that, in the early ages of the Christian church, after the apostolic model, the different church bodies were under the care of elected representatives—elders (presbyters) who were equally bishops (overseers), that there was no priority or preëminence of rank among the ministers as such, and that ordination was by the hands of a presbytery (several presbyters, equally bishops) and not by a prelatie bishop.

Indeed, for the space of the first two hundred years after Christ, we have no traces of either prelacy or independency, except they may be found in the few departures from Presbyterianism, which aberrations we find the subject of censure and condemnation by the Christian fathers. Pitiable and mournful to contemplate is the picture presented in the early accounts of the lapse from the apostolic standard of ecclesiastical polity.

The first step noticeable in the decadence from the biblical norm of church government [by Presbyters (elders) who were equally and indiscriminately bishops (overseers)] was a distinguishing between the two terms, elder (presbyter) and overseer (bishop), putting one presbyter successively above his fellow-presbyters in each presbytery, at first the oldest, then the ablest, presbyter, and giving him a superintendence, not merely parochial (*i. e.*, over one entire church), but diocesan (*i. e.*, over several such churches); clothing him with additional authority, and investing

him with peculiar privileges, the name of "bishop" being received in a new sense, and thenceforth appropriated solely to him; thereby setting up through ecclesiastical sanction, on a plea of necessity, two offices: that of bishop and that of presbyter or priest, in the place of what, according to the original constitution of the church, was but one office bearing two names, as indicative of the different features of the same office. Here we have the abnormal erection of diocesan episcopacy from primitive parochial or presbyterial episcopacy, the polity of the Bible.

The second downward stage in the descent from the biblical norm of truth was a worldly discriminating between the bishops (overseers) thus set up, giving undue precedence to the metropolitan (or city) bishops over the rural (or country) bishops; an ecclesiastical innovation to change the constitution of the church of Christ in order to put down heresy and other disturbances therein. Here metropolitan or provincial episcopacy comes into view out of diocesan episcopacy.

The third lapse from primitive apostolic purity in polity, as it regards the church, was a further discrimination among the metropolitan (or city) bishops, giving the bishops (presbyters) in the larger cities preëminence over the bishops (presbyters) in the smaller towns. The natural outcome of one brother having become superior to the rest at several different points of Christendom was, that these humanly erected superiors, the metropolitan bishops, must needs again contend together for supremacy in the church at large. Here we pass from the notice of provincial to that of national churches, subject to patriarchs, and attempered to the civil power more or less.

Thus, out of the patriarchates of Jerusalem, Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, in the course of time, we find metropolitan episcopacy culminating in the establishment of two great ecclesiastical empires, the Eastern and the Western, corresponding to, and having their two head-bishops in the two principal cities of the world, Constantinople and Rome. The church power, hitherto existing in soluble quantities throughout the ecclesiastical realm, at last crystallized into definite shape around these two centres, now engaged in black intrigues, now in hard

struggles for the mastery, and episcopacy found its next complete development in the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Patriarch of Rome.

The final step is taken in this great apostasy, and there emerges from the turmoil of this unholy strife after preferment in the ecclesiastical world, as the next prelatie assumption and climactic usurpation of the crown rights of the Lord Jesus Christ as prophet, priest, and king over his people, in the process of the corruption of primitive purity, in the capital of Christendom itself, a supreme pontiff, making the Bishop of Rome the great and sole patriarch, the bishop over all bishops, the papa, pope, father of the church universal: declared by the carnal mind (which, be it remembered, is at enmity with God) to be "the vicar of Christ" and "the successor of St. Peter," with unbounded authority over the souls and bodies of all men in the earth. Verily, verily, this, the papal government, was "the last refinement of cunning and self-aggrandizement, the culminating point of ecclesiastical usurpation, towards which the government of the church under the episcopal hierarchy had been approaching for several centuries. It was an ecclesiastical monarchy, a spiritual despotism," and so continues to be, calculated to overthrow the authority of the church as a spiritual and republican body under the legislation of Jesus the Christ, its Supreme Head and Saviour.

Thus it came about that the normative biblical government of the church, beginning in the form of ecclesiastical republicanism, became distorted through man's devices—on the one hand into open independency, and on the other hand from apostolic presbyterial and parochial into diocesan, from diocesan into metropolitan, from metropolitan into patriarchal, and from patriarchal into papal episcopacy. In the evolution of this latter anomaly, beginning with the rulers of each individual church, the unholy spirit of domination ceased only when well-nigh all the visible church and the world itself became subject to one fallible (mis-termed infallible) man, the pope, the antichrist. Might was substituted for right, the will of man for that of God Almighty, and so, subversive of all purity and liberty in the church, this papa of papas, the Roman pontiff, in an evil hour, horrible thought! this

worm of the dust, was accorded a position of power such as no one nor all of the apostles together ever held, nor even Christ the Saviour himself ever exercised while upon the earth in human form.

While the independent or congregational system lacks the strength of external unity because of its *disjuncta membra*, and does not go far enough in the right direction as to polity, the prelatie or Episcopal system of church government abuses the power of such organic union to the detriment of the body, and goes too far in its assumptions. In this respect, therefore, the former is *infra*-scriptural, and the latter is *supra*-scriptural; the Presbyterian system being the nearest approximation known to be scriptural; the first takes from, the second adds to, while the last adopts as a whole, without addition or subtraction, the biblical polity. Even amid the dark ages of ecclesiastical tyranny and prelatie ritualism, while the Christian church was corrupting into the Greek and Roman apostasies, through God's reservation to himself of a faithful remnant who bowed not the knee to anti-christ, the primitive apostolic order of the church of God was never entirely lost or without witnesses, as the noble history of the Paulicians, the Waldenses, the Albigenses, the Culdees, *et al.*, unmistakably testifies; while during the perilous reaction times of the Reformation, it is a standing fact, that all the great leaders therein, in Germany, France, Switzerland, Italy, Hungary, Holland, Scotland, England, Ireland and Wales, were nearly unanimous in their agreement upon the essential principles of Presbyterianism as in accord with the holy Scriptures.

Since then, by the grace of God, through Scotch persistence, Huguenot devotion, English dissent, and Irish fervor, the grand old church embodying these principles of truth has spread its wings of light over a new world, and sent forth its radiant beams unto the uttermost parts of the earth. So that, without professing to be the whole of the church of Christ, and without at all apologizing for its existence, it may still truly "claim to be the largest Protestant body on earth, and that in its organization the great principles of the Scripture plan of a church are more completely elaborated than in any other; at the same time acknowledg-

ing the full churchship of all other evangelical denominations." Its doctrine and worship, alike with its polity, show their purity and worth in withstanding the tests and ravages of time; yet we, who hold them, do not harshly condemn or unchurch those of our Christian brethren who can conscientiously adopt a different principle of interpretation of Scripture, and claim the right to depart from apostolic usage. It is a matter to be settled between them and their God, to whom alone they stand or fall, and must give an account of their stewardship, even as we.

We join most heartily with Merle D'Aubigné in saying: "The great thing in the church is Christ, the blood of Christ, the spirit of Christ, the presence of Christ among us. The great thing is Christ, but there is also an advantage in a certain government of the church of Christ. I am a Presbyterian, not only of situation, but of conviction and choice. Our Presbyterian way is the good middle way between episcopacy on the one side and Congregationalism on the other. We combine the two great principles that must be maintained in the church—order and liberty: the order of government and the liberty of the people."

C. O'N. MARTINDALE.

Tuskegee, Ala.

IX. "A PECULIAR TREASURE."—MAL. III. 17.

THOSE who know the LXX. Version well know how frequently its authors attained only to the semblance of the Hebrew verity, and how contentedly their followers to this day have entered into their labors. סְגֻלָּה is such a word, imperfectly understood by the men of ancient glory and inaptly rendered by generations of accredited translators. The beauty of it is such that even an approximation to its original force is of peculiar grandeur; but *λαὸς περιούσιος* is no translation, notwithstanding the fact that inspired sanction can be claimed for it by those who, like us, revere the *ipse dixit* of the infallible oracles in everything and for everything.¹ *Λαὸς περιούσιος* occurs in the Penta-teuch four times—Ex. xix. 15; Deut. vii. 6; xiv. 2; xxvi. 18—and in one case only does the *λαὸς* find an equivalent in the original Hebrew. Deut. xxvi. 18, *λαὸς περιούσιος*, with approximation sufficient for the seventy-two wise men of Aristeas' fable, corresponds to עַם סְגֻלָּה; in the other cases we may set the *λαὸς* aside as entirely redundant. *Περιούσιος* remains, and *περιούσιος* is most like in pattern to the true, for one's heart is naturally set on all his *περιούσια*; but the radius of the circle described thereby is quite large, and there are things on the circumference that are perfectly dispensable without injury to the person or his affections. To be deprived of one's סְגֻלָּה, however, is to have some Shylock cut the pound of flesh off next the heart, and in the cutting spare not drops of blood. *Περιούσιος* we will say, then, is only the shadow of the substance, and fisherman Peter felt it so; for though Paul, the scholar, is content (Titus ii. 14) to quote Scripture

¹ The mention of *περιούσιος* reminds us that *ἐπιούσιος* has suffered severely at the hands of Bishop Lightfoot and other erudite etymology-mongers. It may be—Matt. vi. 11—that our Lord intended us to pray, "Give us to-day our bread for to-morrow," but it is not likely that students of the New Testament in Greek previously steeped in the diction of the LXX. Version had ever made the discovery. To them it were easier to say, "Give us to-day our bread as we need it," and justification for the saying would not be wanting. If *περὶ* plus *οὐσία* be *περιούσιος*, *ἐπὶ* plus *οὐσία* is *ἐπιούσιος*, and in every way defensible. The LXX. Version is the grand storehouse of materials for the knowledge of Palestinian Greek, and would-be interpreters of the Greek New Testament who neglect it do greatly err.

in the exact words of Scripture, Peter feels the inadequacy of the time-honored version, and turns the quotation into *λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν* (1 Pet. ii. 9), which is an improvement, and leads us to infer that that whereon one sets his heart—his סגלה, in fact—is that whose acquisition costs, it may be time, patience, labor, or drops of blood.

Others than Peter, and before Peter, felt the inadequacy of the rendering, and he whose glad lot it was to translate the one hundred and thirty-fifth Psalm, verse 4, attempted to do better by omitting the *λαὸς* and using *περιουσιασμός*. This much was gain—to recognize that סגלה was able to stand by itself, and to see in what possible way non-Hebrew thinkers might come to know where and how it stood. But there is more gain; for in 1 Chron. xxix. 3 we are told of the great preparation David had made wherewithal to build a house for God—how with all his might, by the use of the state revenues, he had amassed gold and silver, brass and iron, onyx stones and stones for mosaic work, and many things else for the building and adornment of the temple. This, however, was not all; from his own private income, by careful saving and foresight, by self-denial and prudence—for such is the sense of the skilful scholar of Greek who wrote *ἔστιν μοι ὁ περιεποίημα*—he had laid by, in his affection for the house of God, quite a sum for the use of the Lord in the work of his house. And because he thus willingly parted with the סגלה he had so lovingly acquired, he felt justified in calling upon the nation as one man to make large sacrifices for the great work. The Preacher, too, king over Israel in Jerusalem, set himself to seek out all that was pleasant and delightful under the sun. Great works he made and houses he built—vineyards and gardens and parks (*paradises*) planted with vines of Sorek and all manner of pleasant fruits; lakes of water and pleasant fountains ministered to his enjoyment as he walked abroad; while men-servants and maid-servants and great possessions of flocks and herds amply provided for his creature comforts. More than this, what kings especially delight in, and the “peculiar treasure” of provinces (R. V., Koh. ii. 8) he too had, sending his messengers to realms of the Orient to search out and procure that thing which was most costly, rare and precious in each separate province—gold from Ophir, apes and peacocks from Tarshish, horses from Egypt. Did he not gloat over his riches and costly possessions? Was not that סגלה indeed which none else had ever possessed?

There are these two elements in סגלה, then, the one of possession and price, the other of acquisition. The former element has been

acknowledged by the unanimous consent of all exegetes; the latter is contained—peace to the etymology-mongers!—in the fundamental root idea, and demonstrated by the persistency with which the authors of the LXX. Version have striven to attain to the substance by diligent pursuit of the shadow. That part of one's *περιούσια* he values most is his סגלה; it may be personal honor, fame, some chosen war-trophy, some black-letter volume of hoary age, some classic from the Aldine, Juntine, Elzevir press—it may be a little shoe put gently away and treasured with care, or a band of gold, the sole precious memorial of a face now resplendent in mansions of light. The soldier's honor, the maiden's virtue, the honest man's character, the preacher's hire of souls, the Christian's faith—the boys of the mother of the Gracchi, the love of David and Jonathan, the ambition of Napoleon—numberless are the examples of סגלה one might cite.

The people of God, by right, then, are the סגלה of God—a CHOICE treasure REDEEMED by the precious blood of the Lord Jesus. The סגלה of God is indeed a treasure “peculiar” (*περιούσιος*) to himself; but it is more—a treasure whose acquisition has cost more than gems or riches of the Ind. This סגלה—God's people—God spares as a man spares his own son that serveth him; but to gain this סגלה God spared not his own Son, but freely gave him up for us all—made sacrifice to acquire the thing of greatest price the whole creation round.

R. B. WOODWORTH.

Burlington, W. Va.

X. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

STEVENS' DOCTRINE AND LIFE.

DOCTRINE AND LIFE; a Study of some of the Principal Truths of the Christian Religion in their Relation to Christian Experience. *By George B. Stevens, Ph. D., D. D., Professor in Yale University.* Silver, Burdett & Company: New York, Boston, Chicago. 1895. Pp. 247.

Readable? The eye glides back and forth across the beautiful page, runs with pleasure from period to period, and follows the straightforward composition through chapter after chapter.

Able? No reader has gone with Dr. Stevens through a single volume without feeling that the very ink which flows from his pen is like a chemical compound of native power and acquired scholarship.

Satisfactory? How can it be when the aim of the author is to teach denominational theology, to rule out of treatment the great questions which denominational theology has mooted?

Sound? The aching pity is that it is not sounder. Test him upon the following vital matters:

1. With respect to revelation. He underestimates both the inspiration and the authority of the Bible:

"The Bible was inspired in the sense that its authors were men who, in divers ways and degrees, shared in that large enlightenment which was a great factor in the work of revelation. . . . The Bible is sacred literature in the same sense in which Jewish history and church history in the apostolic age are sacred history. . . . Inspiration is a name for that guiding and enlightening influence of the divine Spirit upon the biblical writers which enabled them, in different degrees of fulness and in varying forms, to present in their writings, narratives, examples, and interpretations of the history and contents of the divine revelation, such as, when taken together and rightly interpreted, constitute an adequate and authoritative guide to religious faith and conduct." (Pp. 68-70.)

"The theories (concerning original sin) which have been current in the church all rest upon the assumption that the narrative of the first sin in Genesis is strictly historical. Biblical criticism, however, has rendered this supposition more than doubtful. The legends of the first chapters of Genesis are widely different from historical narratives; and their meaning is to be found, not by regarding them as history, but by observing the general religious conceptions which they embody and symbolize. . . . All men sinned when Adam sinned, but in a figurative sense." (P. 155.)

2. With respect to the character of God. In his relations to men, God's character is defined in the language of fatherhood; but that character, in itself, is described in the language of justice and love. While our author says both justice and love are essential attributes, he writes in such a strain as to show that it is his unconscious opinion that love is the dynamic centre of all divine activity. His aim is to discredit Calvinistic soteriology. He says:

"It is said that God *must be* righteous, but that he *may be* benevolent and merciful, or not, as he chooses. According to this theology, God must punish sin. It would seem to follow that he cannot forgive it, and this theory admits that he cannot forgive it without first punishing it. This he does representatively in the penal sufferings which he lays upon his Son, Jesus Christ. I say the truth that God *is* love, not merely that God *may be* love; not merely that God *has* love; but that God *is* love; that the centre of this universe is a heart whose affections are ceaselessly poured forth upon the world which he has made. . . . The 'necessity' that God should be benevolent is precisely the same as the 'necessity' that he should be just. He must be both, since he must be himself." (Pp. 79-85.)

The conclusion from this reasoning is disastrous to the Deity as a moral ruler of the world. He is just as much bound to forgive sin as he is to punish sin; as bound to save as to destroy. Both obligations, both necessities, are in his character and spring out of his essential nature. When, therefore, he lifts his arm to punish sin, love paralyzes it; when he lifts his arm to save in love, justice paralyzes it. Both arms, the arm of justice and the arm of love, paralyze each other. Neither can be used; they must hang by Jehovah's side. The very character of God "ties up" his moral energies. He must sit beside the world, and do nothing. But Dr. Stevens repudiates such a conclusion. He writes in the interests of an easier salvation. But how can he escape the conclusion unless he first repudiates his logic? This he unhesitatingly does when he discusses the "doctrine of love." There he says: "Love also involves an intelligent choice of its object. True love is never blind." (P. 205.) Then he tells us, "Love is central in religion because it is central in God." (P. 210.) Love, then, is the centre of God's life; it is the inalienable prerogative of love to be elective and discriminative of its objects. Is that true of justice? Is it a prerogative of justice to choose its object? How can this distinguished Yale professor maintain his premise that the obligation to be merciful is just the same in kind, degree, and necessity with the obligation to be just?

The *animus* of the Yale professor's reconstruction of the character of God is to disparage "the preaching of an earlier time, which had for its leading themes divine sovereignty, election, and reprobation." But he ought to think deeper. His metaphysic of God is superficial. Neither justice nor love is "central" in God. All the attributes are not reducible to forms of justice, nor yet to forms of love. The divine character is a unity; but that unity is in his holiness. Here both justice and love root themselves. From this soil they draw up all their life. Justice must be exercised in accordance with the holiness of God; love must also be put forth in accordance with holiness. Here is the reconciliation of attributes so diverse as justice and love. God is bound to do right, but that obligation is regulated by his holiness. God is bound to be benevolent, but that benevolence is regulated by his holiness. In the chambers of his holiness, righteousness and mercy kiss each other.

From the fundamental premise of the fatherhood of God, Dr. Stevens develops a strange doctrine as to the sonship of man. He says:

"Are all men sons of God, or are only those such who are believing and obedient? . . . The conclusion to which such an examination will lead may be correctly stated, I think, in this paradoxical form: God *is* the Father of all men, but men *become* the sons of God. . . . Men are *ideally*, that is, according to the true divine idea of humanity, sons of God; but by reason of sin they are not *actually* what they are ideally and in possibility." (Pp. 75, 76.)

3. With respect to sin. Dr. Stevens is strong as to the fact of sin, but as to theories of original sin he is weak and hesitating. He does not believe the Bible throws any light on the subject. He states his own view in this language:

"I believe that much more light will yet be thrown upon it by the study of the natural laws of heredity than it has hitherto received from centuries of *a priori* speculation and equally *a priori* exegesis. . . I do not believe that what we shall learn from actual observation and experience, that is, from the study of God's action in natural law, will serve to baffle all rational interpretation, and to perplex our moral intuitions, as do the theories that we come into the world under the curse of God on account of a sin committed centuries before we were born, or that God condemns us for the sin of a representative in whose selection we had no share." (P. 157.)

4. With respect to the atonement. This great term stands for that pretext upon which God changed his governmental policy. He began the race's career under a policy formed and executed by justice; after the history of Christ had been added to the history of the world, God changed from a policy of justice to one of love. "And thus mercy is at last brought in and made to determine the policy of God." (P. 162.) He says squarely to the Calvinist, "Shylock will never become a favorite character among men." (P. 164.) Without commenting further, we may ask the learned professor if he thinks *God* will ever become a favorite character with the world!

"The concrete expression of the biblical doctrine of atonement is, that in the humiliation, sufferings, and death of Christ, God has so manifested, vindicated, and satisfied his changeless, essential righteousness, and has so met the ends of punishment in the assertion of his holy displeasure at sin, that he can consistently forgive sin without punishing it. In other words, God, in his mercy, adopts another mode of action in reference to sin than that of punishment. He substitutes for the punishment which is due to sin another method of vindicating sin's desert of punishment, thereby meeting the end of punishment. He did not substitute Christ for us *in punishment*, for the punishment of an innocent person is a contradiction in terms. He graciously substituted for punishment another method of procedure, which was not punishment, but which served the purpose which punishment would have accomplished, namely, the expression of the divine righteousness. I believe that this is the true sense of substitution. It is not the substitution of Christ's punishment for ours; it is the remission of punishment altogether, and the substitution in its place of another method of revealing and vindicating the holy displeasure of God against sin. . . . The vicariousness of the Saviour's sufferings was the vicariousness of love." (P. 167.)

As in the points specified, so elsewhere it is the effort of this author to tone down and otherwise weaken orthodox theology.

The topics discussed are as follows: The relation of doctrine to life; the soul naturally Christian; the belief in God; revelation and the Bible; the character of God; the Trinity; the person of Christ; the work of the Spirit; the fact of sin; the atonement; the intercession of Christ; the doctrine of faith; the doctrine of love; the doctrine of prayer; the future life.

R. A. WEBB.

SCOTT'S NICENE THEOLOGY.

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE NICENE THEOLOGY. *By Hugh M. Scott, D. D.* Chicago: Chicago Theological Seminary Press. 1896. Pp. 390. 8vo.

The Teacher and his Teachings—these are topics of perennial pleasure and profit. The personality of the Redeemer is as engaging as the propositions in re-

ligion which he has submitted to the world. On the occasion of his triumphal entry into Jerusalem, the whole city was moved, saying, "Who is this?" That question still trembles on the lip of a thoughtful world.

There are two great methods of answering it: the dogmatic, and the historic. The dogmatic method employs the laws of grammar and logic, and undertakes to formulate a conception of the great Teacher by organizing all the results yielded by exegesis. The historic method relies more upon the imagination than upon the rational faculty. It seeks to create a portrait of Christ—to present him as he was to the thought of the evangelists and the early church. The method is more intuitive than speculative. It presupposes an evolution of the idea of Christ in the mind of the church. Its aim is to trace that evolution backwards to its original. That original is Christ as he was; the Christ of to-day is the Christ as the church has made him. There is, it is claimed, a wide difference between the two. It is the presumption of this class of writers to treat Christology as if the real, historical Christ were known, in reality, by only the first and the nineteenth centuries. The historic theories as to the person of Christ are reducible to four ruling types:

1. He was pure fiction—the fabrication of felony, the figment of fancy. This wretched makeshift has never met much acceptance with the learned world. It has lived in the brain and influenced the thought chiefly of the ignorant.

2. He is pure myth. There was such a person as Christ, of remarkable traits and of remarkable life. The admiration and affection of his disciples gradually exaggerated these traits into the supernatural and miraculous. They let their eye slip from the doctrines to the Teacher; they thought and talked about him until he grew into divine proportions. His divinity was entirely subjective to their fervid and adoring hearts. This is the miserable hypothesis of the Tübingen school, lead by Strauss and Baur.

3. The third hypothesis is that of the Ritschlians. According to the Tübingen school, the Christ of the church to-day is the creation of the imaginations of the evangelists. It concedes that dogmatic theology has properly interpreted the apostles' consciousness. Such a concession is more than the Ritschlians can abide. This party of heretics, so popular and so rhetorical, hold that the Christ of to-day, with all his supernatural endowments and prerogatives, is the creation of the general Christian consciousness. He is not the sole product of the apostolic imagination; he is the product of the imagination of the historic church. He is an evolution—the fruit of centuries of abnormal growth. To thought, Christ is but a man; to faith, he is God. Go back to the original of the apostolic and patristic churches, and cold criticism and analysis yields nothing but a human being; but in the development of the ages and under the heat of piety he has become a divine Saviour. His divinity was not primary and original; it is secondary and developed. Ritschlianism is the hypothesis of the evolution of Christ.

4. The fourth hypothesis is that of the Nicean and Chalcedonian theology, namely, that Christ is consubstantial with the Father, and at the same time consubstantial with man. This is historic and orthodox Christology, against which all these batteries are brought.

Dr. Scott's book is a polemic. It is both offensive and defensive. It is a fearful assault upon Ritschlianism; a powerful defence of Niceanism. It is dynamic from start to finish. He simply explodes Ritschlianism to atoms. By citation, comment and argument, based upon the whole apostolic and patristic

literature, he demonstrates that the modern idea of a divine-human Christ is not recent in its origin, but was precisely the idea of the original sources.

Dr. Scott is professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Chicago Theological Seminary. His professional duties, he tells us, have brought him into close contact with the new (Ritschlian) theology of Germany. His book contains six lectures, delivered on the L. P. Stone Foundation before the Princeton Seminary, and published at the request of the faculty. Foot-notes abound; they are often more valuable than the text.

There is nothing like it in the English language. "Undogmatic Christianity"—the theology which presents primitive Christianity as a mere subjective "impression," perpetually changing its form—is not only dangerous, but rampant. Many of our pastors are inclined to run after a "simple gospel," to decry "dogma," and the aim of their preaching is not higher than to make *impressions* concerning Christ. The book is needed. We would rejoice to know that every preacher in the land had possessed himself of it. He cannot find its like or its equal.

R. A. WEBB.

TOWNSEND'S EVOLUTION OR CREATION.

EVOLUTION OR CREATION: A Critical Review of the Scientific and Scriptural Theories of Creation and Certain Related Subjects. *By Professor Luther Tracy Townsend, D. D., author of "Credo," "Fate of Republics," etc.* Fleming H. Revell Company. New York, Chicago, and Toronto: 1896. Pp. 318.

This book treats of some of the burning questions which arise in the debate between certain types of modern science and the contents of the sacred Scriptures. The author has written on some of these questions in other books, such as "Bible Theology and Modern Thought," "The Arena and the Throne," "The Mosaic Record and Modern Science." He has read quite extensively in the literature of the field wherein are these subjects, and has reached very definite conclusions, which he boldly states and forcibly defends. He very firmly holds to the inspiration of the Scriptures, and has no sympathy with modern naturalism or rationalism. In many respects his book is a refreshing one to read in this age, when definiteness of view is so seldom found in the literature of the field where his discussions lie.

The whole treatise consists of an introduction and fourteen chapters. A brief outline, without much critical comment, is all that we shall devote to these readable chapters. The first chapter states the question, and indicates the three possible theories to account for the origin of man. These three ways are the skeptical, the poetical, and the historical. These are rather three ways of regarding the biblical account of man's origin. He holds firmly by the third view. The second chapter is also somewhat introductory, and has some good things to say in regard to dogmatisms and hypotheses. He makes it very plain that theologians are not the only persons who are dogmatic and speculative.

The third chapter discusses the vexed question of the origin of life. Here the author passes under review various naturalistic views, and shows that they are all inadequate, and that we are forced back to the biblical account at every turn. In the fourth and fifth chapters the hypothesis of evolution is considered at very considerable length, and in the sixth chapter the question of the missing links between the monkey and man is treated at some length also. In this whole discussion

strong ground is taken against the hypothesis of evolution in the sphere of organic forms of existence, and it must be said that he places naturalism in close quarters by his reasonings. He sketches the history of the hypothesis, recites many facts which are inconsistent with it, and quotes a variety of opinions antagonistic to it. He also reasons at some length from human fossils, from the civilization of men, from the differences between monkeys and men, and from race degeneracy among men, to the conclusion that man cannot be the product of natural evolution from some brute ancestry. There is much that is very forcible and convincing in what our author has to say upon this hypothesis, although at times he seems to reason against views which few perhaps of modern scientists would admit to be those held by them. Still, the general force of the reasonings must be admitted, and we freely confess our hearty sympathy with his general conclusions, and with much that is adduced in support of them.

With the seventh chapter the beginning of things as related in the Book of Genesis is passed under review. The nebular hypothesis and other scientific theories of the origin of things are briefly considered. The geological periods of time are indicated, and the biblical creative days are discussed. The poetic and symbolic interpretations of the "days" are rejected, and the literal is accepted as the proper one. He quotes a number of opinions in support of this, but does not fully present the reasons for and against the view he adopts. He further regards the creative days of Moses typical of the creative periods of geology, and he reasons at some length in support of this view, which he thinks surmounts all the difficulties in the case.

The eighth chapter, which treats of the ice age and the Mosaic week, is one of special interest. In brief, our author makes the chaotic period of the opening verses of Genesis identical with the ice age of the geologists, and then proceeds to explain creation in order of the Mosaic week. Whether we agree with all our author has to say in this chapter, and in the ninth, when the same themes are further expanded, or not, it must be admitted that he has many things to say that are full of interest and very suggestive.

In the tenth and eleventh chapters which follow, some vital topics in anthropology are considered. These topics relate to man's first appearance upon the earth, his primeval state, and the unity of the races. He presents many things that mere naturalistic science has to say upon these and kindred topics, and in every case he holds fast by the biblical account. He makes the rough stone age of geology to coincide with the ante-diluvian age of the Bible, and the unity of the races of mankind is supported in a satisfactory way.

The three concluding chapters are partly philosophical and partly theological in their nature. In them the Trinity and the Logos, Christ, the creator, and man, are considered at some length, and in a rather speculative manner. The doctrine of the Trinity and the Logos, as the second person of the Godhead, is treated in a suggestive way, the fact that Christ is the creator is illustrated in various ways, and the solitariness of man as apart from the other orders of finite forms of created things is well brought out. Of the reasonings upon these points our space forbids any discussion, inviting as some of them are.

The book is well written, and is gotten up in good style by the publishers. Its general effect will be wholesome, and we commend it to those who wish a fresh and safe discussion of the important questions with which it deals. We say this

without committing ourselves to all the opinions and conclusions expressed, but because rather of our sympathy with the general attitude of our author, and because of his reverence for the word of God in an age when that word is often treated with so little reverence.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Louisville, Ky.

BEET'S NATURE AND CHRIST.

NATURE AND CHRIST. *By Joseph Agar Beet, D. D.* New York: Eaton & Mains; Cincinnati: Curts & Jennings. 1896. Pp. 183.

Dr. Beet is the Professor of Systematic Theology in the Wesleyan College, Richmond, England. He was invited to deliver eight lectures on Doctrinal Theology at the second session of the Ocean Grove Summer School of Theology. The little volume before us is the result. It is the initial publication in a series, to be known as "Summer Lectures," to be issued under the patronage of this school.

Dr. Beet always entertains his reader. His thoughts are the pulse-beats of an honest, unctious heart. The throbs are so genuinely spiritual that even his errors make one feel like being better. We regard that as one of the highest proofs of art in religious authorship.

Nature and Christ embodies the "best thought and the latest utterances of the distinguished author," writes the dean of this Summer School. The author tells us (p. 24) that his aim "is to set forth both the best method of theology and some of its chief results."

His method is the "scientific," which begins by observing, describing, grouping, comparing phenomena, in order to learn their immediate causes; and from these immediate causes to go on with the generalizing until the widest possible conclusions have been reached. This method led the distinguished lecturer to treat the Scriptures not as the primary source of the facts which he sought to organize. "I have only used the various documents of the New Testament as we should use and test any other literary memorials of the past." (P. 170.) The primary source has been "nature"—understanding by that term the macrocosm and the microcosm, all that is written in the constitutions of men and things, and all that is written in history. The Scriptures are treated as good history. The author finds the facts of life to accord with their teachings. History proves the Bible—this is his ruling idea. History stands here for all that is recorded anywhere.

But let us turn to the "chief results" which his method and studies have yielded to his hand.

Lecture I.: "Religion and Theology." Here religion is defined as "such a conception of the Unseen as makes for righteousness." When we first encountered this language, we wondered how a man could write about the "Unseen," that is, the Unknown, for sight is but one of the avenues of knowledge; then, too, the whole definition was couched in language so vague as to permit it to mean either everything or nothing. We felt that the author intended to carry us headlong into a fog-bank. He did not help matters when, a little further on, we read: "Any conception of that Unseen which makes for righteousness, looked at simply from an intellectual point of view, and without taking account of any moral influence exerted by it in the inward or outward life of man, is theology." Religion is "any conception of the Unseen," and theology is any intellectual "look" at the

Unseen—the Seen of the Unseen. We could scarcely read another page. But the author had set out on a search. Presumably, he did not know what he was going to find. At this stage he calls what he is in search after the “Unseen.” He finds in the end that the “Unseen” proves to be God manifest in Jesus Christ. By this method of pure experimentation the Unseen becomes the Seen; the Unknown becomes Known.

Lecture II.: “The Universal Revelation in Nature.” Here is the first “unveiling of the Unseen”; this disclosure is to the common eye of the race; it finds its embodiment in the world’s religions, more or less accurate; it underlies the entire religious life of man. This revelation discloses the fact that the “doom of death is written upon all that lives.” So far as the race is concerned, this revelation is sadly pessimistic.

Lecture III.: “The Historical Revelation in Christ.” The material universe uncovers the Unseen as Creator and Ruler; it shows man to be the subject of death. But there is another source of information about the Unseen—history, literature. This religious literature is at least as good as that which teaches botany, geology, chemistry, etc. This historical literature presents the Unseen as Christ.

Lecture IV.: “The Gospel of Pardon.” This revelation goes beyond that of nature. It unveils the Unseen, not only as Creator and Ruler, but also, and joyfully, as a Pardoner. Here Dr. Beet, in harmony with Wesleyanism, denies that God can “justify” a sinner in the strict and forensic sense of that word. “Justification through faith is pardon put into legal form.” That is, “justify” does not mean justify; it means pardon. To escape the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, Wesleyanism is driven to the shameful expedient of denying the plain and only meaning of terms.

Lecture V.: “The Superhuman Claims of Christ.” Here the endeavor is “to reproduce the conception of himself left by Christ in the thought and memory of his immediate followers.” The same documents which present him to the world as a revelation of the Unseen also present him as superhuman as a teacher; as possessing an authority and moral grandeur which compels the world to listen to his instructions.

Lecture VI.: “The Supernatural Outward Attestations.” This outward proof is the resurrection of Christ. The documents are carefully and skilfully examined as to the fact, and as to the significance of this fundamental fact.

Lecture VII.: “The Inward Attestation.” This is a really happy development of the experimental argument for the truth of our religion.

Lecture VIII.: “Results Attained.”

For an hour’s delight, we recommend this little book. Its soteriology is Wesleyan.

R. A. WEBB.

RITTER’S MORAL AND CIVIL LAW.

MORAL AND CIVIL LAW PARTS OF THE SAME THING. *By Eli F. Ritter.* New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. 1896. Pp. 212. Price, 90 cents.

This is a well-written little book on some practical aspects of the science of jurisprudence. The author writes from the standpoint of the true patriot and sincere Christian. His aim is to show that there is really only one morality, and

that moral and civil law are really aspects of the same thing. In support of his reasonings he quotes a great many authorities in both morals and jurisprudence, and has given a clear, simple, and useful book.

The theme is treated under a variety of heads in ten chapters. The first explains and illustrates the law of public necessity. Here the author shows by a variety of instances that public welfare may override what appears to be individual rights. In the second chapter it shows that morality is a fundamental principle in civil government. This is established by quotations from various State constitutions. The third chapter undertakes that hard task of defining morality. Our author does not agree with those that would separate the spheres of morality and legislation, and he is also careful to distinguish between morality and religion. Religion, he says, is a matter of belief, and morality is a matter of conduct. The former refers to the inner life, and the law does not interfere with it; the latter relates to the outer life, and the law takes notice of this. This can scarcely be said to go to the root of the distinction between morality and religion. Our author in this chapter, however, and in the fourth, which treats of immorality, holds that morality is fixed and immutable, and not a variable quantity constituted by mere human opinion and custom.

In the fifth chapter, on legislation and morality, the position is well supported that every act of legislation must be in harmony with morality, and that morality is a fundamental principle in legislation. Chapter six shows the relation between common law and morality, and the seventh indicates the influence of morality in the civil court from the significance of the oath administered therein.

The eighth chapter makes it plain that legal principles are fixed as moral, yet the law grows through legislation. This is a very good chapter, as showing how fixed principles are wrought out and applied in concrete cases. In the ninth chapter the position is taken very naturally that evil must be suppressed and good promoted by legislation. The tone of this chapter is excellent, and deserves praise. That there are no privileges for evil is the theme of the last chapter. Here a variety of perplexing questions, with which legislation has to deal, such as the liquor traffic, are earnestly discussed in the light of the main principles of the book. Altogether it is a book which is well worth reading.

Louisville, Ky.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

VANCE'S COLLEGE OF APOSTLES.

THE COLLEGE OF APOSTLES. *By Rev. James I. Vance, D. D.* Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, Chicago, Toronto. 1896.

Dr. Vance has prepared an ever-growing circle of readers to expect something far above average excellence when a new book is announced from his pen. This neat volume will not disappoint such expectation. It possesses, in even larger measure than his former books, certain merits which are characteristic of all the author's work.

It is only fair to let a writer define his aim. It has often happened that a reviewer has found fault with an author for not doing what he never designed to do. One has a right to bound the scope of his purpose, and he is amenable to criticism only within the limits of that scope. In his preface, Dr. Vance has stated explicitly and specifically just what he has undertaken to do: "*The College of*

Apostles is a character study, and an effort to make into real people the men whom Christ selected as the founders of the Christian church. The text-books are twelve, each book a man, each man an apostle. The graduating degree is apostolic succession."

The plan of the book is indicated by the heading of the introductory chapter, "The Twelve by Twos." The writer takes two pictures at a time, and uses each to help define the outline of the other.

The germinant and controlling thought of the book is brought out in answering the question, Why did Christ send forth the twelve by twos? "They were not merely mated; they were matched. Christ was after a more perfect apostleship, and he made six whole men out of the twelve. Each man was the complement of his apostolic comrade. Each magnified the other's virtues, minimized his faults. This is the key to the inner life and character of these men, and as we use it we shall find ourselves coming more and more into realistic and sympathetic acquaintance with the men who first proclaimed to the world him who is its fadeless and eternal Light. According to this divine arrangement of the twelve by twos, Peter, the extremist, went with Andrew, the conservative; James, the elder, with John, the youth; Philip, the dullard, with Bartholomew, the sage; Thomas, the man of doubt, with Matthew, the man of strong convictions; James, the champion of duty, with Jude, the champion of doctrine; Simon, the zealot, with Judas, the traitor."

It will be seen at once that this is an unique method of studying the apostles. Given such a method in the hands of a young writer of lively imagination and sympathetic spirit, resourceful in thought and a master in the art of brilliant phrasing, and the result could not be other than a thoroughly new and readable book.

It occurred to the author as a thing altogether probable that exception would be taken to his ungloved manner of handling men whose names have been enshrined along with the Master's in the innermost sanctuary of our hearts. Certainly he has stripped them with an unsparing hand. He has not left a shred of that fanciful, factitious covering which has been thrown over them by the superstitious reverence of those who have been disposed to place their names too nearly at the same altitude with that name which is above every name. It may be seriously questioned whether he has not stripped them of some little covering to which they could justly lay claim as their own, covering inherited from their "poor but honest parents." We confess that it tinges our feelings with some degree of sadness to look on some of the apostles in their denuded condition. Perhaps it requires that a measure of violence should be done to our feelings to awaken us to a sense of the fact that the twelve were indeed men of like passions with ourselves, frail and faulty, as all the sons of Adam must needs be.

Another objection was apprehended by Dr. Vance. "It may seem to others that the material from which the dominant characteristics of some of the apostles have been determined is too meagre, and the interpretations of Scriptures at times fanciful." It is proper to let the author do his own hedging against this objection. "It must be borne in mind that these men do actually live on the pages of the Bible. They are there brought before the eye of the church in every age. For what? Are we to try to know them, or is the name there merely as the landmark of a dead age? We may take it for granted that God would have us

know the people of the Bible, not less than its dates and doctrines." The substance of the apology for getting so much out of so little is that God designed us to know these men, and therefore we must know them, however slight the clue which he gives us by way of introduction. Is it to be taken for granted that God would have us to know these men? We confess to a degree of skepticism. We would not go so far as to say that God particularly objects to our knowing them, but it seems to us that he has manifested a profound indifference on the subject. It has ever been a matter of interest and admiration, the extent to which the writers of the Gospels have sunk themselves out of sight. How far is it true that "these men do actually live on the pages of the Bible"? Take the author of the first Gospel. How much can we learn of Matthew from the book that bears his name? We cannot learn that he wrote it. We owe our belief in this to tradition. He is not expressly mentioned as the author until toward the close of the second century. It does not record a single word that he ever spoke. It gives us but two facts: he was a publican before his call, and he made a feast at his house after his call, to which, presumably, he invited many publicans and sinners to meet with Christ. We do not deny that both these facts tell us something about Matthew's character, but two such facts furnish scant material for a biography, and yet they are the only data furnished us by the Bible itself. Does it seem that God was much concerned that we should know Matthew? Stronger yet is the case in reference to some others. The venerable Archdeacon Farrar says: "There are three of the 'glorious company of the apostles,' James the Little, Jude, the son of James, and Simon, the Cananean or Zealot of whom we cannot be said to know anything whatever, though St. John does record a single question of 'Judas, not Iscariot.' Of Matthew nothing is recorded except his call and his farewell feast; of Bartholomew, absolutely nothing, unless we regard as certain the conjecture which identifies him with Nathaniel. Of Thomas and Philip and Andrew, only two or three incidents are narrated, some of which have little bearing on their history or character." It cannot be doubted that Dean Farrar has been a laborious student of the Bible all his life; he has attained to great eminence as expositor and exegete. When, therefore, at his advanced age he records it as his conclusion that almost nothing can be known of the great majority of the apostles, is it not stating the matter mildly to say that God has manifested little concern whether we know them or not? The Dean further suggests that it was "perhaps by the express purpose of Providence that we were left in ignorance about the mere personal biographies of the earliest followers of our Lord. We were meant to draw the lesson that they were less than nothing in comparison with him." We do not care to press this point further than to say that it can hardly be taken for granted that God would have us know the personal characters of the twelve, or even their leading characteristics, when he has left us no way of identifying one of them except by the uncertain means of conjecture. Cuvier, it is said, could take one bone of an extinct animal and construct the whole skeleton and define the species to which the animal belonged. That was a tame performance compared to taking a single conjecture and constructing out of that an apostolic biography. But why does Dean Farrar say that we know nothing of James the Little and Jude? Evidently because he thinks, with Marcus Dods and Dr. Plumptre and other eminent scholars, that all the critical authorities, worthy of consideration, have settled it that the epistles of James and Jude were not written by the apostles James and

Jude. Dr. Vance did not write with a purpose of being merely critically accurate, and hence we are not disposed to apply severely critical tests to his work; but we mention this critical question by way of showing that God could not be much concerned that we should know the apostles when he leaves us to construct their characters from an examination of writings which may not belong to them.

We may as well confess, without further ado, that we cannot approve the plan of Dr. Vance's book. We admire the skill, the genius of the author in carrying out his plan, but we think the plan is faulty.

1 It is nothing more than a fancy that Christ so paired the twelve as to neutralize faults and augment virtues, that Christ was making six circles out of twelve semi-circles. A much simpler explanation is on the surface of the narrative. Peter and Andrew were brothers; James and John were brothers; Philip and Bartholomew were devoted friends before their call to the apostolate. If Dr. Vance is correct in reference to James and Jude, they were brothers. Thus we have an easy and natural explanation of the pairing except in two cases, and we may well believe that in those cases the explanation would be similar.

It is making too much out of this pairing to suppose that it has the subtle and profound meaning which Dr. Vance assigns to it. We must bear in mind that it was only for one short mission of preaching in the cities of Galilee. We hardly miss the disciples from the side of Christ. The mission was only a small incidental matter. Nearly the whole time embraced between their call and the crucifixion they were in close companionship with Christ, receiving their training for their life-work. When their life-work began in earnest, which was not till Pentecost, they were no longer paired. The only two whom we see together after that time were Peter and John, and their companionship lasted for a very short while. One would think, from the emphasis laid upon it by Dr. Vance, that this matching, this complementing one with another, was quite essential to their success; that it would not do to send one apostle by himself. If there is anything in this, it held good for only one short evangelizing tour. When the Holy Ghost complemented them they could each go alone.

2. Certainly, in most cases, if not in all, Dr. Vance's method of matching is purely conjectural. Why, for instance, were James and John put together? It is not enough that they were brothers. They are yoked because of contrast in their ages. James stands for old age, and John for youth. It strangely happens that they were the only two of the apostles whose parents are known to have been living at the time of their call. They were in the ship with their father Zebedee; and just at the close of our Saviour's public ministry, their mother was seeking office for them. It is an extreme supposition to put James at forty years of age. Some of us are reluctant to admit that a man only forty years old can properly be held up as a type of old age. On the other hand, John was old enough to have a home of his own, to which he could take the mother of Jesus when they turned away from the cross. Are we not at liberty to think that nothing but the exigencies of his plan would have made Dr. Vance place the two brothers at the extremes of life? Dean Farrar, without a scheme to work out, speaks of the "call which transformed James, the *young fisherman*, into a leader among the apostles"; and, referring to James and John, he says: "Jesus gently bore with the error and ambitious selfishness of the *young men*."

Take the case of Philip and Bartholomew, the "dullard and the sage." While

we are fully persuaded that no other man ever attained to such a reputation for wisdom on such slight evidence, yet we have no disposition to pluck a single leaf from the chaplet that has been placed on the brow of Bartholomew; but pity moves us to interpose a word in behalf of Philip. Here is his picture as drawn by Dr. Vance: "Philip was a typical dullard, a man of heavy, stupid, slowly-moving brain, whose dull mind staggered and stumbled helplessly before whatever called for rapid thought and great sagacity. Everything that we know about Philip serves to accentuate this characteristic. Whenever he appears on the page of the gospel narrative, it is as a man whose heart was right, but whose head was dull. He can be counted on to do the wrong thing at the wrong time, and to say the wrong thing at the most inopportune moment. He is clumsy, utterly lacking in tact, and forever bringing about awkward situations; a dull, slow-thinking, blundering, but earnest-hearted man." What could Philip have said and done to entitle him to such a portrait as that? How did it happen that his unseasonable blabbings and grotesque blunderings escaped the notice of the Christian world so long? We are tempted to express surprise that Jesus should have found Philip running at large. To say the least, is not this a caricature rather than a character sketch? The only thing that could reconcile us to accepting this as a true picture would be our contempt for the high-church doctrine of apostolic succession. We should feel a malicious pleasure in pointing some of our ecclesiastical bigots to such an apostolic ancestry.

3. The plan of drawing pictures by contrasting dominant characteristics results inevitably in exaggerating those characteristics. Having committed one's self to the task, the case must be made out. Exegesis will be strained, and incidents will be laden with fanciful significance. As an instance of the latter, we may cite the reason assigned for the presence of James along with Peter and John on certain important occasions: "We can understand why Peter was there, he was the head of the apostolic college. We can understand why John was there, he was the disciple whom Jesus loved. But why James? The only explanation is that his age entitled him to such distinguished consideration." Can it be that a man, whose father and mother were both still in hale and vigorous life, had nothing to entitle him to consideration but his age? Then, he never had any other title to consideration. As an instance of strained exegesis, we may cite the instance of the interview between Christ and Philip, in connection with the feeding of the five thousand. Christ asked Philip, "Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat?" "Philip begins to wrestle with that problem, but after a severe mental effort the most brilliant thing he can say is, 'Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little.' Of course, Philip, that is apparent to the most thoughtless, but that is no solution of the problem. Any one knows that two hundred pennyworth of bread will not feed five thousand people, but whence shall we buy bread that they may eat"? This is cleverly done, but is it fairly done? Why did Christ put the question to Philip? Just to secure from him an answer that would "get the laugh on him?" The explanation that John gives is that Jesus did this to prove him, to put him to the test, to secure from him an admission of their utter inability to furnish supplies for such a multitude. Why did he put the question to Philip? Would it not be a natural inference to say that it was because Philip was endowed with that rare type of mind which can take in a novel situation at a glance? Philip had but to sweep his eye

over the far-stretching crowds, and in an instant he could tell you to a fraction the minimum amount which would be required to meet the necessity of the occasion. After this view of the case had occurred to us, we thought to look and see if any one else had expressed an opinion on the subject. Taking down a volume of the *Expositor's Bible*, and turning to the passage, we found that precisely the same view was taken by Dr. Marcus Dods. Referring to Philip, he says: "Apparently, this disciple was a shrewd business man, quick to calculate ways and means, and rather apt to scorn the expectations of faith." We do not cite this by way of showing that "great minds run in the same channel," but to show that those who have no theory to maintain find an indication of Philip's superior quickness of intellect where Dr. Vance finds evidence of helpless stupidity.

After so much unfavorable criticism, it might seem that the commendation expressed at first was insincere. But not so. It is a remarkably clever book, and excites, beyond any previous work of the author, our admiration of his brilliant gifts. We think he has failed "to make into real people the men whom Christ selected as the founders of the Christian church." But we know of no one who could take the same plan and succeed, and certainly no one could fail more admirably. It would do Dr. Vance a great injustice, however, to say that he has done nothing more than fail admirably. He has elaborated his contrasted qualities in such way as to teach many timely and important lessons. Suppose he does draw upon his fertile fancy when in the sending out of James and John he represents Christ as "laying the trembling hand of old age on the sturdy shoulder of youth," and bidding them "go down the pathway of life together"; yet the lesson which he inculcates, namely, that Christ would have us reverence age, and utilize in his service the bounding energies of youth, is justly and forcefully taught. He has packed his book with glowing epigrams that fairly flash and sparkle with fresh and fruitful thought. He has clothed many sweet and noble sentiments in the garb of rare poetic beauty. Take this as a specimen: "Old age is sunset, youth is sunrise—sunrise-sunset; and the sunset is gladder for the roseate hues of the morning that gild it, and the sunrise is softer for the glow of the sunset that falls upon it; and all the day is richer because dawn and twilight, youth and old age, stretch out their hands toward each other, and clasping under noontide lift living to its zenith."

Dr. Vance gives us two life-like portraits, those of Judas and Paul, one the blackest, the other the brightest, in the gallery of history, excepting always the one that shines forever in its solitary light. In sketching Judas, our gifted author has clearly demonstrated that all he needs is a bare sufficiency of material. He paints the "dark betrayer" in such vivid and true colors that we almost feel and shrink from his presence as he lives before us: "There in the garden they meet, Judas and Christ, apostle and Master, traitor and Son of God. With the full light of the harvest moon making all vivid and distinct, Judas advances, at the head of the mob, and thrusting his evil face, dark with all the passions of hell, close up to the face of the Son of God, he actually dares to touch lips ablaze with the fires of perdition to the cheek of Jesus, exclaiming: 'Hail! Master!'"

What remains after eighteen centuries of eulogy for one to say in praise of Paul? Nothing absolutely new, perhaps, and yet Dr. Vance has been able to make our hearts glow with fresh admiration of the great apostle by showing how that all

contrasted virtues which dwelt singly in the other apostles blended together in Paul, and made him the consummate product of both nature and grace.

We have spent so much time in objecting to the plan of the book that we can do but scant justice to its many excellencies. Only grant that it fails to make real men out of what must ever be but phantoms, and for the rest we commend it unqualifiedly.

R. C. REED.

Nashville, Tenn.

GAINES' BIBLE COURSE.

BIBLE COURSE; Outline and Notes. *By Rev. F. H. Gaines, D. D., President of Agnes Scott Institute.* I. Creation to the Kingdom, 8vo, pp. vi., 183. III. New Testament, 8vo, pp. 224. Atlanta: Franklin Printing and Publishing Company. 1896.

The author of these volumes is the accomplished president of one of the most successful schools for young ladies in the South. He was pastor until recently of the church which is intimately connected with that school, and for a number of years combined the work of biblical instruction there with his pastoral duties. The great success of the institution, and his eminent fitness for the administration of its affairs, as well as for the conduct of its course in biblical instruction, demanded his release from the cares of the pastorate and his transfer to the sole care of the Institute. Dr. Gaines is recognized by all who know him as qualified in a rare degree for the special work of teaching the English Bible. His contributions to the journals in advocacy of the Bible as a part of the curriculum of every institution for the higher education have shown him to be both earnest and wisely intelligent on this subject. He has claimed, especially in a paper published not long since in this *QUARTERLY*, and in the Preface to this work reiterates it, and emphasizes it from additional thought and experience, that the Bible is marvelously adapted to promote mental development, that it alone contains and can impart knowledge which is of great and fundamental value, that it is of preëminently great literary value, that its study is essential to the preservation in college-bred men and women of a true and adequate appreciation of it, that it is adapted to form and develop the highest type of moral character. The books before us give his answer, practically, to the question, "How should the Bible be taught?"

The recognition of Bible study as a part of the curriculum of every well-organized institution is no longer a question of doubt. The success attending its introduction in this manner has been marked. With the exception of the great state universities, there is scarcely a well-known college or university which does not advertise the fact that it requires or offers systematic study of the word of God. In some the work is meagre, but growing; in others it has been developed to as full and complete a course as that in the classics, or in literature. It is such a complete, thorough course as this that Dr. Gaines has given us here.

In the examination of these books, the first thing that we notice is the modesty of the author. He claims little for himself, beyond the arrangement of his work. The elaboration of such topics as he thinks wise to develop is largely in the exact words of different authors from whom he quotes, especially Humphrey, Blaikie, Geikie, Andrews, and Broadus. We could wish that the "personal equation" had been a little more freely made, for we know Dr. Gaines' ability to present in

his own words and as the product of his own study many of the thoughts which he is content to give only as these others have moulded them. In the volume on the Old Testament, his favorite author is unquestionably Dr. E. P. Humphrey, whose *Sacred History from the Creation to the Giving of the Law* we think is rightly regarded as the finest piece of work extant on biblical history, of the time which it covers, making it a source of regret to all students of biblical history that the remainder of Dr. Humphrey's able notes were not completed and elaborated before his lamented death. Dr. Gaines had the advantage of these notes, however, as Dr. Humphrey left them in written form. In the New Testament his favorite author, so far as the harmony and chronology are concerned, is Dr. John A. Broadus, who, it is well known, departs from the usual method of the Harmonists in their emphasis of the division of the Lord's ministry into periods marked by the several passovers, and bases his division upon certain manifestations of development or progress in the life recorded, as in our Lord's self-manifestation, in the hostility of his enemies, in his training of the Twelve.

The author manifests himself, however, most fully and admirably in the skilful arrangement of his materials. Each section presents a study in outline, and then, in notes following, this outline is more fully developed, the notes themselves being no more than notes, and the fuller amplification of them being left to the class-room or the study. A happy adaptation of the printer's types to the different parts or divisions of these outlines and notes shows their relations clearly to the eye, and thus facilitates study and classification. The Old Testament history is presented in periods, marked by great movements or incidents, a method familiar to most students. At the end of the study of each of these periods, Dr. Gaines has affixed a review chart, which, with questions and topics for special study, greatly helps one in a comprehensive view of the entire period. In passing we cannot but think Dr. Gaines' nomenclature, while usually admirable, is a little at fault, or likely to be misunderstood, in naming the first period, from the creation to the call of Abraham, the "ante-ecclesiastical." In the narrower sense of an *ἐκκλησία*, strictly so-called, a "called-out" body, a "separated" body, there was no church before Abraham's day; but in the broader meaning of the word, and as respects the *essentiæ* of the church, few earnest students of the word, such as Dr. Gaines himself, will deny that there was everything inherent in the idea of the ecclesiastical from the time of Abel. From personal knowledge of the author's views, we know his meaning here; but those who do not know him may misunderstand. The same suggestions apply, in the opposite direction, to his calling the second period "post-ecclesiastical." A foot-note to this title—we think titles should always be so clear and precise as not to need an explanatory foot-note—states, "Not after the church, but after the *organization* of the visible church." Dr. Gaines' treatment of the covenant made with Abraham is specially fine. He shows its parties, its subject, God's part, Abram's part, its sanctions, and its seal with great clearness of arrangement and with unusual minuteness of detail for a book of this character. In connection with the third period, from the exodus to the settlement in Canaan, he gives a very elaborate chart, showing the principal features of the Sinaitic covenant. This chart first describes that covenant as to its parties, its manner of giving and receiving, etc., and then its matter is set forth as law, this law being shown to be threefold, and each element of it being drawn out in its special features. Under the ceremonial he places four divisions, viz., the sanc-

tuary, the priesthood, the ritual, and the calendar. In the classification of the sacrifices and offerings, he distinguishes the sin and trespass-offering too greatly, we think, by erecting them into separate classes, as distinct from each other as each is distinct from the burnt-offering or the peace-offering. We think it better to regard them as belonging to one class, viz., the expiatory, and to make only three general classes, viz., the expiatory (sin and trespass), the self-dedicatory (burnt), and the sacramental (peace). This chart, however, will be found very valuable and helpful.

The third volume is devoted chiefly to the life of our Lord. As already indicated, the author's outline follows Dr. Broadus' *Harmony* in its views of the successive events, their order, etc. Section numbers to each heading refer to this work. Review charts are introduced here also. A short chapter gives an outline of apostolic history, special attention being devoted to the subject of the apostolic writings, their occasion, time, etc. A few pages at the close deal with prophecy, the word being used in its more limited sense of prediction, and the outline being upon the Book of Revelation.

It is difficult to form a correct and fully appreciative estimate of a work like this. The skeleton is necessarily very unlike the frame clothed with flesh. What seem to be sharp angles or cavities become the rounded features glowing with beauty or the speaking eye beaming with light and intelligence. No one can fill up for another what the latter has given only in skeleton form. But if we must express an opinion or form a judgment, we will say that this work indicates not only painstaking care, earnest study, perseverance, and holy ambition, but also a profound insight into the meaning of redemption's story and of the relation of the great events and doctrines recorded in the word of God as they trace the development of that scheme of grace which God announced in the protevangelium and which in all its fulness and clearness was left to us when the sacred canon was closed. We should like to hear Dr. Gaines' own filling up, in class-room work or in fuller literary form, of these unusually fine and suggestive outlines and notes. Seldom have we seen a work covering so great a scope of history and thought as little subject to criticism as this, and as thoroughly commendable in every way. It is greatly superior to the somewhat similar productions of Price, Steele, or Semelroth, in mechanical arrangement, philosophical insight into the history, and earnest, reverential spirit.

XI. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

OXFORD TEACHER'S BIBLE. Printed at the University Press. London: Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press Warehouse, Amen Corner. New York: 91 and 93 Fifth Avenue.

The establishment of a branch of the Oxford Press in New York is a matter for congratulation to American Christians. The Oxford Teacher's Bible, of which a new edition, in long primer type, India paper, Levant binding, is before us, is, in our judgment, by long odds, the best extant. Its various helps are sound and conservative. The authors contributing the several parts, especially the Introductions to the Pentateuch and the different books of the Bible, are at once scholarly and free from the taint of modern advanced criticism. This fact appears abundantly in the discussion of the Pentateuch, Isaiah, and Daniel. The helps are generous as well as learned. They are preceded by a series of one hundred and twenty-four plates illustrating the language, writings, and versions of the Scriptures, and the men, habits, beliefs, religions, social customs, coins, etc., of Old Testament and New Testament history, and the history of the nations whose contact with the Chosen People affected their life and career. In six parts, entitled The Bible; The Old Testament; The Apocrypha; The New Testament; Palestine, Its Inhabitants, Physical Geography, Customs, etc.; and Indices, they embrace General Introduction, discussing the titles, canonicity, languages, and authenticity of the Bible; the integrity of the text, versions, etc.: special introduction to the several books; chronology and ethnology; a summary of the Apocrypha; a historical sketch of the inter-biblical period; the political conditions, sects, and parties of the Jews; the physical features of Palestine; and very full indices, composed of a glossary of antiquities, customs, etc.; a dictionary of Scripture proper names and meanings, a subject-index, and concordance. A series of fifteen maps of remarkable clearness and beauty closes the volume. Taken altogether, this edition is the best Teacher's Bible that we can find, and it should be recommended as such to all inquirers. Its publication in a type as large as long primer, as well as in smaller types, while it is yet, by the use of India paper of the finest quality, a light and thin volume, adapts it to the use of those whose eyes are not strong, or who are advancing in years.

CHRIST AND THE CHERUBIM; Or, The Ark of the Covenant a Type of Christ Our Saviour. By J. M. P. Otts, LL. D., author of "*The Land Where Jesus Lived*"; "*At Mother's Knee*," etc. With an Introduction by Francis R. Beattie, B. D., Ph. D., D. D., Professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics in the Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary. 12mo, pp. 63. Richmond, Virginia: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1896.

The author's aim in this work, as he himself states it, and as is clear to the reader, is to show that the ark of the covenant was a type of the man Christ Jesus; and, in connection with this, that the gospel of love and mercy has always been

known, having been especially set forth in the ark of the covenant. He first studies the ark as to its typical relations to the person of Christ, and maintains that in its materials and form it was a type of the two natures in the one person of the man Christ Jesus. The perfect wood of the inner box of the ark was a type of Christ's perfect human nature; the precious gold of the outer box, of his perfect divine nature. The incasing of the one box in the other, the two being so blended and wrought together that they constituted but one thing, sets forth the two natures in the one person. He holds that the only contents of the ark were the tables of the law, and these so sealed up in it that they could not be taken out without removing the mercy-seat and breaking open the holy chest, thus typifying Christ's atonement, which, as it were, shut up the law within himself by his perfect obedience. Thus both the person and the work of the Redeemer are set forth. In subsequent pages the author argues that the cherubim on the mercy-seat were a type of the eternal life of the redeemed; that the cherubim and flaming sword at Eden were the prototype of the ark of the covenant; and that the ark in its successive sanctuaries was a type of Christ in the church in all dispensations. In the elaboration of all the details of these positions the author evinces the most reverent spirit and devout purpose. We can most cordially commend the work as a whole, though questioning certain particulars of the elaboration; and we think that the author has not clearly grasped, or, at least, set forth, the distinction between the typical and the symbolic in the Levitical ceremonies and materials. Much that is symbolic is not to be regarded as typical, in the technical sense of the word; and there is always danger of Origenizing in our interpretations when we seek for a spiritual meaning in every detail of Bible description. The evangelical spirit, soundness in the faith, scholarliness, and unusual common sense of the author have prevented his yielding to this tendency in a work which, in another's hands, would, most probably, have developed this style of interpretation.

The Introduction to the book is a brief, but suggestive, discussion of the subject of typology, its nature, usefulness, and importance as a branch of biblical study.

HE IS NOT HERE. The Resurrection of Christ. *By the Rev. J. H. Brookes, D. D.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1896. 12mo. pp., 170.

This treatise on the resurrection of Christ begins by showing the importance of that fact. The author shows that if there be no risen Christ the Gospels are a myth, there is no revelation, the apostles are liars, the church has no basis upon which to rest, the remarkable power of early Christianity cannot be accounted for, there is no ground for either Christian doctrine or Christian morality, and the truest and best that man has known must be blotted out. He then shows from the marvellous spread of the word of God, and the genuineness and authenticity of its books, that men have reliable sources for information and proof of the fact of the resurrection. The schemes and efforts of infidelity to disprove the fact, as that it was a theory of fraud; as that, according to the naturalistic theory of Paulus, there was not really death upon the cross; as that, with Strauss, the story of it was mythical; as that, with Renan, it was a hallucination; or with Keim, that his

appearing again was a spiritualism or spiritistic manifestation; or, as that, with a certain class of so-called higher critics, the Bible is not trustworthy, are all shown to be failures. The possibility of a miracle is then clearly proved. After this, the author presents the testimony from Christ himself, the evangelists and other witnesses, the monuments, the prophecies, and that of science and nature. Lastly, he shows the relation between Christ's resurrection and our own, closing with a brief chapter on Christ's personal return. The whole is written in the clear and eminently scriptural and evangelical style and spirit for which the author is so well known. It is a book to be read and prized.

BEYOND THE HORIZON; or, Bright Side Chapters on the Future Life. *By Henry D. Kimball, D. D.* 12mo., pp. 250. \$1.00. New York: Eaton & Mains. 1896.

The author of this book maintains, and brings the evidence of a thirty years' ministry to prove it, that the idea that thought of the future and inquiry into it are impractical and of no appreciable value is entirely erroneous, and that there is really a wider and deeper interest in the discussion of questions relating to the future life than in any other. In this work he studies the brighter side of the life beyond. He first shows, by a most satisfactory line of argument, the immortality of man, and that the future is a conscious existence. He then discusses the idea of an intermediate state. He shows that neither philosophical necessity, nor the right interpretation of the Scriptures, demand such a place for the spirits of the dead. He then presents the subjects of the resurrection and the judgment, holding to evangelical views on both these doctrines. The questions, Where is Heaven, What is Heaven, and Recognition in Heaven, form the last three chapters. They are discussed from both scriptural and philosophical standpoints, and without affectation or any attempt at novelty. The whole volume is practical and simple, while abounding in careful thought and study. The author has fully justified his claim when he says, in the preface, "The possible readers we have had in mind are not great theologians, or profound philosophers. Nor have we had a vision of the sentimentalist, who lives in his feelings, poring over these pages."

PREDESTINATION AND FREE AGENCY. A sermon delivered in the First Presbyterian Church of Richmond, Va., and published by request. *By Robert P. Kerr, D. D.* Richmond, Va.: Whittet & Shepperson. 1897.

A sermon that will well repay reading. It is in Dr. Kerr's happiest vein. It presents the relations of the two subjects considered most practically. It specially dwells upon the inability of man to understand the hidden things of God, and shows clearly that mystery is no necessary barrier to belief, but that it rather makes us adore, and the adoring soul does not wish to comprehend its God.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, Under the Rules of Evidence Governing Courts of Justice. *By J. P. Hobson.* Second Edition. 16mo, pp. 131. Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1896.

From the quotations taken from the *Confession of Faith*, and the deliverances of the General Assembly of 1894, which appear in this booklet in the usual place of the preface, we infer that the author is not disposed to think that the Assembly

had the right to declare, in one sentence, the utter unscripturalness of baptism by immersion and the validity of the ordinance when thus administered. The treatise is admirably compact and clear, following the method named in the title. Its chapters are: The Case Stated, The Evidence for Immersion, The Evidence for Affusion, The Evidence Summed up, and The Difficulties of Immersion. The usual arguments are stated forcibly. As a handbook on the subject, this booklet is well adapted for general use. It should be widely distributed, and its cheapness will make this practicable.

SABBATH-DAY JOURNEYS. A study of the thirty-third chapter of Numbers. *By the Rev. William Justin Harsha, D. D., Pastor of the Second Collegiate Reformed Church of Harlem, New York City.* New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896. 12mo, pp. 275. \$1.00.

The title, "Sabbath-day Journeys," refers rather to the use of the several chapters of this book, which number practically one for each Sabbath of a year, than to the successive stages in the wilderness wanderings of the children of Israel. The book is an attempt to draw spiritual lessons from the names of each of the places mentioned in Moses' summary of the wandering in the desert. The incidents occurring at some of the places named are, of course, well known through the Scriptures; but in the other cases, the author, following chiefly the suggestions of a fanciful writer of England of a century and a half ago, Thomas Bromley, "spiritualizes" the names of the stations and thus draws lessons from them. It is an unusual specimen, for this day, of "Origenizing" the Bible. The lessons are good and wholesome, we think, but they could as well be drawn from other sources. As a specimen, one finds that Abarim, the name of the mountain range lying to the east of the Ælanitic Gulf, is supposed to mean "passings-away." So "There are certain practical lessons to be drawn from the station which no thoughtful mind can miss. We learn: 1, The passing away of Moses and the old covenant; 2, The preparation for passing from law to Christ; 3, The preparation for passing from the observation of the letter to the love of the Spirit—from prophecy to power." We are reminded of a sermon of which we have heard on the text, "And it came to pass," in which the preacher sets forth the evanescence of all things, showing how health, beauty, wealth, fame, even life itself, "comes only to pass." Each one, precious and happy though it seemed to be in itself, or in its capacity to bring us blessing, only "came to pass."

FOUR BIBLE STUDIES: Shamelessness, Revenge, Prayer, Fidelity. *By John H. Osborne.* 12mo, pp. vi., 90. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1896.

These are studies on the parables of the Friend at Midnight, the Unjust Judge, the Mammon of Unrighteousness, and on Elijah's Prayer. Of the first the author makes the singular interpretation that the man coming at midnight to borrow loaves to feed his guest was doing an unnecessary and unreasonable thing, merely making a show of zeal in fulfilling the duties of hospitality, reckless of the outrage he was committing against the kindly and considerate feelings of others, a man of reckless spirit and brazen ways. Of the parable of the Unjust Judge, he holds that the widow who sought with such importunity to be avenged is not one who gained her point merely by her importunity, but who had a full resolution and a

settled plan for getting even and more than even with her adversary, and whose case the judge recognized to be of so strong a nature that he had to yield lest she "give him a black eye," that is, defeat his plans, disappoint him in some of his expectations, overthrow him by some sudden and unpreventable disaster. This will sufficiently illustrate the author's methods of interpretation. The principle upon which he bases his method, and for which he argues, is that no parable was ever uttered to teach a truth by way of contrast or unlikeness.

CHOSEN OF GOD. *By Rev. Herbert W. Lathe.* 12mo, pp. 306. \$1.25. Chicago, New York, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896.

The author of this book recognizes the fact that many Christians make little progress after conversion, and it is his object to lead such into the richer experiences of the life of Christ. He believes that a most fruitful cause of Christians' failure is that to many of them the Christian life is a human undertaking attended by divine aid. They are here shown that as they are the chosen of God before their new birth, so they are his chosen in the Christian life, and, therefore, should cast themselves entirely upon him, committing their souls to him in well-doing. He carefully guards against all antinomianism and fatalism. The chapter on the sovereignty of God in its practical relations is delightful. He shows that this great doctrine runs through the Bible and is its ruling idea, that all God's attributes partake of it, that the devout soul rejoices in it, that it is manifest in the origin of redemption, and in the application of redemption, that the Christian life depends upon it, and that it is the comfort of God's people. The whole work is full of richness and strength and scripturalness. It is the most complete in its development of the principle of election as shown in the believer's life that we have ever read.

THE CELESTIAL SUMMONS. *By Rev. Angelo Carroll; Edited by Homer Eaton, D. D.* New York: Eaton & Mains. 1896. 12mo, pp. 280. \$1.25.

Mr. Carroll was a noted pulpit orator of the Methodist Episcopal Church, spending the larger part of his ministerial life in the prominent New England pulpits, and closing his career in the California Conference, after a most successful ministry of forty-four years. The book before us is a memorial volume of his sermons, the title being taken from the first of this collection of twelve discourses. They are all full of fervid eloquence and power, clothed in English of rare beauty.

LIFE'S BYWAYS AND WAYSIDES. *By J. R. Miller, D. D., author of "Week-day Religion," "In His Steps," etc.* 12mo, pp. 320. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1895.

A series of twenty-five studies, named from the first, in the author's best vein. Dr. Miller is too well known for his happy gift in the preparation of devotional literature for us to commend him. The studies in this book, on such subjects as Wayside Ministries, The Silent Christ, Unto His Nest Again, The Ministry of Suffering, Great in God's Sight, etc., are full of interest and are most beautifully and strikingly illustrated by the scriptural facts which are gathered up under each of them. We take pleasure in recommending that this book be in all our Sunday libraries, and that those who would read a sermon or lecture in a pastor's absence take some of these delightful chapters.

FAITH BUILDING. *By William P. Merrill, Pastor of the Sixth Presbyterian Church, Chicago, Ill.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1896. 16mo, pp. 77.

Five discourses to young people on the topics of dealing with doubt—the one foundation, the one truth, the one duty, the condition of progress. It is a dainty booklet, and full of helpful ideas and suggestions.

JESUS AND CHILDREN. *By the Rev. Charles E. Craven.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1896.

A very interesting and suggestive sermon on the text, "And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them," setting forth the practical relations between the Christ and the little ones.

WHAT IS TO BE YOUR LIFE WORK? Why not the Ministry? *By Rev. A. M. Fraser, D. D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Staunton, Va.* Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication.

A series of three admirable tracts on the duty of young men considering the ministry, and young women the missionary field, for their life-work. It does not pretend to be an exhaustive treatment of the subject. It is only an appeal to stop and think, and it wisely urges all to read Dr. Dabney's noted tract, entitled *What Is a Call to the Gospel Ministry?*

FROM THE EXILE TO THE ADVENT. *By Rev. William Fairweather, M. A., Kirkcaldy.* 12mo, pp. 210. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons. 1895. 60 cents, net.

This little volume is one of the *Hand-Books for Bible Classes and Private Students*, of which Professor Marcus Dods and Dr. Alexander Whyte are editors. It embraces the time from the beginning of the exile until the close of the reign of Herod the Great. It describes the significance and rationale of the exile, the home of the exiles, the story of the exile, and the return from the exile. It then presents the life and career of the Jews in the Persian period, the Greek period, the Maccabean period, under the Asmonean dynasty, and in the Roman period. A complete index makes its contents most available. In treating of the literature of this epoch, the author, as one would expect in a series under such direction, says that "the marvellous collection of writings appended to the Book of Isaiah, and forming in our Bibles chapters xl.-lxvi. of that work, were distinctly, for the most part, the product of the exile." He also seems to sympathize with the view that the Book of Job should be assigned to this period, and declares it to be practically certain that "the latest redaction" of the Books of Kings took place then. The Book of Daniel is assigned to the Maccabean period, and this hypothesis declared to be the key to its design, for if it be "the 'direct product of the Maccabean struggles,' its point and significance are unmistakable." The Book of Ecclesiastes and the bulk of the later Psalms are assigned to the Persian period.

With the exception of the author's position on matters of this kind, pertaining chiefly to the literature of the Jews during the inter-biblical epoch, his work is an admirable presentation of the facts of that remarkable time, so little studied, and yet having so intimate a relation to the coming of Christ and the preparation of the world for his advent.

THE HERO OF THE AGES. A Story of the Nazarene. *By Catherine Robertson McCartney.* New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896. 12mo, pp. 240. \$1.00.

Another of those books which attempt to weave together the incidents of the Gospels into more or less of a romance. The author is earnest and devout, but we believe that earnestness and devoutness will not be strengthened in others by such a use of the words and scenes in our Lord's life. For instance, she depicts the closing scenes of the forty days' temptation in the wilderness as witnessed by a beautiful young woman, one of the heroines of the book, who goes and ministers to Christ there. Again, she has Christ, just after uttering the parable of the Prodigal Son, to go and sit down near a young man who had looked on sullenly while he was uttering it, until the young man came up and said: "Did you mean me by that story?" and then, touched by the Saviour's kindness, went back to his aged father and to the paths of virtue and truth. The scene upon the Mount of Transfiguration she has caused others than the three disciples to see, by narrating that two of her characters in Cæsarea Philippi sat at a window or on a roof to a late hour at night watching the strange light, and pronouncing it the grandest aurora borealis they ever saw! The manner in which the distressed sisters at Bethany found that Christ was in Perea was through Simon, who "met a gentleman of the name of Heber," who informed him of where Christ had been shortly before. The author's knowledge of antiquities is not accurate enough to prevent her making a number of errors in respect to historical and geographical matters, and in references to the homes and customs of the people.

COMPENDIUM OF CHURCH HISTORY. *By the Rev. Andrew C. Zenos, D. D., Professor of Biblical Theology in the McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois.* With an Introduction by the Rev. John DeWitt, D. D., LL. D., Archibald Alexander Professor of Church History in Princeton Theological Seminary. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school work. 1896. 12mo, pp. x., 340. \$1.00.

A wonderfully compact little volume, and by reason of its type and unledged lines containing far more matter than one would at first suspect. The method of division adopted is that of periods, subdivided by ages or epochs, each marked by pivotal events or critical movements in the church which furnish logical and convenient points of partition. The Ancient Period is divided into the Apostolic Age, the Sub-Apostolic Age, the Ante-Nicene Epoch, and the Post-Nicene Epoch. The Mediæval Period is considered under the heads of the Development of the Papacy, the Papacy and the Holy Roman Empire, the Ascendancy of the Papacy, and the Decline of the Papacy. The Modern Period includes the Reformation Generation, the Consolidation of the Reformation, to the Treaty of Westphalia, the Post-Reformation Epoch, to the French Revolution, and the Contemporaneous Age, or the Nineteenth Century. The limits of the volume prevent any elaborate discussions or details. Modern church history receives its due proportion of presentation and study, especially such movements as the influence of modern German thought, under Schleiermacher, Hegel, Baur and the Tübingen School, Ritschl, Tractarianism, etc. Special attention is given to modern missionary movements, Bible societies, and Sunday-schools. Two chapters, the last in the book,

are specially devoted to the study of Christianity in America. The Southern Presbyterian Church is dismissed with a ten-line paragraph, which gives in its opening and closing sentences somewhat contradictory statements of the *raison-d'être* of this church. We quote it in full: "The question of slavery led to another division. The New School presbyteries of the slave-holding States seceded from the New School Assembly in 1857. The Old School presbyteries in the same region left the Old School Assembly in 1861. Two years later these presbyteries united in the Presbyterian Church in the United States. The fundamental principle of this church is that the church, as a purely spiritual institution, must abstain from legislation with reference to political questions." In describing the part which Presbyterianism has taken in education and the theological seminaries which it has planted in the land, the author mentions even such recently organized institutions as the San Francisco and Omaha Seminaries, but omits institutions like Union Seminary, Va., with its seventy years' history and thousand or more graduates, Columbia, with nearly as long a history, and others.

AMERICAN PRESBYTERIANISM, in its Development and Growth. *By the Rev. Robert M. Patterson, D. D., LL. D., author of "Paradise," "Visions of Heaven for the Life on Earth," "Elijah, the Favored Man," etc.* 12mo, pp. 132. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1896.

The author should rename his book. Half of it is devoted to Pennsylvania Presbyterianism, and a considerable portion of the balance to all denominations in the United States. He should also revise his statement that the Southern Presbyterian Church seceded from the Northern on account of slavery and the Civil War, for this is not a fact. He needs to tone down the arrogant title, "Our National Church," or the "National Presbyterian Church," which he applies to one branch of the Presbyterians in this country. Our Kentucky brethren will not enjoy the statement that their Synod "also withdrew from the National Church," and entered the Southern Church. For a book intended to circulate among all Presbyterians, and to trace American Presbyterianism, this is a singular compilation and composition. It recounts much that is familiar and nothing that is new. Its chief value lies in its presentation in condensed form of many of the statistics gathered from the census reports of 1890.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SIXTH GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE ALLIANCE OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES HOLDING THE PRESBYTERIAN SYSTEM, HELD AT GLASGOW, 1896. *Edited by the Rev. G. D. Mathews, D. D., General Secretary of the Alliance.* 8vo., xvi. 480. Appendix, iv., 216. \$3.00 net. London: James Nisbet & Co., Limited. New York and Chicago. Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896.

This volume embraces all the proceedings of the Glasgow Council, the sermons and addresses delivered, the rolls of members or appointed delegates, and the appointment of the different committees. In the appendix, which would be almost a large volume by itself, will be found the reports of the several churches included in the Alliance, the reports of the various committees appointed at the last Council, a translation of the "Post Acta" of the Synod of Dort, 1618, the treasurer's report, and certain papers ordered by the Council to be printed, and certain addenda, in the form of documents referring to the history of the Alliance

and its executive commission, the basis and constitution of the Alliance, rules of order, etc. In reading the volume, we are naturally most interested in the representation which the Southern Church had in this historic gathering. The only formal papers or speeches from those delegated by our Assembly were Dr. Hemphill's paper on "The Mission of the Church as a Promoter of Social and Public Worship," a brief, but beautiful and suggestive study, and Dr. Moses Hoge's address on the "Educational Influence of Presbyterianism on National Life," an address characterized by all the eloquence and beauty of diction for which this great preacher is so well known. Dr. Thornwell's speech in moving the adoption of the Council's resolutions on International Arbitration richly deserves the encomium passed by Professor Lindsay, of Glasgow, in seconding it, as most eloquent; while for attractiveness and appropriateness, playfulness and power, polish and beauty, Dr. Moore's address at the close of the Council could not have been surpassed.

CELEBRATION OF THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE APPOINTMENT OF PROFESSOR WILLIAM HENRY GREEN AS AN INSTRUCTOR IN PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, MAY 5, 1896. With a Portrait. Sqr. 8vo, pp. 193. \$1.50 net. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1896.

This beautiful volume, a model in its typographical and other material features, commemorates the fiftieth anniversary of Dr. Green's appointment as a Professor in Princeton Seminary, by giving us in permanent form all the incidents, observances, and speeches of that memorable occasion. Its appendix, comprising more than half the volume, records the many testimonials and letters from institutions of learning and from prominent individuals which poured in, the leading press notices of the occasion, and a most complete bibliography of Dr. Green. Not only to all who took part in that remarkable gathering, but to all who rejoice in the life and work of this great teacher and master, will this superb book be of value and interest.

THE CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR HOUR. With Light for the Leader. *By Thomas G. F. Hill, A. M., Pastor of Wakefield Church, Germantown, Philadelphia; and Grace Livingstone Hill, author of The Parkerstown Delegate; Katherine's Yesterday; A Chautauqua Idyl, etc., etc.* With an Introduction by Mrs. G. R. Alden (Pansy). Part I. (January-June.) 1897. New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. Pp. 63. Single part, 15 cts.; both parts, 25 cts.

A convenient and compact volume, containing, besides the introduction, general hints to leaders, forms for the reception of members and officers, and a series of very valuable suggestions called "Don'ts," topics for each Sabbath of the first half of the year, the Scripture passage containing them, lists of appropriate hymns from Gospel Hymns, No. 6, and Christian Endeavor Hymns, parallel passages, practical applications and illustrations, and helps and hints to the leader. Members of young people's societies will find it useful.

METHODIST YEAR-BOOK FOR 1897. A. B. Sanford, D. D., Editor. New York: Eaton & Mains. 1897. Pp. 134. Paper, 10 cts.; postage, 4 cts. additional.

It should be the aim of the intelligent Christian to be acquainted, in at least a

general way, with all the evangelical denominations and their work. Especially should one know something of that great body which numbers more adherents in its ranks than any other single organization of the religious bodies of our land. The statistics, benevolences, educational enterprises, societies, and various organizations of this great body, the Methodist Episcopal Church, are succinctly given or described in this little volume. A chapter of general information, on the Young Men's Christian Association, the World's Evangelical Alliance, the American Sabbath Union, Temperance Organizations, Old World Methodism, etc., is added.

WEBSTER'S INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. Being the Authentic Edition of Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, Comprising the Issues of 1864, 1879, and 1884. Now Thoroughly Revised and Enlarged under the Supervision of Noah Porter, D. D., LL. D., of Yale University. With a Voluminous Appendix. Springfield, Mass.: Published by G. & C. Merriam Company. 1896.

A simple announcement of this as "The International" would, perhaps, have been sufficient. For all the purposes of a dictionary, our careful examination of the leading competitors for acceptance shows this to be by far the best. It is a dictionary, and not an encyclopædia. It tells one just what one goes to a dictionary to find out. It is up to date in both definition and illustration. Its Introduction furnishes all that one could wish in the way of a History of the Language, Guide to Pronunciation, Synopsis of Words Differently Pronounced by Different Orthoëpists, etc.; while its ample appendices of Fiction, Biography, Gazetteer; Scripture, Greek, and Latin names; Words, Phrases, etc., from other languages; Illustrations, etc., are complete and available. It is unrivalled in completeness, comprehensiveness, and clearness. In reliability and readiness of reference it is incomparable.

A CYCLE OF CATHAY; or, China, South and North. With Personal Reminiscences. By W. A. P. Martin, D. D., LL. D., *President Emeritus of the Imperial Tungwen College, Membre de L'Institut de Droit International, Membre Cor. de la Société de la Legislation Comparée, etc.* With Illustrations and Map. New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896. 8vo., pp. 464. \$2.00.

A Chinese cycle is sixty years. It is to describe the condition, life, and history of China during about this length of time that the author writes. For three-fourths of the time he was living in China, identified with its domestic and public life during a part of the time as no other American has ever been, and from official relations to its government intimately familiar with such aspects of its life as few have the opportunity to become. Dr. Martin went to China early in 1850, as a missionary, settling in South China. In 1863 he began work in North China, at Peking. Here his relations with Mr. Burlingame, the American minister, were most intimate. His work here was to establish a school for the education of preachers, physicians, and engineers. The government offered material aid in the support of the enterprise. In 1868 he was called to a professorship in the new government college, of which he became president. The special object of

this college, the existence of which was due to certain provisions in the British Treaty with China, was to train young men for the public service, especially as agents of international intercourse. Of this college Dr. Martin is still president emeritus, and we note with interest the statement, that on his recent passage through this country, Li Hung Chang, on seeing Dr. Martin, told him that he looked well and strong enough to return to China and resume his life and work there. All these opportunities afforded Dr. Martin rare facilities in the preparation of the book before us. The volume gives a mass of useful information, and all so naturally suggested by Dr. Martin's sojourn in the land that it is marked with unusual vividness and interest. The personal elements in it make it the more interesting, and a vein of humor constantly shows itself, adding spice to the narrative and history. The author devotes much attention to subjects like the opium curse, the missionary problem, relations to other nations, etc., as well as to the country's physical aspects, the language and literature, domestic life, customs and manners, government and religions of the country. The large number of excellent illustrations add interest to the book and make it most attractive.

COLLEGE HYMNAL. A Selection of Christian Praise-songs for the Use of Worship in Universities, Colleges and Advanced Schools. New York and Chicago: The Biglow & Main Co. 1897.

"Of making many [hymn]-books there is no end." We suppose they are made to sell; that wherever there is an organization or gathering in which there is some *esprit-du-corps* with a sufficient large number of members or constituents, there is an opportunity to sell. This is the only way in which we can account for this collection. There is nothing except the title to differentiate it from any other really good collection of hymns and tunes. The compiler is not named. The print is good and clear, the type used for the hymns being unusually large and distinct. The binding is attractive and very substantial. The collection is one of a better and more dignified type than the popular collections for youth, and will therefore cultivate a more elevated class of song-service.

POCKET MANUAL OF RULES OF ORDER FOR DELIBERATIVE ASSEMBLIES. Part I. Rules of Order. A compendium of parliamentary law based upon the rules and practice of Congress. Part II. Organization and Conduct of Business. A simple explanation of the methods of organizing and conducting the business of societies, conventions, and other deliberative assemblies. By Colonel Henry M. Robert, *Corps of Engineers, U. S. A.* One hundred and eighty-seventh thousand. 16mo, pp. 218. Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co. 1896.

The popularity of this hand-book proves its adaptability to its purpose. In terser, clearer terms than any such publication with which we are familiar, it sets forth the rules of order which are generally accepted as the guide of deliberative bodies. In arrangement, difference of type used, etc., it is ready of reference, a most decided advantage in a hand-book of the kind, in view of the fact that in most cases in which such a book must be consulted, it must be consulted immediately and without undue delay to business.

THE RELIGIOUS OUTLOOK. *Editors, W. M. McPheeters and D. J. Brimm.* Published monthly at Columbia, S. C., by the Bryan Printing Company. \$1.00 per annum.

This new monthly periodical of twenty-four large pages, presents a handsome appearance. It is well printed, and its contents attractively arranged. A photograph of Dr. Thornwell adorns one of its pages. The contents are in short, crisp, editorial notes and brief articles on topics of present interest, followed by historical notes, a digest of ecclesiastical information, and exegetical suggestions and opinions. Large attention is to be devoted to biblical research and discovery. The contributors to the initial number are Drs. S. M. Smith, R. C. Reed, A. R. Cocke, S. S. Laws, J. L. Girardeau, R. L. Dabney, and J. D. Tadlock. These names are a guarantee of its ability. And the reader will not be disappointed when he turns to the pages which they have written. We wish the founders of this magazine great success in their venture.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 41.—JULY, 1897.

I. PHILIP MELANCHTHON, SCHOLAR AND REFORMER.¹

OF the many brief descriptions of the Reformation, none is more striking than that which represents it as the return of Christendom to a book. Of course, so continental, profound and complex a movement cannot be described in a single sentence. But with a rough kind of truth it may be said, that when the hour of the great religious revolution struck, the various lines on which its historical causes had for centuries been moving converged and terminated in the Holy Bible. If we were limited to a single statement as to what the Reformation, in its inmost essence, was, and what, as it perpetuates itself in the Protestant churches, it still is; after all our study of the historical events which preceded it as coöperating agents—the papal schism, the reforming councils, the struggles between Gallicanism and Ultramontanism, the classical revival, the destructive and constructive forces which tore down the mediæval and built up the modern society, as the inventions of printing, of gunpowder and of the mariner's compass and the great voyages of discovery, the religious labors of local and national reformers like Wicliff and Huss and Savonarola—if, I say, after all this study, we were called to select a single sentence in which to embody the idea of the Reformation, we could find no better sentence for the purpose than that of Wil-

¹An address delivered in the chapel of Princeton Theological Seminary on the occasion of the celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the birth of Philip Melanchthon. The Rev. Dr. Green, Chairman of the Faculty, presided; and the Rev. Dr. Jacobs, Dean of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, took part in the services. The hymns sung were written by Melanchthon and Luther.

liam Chillingworth: "The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants." And because this is the Reformation in its essence, there is no other single line of events leading up to it so interesting or fruitful as a subject of investigation as the line of literary studies. Certainly, there is no other line which will bring us, by a route as direct or as charming, to the University of Wittenberg and to Philip Melanchthon, the preceptor of Germany.

It need not surprise us that the early Christian church rejected a literature whose charm was due, partly at least, to its association with a religion which the fathers of the church called the worship of demons. There is more reason for surprise in the fact that we can trace a line of Christian scholars, like St. Augustine, who extolled the study of heathen writers as introductory to the study of the divine revelation, or like Alcuin, who could write of his little collection of the classics in language as affectionate as if he were speaking of his best-beloved friends. But these were exceptions; and of these exceptions, Mr. Symonds tells us that "Augustine deplored his time spent in weeping over Dido's death by love, while all the while he was himself both morally and spiritually dead; and that Alcuin regretted that in his boyhood he had preferred Virgil to the legends of the saints, and stigmatized the eloquence of the classic Latin writers as wanton." The tardy penitence of the North-African theologian and of the Saxon teacher is mild, indeed, when compared with the vehement denunciations of most of those who contrasted their own writings with the classics. "I warn the reader," says one, "not to mind the mass of barbarisms in this work, but to seek the pearl within the dung-heap"; and Gregory the Great struggles after language equal to his contempt for the literary masters of his own Italy. "The places of prepositions and the cases of nouns," said he, "I utterly despise, since I deem it unfit to confine the words of the celestial oracles within the rules of Donatus."

Undoubtedly, the western church, during the Middle Ages after the Dark Age, enjoyed an active intellectual life and abounded in missionary work. The Teutonic peoples were christianized and civilized, and the great doctrines of Christianity were stated, defended, and organized in systems in which their relations to the

truths they presuppose were exhibited. But this intellectual activity was largely unfruitful, for the reason that both the facts of nature and the great literatures, whether Christian or classic, of the previous ages were neglected. The human intellect fed itself almost exclusively on its own speculations, and its only activity was excessive analysis. How this activity in analysis wearied and angered scholars like Erasmus appears in his *Colloquies* and his letters. "The schoolmen," he writes, "have been arguing for generations whether the proposition that Christ exists from eternity is correctly stated; whether he is compounded of two natures, or consists of two natures; whether he is *conflatus*, or *commixtus*, or *conglutinator*, or *coaugmentatus*, or *geminatus*, or *copulatus*. The present opinion is that neither of these particles is correct; and we are to have a new word, *unitus*, which still is to explain nothing. And all this stuff, of which we know nothing, and are not required to know anything, they treat as the citadel of our faith."¹

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries this characteristic intellectual activity was employed in the defence and maintenance of an ecclesiastical system which had become tyrannical and corrupt. How, after the new learning had penetrated the Teutonic countries and had aroused the friends of good studies, the city of St. Peter and St. Paul was regarded, we know from the indignant and brutal satire by Ulrich von Hutten, called *The Roman Trinity*, each sentence of which falls like the stroke of a battle-axe. "Three things sustain the dignity of Rome: the reputation of the pope, the bones of the saints, and the traffic in indulgences. Three things are innumerable in Rome: harlots, priests, and scribblers. Three things are proscribed in Rome: simplicity, piety, and temperance. Three things are in universal demand at Rome: short masses, good money, and voluptuous living." And as they knew Rome corrupt, they held that its corruption had poisoned its intellectual defenders. It is of the theologians of his day—the "theogastrics," as he calls them—that Erasmus is writing when he says: "than whose brains there is nothing more rotten; than whose language, nothing more barbarous; than whose life, nothing more foul; than whose speech, nothing more virulent; than whose

¹Translated in Froude's *Life of Erasmus*, Lecture VII.

hearts, nothing more black." Of course, this is the violent language of a partisan. It is not truthful portraiture, but caricature; and yet caricature, if it does not convey, often suggests, the truth.

It was when scholasticism had exhausted its resources, and when the church was more corrupt than it had been since the pornocracy, that the literary movement began in Italy. We call it "the classical revival," because it was a return to classical ideas and forms, for inspiration, for instruction, for ultimate truth, and for loftiest ideals. But if we would give expression to the spirit which informed the movement, we must employ the term "humanism." "The essence of humanism," according to the English historian¹ who has given to the movement the severest study, "consists in a new perception of the dignity of man as a natural being, apart from theological determinations; and in the further perception that classical literature alone displayed human nature in the plenitude of intellectual and moral freedom. Hence the single-hearted devotion to the literature of Greece and Rome that marks the whole Renaissance era. Hence the watchword of that age, the *litteræ humaniores*. Hence the passion for antiquity possessing thoughtful men, and substituting a new authority for the traditions of the church." Certainly the movement, at the beginning, was directed toward noble ends. Of the enthusiasm of those whom it influenced, I have not time to tell the story; but even now it is impossible to read of Boccaccio's journey to the library of the Benedictine monastery on Monte Casino in search of manuscripts, or of the enthusiastic hearers of John of Ravenna and Emanuel Chrysoloras, without a quickened beating of the heart. What the general feeling was about the lectures of the Greek Chrysoloras may be inferred from the account of his own, written by Leonardo Bruni, the historian of Florence. "Letters," he says, "at this period grew mightily in Italy, seeing that the knowledge of Greek, intermitted for seven centuries, revived. Chrysoloras of Byzantium brought to us the Greek learning. I, at that time, was following the civil law, though not ill-versed in other studies, for by nature I loved with ardor, nor had I given slight pains to dialectic and rhetoric. Therefore, at the coming of Chrysoloras, I was

¹J. A. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy*.

made to halt in my choice of lives, seeing that I held it wrong to desert the law; and yet I reckoned it a crime to omit so great an occasion of learning the Greek literature; and oftentimes I reasoned with myself after this manner: Can it be that thou, when thou mayest gaze on Homer, Plato and Demosthenes, together with other poets, philosophers and orators, concerning whom so great and wonderful things are said, and mayest converse with them, and receive their admirable doctrine—can it be that thou wilt desert thyself, and neglect the opportunity divinely offered thee? Conquered at last by these reasonings, I delivered myself over to Chrysoloras with such passion, that what I had received from him by day in hours of waking occupied my mind by night in hours of sleep.”¹

Almost everywhere in Italy men were moved by the reasons which so powerfully influenced Leonardo Bruni. A new fine art, a new politics, a new learning resulted. Academies were founded to study antiquities, to inaugurate searches for manuscripts, to adopt classical customs. The new printing-press not only diffused the learning and intensified the general enthusiasm, but was itself conquered by the genius of classical beauty; as one may see in the Princeton University library, if one will look into the cases which, by the generosity of Mr. Morgan and Mr. Pyne, hold editions of the classics from the noble types of the great scholar and printer, Aldus Manutius.

Great as the humanistic movement was, its influence on Italy was such that we must regard it as a Nemesis, following with vengeance what, during the Captivity and the Schism, had become a corrupt and corrupting church. It both revived pagan vices and destroyed Christian faith. Platonism was the highway over which, centuries before, Augustine of Hippo moved to Christian belief; and there were some in Italy at this time for whom the classical learning proved a similar highway. Such it proved to the great Pico di Mirandola; and Laurentius Valla passed over it to fruitful New Testament studies. But it also fostered immorality and skepticism; as you may see if you will contrast Dante and Boccaccio, or if you will study the condition of the court

¹ Quoted by Symonds.

of Rome during the revival of learning. Macaulay, in his essay on von Ranke's *History of the Popes*, has described it for us in his own vivid way: "Even its most respectable members were utterly unfit to be ministers of religion. They were men like Leo X., men who, with the latinity of the Augustan age, had acquired its atheistical and scoffing spirit. They regarded these Christian mysteries, of which they were the stewards, just as the Augur Cicero and the Pontifex Maximus Cæsar regarded the Sibylline books and the pecking of the sacred chickens. Their years glided by in a soft dream of sensual and intellectual voluptuousness. Choice cookery, delicious wines, lovely women, hounds, falcons, horses, newly-discovered manuscripts of the classics, sonnets and burlesque romances in the sweetest Tuscan—just as licentious as a fine sense of the graceful would permit—plates from the hands of a Benvenuto, designs for palaces by Michael Angelo, frescoes by Raphael, busts, mosaics, and gems just dug up from among the ruins of ancient temples and villas—these things were the delight, and even the serious business, of their lives." Surely, if this had been the last or the greatest result of the classical revival, it would have been like a noble river which fails to reach the great and wide sea, and loses itself in the sands of the desert.

Happily, the movement begun in Italy did not stop at its borders. In other countries it became both the greatest aid and the strongest stimulus to even far more beneficent studies. What it might have done for Spain, but for the Inquisition, may be inferred from the preparation and publication of the Complutensian Polyglott. But it was only when it passed the Alps and took possession of the serious and religious Teutonic mind that it performed its highest service for humanity.

We must not fall into the error of supposing that the revival of classical learning preceded the Reformation. We are accustomed to date the revival from its beginnings and the Reformation from what, in one sense, was its culminating act. So we date the former at the close of the fourteenth century, and the latter at a point in the first quarter of the sixteenth century. But Taine is right when he says, that "side by side with the Renaissance was born the Reformation." Both movements had the

same negative source, namely, a profound and widespread dissatisfaction with life, with society, and with the church. The religious reformation, as Taine says, was "also a new birth, one in harmony with the genius of the Germanic peoples. The distinction between this genius and others is its moral principles. For these peoples the ideal is not amidst forms made up of force and joy; but is transferred to sentiments made up of truth, law, attachment to duty, observance of order." While the classical revival was going forward in the ancient home of the Latin peoples, the religious revival was going forward in the homes of the Teutonic peoples. It only needed that the two movements meet and coalesce to make the Reformation, what at the beginning I called it, the return of Christendom to a book.

There were many points at which the two movements thus united. But certainly there is no more interesting point of union than the acquaintance between the Italian Pico di Mirandola, of whom I have already spoken, and John Reuchlin, the first in time and almost the greatest of the German humanists; who began among the Teutonic peoples the study of Hebrew, and who stimulated if he did not begin the study of Greek. It was not, indeed, from Pico that Reuchlin received his first impulse toward linguistic study. He had studied Hebrew at Paris under the great John Wessel; and years before his journey to Italy he had labored upon a Greek grammar and lexicon. But Italy was the *caput studiorum*; and when, in 1482, he made his first journey to Italy, he was brought into personal contact with the scholars of Rome, and with "the circle of learned men in Florence whom Lorenzo di Medici had gathered around him." The friendships he then made became permanent; they were cemented by correspondence; they contributed to his positive work in behalf of linguistic studies, and they sustained him in that long bitter conflict with Pfefferkorn and the Dominicans, to which conflict, as much as any single event, we owe the consolidation and the deepening enthusiasm of the German humanists. Reuchlin never shows better than he does in this conflict, pleading for the Jews and against the burning of the Talmud. Though his tracts are disfigured by horrid vituperation, as Martin Luther's, John Calvin's

and John Milton's afterwards were; though he calls Pfefferkorn "a venomous beast and a scarecrow," and the Dominicans "crafty dogs and hell-furies," we must not forget either that this was only in the way of customary reciprocity, or that his noble plea for the preservation of the Jewish books is urged on noble ground, that Christians should welcome all learning, that, to quote his words, "as the bee sucks honey from every flower, so should the Christian draw from all the books that which is best; he should pluck the rose out of the midst of thorns, wherever he finds it." This conflict of Reuchlin's united the German humanist party, and gave an added force and depth to the humanistic movement.

Meanwhile, a greater man even than John Reuchlin was doing his part in the literary preparation for the religious Reformation. The publication of Mr. Froude's lectures, with the title the *Life of Erasmus*, has lately re-awakened the public interest in this great man of letters, of whom, whatever were his faults, it must always be said, that as he himself is never dull, so the story of his life will never be stale. The brilliant satire, called the *Praise of Folly*, *The Colloquies*, written by him as a school-book, and, better than either, his letters have a vitality and perennial freshness like those which charm us in the prologues to the *Canterbury Tales*. Indeed, in the rapid, genial, spontaneous products of his pen there are character sketches, more quickly drawn certainly, but with a hand as true and as firm as that which gave us the Holy Clerk, the Franklin, and the Friar who "was a wanton and a merry." This kind of literary genius is not a good foundation on which to build up the reformer. The painter of character is for the purpose of reform usually too little a partisan. He too warmly loves all the characters, good or bad, that he portrays. Erasmus was, indeed, a partisan, and on the right side in the main. But he enjoyed too much the study even of the monk and the schoolman, whom he pillories, to hate them with a righteous indignation like Luther's. So Shakespearë, because his genius was literary, enjoyed the action of Macbeth or Iago quite as much as that of Hamlet or Portia. The impulse that dominated Shakespeare came near to dominating Erasmus. Hence he was

no reformer. But he did a great work for reform. More than any other man, north and west of the Alps, he promoted the study of the classics. He poured contempt upon the scholastic theology now run to seed. He lifted up his voice against the ignorance or the obscurantism of the monks. He turned the attention of the theological mind from the Schoolmen to the Fathers. Pelagian as he was, he prepared the way for the profound Augustinianism of Luther and Calvin. Above all, he gave to Europe again, in its original language, the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

We call Reuchlin and Erasmus the greatest of the Teutonic humanists. But "humanism" is not the word by which their spirit or their work can be best characterized. "Humanism" describes the spirit of the revival in Italy; but beyond the Alps, and, above all, as employed by Reuchlin and Erasmus, the classical revival became the instrument of the new biblical study. If we would understand the mission of the man whom to-day we honor, and whose great work we are met to commemorate, we must hold in mind the fact that he nobly continued the work which Reuchlin and Erasmus began—linguistic study in the interest of biblical knowledge.

In 1497, when Reuchlin, then forty-two years of age and a fugitive from Wurtemberg, was teaching Greek and Hebrew at Heidelberg, the year of Erasmus' first visit to England, Philip Schwartzerd—known to us as Philip Melanchthon—was born at Bretten, in the lower Palatinate. Reuchlin was his great-uncle. His father was an armorer, and a master of his art. The father became an engineer, or, as we might better say, an officer of ordnance, in the service of two successive Palatinate princes, and was known favorably to the Emperor Maximilian. He was a grave man, of high character, whose death, when it took place in 1508, was a great loss to the boy Philip, then eleven years old. His mother was Barbara Reuter, the daughter of the mayor of Bretten, a strict and faithful mother, who trained her son carefully in the duties of religion. Philip began his career of learning in the school of his native town, which he left to enjoy the teaching of a strict and faithful private tutor, of whom he after-

wards said, "He flogged me, yet with due moderation." It was while under this tutor that his gift of rapid acquisition and his gift in debate discovered themselves. His active mind incessantly put questions to his teacher, and after his lessons he was ready to dispute almost any question with his fellow-pupils. On the death of his father and his grandfather, the latter of whom had provided for him this private tuition, he was sent to a Latin school at Pforzheim, where one of his school-fellows was Simon Grynæus, so renowned afterwards as both a Greek linguist and a theologian, and where his teacher was George Simler, who had imbibed the spirit of the revival, and who must have enjoyed teaching pupils like the young Grynæus and young Schwartzerd. Here Philip made such progress as, even with Grynæus as his rival and companion, to earn the nickname of "the Grecian." While still at Pforzheim attending the Latin school of Simler and living at the house of his great-aunt, Philip met for the first time his great-uncle Reuchlin. We are told that "Reuchlin was attracted by the quickness and talent of the boy, and often talked with him about his studies"; that "soon, seeing the great promise given by his ability and attainments, his interest in him deepened"; and that "finally, he called him his son; placed his own doctor's cap upon his head; made him a present of some books then difficult to obtain, and with them a Greek lexicon and grammar; and changed his name from Schwartzerd to 'Melanchthon,' an act which he intended as his introduction into the republic of letters."¹

Melanchthon left Pforzheim for the University of Heidelberg, matriculating in 1509. Two years later, when fourteen years old, he was graduated bachelor of arts. The almost incredible statement is made that, more than once when he had to be absent, the professor of Greek in Heidelberg requested this boy of fourteen years to take his classes. When fifteen years old, he offered himself as a candidate for the master's degree; but the examination was not permitted, solely because of his youth. This refusal led him to enter the University of Tübingen in the autumn of 1512. He enlarged his course of study. To Greek and Latin he added jurisprudence, the higher mathematics, school divinity, and

¹Matthes, *Life of Melanchthon*.

even medicine. It would seem that his mind never employed itself upon a branch of study of which it did not become fond. His affections followed his intellect. If his interest had once been engaged by a study, it was never afterwards lost. Up to the close of his life, and amid all the distractions of the stormy times in which his lot was cast, he found time to extract enjoyment from studies in the higher mathematics. In January, 1514, when not yet seventeen years of age, he was not only admitted to the second degree in the arts, but was given the privileges of a *privat docent*. He thus began his great career as a teacher. He rose to eminence at once; for what less than eminence shall we name that which called from Erasmus, in 1515, a eulogy like the following, written in a letter addressed to Ecolampadius? "Of Melanchthon I have already the highest opinion, and cherish the most magnificent hopes; so much so that I am persuaded Christ designs this youth to excel us all. He will totally eclipse Erasmus." When Erasmus wrote this letter, the boy of eighteen years was not only teaching the classics, but was lecturing publicly on rhetoric, logic, ethics, mathematics, and theology. He found time also to prepare and publish an edition of Terence. During his life at Tübingen, the controversy between Reuchlin and the Dominicans took place over the proposed destruction of the Jewish writings. Reuchlin, as arbitrator in the quarrel between the Jews and the Dominicans, had decided that they should not be destroyed; and the Dominicans sought Reuchlin's excommunication. Melanchthon rushed to the defence of his great-uncle, helped him to obtain his vindication, and rejoiced in his acquittal.

The University of Wittenberg, in electoral Saxony, was founded in 1502. A papal bull sanctioned it. The Emperor Maximilian licensed it. The Elector did all that a royal patron could do to make it a great seat of learning. Martin Luther became a member of its faculty in 1508, and added to his duties as lecturer those of priest and preacher in the church of the city. On All Saints' day, in 1517, Luther made Wittenberg the most famous place in Germany by nailing on the door of his church the theses on grace and indulgences. It was just six months after the theses had been published, and while Germany was full of excitement over

Luther's boldness, that the Elector wrote to Reuchlin asking him to name two or three persons for the same number of chairs in the Wittenberg faculty. For the Greek chair Reuchlin named Melanchthon, and in doing so let the Elector know that in proposing him he was doing the young university a great service. Melanchthon wrote to Reuchlin that he was willing to go where Reuchlin thought best. In July, Reuchlin sent to Melanchthon the Elector's letter, in which the latter promised Melanchthon "his kindness and favor." Reuchlin urged Melanchthon's acceptance, quoting the words, "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee: . . . and I will bless thee, and will make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing." "So," said Reuchlin, "my mind presages; and thus I hope it will be with thee, my Philip, my care, my consolation."

Melanchthon accepted the invitation, and thus became Professor of Greek in Wittenberg, at the age of twenty-one. On the 29th of August, 1518, four days after reaching Wittenberg, he delivered in Latin his inaugural discourse on "The Reformation of the Studies of Youth." It is in part a narrative of the decline of classical studies, after the Gothic uprising and especially after the devastation of Italy by the Lombards, of the retirement of learning to England and Ireland, of the brief but glorious revival under Charlemagne and Alcuin, of the rise of scholastic studies, and of the revival of letters; and in part a plea in behalf of classical studies in view both of their value as disciplines and of their relation to higher studies, above all to theology. "Since theology," said the orator, "is partly Hebrew and partly Greek—for Latin scholars drink only the streams which flow from it—these foreign tongues ought to be mastered, lest we be blockheads when we discuss theology with the theologians. It is in the Greek and the Hebrew that the splendor and fitness of the words reveal themselves. It is there that, like flowers in beds beneath the southern sun, the true and inner meaning of the letter unfolds itself. At present a lot of silly interpretations, analogies, discrepancies and other hindrances drive us away from theological study. But whenever we shall bring our souls to the fountains,

we shall feed on Christ, his will will be clear to us, and we shall be satisfied with the blessed nectar of the divine wisdom." He points out the absolute necessity of the correct interpretation of the Scriptures; and asserts that while recognized evils might be tolerated elsewhere, here there are no *ineptiæ tolerabiles*.¹ Thus he began his work as professor, with the assertion of his sympathy with the friends of the new learning, and of his conviction of its high value and absolute necessity to theology.

When Melanchthon left Tübingen, "the whole city," wrote Simler, "lamented his departure"; and now that the inaugural discourse had been pronounced, all Wittenberg was rejoicing in his accession. Upon no one did the discourse make a profounder impression than upon Luther. "Melanchthon," Luther wrote to Spalatin, and the letter was no doubt intended to be read to the Elector, "Melanchthon delivered four days after his arrival so learned and so terse a discourse, and with such grace, as to call out the admiration of all, so that we no longer wondered why you recommended him to us. We forgot our prejudices and his stature and appearance, and praised and admired the oration itself." Luther at once seized upon Melanchthon, took possession of him, made him at first his ward, and then his teacher, and finally his nearest friend. From Melanchthon's arrival at Wittenberg until Luther died they were united in heart, in aim, and in labor.

How sorely Luther needed at this time a calm, wise, learned, faithful friend will be clear, if we recall his own situation. On the last day of October, in the previous year, he had nailed the theses to the church door and aroused Germany. Tetzel had denounced him. The Dominican general, who was also the Roman censor, had attacked the theses with violence; and Luther in his reply had affirmed his dependence on the canonical Scriptures as the prime and ultimate source of truth. Worse than this and more dangerous, his old friend Eck of Ingolstadt had pointed out the Hussite heresy, "the Bohemian poison," with which the theses were saturated. Luther had undergone the excitement and

¹ "*In aliis nota mala pro bonis ducantur, in hoc negotio diutius citra jacturam ineptire non licet.*"

fatigue of a public disputation at Heidelberg, had written to the Pope and had been summoned before the papal legate. The work and excitement of the past eight months had seriously diminished his strength. He had been ill, was just now despondent and was in the midst of his preparations to meet the Pope's representative. At this juncture Melanchthon came to Wittenberg. Luther was drawn to Melanchthon not more strongly than Melanchthon was drawn to Luther. "If there is any one," wrote Melanchthon, "whom I deeply love, and whom I embrace with my whole heart, it is Martin Luther." "If you will believe me," he says in another letter, "I find Martin a greater and more admirable friend than I can possibly describe. I admire him as one who, when I look at him again, seems still greater than himself. I only wish that you could see from how sincere a heart this eulogy proceeds." To Spalatin, at the court of the Elector, he writes, "Martin seems to me to be inspired. That he may be successful we must use our efforts in prayer. I value his safety higher than my very life, and know of nothing that could happen more disastrous than the loss of him. If you have any influence where you are, see that you preserve from being overwhelmed this man whom I boldly and sincerely place not only above all his contemporaries but above all men of every period, above the Augustins, the Gregories, the Jeromes of all ages."

Wittenberg henceforth, until his death, was Melanchthon's, as it was Luther's, home. They worked in harmony, not only because they were agreed in belief, but because each finely supplemented the other. That Luther's was the more commanding personality, the greater genius, the more profound religious life, the more rapid and more exact insight in all affairs demanding action, is the unanimous verdict of history. Indeed, we may almost say that, had Luther died at any time prior to the Augsburg Diet of 1530, and had the responsibility of leadership been devolved on Melanchthon, the German Reformation would have been, if not an absolute failure, a comparatively narrow, feeble, and temporary movement. How much Melanchthon owed to Luther may be inferred from the conduct of the former in great crises during Luther's absence. I have time to refer to but one instance. It

is Melanchthon's attitude toward the claims of the Zuickan prophets, who infected Wittenberg with their fanaticism, and started Carlstadt upon the movement which almost wrecked the Reformation. Melanchthon conversed with the prophets, and was strongly influenced by them. "I have heard their statements," he writes to the Elector, "and it is astonishing what they relate of themselves: as commissioned from heaven to teach; as having a familiar intercourse with God, and able to foresee future events; in a word, as having the authority of prophets and apostles. How much I am struck with this language it is not easy to say; but, certainly, I see great reason not to despise them; for they have many arguments to adduce, and something of an extraordinary spirit about them." Wittenberg was in a ferment, and Melanchthon confessed that, "for his own part, he could not possibly pronounce upon the merits of the case." The Elector was troubled, for he did not yet dare to permit Luther to leave the Wartburg for Wittenberg. But Luther could write; and there came a letter from Luther to Melanchthon, clear, wise, and decided: "In regard to these prophets, I cannot approve of your timidity, though you are my superior both in capacity and in learning. I would have you examine whether they can produce a proof of their commission; for God never sent any one, not even his own Son, who was not either properly called to the office, or authorized by miracles. So much for their public character. You should also examine their private spirit: whether they have experienced spiritual distress, and conflicts with death and hell, and the power of regeneration. If you hear smooth, tranquil, and what they call devout and religious, raptures, though they speak of being caught up to the third heavens, do not regard them while the sign of the Son of man is wanting—the cross, the only touchstone of Christians, and the sure discoverer of spirits." These two letters bring before us strikingly Melanchthon's defect and Luther's greatness. As a reformer, Melanchthon does not belong to the class to which Martin Luther, Ulrich Zwingli, John Calvin, and John Knox, and no others, belong. His force in the Reformation was not original, but derived. So long as he and Luther labored together, the ultimate aim of their labors, not only as a whole, but consid-

ered severally, was determined by the wise, the sagacious, the heroic Luther. Luther is the great commander. The objective of every battle and the large lines of its conduct are his alone.

How quickly Luther saw and seized upon Melanchthon's special genius, how thoroughly he subordinated it to the purposes of the Reform, how wisely he directed it, with what diplomatic skill he called it out, and turned it to this and that employ, and with what parental affection he cared for him, watching over his health, even selecting (and with uncommon wisdom) a wife for him—the time at my command does not allow me to tell. And never did a really great man more thoroughly enjoy being in leading-strings than Melanchthon enjoyed being led by Martin Luther. No one could have been better aware than himself of his limitations. It is proof of his self-knowledge and quick perception that, without the slightest delay, he accepted Luther as his leader. So far as I know, the relations of the two were never changed. Both of them were made more powerful by these relations, as well as by a mutual affection as tender and as strong as that between David and Jonathan. We shall not understand Melanchthon's services to the Reformation unless we recognize this subordination of Melanchthon to Luther. It is of these services that I must now speak.

Other great services were rendered by Melanchthon to Germany and to the cause of the higher education, on which it were grateful to dwell at length. Living, as we do, in a university town, and in close friendship with a great institution of liberal learning, it is impossible not to remember that we are commemorating a great student and one of the greatest teachers of the humanities. What unexampled fertility in production! As one has said, "New editions of the classics, grammars, glossaries, chronicles, treatises on rhetoric, logic, ethics, and the elements of physical science, attest his unwearied pains." Erasmus was not more cultivated; John Colet was not more enthusiastic in his praise of the *litteræ humaniores*; and in order to come upon a teacher as stimulating and as popular we should have to go back to Abelard. Of his orations, there is thought to be none in which he is more eloquent or enthusiastic than that in which, when in-

augurating a learned academy at Nuremburg, he glorifies the classical revival, and calls upon the citizens of Nuremburg to emulate the greatness of Florence in the day when Florence was "the harbor into which shipwrecked literature was received and secured."

But it is Melanchthon's services to the Reformation that we most appropriately commemorate. Opportunity to begin them was offered soon after he came to Wittenberg. The theses had aroused the enthusiasm of Germany; but they had also awakened among the theologians the most determined opposition. Luther had announced himself ready to defend them against the world; but "the conduct of the war is not always up to the high-sounding phrase of the manifesto." He had easily beaten Tetzels; but it was not so certain that he could maintain himself against Eck, at Leipzig. I cannot dwell on the Leipzig discussion, at the close of which, as always, both sides claimed the victory. Luther was the protagonist; but from first to last Melanchthon was in charge of the literary and theological missiles, and so thorough was his possession of these weapons, that Luther was able to deliver them with a rapidity which prevented defeat, if it did not gain the victory. It was due to Melanchthon that Luther and Carlstadt, if they did not convince the court of Duke George, at least retired with honor. If the anger of one's opponent is to be regarded as a tribute, it was to Melanchthon that Eck awarded the honors of the discussion. So violent a letter did he write about Melanchthon that a new debate between Eck and Melanchthon was begun.

The Leipzig disputation must be regarded as having driven him to the composition of a great work, for which the Reformed as well as the Lutheran churches should be profoundly thankful to God. That discussion made a profound impression on both Luther and Melanchthon, and drove each to characteristic literary labor. It led Luther to write his stirring address to the "German Nobility" and his vigorous tract on the *Babylonish Captivity of the Church*. It led Melanchthon, deeply impressed with the absolute necessity of a positive statement and defence of what we may call the Wittenberg beliefs, to write the *Loci Communes*.

He thus became the author of the earliest Protestant Body of Divinity. In its first form it was published at Wittenberg in 1521. If I must say what I think was Melancthon's greatest service to the great cause to which he had given himself, I know none which is better entitled to this designation than his *System of Theology*, published less than four years after the nailing of the theses. In the lecture-room the *Loci Communes* must be subjected to criticism, and the points at which it seems to us to depart from the teaching of Holy Scripture must be indicated. But to-day it is our high privilege to commemorate without criticism the greatness of the work he did, who thus lifted the Reformation above the level of a negative protest, and gave to it the dignity and the strength which belong to every movement supported by a great and positive system of truth, based on the word of God and the Fathers. "The continuity of Christian thought thus testified to is," as President Warfield has well said, "one of the most important services of Melancthon's life, and it was this which gave the Reformation its hold upon the educated and thoughtful men of Germany."¹

Of course, we must agree with the statement, so often made, that Luther's was the great creative mind. But for the impulse given by Luther, the *Loci Communes* would never have been written. On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that while, "in reference to some single doctrines," and these the most important, as the rule of faith and justification by faith, "Luther had great insight, acuteness, and logical strength," he had not the constructive and systematizing gift. As Dr. Shedd well says, "His power as a theologian did not lie in systematizing, but rather in penetrating and deep views of particular truths. He was inferior to Melancthon and to Calvin in the ability to combine doctrines into a scientific whole."² We have a right, therefore, in estimating the value of the *Loci Communes*, to add to its absolute necessity at the juncture at which it appeared the fact that it was a work for which Luther was unfitted. It required a larger culture, a severer discipline, and a calmer temperament than he possessed.

¹ *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, January, 1897.

² Symposium on Luther, Union Theological Seminary.

It is to be remembered, too, to its praise, that it was the first systematic construction of Christian doctrine for centuries, that rested on, as it sprang directly out of, careful exegetical study. Dr. Farrar goes so far as to say that it is the development of his exegetical lectures on the Epistle to the Romans.

It is easy for those who have not examined them to make light of the great *Summæ Theologiæ* of the mediæval schoolmen; but I do not believe that any candid man can study the greatest of them, that of Thomas Aquinas, without admiration for his logical and constructive genius. That the system which they embody is capable of being synthesized in loftiest literary forms, the *Divine Comedy* is the abundant demonstration. It is when we test them by Holy Scripture, when we note their crudities in exegesis, when we mark the employment of any one of the fourfold senses which the Bible is made to bear, that we sympathize with Erasmus in his attacks upon their *hæccitates* and *quidditates*, and understand how great a boon to the church of God was this first of the scriptural systems of theology produced by the Reformation.

As Melanchthon was the author of the Reformation's first body of divinity, so he wrote the first of its great creeds. The Augsburg *Confession* does not express the faith of united Protestantism. It was composed and presented to the Imperial Diet after the sacramentarian controversy had divided the forces opposed to Rome. But, with the exception of the articles in which it is polemic against the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's supper, it has been signed by Farel and Beza and Calvin. Luther could not be present at the Imperial Diet. The ban which had been put upon him ten years before had not been removed. Upon Melanchthon, therefore, was devolved the duty of formulating the *Confession* and the *Apology of the Protestant Princes*. In the performance of this great and critical duty he rose above himself. Its emphasis of what is positive, its restraint in what is negative and polemical, the dignity of its style, the careful marshalling of the scriptural proofs, and the deep religious feeling which underlies and informs the document, give to this earliest Reformation symbol the first place, on the whole, among the creeds of an era more fruitful in creed-statements than any other in the church's history.

No doubt the substance of the *Confession* can be found in earlier documents, of which Luther was the chief author; but, as Dr. Schaff has well said, "Melanchthon's scholarly and methodical mind freely reproduced and elaborated it into its final shape and form, and his gentle, peaceful spirit breathed into it a moderate, conservative tone." And these, when the circumstances of its promulgation are considered, are qualities of the highest value. The Reformation had gained tremendously since the Diet of Worms; but after the first Diet of Spire, in 1526, when the principle of *cujus regio ejus religio* was announced, the forces in the empire opposed to Protestantism began to organize against the Reformation. A year before the Augsburg Diet, it had been ordered that the Lutheran forward movement cease, and that the *status quo* be maintained. The protest of the Lutherans had been offered, and now, in the face of a Diet overwhelmingly Roman, the Protestants were summoned to define their faith. It needed a calm temper, a discriminating mind, and a fine and firm hand, to compose a document which would be true to truth, on the one hand, and would give no occasion to frenzy, on the other. And it was the composition of just such a document that Melanchthon achieved in the Augsburg *Confession*. "The Romanists," says d'Aubigné, "expected nothing like it. Instead of a hateful controversy, they heard a striking confession of Jesus Christ." It united the German Protestants, and it divided the forces of Rome. We need not wonder that a document with such a passage in its history should be deeply venerated by the great communion out of which it sprang, and that the cry, "Back to the unchanged Augsburg *Confession*!" should rally so many of its ablest theologians.

The relation of Melanchthon to the translation of the Scriptures into German was intimate and important. He was Luther's closest and most highly valued coadjutor. He was Luther's preceptor in both Hebrew and Greek. To Luther is due the great literary merit of the translation, especially the qualities which make it the book of the German people. To him German scholars, doubtless with justice, attribute the high service of giving firmness and consistency to their tongue through this priceless version. But though, in all this work, Melanchthon is in the background, the

support and the encouragement which he gave to Luther at its inception, and through all the work until its completion, entitle him to be remembered, next to Luther himself, as the man who gave to Germany in her own tongue the Holy Scriptures.

I cannot speak of Melanchthon's Commentaries except at second hand. It must be said that modern commentators do not quote him with the frequency or mention him with the respect with which, for example, they quote or mention Chrysostom among the Fathers, or John Calvin among the Reformers. Dean Farrar, in his *History of Interpretation*, devotes to him only two or three lines. Perhaps, as Dean Farrar thinks, his dogmatic views too thoroughly dominated him as an interpreter. Perhaps his labors were too various to enable him to give sufficient reflection to the work. Haste—and haste to Melanchthon was a necessity—must greatly mar the work of the exegete. Close study, where so many things must be considered and compared, is not more needed than prolonged reflection. Perhaps, with all his other gifts, he lacked the peculiar genius of the exegete. Perhaps he began to publish too early, at a time, when, though his powers of acquisition were exceptional, his judgment was not matured. But whatever is thought of his Commentaries to-day, Luther valued them most highly; and they did a great work for the Reformation. Melanchthon's *Romans* Luther recommended as a textbook for all students.

But the greatest of the special services Melanchthon rendered to the Reformation I take to have been his daily lectures in the University. His great learning, his various culture, his engaging personality, his lucid speech, his deep religious life, his fine simplicity of character, made him through all his life the most popular of teachers. He lectured often to fifteen hundred or two thousand educated men, and on the highest themes. He was the most learned German of his day, he employed his learning to advance the cause of the evangelical faith. His works are published in twenty-eight quarto volumes;¹ and the works of no man are more thoroughly unified by a single purpose, or more thoroughly pervaded by the same abiding spirit. When I think of

¹ *Corpus Reformatorum.*

him, day after day for more than forty years, directing, inspiring, informing, edifying these educated minds, from the principalities of Germany, from the Cantons of Switzerland, from France and from Great Britain; when I add to these daily lectures the thousands of letters, in which he cheered and informed and consoled the minds of those whom he had taught, I do not wonder that he gained the high title of Preceptor of Germany. I only wonder whether we have the right to say that even Luther's influence was greater than was his.

Even if I had the time to do so, I am in no mood to-day to dwell upon his weaknesses and mistakes. There were times when he came, to say the least, perilously near to yielding truth in the interest of a merely external unity. Certainly I could not defend the Leipzig Interim. But even his failings leaned to virtue's side. Greatly as it is to be deplored, in his case at least, it must be said that the tendency to compromise sprang, not from lack of belief in the value of the truth, but from love of the whole body of Christ.

But the man was greater than his activities. Those who were brought into personal contact with him were more profoundly impressed by his goodness than by his learning. The Christianity he taught he lived; and in its faith he died. His trust in his Redeemer never faltered through the painful and prolonged sickness by which he was brought to the grave. It is interesting to learn that the words which during his illness he repeated oftenest were the words: "Being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Just before he died he gave expression to his confidence that, through the merits of his Lord, he would be admitted to heaven.

How often, on occasions like the one by which we are assembled, have been repeated the eloquent words of Pericles, in the great funeral oration at Athens: "The whole earth is the sepulchre of famous men. Not only are they commemorated by columns and inscriptions in their own country, but in foreign lands there dwells also an unwritten memorial of them, graven not on stone but in the hearts of men." Never were they more appropriately repeated than now. Graven deep in the hearts of men,

the world over, is the name of Philip Melanchthon. It stands a symbol for simplicity and godly sincerity, for faith in the word of God, for brotherly kindness and charity, for learning consecrated to the service of the highest truth. But a higher name is his to-day: "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out; and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God which is New Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God; and I will write upon him my new name."

JOHN DEWITT.

Princeton.

II. MARIOLATRY.

PAUL's spirit was painfully excited at seeing Athens full of idols. Moved by the same zeal for the honor of Christ and the same pity for duped souls, the Christian of to-day is filled with like sadness and indignation at seeing the Romish Church, which claims to be the sole repository and dispenser of grace, wholly given to idolatry, changing the truth of God into a lie, and worshipping the creature more than the Creator.

Her supreme idol is the mother of Jesus. Not merely "by the space of two hours" (Acts xix. 34), but incessantly, day and night, the world over, her refrain is: "Great is Mary; great is Mary, the mother of God." Several days in the year and the whole month of May have been set apart to do her special honor, to praise the beauty of her person, to extol her virtues, to magnify her power, to invoke her intercession, to give thanks for her protection, and to vow fealty in her service. Images of Mary, in gold, silver, bronze, plaster or wood, abound in churches, schools, convents, hospitals, asylums and private dwellings, and are bowed down to and worshipped. She is exalted, not to heavenly places in Christ, but, by virtue of her own sinlessness and merit, to the highest place in heaven itself, with the Father and the Son on either side, whom she commands to grant the petitions which ascend to her.

If glorified saints are cognizant of what takes place on earth, and are affected by it as they would certainly be were they still in the flesh, Mary, though in heaven, must be unutterably unhappy because of this idolatry, which not only makes her worthiness the ground of the sinner's acceptance and the plea of prevailing prayer, but ascribes to her the perfections of deity, and invests her with the gracious sovereignty of Almighty God.

Rome, "full of all subtlety and all mischief" (Acts xiii. 10), confounds and catches the ignorant and unwary by making a distinction in the kinds or degrees of worship. That which is offered to relics, images and ordinary saints, she calls *dulia*, a sort of pious

honor; that addressed to Mary, *hyperdulia*, profound reverence; that to the persons of the Trinity, *latria*, the worship with which none but God may be approached. That this is a distinction without a difference must be admitted, when one can see, even in this country, hundreds of Romanists on bended knees before a little image, with the same semblance of devotion and grateful affection and implicit trust that the cleansed leper exhibited at the feet of the Lord Jesus. More than this, it is a distinction that is ignored, not only in fact, but also in the authoritative teaching of the Romish Church. For example, one of the most eminent of her theologians, Thomas Aquinas, who has been elevated to saintship, says: "A cross of any material ought to be worshipped with *latria*, because not only the cross upon which Jesus Christ hung is worthy of that worship, for the reason that it touched Christ, but also because it is a cross, *i. e.*, a sign and image of Christ hanging on the cross." Another distinguished doctor of theology wrote: "Those things which by contact with our Lord partook of his holiness, as the cross, nails, spear, thorns, etc., are to be adored with *latria*." Accordingly, the Breviary, which is the manual of daily devotion, and the use of which is obligatory on every priest, prescribes the following prayer for the fourteenth of September: "O Cross, more splendid than the stars, illustrious throughout the world, much beloved by men, more holy than all things, who alone wast worthy to bear the treasure of the world, bearing sweet wood, sweet nails, a sweet burden, save the multitude assembled this day in thy praise." And as with the cross, so with the image of our Lord. The same writer already quoted, Thomas Aquinas, says: "Since Christ is to be adored with the worship of *latria*, the consequence is that his image is to be adored with the worship of *latria*."

The claim that the worship offered to Mary is only *hyperdulia* is bald pretence. If "those senseless material things, the cross, nails, spear, thorns, etc., which, by contact with our Lord, partook of his holiness, are therefore to be adored with *latria*," surely she, in whose womb he was conceived, at whose breasts he was nourished, in whose arms he nestled, and who was in "contact" with him times without number during his life of thirty-three years, is,

by the same reasoning, entitled to, and receives, the highest form of worship, precisely that which is paid to the persons of the Trinity, only, in addition, it nauseates by its sickly sentimentality and shocks by its studied blasphemy.

The heathen Chinaman uses a rosary, or string of beads, to aid him in his devotions. On this he counts his prayers. As he passes each bead between his thumb and finger, he pronounces the name of his god, "Oma-da-voo," repeating it until he gets to the end of the string. This is his prayer. The Romanist, also, from the pope down to the baptized savage, says his prayers with the help of a string of beads, which is called the "rosary of the Blessed Virgin," because most of the prayers counted off by means of it are addressed to her. It may be seen dangling ostentatiously from the girdle of the "sisters" who are ever begging in our markets, places of business, and from house to house, and most successfully from gullible Protestants. It consists of one hundred and sixty-five beads, fifteen of which are larger than the others, and are placed upon the string so as to divide the smaller ones into blocks of ten. After kissing the attached crucifix, and making the sign of the cross on his face and breast, the worshipper recites the Apostles' Creed, the "Gloria," and the Lord's Prayer, and then repeats the following ten times, with each repetition grasping one of the smaller beads:

"Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary, mother of God, pray for us sinners, now and at the hour of our death. Amen."

This brings him to the next of the larger beads, when he recites again the "Gloria" and "Our Father," and then repeats ten "Hail Marys." So the performance goes on, ten "Hail Marys" succeeding one "Gloria" and "Our Father," until he, too, like the "heathen Chinee," gets to the end of his string, when he will have repeated the Lord's Prayer fifteen times, and the prayer to Mary one hundred and fifty times; that is, in this religious exercise, the creature is worshipped tenfold more than the Creator; and it is simply absurd to pretend that this worship is on the zig-zag order, by which the devotee first offers *latria* to God, and then drops down to *hyperdulia* to Mary, and repeats this marvellous spiritual gymnastics until the beads are all counted.

When two or more persons repeat the rosary together, one recites the first half of the prayer, and the others respond with the second. The first half will be recognized as composed of the salutation of Gabriel and of Elizabeth to Mary, except that the angel's words, "highly favored," are perverted into ascribing to Mary "fulness of grace." What this means may be learned from a work entitled *Real Principles of Catholics*, written by a bishop and approved by bishops, among others, by the late Bishop Kenrick, of Philadelphia. In reply to the question, "Why is Mary said to be full of grace?" the answer is given as follows:

"By grace are understood all supernatural gifts which made her acceptable to God and preferable to all other creatures; and this is expressed by fulness; . . . but most especially the fulness of grace consists in the particularity of graces, viz., she was not only *sanctified in her mother's womb*, as some few others had been, *but was exempt from the guilt of original sin*, and, as a consequence of that, from concupiscence of the flesh, and never was guilty of the least sin. Besides, she possessed all divine gifts in the most eminent degree, viz., faith, hope, charity, humility, obedience, chastity, with all the moral virtues," etc.

The second half of the "Hail Mary" is entirely of man's concocting, and is pure blasphemy, in that it makes Mary, not only a mediator, but the mother of God. "There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." (Eph. ii. 5.) "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." (1 John ii. 1.) "Through him we have access by the Spirit unto the Father." (Eph. ii. 18.) "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." (John xiv. 6.) "He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." (Heb. vii. 25.) "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." (John i. 1, 3, 14.) It was this "flesh," the human body of our Lord, not his eternal Godhead, of which Mary was the mother.

Furthermore, the Romish Church attaches expiatory virtue to the prayer, "Hail, Mary." The repetition of it so many times is often assigned as a penance, the performance of which is the condition on which pardon of sin hangs. The absolution granted by

the priest to the confessing penitent becomes effective only on the rendering of "satisfaction" by the latter, which "satisfaction" is the reciting of a prayer a prescribed number of times, or the performance of some other "penance."

Similar repetition of the "Hail Mary" accrues merit to the reciter, which is put to his credit, or to that of some departed soul whom he wishes to serve, and the effect of which is to shorten the stay of himself or of that other soul in the dismal mythical place of purifying torment called "purgatory."

Additional proof that the highest form of worship is offered to Mary is found in Deharbe's *Catechism*, page 132:

"Hail, Holy Queen, Mother of Mercy, our Life, our Sweetness, and our Hope! To thee do we cry, poor banished sons of Eve; to thee do we send up our sighs, mourning, and weeping in this valley of tears. Turn, then, most gracious Advocate, thine eyes of mercy toward us, and, after this our exile, show unto us the blessed fruit of thy womb, Jesus, O clement, O loving, O sweet Virgin Mary." And page 135: "O Mary, my Queen and my Mother, I offer myself entirely to thee, and, in order to prove myself devoted to thee, I consecrate to thee this day my sight, my hearing, my speech, my heart, my whole being. Since, therefore, I am thine, O good Mother, preserve and defend me as thy property and possession."

The above may be found also in *The Christian's Guide to Heaven; a Manual for Catholics*, published some years ago by a Catholic bookseller in Baltimore, and under the sanction of the then archbishop in that city. From the same book, I quote:

"O Blessed Virgin, I come to offer thee my most humble homage, and to implore the aid of thy prayers and protection. Thou art all-powerful with the Almighty. Thou knowest that from my tender years I looked up to thee as my mother, my advocate, and patroness. Thou wert pleased to consider me from that time as one of thy children. I will henceforth serve, honor, and love thee. Accept my protestation of fidelity; look favorably on the confidence I have in thee; obtain for me, of thy dear Son, a lively faith, a firm hope, a tender, generous and constant love, that I may experience the power of thy protection at my death."

An archbishop of Florence, commenting on the words of Paul, says: "'Come boldly to the throne of grace.' Mary is the throne of grace; to her let us, therefore, come with boldness, that we may obtain mercy and grace in the time of need." Another commentator, Biel, declares: "The name of Mary, to us, affords a sweeter taste than that of her Son." In 1832 Pope Gregory exhorted

thus: "Let us raise our eyes to the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, who alone destroys heresies, who is our greatest hope, yea, the entire ground of our hope." Archbishop Gibbons, in his *Faith of our Fathers*, page 221, says:

"I find Jesus and Mary together at the manger, together in Egypt, together in Nazareth, together in the temple, together at the cross. I find their names side by side in the Apostles' and the Nicene Creed. It is fitting that they should both find a place in my heart, and that both names should flow successively from my lips. Inseparable in life and death, they should not be divorced in prayer. What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."

In the *New Raccolta*, a Catholic prayer-book approved by Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ryan, the following, known as St. Alphonsus Liguori's prayer, is found on page 285:

"Most holy and immaculate Virgin! O my mother! the queen of the world, the advocate, hope, and refuge of sinners! I, the most wretched among them, now come to thee. I worship thee, great queen, and give thee thanks for the many favors thou hast bestowed on me in the past; most of all do I thank thee for having saved me from hell, which I had so often deserved. I love thee, lady, most worthy of all love, and, by the love which I bear thee, I promise in the future ever to serve thee, and to do what in me lies to win others to thy love. In thee I put all my trust, all my hope of salvation. Receive me as thy servant, and cover me with the mantle of thy protection, thou who art the mother of mercy! And since thou hast so much power with God, deliver me from all temptations, or at least obtain for me the grace ever to overcome them. From thee I ask a true love of Jesus Christ, and the grace of a happy death. And, my mother! by thy love for God, I beseech thee to be at all times my helper, but, above all, at the last moment of my life. Leave me not until you see me safe in heaven, there for endless ages to bless thee, and sing thy praises. Amen."

The late Pope Pius IX. granted three hundred days' indulgence for each repetition of the foregoing prayer. That is, the utterance of the prayer would shorten the utterer's sojourn in purgatory by almost a year, and it is easy to calculate that a glib tongue could rattle off, in a few hours, sufficient repetitions of the prayer to "dock" his time in purgatory at least a thousand years, perhaps to secure his release altogether, though "the church" is conveniently unable to say how long one must stay there, or when one has been sufficiently purified by its fiery discipline to be set free.

Every prayer-book for priest and layman has a form called the Litany of the Blessed Virgin. It consists of senseless, ridiculous, most extravagant ascriptions to Mary, after each of which the person says: "Pray for us." Here are specimens: "Holy Mary: Pray for us."

“Holy Mother of God: Pray for us.” “Mother of Divine Grace: Pray for us.” “Mother undefiled,” “Mother unviolated,” “Mother most admirable,” “Mother of our Creator,” “Virgin most venerable,” “Virgin most powerful,” “Mirror of Justice,” “Seat of Wisdom,” “Spiritual Vessel,” “Vessel of Singular Devotion,” “Mystical Rose,” “Tower of David,” “Tower of Ivory,” “House of Gold,” “Ark of the Covenant,” “Gate of Heaven,” “Morning Star,” “Refuge of Sinners,” “Queen of Angels,” “Queen of Patriarchs,” “Queen of Apostles: Pray for us.”

A very popular prayer-book is entitled the *Glories of Mary*. It was approved by the late Bishop Hughes, of New York. I quote from the edition of 1891: “God has ordained that all graces should come to us through the hands of Mary.” “In every danger we may obtain salvation through the glorious Virgin.” “To honor the Queen of Angels is to acquire everlasting life.” “All graces are dispensed by the hand of Mary alone.” “All angels and men, all things that are in heaven and on the earth, are also subject to the dominion of the glorious Virgin.” “Let sinners who have lost grace flee to Mary; with her they will certainly find it. Therefore she is ordained to be the mediatrix of peace between the sinner and God.” “Sinners receive pardon only through the intercession of Mary.” “The soul cannot live without having recourse and commending itself to Mary.” “He falls and is lost who does not flee to Mary.” “The Virgin has all power in heaven and on earth.” “Omnipotent to save sinners.” “Mary is always before the divine tribunal to mitigate the sentence and punishment due to the sinner.”

Dr. Oswald, a German Catholic theologian, asserts:

“We maintain the co-presence of Mary in the Eucharist. This co-presence is a consequence of our Marian theory, and we must not shrink from any consequence. We believe that in the elements of the Eucharist the presence of Mary is complete; that she exists there entirely, body and soul. . . . We must familiarize ourselves with the idea of a mutual and permanent inter-penetration of the body of Christ with the body of the Virgin, and at the same place, that is, in the holy elements.”

This blasphemy is capped by Cardinal Bonaventura, who was canonized by Pope Sixtus IV., and his works published by order of a succeeding pope, by whom he was called the Seraphic Doctor.

Bonaventura adapted the Psalms to the worship of Mary by substituting her name for that of Jehovah, and her title of Lady for Lord. Thus: "In thee, O Lady, do I put my trust. Let me never be confounded." "Let our Lady arise: let her enemies be scattered." "O come, and let us sing unto our Lady, and make a joyful noise unto the Queen of our salvation." "The Lord said unto my Lady, sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." "Praise our Lady of heaven, glorify her in the highest. Praise her, all ye men and cattle." "Let everything that hath breath praise our Lady."

Let us now see what foundation there is for this huge, grotesque structure of deceit and blasphemy. A priest in the city of New York, who has made quite a fortune by exhibiting for the adoration of the "faithful" what he avers to be a piece of the arm bone of the mother of Mary, but which those who have examined it pronounce a chicken bone, congratulates himself and his parishioners that they are so favored as to possess a portion of the body of the "grandmother of God." There is nothing true about this but its impious roguery. Who was Mary? Who were her parents? Where was she born? How long did she live? Where did she die? Where was she buried? Nobody knows. Her name occurs five times in Matthew (Matt. i. 16, 18, 20; ii. 11; xiii. 55), once in Mark (Mark vi. 3), twelve times in Luke (Luke i. 27, 30, 34, 38, 39, 41, 46, 56; ii. 5, 16, 19, 34), not at all in John, once in the Acts (Acts i. 14), and nowhere else in the New Testament. Besides, she is referred to without mention of her name, six times in Matthew (Matt. ii. 13, 14, 20, 21; xii. 46, 47), twice in Mark (Mark iii. 31, 32), seven times in Luke (Luke i. 43; ii. 33, 43, 48, 51; viii. 19, 20), and nine times in John (John ii. 1, 3, 5, 12; vi. 42; xix. 25, 26, 27). The reader is earnestly asked to turn to these passages of Scripture. He will find that there is nothing in them that distinguishes Mary, except the fact that she was honored to be the mother of Jesus of Nazareth. They record the message of Gabriel to her; her visit to Elizabeth; the removal of Joseph's hesitancy to take her to wife; the birth of the child in Bethlehem; the visit of the shepherds and the wise men to the new-born babe; the prayer of Simeon in the temple

and his words to Mary; the flight to, and return from, Egypt; the dwelling in Galilee; the going up to Jerusalem at the pass-over, when the lad remained behind; the miracle at the marriage in Cana; the interruption of his discourse by the announcement that his mother and brethren wished to speak to him; the wonderment of his neighbors who knew him as the carpenter's son; her presence at the crucifixion; our Lord's committing her to the care of John; and John's taking her to his home. This, I believe, is an accurate summary of the little that is said about her.

It is significant that the message of the angel to the shepherds was exclusively concerning the babe, and that, on their return from the manger, "they made known the saying that was told them concerning the child." It is significant that Simeon and Anna in the temple spoke of Jesus only, except that Simeon forewarned Mary of the anguish in store for her. It is significant that when the wise men saw the young child with his mother they worshipped him, not her, and offered gifts to him, not to her. It is significant that John, to whose filial care the dying Jesus committed her, never mentions her name, but merely refers to her as suggesting the lack of wine at the Cana marriage, as going down to Capernaum, as well known as the mother of Jesus and the wife of Joseph, as present at the crucifixion and as going thence to be a member of his household. This is absolutely all that the beloved disciple has to say about his precious charge.

Surely, if God meant Mary to be the queen of heaven, the tower of ivory, the house of gold, the refuge of sinners, the throne of grace, the entire ground of our hope and the dispenser of salvation, the Holy Spirit would have used her foster-son to give us some intimation of it. But from the time he took her to his own home she is wholly lost sight of, except Luke's incidental mention (Acts i. 14), that she with the other women and our Lord's brethren continued with the rest of the disciples in prayer and supplication.

It is significant that she is not mentioned as being at the sepulchre, and that the risen Jesus sent no message to her, except as she was included among the brethren. It is significant that during his sojourn on earth after his resurrection he did not single

her out for special personal interview, neither by act or word distinguished her above others, nor intimated that, either here or hereafter, she was to have any præminence. It is significant that his answer to her at the Cana marriage, "Woman, what have I to with thee?" and in the temple, when he discoursed with the doctors of the law, "How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" implied that she was not a participant in that "business," and that her earthly relation to him must be held subordinate to the mission that brought him into the world. It is significant that the exclamation, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou has sucked," elicited the rejoinder, "Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it," and that when his mother and brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him, he said: "My mother and my brethren are these which hear the word of God and do it."

It is significant that in none of the epistles is her name mentioned or the slightest reference made to her. The expression (Gal. iv. 4), "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman," means no more than that the Son took upon him human nature, and the omission to particularize the woman who gave him birth, when it might so naturally have been done, is the strongest presumption against Rome's impious exaggeration of the worthiness and power of the mother of Jesus. It is not conceivable that, if Mary is entitled to deification, the Holy Spirit would have neglected to move Paul, and Peter, and James, and John, and Jude to include this in their instructions to the believers in that day and in all time.

It is significant that in her praiseful response to Elisabeth's salutation, "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour" (Luke i. 46, 47), Mary confesses that she is a sinner, acknowledges her need of a Saviour, and rejoices in her Redeemer.

The foregoing testimony of Scripture is very contrary to the teachings of the Romish church, which is boldly set forth by a painting in St. Peter's Cathedral at Rome, an exact copy of which the New York *Churchman* caused to be made and gave to its readers a year or so ago. The Virgin is represented in heaven

with God the Father on her left, God the Son on her right, and God the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove above her. She is the most prominent person in the quaternity, and stands upon a serpent, as overcoming evil, while the world is under her feet. A similar picture has been seen in the Jesuit College, at Georgetown, D. C. One of the figures is an aged man, intended to represent God the Father, another is a young man, intended to represent God the Son. These two are in the act of placing a crown on the head of a female, intended to represent the mother of God, while above them all is the figure of a dove, intended to represent the Holy Spirit. This explanation of the picture was given by a priest in the College.

Further proof that Rome is wholly given to idolatry, that she is the church of Mary, not of Jesus, is furnished by the dogma of the immaculate conception of the Virgin. These are the words in which the dogma was promulgated by the late Pope Pius IX.:

“We declare, pronounce, and define, that the doctrine which holds that the Blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instant of her conception, by a singular privilege and grace of the omnipotent God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and, therefore, is to be firmly and constantly believed by the faithful. Wherefore should any presume, which God avert, to think in their heart otherwise than has been defined by us, let them know and, moreover, understand that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have made shipwreck as regards the faith, and have fallen away from the unity of the church.”

Of course, there was no “revelation” in the case. Pius, during his exile from Rome, had a dream, so he said, in which Mary appeared to him and commanded that, when permitted to return to that city, he should declare her to have been conceived free from sin. Until then, it had not been a doctrine of the church, but merely an opinion on which the clergy and people were much divided. Pius, however, took the matter in his own hands and settled the question; and though preceding popes had forbidden those who denied Mary’s immaculate conception to be charged with heresy, he declared it an article of faith, and anathematized all who should reject it. The doctrine is simply a pious fraud to make surer and more intense the devotion of the faithful to the omnipotent Queen of Heaven. Had Mary been without taint of

original sin, she would have been exempt from the requirements which the Levitical law imposed on all women of Israel after childbirth; but we see that in her ceremonial uncleanness, symbolical of spiritual defilement, she brought a pair of turtle-doves or two young pigeons—the one for a burnt-offering, the other for a sin-offering, that the priest might make an atonement for her.

This tricky pretence of Mary's immaculate conception is in the face of the unvarying law which reigns over all the descendants of Adam by ordinary generation, and which was recited by our Lord himself: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." Moreover, it both robs our Lord of the glory of his humiliation, in that he made himself of no reputation but stooped to our low estate, and takes away from us the ground of unspeakable comfort and bold confidence, in that not only it behooved him to be made like unto us, but that he condescended to be born of a woman whose first father brought sin and misery and death into the world, and some of whose succeeding ancestors were guilty of lying, adultery, incest, and murder. It is noteworthy that in Matthew's genealogy of the Saviour only three women are named, Tamar, Rahab, and Bathsheba, all of them of bad repute. "This," says Poole, "was one degree of our Lord's humiliation, and it was no way incongruous that he who came into the world to die for great sinners should be born of some that were such."

By solemn act of the sixth council of bishops at Baltimore, "the Blessed Virgin Mary, conceived without sin, was chosen as the patroness of the United States." And, the world over, "Great is Mary! Great is Mary, the Mother of God!" is the refrain of the Romish Church. But, as already said, if glorified saints are cognizant of what takes place on earth, and are affected by it as they would certainly be were they still in the flesh, the humble woman whom we with angels and men call blessed, because God chose her to incarnate his Son, must be unutterably unhappy even in heaven, at the idolatry which not only makes her merit the ground of the sinner's acceptance and the plea of prevailing prayer, but ascribes to her the perfections of deity and invests her with the gracious sovereignty of Almighty God.

ROBERT P. FARRIS.

St. Louis.

III. POPE LEO XIII. ON THE VALIDITY OF ANGLICAN ORDERS.

It is now several months since the Pope gave his answer to certain high churchmen in the Anglican communion who asked him whether he could recognize the validity of Anglican orders. We trust, however, that sufficient interest in the subject lingers in the minds of our readers to justify our inviting their attention to some reflections growing out of it. Of course, the validity of Anglican orders is not a matter of any practical importance to dissenters. If they are valid, we gain nothing, as we obstinately refuse to avail ourselves of the benefit which their validity is supposed to confer. If they are not valid, we lose nothing. We can look, therefore, at question and answer from a purely disinterested standpoint. In fact, we have never known a question asked in which we felt less personal concern; nor have we ever known an answer to a question that had less influence on our judgment. Had our Anglican friends asked the Pope that famous question with which the minds of the mediæval schoolmen wrestled, "How many angels can stand on the point of a needle?" it would have come as close "home to our business and bosoms" as the question touching the validity of their orders; and the Pope's answer to this angelic problem would have carried the same weight of conviction. Let no one suppose that we should have been mightily tempted to enter the Anglican fold had the Pope's answer been different; and let not our Episcopal friends think that our confidence in the validity of their orders has been in the slightest degree impaired by the Pope's unfavorable response. What we propose to say grows out of a merely curious or speculative interest.

THE MOTIVE OF THE QUESTION.

Why did Lord Halifax and his company go to the Pope with such a question?

1. They had much staked on it. Cardinal Vaughn, speaking

of them, says: "This minority holds, in common with ourselves, that the divine founder of Christianity established his religion as a sacramental and sacrificial system, absolutely dependent upon a sacerdotal order, instituted by Christ himself. Its earnest and devout members believe, with us, that the supernatural life of the soul is created, nourished and perfected through the sacraments; and that the priests administering them possess miraculous powers whereby they daily offer the true sacrifice of Jesus Christ upon the altar, forgive the sins of men, and teach the truths of salvation with divine authority. This priesthood is nothing less than the priesthood of Jesus Christ." No doubt the Cardinal has stated accurately the religious views of those who asked for the Pope's judgment on the validity of Anglican orders. They are those who have departed, both in heart and practice, from the Protestant faith. The question with them is not a question as to whether the bishops and priests of the Anglican Church have derived authority by uninterrupted succession from the apostles to preach the word, administer the sacraments, and exercise discipline. It is altogether a different question. Have the bishops and priests of the Anglican Church succeeded to the apostolic right to offer up Jesus Christ as an expiatory and propitiatory sacrifice, and on the ground of this sacrifice forgive the sins of those who come to the confessional? Do the bishops and priests of the Anglican Church possess the miraculous power to change the bread and wine of the sacrament into the body and blood of Jesus Christ? Are they really and truly priests, *sacerdotes*? Are they performing the vital priestly functions of expiating sin, propitiating God by offering atoning sacrifices, and do they actually forgive sins in pronouncing sentence of absolution? According to the views of those who are asking as to the validity of their orders, unless they are discharging these genuine offices of priesthood they are incurring great sin, the sin of Nadab and Abihu, and are fatally deluding the souls of those to whom they minister. Nothing, then, can be a matter of graver concern to these believers in Romish salvation who still worship in the Anglican Church than to know whether their worship is true and saving, or false and delusive. "How shocking," says Cardinal Vaughn, "to adore

as very God elements that are but bread and wine, and to bend down after auricular confession in order to receive a mere human and useless absolution!" Believing as they do that the supernatural life of the soul can only be "created, nourished and perfected through the sacraments," and that the sacraments are effective to this end only when administered by priests of Christ's appointment, the question is viewed by them as involving the highest interests of the soul. It is a question of life or death, heaven or hell.

2. Their question implies doubt. They only believe, they do not know, that their line of bishops extends in unbroken succession back to the apostles. Their belief is timid and tremulous. They cannot avow it with the confidence of a certain writer who says: "I suppose it cannot bear any dispute, but that it is now more easily proved that the Archbishop of Canterbury was canonically ordained than that any person now living is the son of him who is called his father; and that the same might have been said of any archbishop or bishop that ever sat in that or any other Episcopal see." It is an old saying that "it is a wise child who knows his own father." According to the *dictum* of the foregoing writer it is not necessary that one be so wise in order to know the truth of apostolic succession. We are willing to concede as much. Indeed, we should not object to conceding that the less wise one is the more certainly he knows apostolic succession to be true.

It is noticeable that the higher the churchism, the more important the validity of orders becomes. At a certain height of churchly pretentiousness, it is deemed a matter of very great importance, because only those in the line of apostolic succession can properly administer the sacraments; and, therefore, only those who enjoy their ministrations can be sure of the "covenanted mercies of God." But they do not believe that saving grace is so restricted to the sacraments thus administered as that no one can possibly be saved without them. Honest and sincere, though misguided, souls may be saved by the "uncovenanted mercies of God." Those who have attained to this height insist strongly on apostolic succession, and lay great emphasis on the validity of Anglican orders. These are they who have no doubts, who are able to

say to dissenters: "You are no church, because you have no valid ministry. We can have nothing to do with you until you acknowledge your fatal defect, and accept our historic episcopate." When they grow higher still, and come to believe that all spiritual life is dependent on the sacraments, and that the sacraments are dependent on the validity of orders, then their tone is not so confident. When the conviction is reached that the soul's salvation is bound up inseparably with the validity of orders, then the degree of certainty that satisfied before does not satisfy now. Mr. Gladstone, by a strange process of mathematics, demonstrates that the chances for the true consecration of any given bishop are eight thousand to one. "Be it so," says Macaulay, "this only diminishes the probability that in any given case the suspicion of invalidity is unfounded. According to this theory, no man in the Anglican communion has a right to say that he is commissioned to preach the gospel, but only that he has seven thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine eight-thousandths parts of certainty that he is!" Mr. Gladstone is not seriously disturbed by the probability that one out of eight thousand priests is performing his functions without divine commission. He does not think that his soul is imperilled by the want of absolute certainty. But let a person once seriously entertain the horrible suspicion that if the priest at whose hands he is receiving the sacraments is not in the line of apostolic succession, then his own hopes of heaven are delusive, and he begins to look with frightened face toward Rome. Lord Halifax and those who joined with him in seriously propounding this question to the Pope thereby seriously confessed their doubts as to the validity of Anglican orders.

3. Why did they apply to the Pope? Did they recognize him as the most learned man in the world, and, by reason of his greater learning, more capable of giving a trustworthy answer? Manifestly not. They applied to him because, in their heart of hearts, they believe in his asserted prerogatives, they bow down to his ghostly authority. If it were a matter to be settled by historical investigation, they were as capable of settling it as the Pope. Whatever facts bear on the question are as accessible to others as to Leo XIII. They admit that, after the most careful investiga-

tion of history, and the most careful study of all obtainable facts, and the most ardent desire to believe in the validity of their orders, the question is still in doubt. In such a case there is only one resort, and that is to a supernatural source of information. For this reason they resort to the successor of Peter, Pope Leo XIII., the vicegerent of Christ, who is evidently supposed by them to speak on this vital subject with infallible authority. They doubtless believe with Cardinal Vaughan, that "the pope is the chief guardian of the sacraments, and he is a debtor to God and to souls for the due discharge of his supreme office as judge in these matters." The Pope does not need to investigate history, does not need to worry his mind with facts. He has but to consult his feelings and what he conceives to be to the interests of the papacy, and, without further ado, he is prepared to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth!

This question did not emanate from the whole Anglican Church. Only a minority, it is to be hoped a small minority, are responsible for it. We are naturally curious to know how the majority regard their act. It must not be particularly agreeable to have a party in their church, a party respectable in numbers and influence, asking the Pope of Rome whether or not he regards the Anglican Church a true church, or a schismatical body destitute of ministers and means of grace. Remember they have asked this question in a voice loud enough for all the civilized world to hear; and the civilized world has been sufficiently interested to give ear both to question and answer. Suppose that a presbytery in Scotland should seriously and solemnly, for the peace of its own conscience, propound such a question to the Pope touching the Church of Scotland? Would not the other presbyteries and synods rise up and rebuke it with indignant protest? Surely they could not easily bear that any respectable body in their church should gravely submit to a wily old Italian priest, on the banks of the Tiber, the question as to whether they had a right to regard themselves as members of a true church of Christ. But how absurd the idea that any high dignitaries in a Presbyterian Church should ever so far forget the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free as to ask permission of a trembling old fraud to claim an interest in the grace of

God. It almost sets one's teeth on edge to entertain for one moment the bitter thought of a truly Protestant church cringing again at the feet of the Pope. But we hear no protests from the majority in the Anglican Church. Some of them may have felt indifferent, but there is reason to think that many were profoundly interested, and would have been gratified if the Pope had given a different answer. Now, would there be any impropriety in the other churches of Christendom suggesting to the Anglican Church to withdraw its proposals of union until its members settle among themselves whether they have any church? It will be remembered that the Anglican Church has strongly insisted that validity of orders, based on apostolic succession, is essential to the existence of a church. Is it not asking too much that other churches should surrender their organizations to join a church, many of whose own members are in painful doubt as to whether it is a church? They have examined with anxious diligence the foundations on which it rests, and have in this most public manner expressed their apprehensions. They practically say that the testimony of facts is not satisfactory.

THE MOTIVE OF THE ANSWER.

Why did Leo XIII. return such an answer to their question?

1. The Pope was professedly very sorry that he was constrained to deny them the comfort which they craved. Most gladly would he have granted the answer which they so much desired. But he could not shut his eyes to evidence, and the evidence was such as to admit of no doubt. He had to suppress his feelings and fight against his heart. "They may rest assured," says Cardinal Vaughn, "that nothing could have induced Leo XIII. to have pronounced his final judgment short of overwhelming evidence, urgent charity, and imperative duty. No choice was left him in a matter so deeply affecting God's honor and the salvation of souls. He has condemned Anglican orders simply because the evidence has conclusively proved them to be null and void. I may say without hesitation that Leo's well-known large-mindedness and sympathies would have naturally led him to avoid an unfavorable judgment, had it been possible to have done so." A dissenter might be pardoned for doubting the Pope's sincerity. It

is easy to see that the answer is in a line with papal interests. The surest way to bring over the Anglo-Catholics into the fold of Rome is to convince them that they cannot have what they want, and what they deem necessary to salvation, while they remain where they are. If it were allowable to suppose that the Pope could be guilty of insincerity, it would be easy to ascribe his answer to no higher inspiration than that of subtle priestcraft. Of course, Lord Halifax and his associates would be restrained by their reverence for the Holy Father from making such a supposition. But *The Churchman* is not under the same restraint of reverence. It does not hesitate to say that the Pope pronounced his sentence against the validity of Anglican orders "with implicit confidence that five hundred Anglican clergymen would renounce their church and fly to the bosom of the Holy Mother." *The Churchman* implies that the Pope's answer was influenced by this expectation. We are not called on to mediate between the Pope and *The Churchman*. We only venture to suggest that if the Pope's answer had been in harmony with Anglican pretensions, his character would probably have escaped such an aspersion.

2. The question was already decided before it was submitted to Leo XIII. It has ever been the custom of Rome to reconfirm converts and reordain priests coming from the Anglican Church. The only reason for submitting the question was the hope that the present pope would make more generous concessions than had hitherto been made. He is looked upon as a man of broader mind and more progressive spirit than the average pope. Then his ardent and oft-expressed desire for the reunion of Christendom, it was thought, would prompt him to go to the extreme limit in meeting the advances of those who were showing themselves anxious for closer relations. But however broad-minded Leo may be, he cannot afford to disregard the decisions of his predecessors. Infallibility must not contradict itself too often. It must reserve this privilege for supreme exigencies, otherwise it will knock the supports from under its own throne. Unfortunately for broad-minded and progressive popes, the prerogative of infallibility belongs to narrow-minded and non-progressive

popes equally with themselves. They thus find themselves frequently bound by fetters that cannot be broken to records of the past. Not that Leo XIII. cared to have the decision of this question different from what he found it. Considering how overwhelming the evidence in favor of that decision, and the further fact that its reaffirmation might result in bringing over five hundred clergyman from the Anglican Church, he was reconciled, to say the least, to leave it unreversed.

3. The answer of the Pope was not influenced in the slightest by the consideration that the Anglicans are schismatics. "The Holy See," says Cardinal Vaughn, "has never had difficulty in recognizing as valid the orders of the Greek and other eastern schismatics, because the evidence of their validity is sufficient. And now it has not condemned Anglican orders because they were Anglican, or given in heresy or schism. It has condemned them simply because the facts and the evidence admitted of no doubt." It seems as if the purpose of the large-minded and sympathetic Leo was to cut the Anglicans off from every way of escape. He forbids their attributing his decision to any other cause than the irresistible weight of evidence.

Some who were interested in the Pope's decision declared before it was announced that they were going to disregard it. They evidently had strong suspicion that papal judgment would go against them, and so they fortified their minds by assuring the public that no matter what the Pope said, they meant to rest satisfied with such orders as they had. "But with their mouth full of reproaches they must face this fact—that neither Jansenist, Russian, Greek, nor any of the eastern sects who possess valid orders, have ever been able or willing to recognize the validity of Anglican orders. These stand alone, shivering in their insular isolation, and worse, for they are disowned within their own communion, as well as by the immense majority of the English people." Thus speaks the distinguished Cardinal from whom we have had frequent occasion to quote. It appears that our Anglican friends have carried their orders around and exhibited them to experts far and near, and have found "none so poor as to do them reverence." They have had to witness the mutual recognition of those

who had valid orders, and feel themselves disowned by all. *Hinc illæ lacrimæ.* We might almost think the prophecy was addressed to them: "Many shall come from the east and the west and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness." Disowned by their old mother to whom they look with such pleading affection, disowned by all the brothers and sisters to whom they have gone humbly begging for recognition, they would be objects of pity were they not so peculiar in their bearing. One would think they would care very little for orders which have been pronounced spurious by all those whom they themselves have selected as the most competent judges. Most people set little store by money which has been declared counterfeit by experts. But they are nothing daunted. "Standing alone, shivering in their insular insolation," with every door shut in their face at which they had knocked for admittance, they yet assert the validity of their orders with a dogmatism as emphatic as if to them, and not to St. Peter, had been committed the gift of infallibility. The fact that nobody else believes in their orders apparently strengthens their own faith in them.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS.

1. How many persons in the Anglican communion, in this country and England, are directly and personally concerned in the Pope's answer for the reason that they are Romanists in all but name? How many believe that "the divine founder of Christianity established his religion as a sacramental and sacrificial system, absolutely dependent upon a sacerdotal order, instituted by Christ himself"? It is reasonable to suppose that the number is comparatively small, but it is amazing that it should be as large as it is, and that it should include so many persons of culture and wealth, and social influence. We have been able to account for the Romanism of Rome. It grew up gradually, appropriating a little here and a little there from the paganism with which it came in contact, as a means of rapid propagandism. It flourished more and more as ancient civilization decayed and intellectual light waned. Its rankest errors sprang up in the Dark Ages, and

took such deep root, and attained such vigorous development, as to enable them to live on under the glowing sun of these modern centuries. It is strange, but not altogether unaccountable, that those reared in the dense shadow of these errors should never escape into the light. But how account for it that those who have once stood where the bright beams of a pure Christianity could fall on them should deliberately exchange the light for darkness, freedom of soul for bondage, and a rational faith for dogmas more incredible than the myths of ancient Greece and Rome? "Believe in the Pope!" exclaimed Dr. Arnold, "I would as soon believe in Jupiter." To believe in the Pope requires that reason give place to a credulity that says after the old formula: "I believe, because I do not understand." Bacon declared that he had rather be an atheist than to believe in a god who devours his children. Is it not even more monstrous to believe in a god whose children devour him? This is the feat performed by those who believe in the Pope. A witty nobleman balked the efforts of a Romish priest to convert him by suggesting that he had with great difficulty gotten the consent of his mind to accept the proposition that God made man, but he was sure he could never persuade himself to accept the proposition that man could make God. Not only does the Romish priest require you to believe that he can make God, but he demands, as a condition of salvation, that you shall eat the god whom he makes. To one who can assent to such demands on his faith, the narratives of Munchausen must seem in the highest degree credible. Can one look at the perverts from Protestantism to Rome and then wonder that Joseph Smith succeeded in building up the glaring fraud that goes under the name of "The Church of the Latter Day Saints"? To us it seems a far lighter tax on credulity to believe the book of Mormon, and the book of Doctrines and Covenants, than to believe the dogmas which the papacy imposes as essential elements of her system. England has been called the "chosen recruiting ground of the Mormon Apostles." Is it any wonder, when once it becomes known that the English lords and ladies, and English men of letters, like Manning and Newman, reared in the light of Christian truth, can turn away to a superstition compared with

which the "Revelations" granted to Joseph Smith through his Urim and Thummim are crystalline in their beauty and simplicity?

2. The serious aspect of the situation is not in the numbers who at present are in heart Romanists, but in the fact that there is a current setting Romeward, a current ever deepening and widening, and increasing in momentum. One after another, bishop, priest, diocese, is loosened from a position of safe conservatism and floated out from shore. Low churchmen are drifting to high churchism, and high churchmen are drifting from sacramentarianism to full-developed Romanism. Evangelicals have become discouraged, and have almost ceased to bear testimony against the drift. The *Outlook* (New York), October 10, 1896, says: "There has been during the past fifteen years a notable reaction in the English Church toward what are known as high-church views. The bishops, owing to the fact that both Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury sympathize with the high-church party, are now advanced churchmen in an overwhelming majority. The elaboration of service has gone on in all parts of England, and in many places ritualistic practices have succeeded the ancient simplicity." We must antedate this reaction by twice fifteen years. Nearly thirty years ago Froude wrote: "The sacramental system means something, or it means nothing. It is true, or it is false. The English evangelicals used to answer in clear ringing tones for the second alternative. There was no playing with words, no sentiment, no mystification. They insisted sternly and firmly that material forms were not and could not be a connecting link between God and the human soul. The English high churchman was less decided in his words, but scarcely less so in practice. He was contented to use the ambiguous formulas which the Reformation left in the liturgy, but he confined his "celebrations" to four times a year. He regarded the Anglican ceremonial generally rather as something established by law, which it was his business to carry out, than as a set of rites to which he attached a meaning. High churchmen have discovered now that the mystic body in the eucharist is in the hands as well as in the heart of the believer. They pine for more frequent communions as the food of their spiritual existence. They are gliding rapidly into the

positive affirmation of the doctrine which Latimer and Ridley were executed for denying. The evangelicals shrink from being behindhand. They have lost confidence in themselves; they play with mysticism, and admit that things untrue in one sense may be true in another. They are patching their garments from the rags which their fathers threw away, anxious to maintain their party rather than their principles."

The drift is as discernible in this country as in England. Only a few years ago it was an easy thing to take the census of all Episcopal churches that were using distinctively Romish rites in their worship. It is only about a half-dozen years since *The Independent* summed up the situation as follows: "Daily mass is celebrated in eight Protestant Episcopal churches in New York City, seven in Philadelphia, six in Newark, New Jersey, four in Chicago, three in Baltimore, and in thirty-three other churches mentioned by a ritualistic journal of New York City. These celebrations are generally early in the morning, and worshippers, even if present, are not expected to partake, as these are not communion services, but sacrifices, which have a certain value which Catholics understand better than Protestants. But sixty-one parishes in all are not a very large number out of nearly five thousand. For example, there are only four in all New England, and not one south of Washington." We have no recent data that would enable us to make an exact comparison of the present status with the foregoing statement, but it is a matter of common observation and general remark that the elaboration of ceremonies and the development of high-church views are going on at a rapid rate.

The *rationale* of the drift is of easy explanation. Once let it be accepted that grace is tied to particular forms, and the multiplication of forms becomes inevitable. Their virtue will be more and more magnified, until exclusive virtue is ascribed to them. "Wherever," says Froude, "external ceremonial observances are supposed to be in themselves efficacious, the weight of the matter is, sooner or later, cast upon them." The soul seeks rest in unity. It will not long give its assent to two opposing systems of justification. If justification is by faith in Christ, then forms, except

the simplest, become a hindrance; but if justification is by forms, then the preaching of faith becomes a weariness. As the ritual is elaborated, the sermon is dwarfed. The worshippers are instructed in the merits of ceremonial rather than in the merits of Christ. But the efficacy of rites is not inherent. If it were, then anybody might exercise the office of ministrant. It is imparted, and only the duly authorized can impart it. This raises the question, What constitutes due authority? to a place of first importance. Of course, the primal source of authority is Christ; and what more natural than to make the authority of the administrator of rites depend upon direct connection with Christ through unbroken succession in office? Thus the magnifying of the virtue of forms results in magnifying the validity of orders. One step more, and Rome is reached. If the validity of Anglican orders depends upon unbroken succession from the apostles, then this validity is derived from Rome. If derived from Rome, it more certainly belongs to Rome; and, therefore, those who are taught to regard validity of orders as the prime requisite in religion cannot logically stop short of Rome. Bishops and priests in the Anglican communion who teach that the sacraments are channels of grace when administered by lineal successors of the apostles, and only when administered by such, are leading their obedient disciples to the borders of papal territory, and inspiring them with an unrest which will certainly carry many of them across the line.

3. There is no sense in basing the validity of orders on unbroken succession from the apostles unless it is contended that those in the line of such succession can impart virtue to ceremonies. Let us suppose that the Anglican orders are valid in the sense denied by the Pope, of what practical value are they?

(a), They do not secure soundness of doctrine. If Anglicans possess valid orders, much more the Greek and Romish churches. Are these sound in the faith? If so, the Bible is the falsest book ever written. Its only value can be to show us what is not true by regarding its teachings as the standard of falsehood. If validity of orders has not kept those bodies from enshrining all lies and sanctioning all iniquities, it cannot be a possession to boast of on this ground. It has not preserved soundness of faith in the

Anglican body unless directly contradictory doctrines can be alike sound. It permits the highest Calvinism and the lowest Arminianism, the broadest churchism and the narrowest sectarianism, the most earnest evangelical doctrines and the most pronounced sacramentarianism. No greater medley of doctrinal views can be found out of Bedlam than are to be found in the pale of the Anglican Church. Validity of orders has not even secured uniformity of belief touching the basis on which it rests. Many of the greatest lights in that church have scouted the idea that validity of orders rested on ordination by bishops in a line of succession from the apostles. Archbishop Usher expressed his judgment on the subject in the following language: "I have ever declared my opinion to be that *episcopus et presbyter gradu tantum differunt non ordine*, and consequently that in places where bishops cannot be had, the ordination by presbyters standeth valid." Bishop Hall, in speaking of the difference between the Church of England and the non-Episcopal churches abroad, writes thus: "Blessed be God, there is no difference in any essential matter betwixt the Church of England and her sisters of the Reformation. We accord in every point of Christian doctrine without the least variation; their public confessions and ours are sufficient convictions to the world of our full and absolute agreement. The only difference is in the form of our outward administration, wherein we also are so far agreed as that we all profess this form not to be essential to the being of a church." The "Judicious Hooker," whose opinion was standard authority for the Church of England in his day, spoke to the same purport, that episcopacy was merely an accident and not an essential of the church, a matter of human appointment and not of divine ordination.

(b), Validity of orders does not impart any special force to the truth as preached by those who possess it. The names of some preachers of very great power adorn the annals of the Anglican pulpit, as, for example, the names of Canon Liddon and Phillips Brooks, the memories of whose effective ministries are still fresh in our minds. But it is easy to match them with names equally illustrious from the pulpits of dissenting bodies. As for the rank and file of Anglican preachers, the public has never been im-

pressed with their superior effectiveness. Seldom do we find, even in our large cities, crowds drawn to an Episcopal church by the fame of its preacher. The preaching is usually not relied on to attract, but the music and the ritual are held forth as the attraction. Nor does the growth of the church as compared with other bodies indicate that its preachers are endowed with unusual power. They have rather fewer conversions under their ministry than dissenting preachers. Nor does the type of piety exhibited by the constituency of the Anglican communion demonstrate that validity of orders gives its possessors any advantage in the matter of building up Christian character. So far as effects enable us to judge, those without valid orders can preach sermons equally as edifying to God's children as the sermons preached by those who have valid orders.

(c), Hence, if there be any efficacy in validity of orders, it must be in enabling those who possess it to impart some kind of magical virtue to the sacraments. But when we apply all available tests we fail to find what this magical virtue is. So far as appearances go, and so far as conscious experience goes, the sacraments accomplish just as much when administered by those who do not, as by those who do, possess valid orders. Many persons have received the sacred emblems at the hands of both kinds of ministers, and they have been utterly unable to discern the slightest difference. Is it not strange that so much importance should be attached to a possession which we have no means of discerning? which we may have and not know it, or may not have and think we possess it? Macaulay's reflections are not less just than witty: "We can imagine," he says, "the perplexity of a presbyter thus cast in doubt as to whether or not he has ever had the invaluable gift of apostolic succession conferred on him. As that gift is neither tangible nor visible, the subject neither of experience nor consciousness, as it cannot be known by any effects produced by it, he may imagine—unhappy man—that he has been regenerating infants by baptism, when he has been simply sprinkling them with water. 'What is the matter?' the spectator of his distractions might ask. 'What have you lost?' 'Lost!' would be the reply, 'I fear I have lost my apostolic succession; or

rather my misery is that I do not know and cannot tell whether I ever had it to lose.' It is no use here to suggest the usual questions, 'When did you see it last? When were you last conscious of possessing it?' What a peculiar property is that of which, though so invaluable, nay, on which the whole efficacy of the Christian ministry depends, a man has no positive evidence whether he ever had it or not! which, if ever conferred, was conferred without his knowledge; and which, if it could be taken away, would still leave him ignorant, not only when, where and how the theft was committed, but whether it had ever been committed or not! The sympathizing friend might probably remind him that as he was not sure he had ever had it, so *perhaps* he still had it without knowing it. '*Perhaps!*' he would reply, 'but it is certainty I want.' 'Well,' it might be said, 'Mr. Gladstone assures you that on the most moderate computation your chances are as 8,000 to 1 that you have it.' 'Pish!' the distracted man would exclaim, 'what does Mr. Gladstone know about the matter?' And truly to *that* query we know not well what answer the friend could make."

We have not been able to exercise much faith in the electro-poise, because there is a difference of opinion among those who use it as to whether it produces any sensation. It is difficult to believe there is much efficacy in a remedy which has not sufficient potency to declare its presence. In like manner we must be permitted to entertain a measure of skepticism as to the value of apostolic succession, seeing that it produces no effects by which it is possible to discern its presence. Can it be wise in the Anglican communion to suspend the existence of the church on the possession of such an undemonstrable gift? The Romanists, from whom they profess to have received it, solemnly assert that they did not give it to them. The Greeks and other chosen witnesses, to whom they have submitted their claims, say that their claims are baseless. All dissenters regard their pretensions to any such gift as utterly preposterous. What then? They have no way of making good their claims. Moses could not convince the Egyptians that his orders were valid until he did something which Pharaoh's magicians could not do. Unfortunately for our Anglican friends

they cannot do anything that others cannot do. They present, therefore, a very peculiar spectacle as they "stand shivering in their insular isolation," and look with a kind of supercilious pity on those whom they, in their delirious fancy, imagine to be less favored than themselves. We heartily agree with a writer in the *Outlook*, of New York, when he says: "It will be well if some members of the English Church are able to learn a lesson which lies written very clearly on this action of the Pope. That action is characterized by English churchmen, justly, as a great piece of assumption, a cool claim to the position of infallibility, and the consequent authority to deprive a great historic church of its spiritual order and significance. Those English churchmen who are in the habit of putting forth the claims of their own church in arbitrary and exclusive terms will do well to remember that in the thought and to the conscience of non-conformists in all churches, they but reassert pretensions kindred to those of the Pope. They claim for themselves the same kind of authority which they resent when it is claimed by the Pope." Non-conformists can look on with no little complacency and see the wry face which these churchmen make when forced to take medicine out of their own spoon.

R. C. REED.

Nashville, Tenn.

IV. THE PUBLIC LANGUAGE OF OUR LORD.

It is plainly apparent that of all New Testament literary questions the synoptic problem is easily to the fore. It has been faithfully grappled with by many a brave soldier from Leclerc and J. D. Michaelis down, but its solution appears no nearer than when the essential facts were first discovered, and the Ammonian sections and Eusebian Canons were added to the margins of Greek manuscripts in order to facilitate the comparative study of the Gospels. True, the church has always had what it conceived to be a satisfactory explanation of all the phenomena. It is based on the written evidence of competent witnesses, Luke, the physician, and Papias of Hierapolis, and asserts: 1st. That Matthew wrote down the *logia* in the *Hebrew* dialect, and that each one interpreted them as he was able; 2nd. That Mark was the interpreter of Peter, and wrote down accurately, *though not in order*, such things as he remembered which were said or done by Christ; 3rd. That Luke, who was not an apostle, but had nevertheless traced the course of all things accurately from the first, wrote unto Theophilus *in order* the essential facts of the gospel narrative; 4th. That last of these, John, even he that was surnamed Son of Thunder, when a very old man, at the time when fearful heresies were springing up, dictated his Gospel to his disciple, Papias of Hierapolis, as a *supplement* to the words of those who before him had preached the word to the nations in all the earth;¹

¹ These original documents run as follows:

Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο ἡρμηνεύσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἑκαστος.

Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου γενόμενος, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει, τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα.

Ὅ γὰρ τούτων Ἰωάννης ὁ τῆς βροντῆς υἱὸς μετακλιθεὶς, πᾶν γηραλέου αὐτοῦ γενομένου, κατ' ἐκείνου καιροῦ αἰρέσεων ἀναψυεῖσθων δευνῶν δπηγόρευσε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῷ ἑαυτοῦ μαθητῇ Παπία ἐν βιβλίῳ τῷ Ἱερουσολίτῃ, πρὸς ἀναπλήρωσιν τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ κηρυξάντων τὸν λόγον τοῖς ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἔθνεσιν.

These statements are cited from *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera* recensuerunt Gebhardt, Harnack, Zahn, editio minor repetita, pages 72-78. The statement about

5th. That Matthew's Gospel in the current Greek is the work of Matthew's own hands; 6th. And that these Gospels in the Greek in which—in their present form—they were originally written are inerrantly inspired of God to be an infallible rule of faith and

Luke is the well-known preface to his Gospel. It may be said here that the logia which Matthew compiled need not be his present Gospel, need not be discourses of our Lord, but may be (and the writer would almost say were) Old Testament prophecies relating to the Messiah. For *συνεγράφη* is a singular word to use of an original composition, and an Aramaic or Hebrew gospel, at all like the Greek Matthew, has never been in evidence; for it is the Greek Matthew of our canon which the ancient witnesses, from Papias to Eusebius and Jerome, accept whenever they mention it as the work of an apostle, and that without any doubt of its genuineness. All the ancients seem to know about a Hebrew or Aramaic Matthew, hark back to the statement of Papias, and the evidence stands or falls with the exegesis of this single line of dubious Greek. Now, Matthew's Gospel contains a catena of fulfilled prophecies, and it is not, therefore, hard to believe that what Matthew did was to draw up this collection of fulfilled prophecies; for his office as public tax-gatherer made him a ready scribe, and the work was much needed. It is no singular thing for the ancient fathers to follow "Indian file" in the tracks of any predecessor at all, without investigation. The student of patristic literature soon learns to be on the watch for that very thing. The legend about the LXX. translators is a case in point; it is a far cry from the simple narrative of Philo to the monstrous and miraculous yarn of Epiphanius. Yet it is the same tale improved and embellished in its transmission.

It was once my fortune to have a class-room dispute with Dr. H. C. Alexander, *ὁ μακάριος ἀνὴρ*, over the word *καθεξῆς* in the preface to Luke's Gospel. The doctor was prejudiced in favor of Gardiner's harmony, which follows, I believe, the order of Mark, and wished so to explain the word as to indicate that Luke's material came, in part at least, from those persons who had first taken in hand the composition of a gospel narrative. Now, I am not prepared to say that *καθεξῆς* cannot denote succession in time; but the translation "in order" is supported by both English versions, by nearly all the references given in Liddell and Scott, and by, I believe, the usual usage of the LXX. version. What Luke intended on the face of his preface was to make a scientific statement of the facts in regard to Jesus which should be differentiated from the narratives already in circulation by its accuracy, precision, and logical arrangement. From this scientific character, Matthew is excluded by the words *τὰ λόγια*, and the evidence of the book itself; and Mark is excluded by the direct testimony of Papias, whose *οὐ μέντοι τάξει* should be conclusive. Luke lends itself readily to the construction of a harmony, as can be seen (to cite an easy reference) from the one in the common *Oxford Helps*. Luke is also the writer whose precision in the Acts of the Apostles commands our admiration; the only writer who furnishes the data whereby to orient the times of the Messiah with the history of the nations, and we therefore should be ready to acquiesce when a precise writer makes precise statement of a precise aim.

practice. With these statements as to the origin and correlation of the four Gospels, sober-minded faith is content, in full assurance that in the wise providence of God the facts which alone could explain the difficulties of the question are totally unknown and irretrievably lost. Their agreement in minute particulars faith believes due to the use by the follower of the work of his predecessor; their discrepancies are the earmarks of independent and faithful witness. The very simplicity of the position is also believed to be a note of its trustworthiness, and devious complexness ever accompanies error.

Beyond these four documents the record does not go. Other writings were in early circulation, but not one scrap of evidence exists to show that these four ever existed in anything but their present shape, that they were ever composed by cutting and tearing, and patching, and making over the cloth of other men's weaving. They have borne the names of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John ever since they became known at all. Only there are those who do not care to rest their case on the evidence of competent witnesses, but must perforce find some middle way by which to escape the church's unpalatable dogmas which inhere in the inspiration of the Greek text; and the noteworthy thing is, that while the traditional view of the matter with all its coherence is rejected, the most wearisome investigation fails to find a substitute which can gain general acquiescence, or outlast the generation that gave it birth. Attempts are thick as lie the leaves in Vallambrosa, but they fail to displace the general explanation offered by the church. Now, it is, by reason of this continual failure, that renewed prominence has recently been given to the language in which our Lord uttered his discourses; for the latest explanation of the synoptic problem is that our Lord used the Aramaic in his public utterances, and that the divergencies in the Gospels are due to mistranslation or misreading of the common Aramaic source.

The hypothesis of an Aramaic vernacular is, of course, not new; but the present form of its application is. Only it must be said at the outset, that the righteous endeavor to solve the synoptic problem has led into the discussion some of that clamant crowd

whose shibboleth is "Back to Christ," whose delight it is to hear the very accents of the Lord's own voice, while they spurn from them the words of the disciple the Lord sent his Spirit to inspire. For them, however, the establishment of the Semitic source is of no avail; they are in no whit better case; for there remaineth no criterion by which to decide what residual variant represents the very utterance of the Christ; no one to tell us whether the two women were "grinding in the mill" (באדרא) or "grinding together" (בהררא). But for the orthodox student of the word, there is this to be said, viz.: That the task of New Testament interpretation becomes much more complicated if we have to reconstruct the original Aramaic in order to check our exegesis. We argue from the Greek words as from a document of last resort, beyond which there is no appeal. The case is somewhat different when we come to make allowance for the mistakes Matthew, and Mark, and Luke, and John may have made in the work of translation from this Aramaic original. This, however, we are calmly told must be done before we are in a situation rightly to appreciate the words of Jesus. "Until it has been proved that he spoke Greek, the Greek words of the evangelists must not be quoted as if they were his;" not even on the supposition that these same evangelists were inspired of God thus and so to write! The situation is, therefore, a critical one, and we need great boldness of face to meet it. But the battle is not always to the noisy, and the New Testament has been in the conflict before.

Neither is it the first time in the world that the Lord's vernacular has been the theme of fierce dispute. The revival of letters brought on a discussion which raged for more than a century as to whether the Greek of the New Testament was to be regarded as "good" Greek, or a bastard mongrel of Greek and Hebrew parentage, subject to no laws of language, and irreducible to exact principles of interpretation, in which Desiderius Erasmus, Theodore Beza, Henri Estienne, Heinsius, Gataker, and Leusden are the great names. This discussion was ended only by the interposition of the exact philologic science represented by the many-sided scholar, J. A. Ernesti, to whom the Bible and Greek and Latin classics are alike indebted. Syriac was

brought into play by the publication of the Gospels in Syriac by J. A. Widmanstadt (1555), of which the Maronite, George Amira, believed that they contained the very language of the Christ. In this opinion he was followed by the editors of the *Antwerp Polyglot* (1569–1571), Arias Montanus, Andreas Masias, Boderianus. Cardinal Bellarmine, Rome's greatest and fairest controversialist, saw whereunto this might grow, and opposed the contention with all the wealth of his keen researches. Joseph Justus Scaliger, however, pointed out that Syriac is to be distinguished from the Aramaic, in which parts of Ezra, and Daniel, and the Targums were written, and in which Jesus would have spoken, if he spake Semitic at all. The publication of the great Chaldee Lexicon of Buxtorf (1639), and the remarks of Grotius, served to keep the distinction in the mind of the public. Brian Walton, who edited the last and greatest of the Polyglots (London, 1657), is found as usual on the right side of the philologic distinction, and decides that the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan have the first right as the representatives of Christ's vernacular, while Lightfoot decides that the Hebrew had entirely died out in Babylon. Such, also, was the judgment of Huet and Maldonatus, whose commentaries are the authoritative exposition of the Scriptures for Catholics.¹

But the Semitic did not gain entire possession of the field. The attack came from the Protestant side, and the discussion became entangled with party polemics. As Richard Simon published his *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* (Rotterdam, 1685), with the express design of shattering the Protestant stronghold, viz.: The integrity of the original texts of Holy Scripture and the therein inherent dogma of inerrant inspiration; so Isaac Voss, in his

¹ Lightfoot's *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*, Cambridge, 1658–1674, is the great thesaurus of such rabbinical and Old Testament material as bears on New Testament interpretation; and scattered references to the use Aramaic might afford in New Testament exegesis are found in the many works of J. D. Michaelis and Eichhorn; but it was the Altona pastor, John Adrian Bolten, who first made any thorough, systematic use of it in consecutive exposition of New Testament books. He put forth a German version of the whole New Testament, accompanied by exegetical notes, the Matthew of which is almost a translation from a presupposed oriental original. And the motive which moved Bolten to invoke its use was exegetical embarrassment as Joseph Addison Alexander has already noticed.

various publications, defends the proposition that Jesus and his apostles spake Greek, and cited the version of the LXX. Only, Voss went so far in his zeal as to defend the inspiration of that hoary translation. Voss was followed by Dominic Diodati whose book, *De Christi Græce Loquente*, Neapoli, 1767, was based on Voss' *De Sibyllinis Oraculis* (1680), but increased the evidence by contributions from classic and rabbinic sources, from coins and inscriptions. Diodati, however, could not carry his Italian compeers with him, for the influence of the name of J. B. De Rossi, who disputed his deductions, has been too great. De Rossi and Kennicott are the two great names for the eighteenth century in the textual criticism of the Massoretic texts; and their names have not yet lost their weight. The Greek succession, however, was carried on by Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob Paulus, a man by no means in favor among the opponents of German rationalism. Paulus recognized the traces of Aramaic in the New Testament, but protested that while Christ used the Aramaic in private, it was Greek which formed the medium of his public utterances. Paulus' work appeared in 1803, and was followed in 1808 by the *Introduction to the Scriptures of the New Testament*, from the pen of the Roman Catholic scholar, John Leonhard Hug, who comes to the same result in the use of the same means. With him stands Karl Aug. Credner, whose *Einleitung in das N. T.*, Halle, 1836, still contains much that is valuable in New Testament literary criticism. Neither is Credner to be neglected in the study of the original manuscripts. The Greek succession continues to the present time in the various publications of Alexander Roberts, D. D., profes or at St. Andrews, whilom member of the English Revision Committee, and editor of the *Anti-Nicene Fathers* (T. and T. Clark). In four separate publications from 1859 to 1893 he has striven to maintain the thesis that "Christ spake for the most part in Greek, and only now and then in Aramaic," in order that there might be established a close connection between the Christ and the New Testament. The hypothesis that Christ made use only of the Aramaic continues its hold on biblical scholarship, however, and reached its utmost development in the work of Eduard Bohl (*Forschungen nach einer Volksbibel zur Zeit Jesu.*

Wien, 1873). Bohl advances the notion that Christ and the apostles quoted from a popular version of the Scriptures into Aramaic, which version was not made from the Hebrew but from the LXX., or was, at least, based upon it. Bohl's motive in the explanation given is the desire to escape the force of the argument from the use of the LXX. version; but it is plainly apparent that the solution raises more questions than it solves.

1. We come thus to the question: In what language were the discourses of the Christ uttered? And we can say at once that of the three languages inscribed over the Master's cross, it was surely in Latin that he did not speak. Time was, however, that men said he did use the Latin, and a like reason even to-day leads to similar statements. The Jesuit Melchior Inchofer (died 1648), of Vienna, who had asserted the genuineness of a letter purporting to be written by the Virgin Mary to the people of Messina also "*ad Ecclesiæ Latinæ exaltationem*," made the assertion that Jesus spoke Latin while on earth just as the saints do in heaven. Inchofer's theories found little audience, but he had one notable successor, Jean Hardouin, who was at once singularly learned and learnedly singular; for he contended that, with the exception of the works of Homer, Herodotus, and Cicero, the *Natural History* of Pliny, the *Georgics* of Virgil, and the *Satires* and *Epistles* of Horace, all the ancient classics of Greece and Rome were spurious, having been fabricated by monks of the thirteenth century. According to him the apostles had either written in Latin or else, at the least, had a Latin version of their works made at once; for the Greek text is an arbitrary private performance. The situation in the Gospels, however, demanded that Jesus should use the Vulgate of the Old Testament in his citations; and that had already been turned from Hebrew into Latin, *a laudatissimo interprete*. At the time of Jesus, only the scholars understood Hebrew; every man of quality, however, knew the Latin which was taught in the schools, of which mention is made in the Books of Maccabees. Christ preached in Latin in the temple and in the synagogue, and because he understood the Latin so well was Peter chosen to found the Church of Rome. For these propositions the proofs are: (1), The Roman overlordship of the whole known

world and the presumptive general use of Latin; (2), The obedience of Christ to the civil powers as shown by the payment of tribute; (3), The commercial dealings of the Jews; (4), The Latin on the cross was the nearest to the Christ. We learn also that Baronius, editor of the far-famed *Annales Ecclesiastici*, and Bellarmine, think it possible that Mark may have written his Gospel in Latin. In St. Mark's church in Venice, too, Meyer tells us there is a leaf from a Latin Gospel-codex shown to the faithful as part of Mark's own autograph.

2. It has been likewise contended that the Master and his disciples could not have spoken Hebrew; and the proof is supposed to be that Hebrew had entirely disappeared from the range of the common people, and was the solitary possession of the scribes; that it was not even read in the synagogues, though it may have been heard in the temple service; and we are referred to the sacred literature of the Hindoos and Persians, and the ecclesiastical Latin, as instances in point. There are those, however, who are not inclined to let such statements pass unchallenged. There was Franz Delitzsch, whose services to Hebrew scholarship were second to none in his day and generation, who was certainly called to the restoration of the Aramaic words of the Lord Jesus; but when he was asked to translate the New Testament into Aramaic, he held it a vain work, perhaps also a desecration of the sacred words. The words of Delitzsch are well worth further repetition, and few of my readers have access to Kautzsch's *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*, whence I take them (page 5), or to the Hebrew New Testament, where they first appeared:

"One of my friends will not desist from the request that I would translate the New Testament into the Aramaic idiom, which was spoken in Palestine in the days of Christ and his apostles; that is, into the language of the Talmud and the Palestinian Targum. But this wish rests on an illusion. Even after the exile, the Hebrew remained the language of Jewish literature. The Ecclesiasticus of Jesus Sirach was written in Hebrew, as appears from the fragments in the Talmud. The original of the First Book of Maccabees and of the so-called Psalter of Solomon was Hebrew. The inscriptions on coins and gravestones, the

liturgical prayers, were Hebrew; the laws were composed in Hebrew, as appears from their codification in the Mishna. Even the book in which, as Papias says, Matthew has collected the Lord's discourses, was written *ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ*. It is true that in this time *ἑβραϊστί* and *χαλδαιστί* were not accurately distinguished, in spite of which it is QUITE IMPROBABLE THAT MATTHEW WROTE IN ARAMAIC. [Emphasis mine.] For the Palestinian Aramaic dialect—which is called in the Talmud סְרִיט—was the language of the daily life, the vulgar speech, in which the people and the cultured classes were accustomed to transact business and to discuss disputed questions; but *ἡ ἑβραϊκὴ διάλεκτος*, in which Paul (Acts xxvi. 14) was addressed by the exalted Saviour, and in which he himself addresses himself to the people of Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 40; xxii. 2), was the sacred language, the language of the temple-cult, of the synagogal and domestic prayer, of all formulas of benediction, as well as of the transmission of the law. Not the less, also, are the parables, the fables, and the dirges in the Talmuds and Midrashes in large measure Hebrew. The sacred language continued to be the language of the higher modes of discourse; even the familiar saws of the people were only in part Aramaic. When Josephus, in the preface to his work on the Jewish war, says that his narrative was originally composed in their common vernacular for his countrymen in Asia, he certainly means the Hebrew, not the Aramaic. Knowledge of the Hebrew was at that time, as at present, generally disseminated among the cultured classes of the nation. The Aramaic, on the other hand, was understood only by a small part of the Diaspora. So it would be a useless undertaking to translate the New Testament into the Palestinian Sursi. The Semitic wrapper (*einschlag*) of New Testament Hellenism is Hebrew, not Aramaic. Our Lord and his apostles thought and spoke for the greater part in Hebrew."

Such is the judgment of the honored Delitzsch. Kautzsch, who adds an interrogation point to the word "spoke," seems to me also to admit that the reference to Targums in the Talmud does not prove their use in the time of Christ. Next to Delitzsch we may set Dr. Alfred Resch, who has in hand a monumental work, parts of which have appeared under the title *Aussercanonische*

Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien, in the series *Texte und Untersuchungen*, edited by Harnack and Gebhardt. His aim is to examine the whole range of patristic writings, and to extract therefrom such putative fragments of our Lord's discourses as are preserved in sources extra-canonical, as, for example, the parallel to Luke x. 16—"He that heareth you heareth me; *and he that heareth me heareth him that sent me*"—where the italicized words are not in the New Testament transmission, but are added by some father of the church. Resch's idea is that there was an *Urevangelium* in very wide circulation alongside the canonical Gospels, composed originally in Hebrew, but afterwards translated into Greek; and that from this document come the remarkable variants found in even the oldest New Testament codices. Now, Dr. Resch uses the Hebrew to explain such passages as Luke xvi. 16; Matthew xi. 12—"The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force"—where there is a play on פָּרֵץ. When Luke uses *ἐυαγγελίζεται* for Matthew's *βιάζεται*, he reads אֶתְפָּרֵס for אֶתְפָּרֵץ. And Professor Marshall admits (in *The Critical Review*, Vol. VI., page 48, 1896) that were not פָּרֵץ the same in both Hebrew and Aramaic, he would be obliged to admit the use of Hebrew in the source. Resch tells us, in the third part of his work, that his conviction of the sure character of his presupposition increases as he goes through his material; and that he is more sure of the Hebrew as the language in which our Lord uttered his discourses.

Besides Resch we have another notable man to support the theory of Hebrew as the language of our Lord. Professor Eberhard Nestle, of Ulm, stands second to none in the departments of Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, and Greek languages. He is the author of numerous works in Semitic philology, an indefatigable contributor to learned periodicals, a trained collator of manuscripts, and the editor of Tischendorf's text of the LXX. version.¹ These

¹ Various notes by Nestle are to be found in the current volume of *The Expository Times* (VIII.), but his pamphlet on the original shape of the Gospels contains his most complete exposition of his views. It is: *Philologica Sacra. Bemerkungen über die Urgestalt der Evangelien und Apostelgeschichte*, Berlin, 1896. Nestle, be it said, is the one great name in Germany that has given adherence to Blass' view as

past two years the world of scholarship has been receiving from him fruitful exegeses of Gospel texts, all in the method just illustrated, and all to prove that the present Greek text rests upon a written Semitic source. Only Nestle does not stop at one language, but compels Syriac, Aramaic and Hebrew alike to the service (may I say—for we remember Bolten) of his exegetical embarrassment. Only when pushed he has given a decisive answer. *The Expository Times*, December, 1896: "As to the general question, whether the original Gospel was Hebrew or Aramaic, I feel, *a priori*, much more inclined to suppose that it was Aramaic; but we must keep the possibilities open, not to run into a deadlock." Now, Nestle stands square on his feet, and he is not willing to base too large a structure on the evidence; for, in character, it is too precarious. As we have seen, the word פֶּרֶץ may be either Aramaic or Hebrew; and the evidence being all purely linguistic cannot decide. The only sure conclusion is: the background is Semitic. The character of the evidence will be more fully stated, but the names of these three men are sufficient to show what a case can be made for Hebrew if the need of a Semitic source can be proven.

Now, the case is made stronger by the recovery during the past year of ten leaves (20 pages) of the original Hebrew text of "The Wisdom of Jesus, son of Sirach." A careful account of the discovery is given by the present writer in *The Union Seminary Magazine*, January–February number, 1897, to which reference may be made. It will suffice to say here that by reason of that discovery we know that a pure, idomatic, vivacious Hebrew, free

to the Book of Acts. Blass' idea is that the Greek text of the singular bilingual manuscript *Codex Bezae Cantabrigensis*, ordinarily denominated D, contains the first rough draft of Luke's second book addressed to Theophilus, and that in the current critical text of the Acts we have the fair copy Luke actually sent to his friend. If, now, D is the rough draft, and the traditional text critically revised the fair copy, it is Luke's own last revision which we want, and we may, therefore, do with D in glad assurance what we have hitherto done with more or less critical uneasiness, viz.: reject it and its readings altogether. For surely the author's own revision is to be preferred to the rough draft he himself laid aside. It is strange that neither Professor Blass nor Professor Nestle has seen or acted upon the logical outcome of the theory.

from any taint of the rabbinic farrago of phrases and particles and corrupted grammar, could be written in Jerusalem at 200 B. C.; and that by reason of the same discovery we cannot be so dogmatic as hitherto in our statements as to what was spoken or written when Jesus walked on earth. I have intimated in that article the opinion that it was possibly the overthrow of Jerusalem which occasioned the abandonment of the ancient Hebrew by the educated classes to the schools of professed devotion to the preservation and transmission of the Scriptures. It is a historic fact, too, that the very earliest notice of a written Aramaic Targum points to the middle of the first century A. D. It thus becomes increasingly probable that it was a Hebrew parchment our Lord read from that day in Nazareth, that it was in Hebrew that the early prayers of our Lord were lisped, and that Hebrew may yet have been understood by a "carpenter's son." Mind, now, the evidence does not warrant dogmatic statements, only the Ecclesiasticus discovery does measurably strengthen Delitzsch's position.

3. We come now to the consideration of the theory¹ that Christ spake Aramaic only, and that an Aramaic source thus lies behind the present Gospels. And, first, a word as to the term Aramaic,²

¹ The most careful and thorough work on the Aramaic theory has been done by Licentiate Arnold Meyer, Privat Docent of Theology in Bonn, and Professor J. T. Marshall, M. A., of Manchester, England. Meyer's book is *Jesu Muttersprache. Das galiläische Aramäisch in seiner Bedeutung für die Erklärung der Reden Jesu und der Evangelien überhaupt*. Friburg and Leipzig, 1896. Professor Marshall is the English head of "The American Institute of Sacred Literature"; and the most complete and satisfactory exposition of the theory is contained in his papers printed in *The Expositor* during 1890 and 1891, and in the summary statement he has given in *The Expository Times*, Volume IV., 1892-'93. This volume of *The Expository Times* is well worth purchase and study by students of the Gospels, as it contains the theories of recent date, in careful statement, by their originators, Professor Marshall, Professor Wright, and Rev. J. J. Halcombe, with the criticisms each has to make on the work of the others, and the originators' responses to such criticism. Professor Marshall defends the theory of an original Aramaic Gospel; Professor Alfred Wright, of Queen's College, Cambridge, maintains the oral transmission of our Lord's discourses, while Rev. Mr. Halcombe insists upon the view maintained by the present writer and set at the head of this paper, only he would reject the testimony of Papias altogether, and holds that John wrote first, and then Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in the order named.

² It was August Ludwig Schlözer in his article "Von den Chaldäern," printed

for even Mrs. Lewis herself, to whom Semitic scholarship owes such a debt, has mixed them up in the December, 1896, number of the *Century Magazine* past resolution by lay readers. Christ did not speak Syriac as one would gather from the article in question, "What language did Christ speak?" For Aramaic is not Syriac, and we must not lose sight of a distinction based on sober facts. Mrs. Lewis' pride in the Syriac Gospels is pardonable, but it is an injustice to the reader to endeavor to obliterate the distinctions two hundred and fifty years of Semitic scholarship have pronounced valid. Now, by geographical boundaries, the centres of Syriac culture were Edessa and Nisibis, cities at the headwaters of the Euphrates, at the extreme upper end of ancient Mesopotamia, the nearest some five hundred miles, as the crow flies, from Jerusalem. The lower limit of distinct Syriac seems to have been the mountain range against which the Orontes heads, the ancient boundary known as the "Entering in of Hamath." South of the Anti-Libanus, Syriac had no foothold; and not a document of the long list in Wright's *Syriac Literature* seems to have been composed in Palestine; certainly none of the writings of the early Christian centuries. From the Anti-Libanus southward, Aramaic held the field with Damascus as its earliest centre. As to linguistic phenomena, Aramaic and Syriac are as different from each other as each is from Hebrew, or nearly so. Both belong to the North-Semitic or Aramaean division of the Semitic languages, which is further sub-divided into East-Aramaean or Syriac, and West-Aramaean or Aramaic (sometimes called Chaldee or Syro-Chaldaic). By Syriac we mean the language of Upper Syria and Mesopotamia. By Aramaic we mean the language of Laban and his countrymen, which flourished in Palestine side by side with the Hebrew, and by reason thereof took on Jewish characteristics until what was originally North-Semitic came rather to resemble the Middle-Semitic, of which Hebrew and Phœnician are

in Eichhorn's *Repertorium für Biblische und Morgenländische Litteratur*, Eighth part, pages 113 to 176, Leipzig, 1781, who first used the designation "Aramaic," and pointed out the true signification of Chaldee. His paper covers the whole range of peoples to whom the latter designation has been applied, and is very valuable even yet. We do wrong to neglect these storehouses of eighteenth-century lore; for there is but little really new under the sun.

the great sub-divisions. The factual difference should not be obliterated.

The remains of the Aramaic literature are: (1), Daniel ii. 4 to vii. 28; Ezra iv. 8 to vi. 18, vii. 12-26; Jeremiah x. 11, in the Old Testament, with a few isolated words and sentences in the New Testament and Josephus; (2), The Targums of Onkelos, Jonathan, etc., to the Old Testaments; (3), The Gemara of the Jerusalem Talmud and isolated portions of Mishna and Midrash; (4), The Samaritan Targum to the Pentateuch, which must not be confused with the Samaritan Recension of the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch; (5), Sundry inscriptions on coins and stones from Judea, Egypt, Palmyra, the Sinai peninsula, Idumæa, Hauran, especially valuable as indicative of geographical boundaries; (6), The so-called Jerusalem Evangelistary—which is a translation of the Gospels into an Aramaic, into which many Syriasms have been injected by the ignorance of transcribers—together with certain fragments of the Old Testament and Paul's epistles in a similar version. These are very valuable as representative of the translation of the Gospels for the early Palestine Christian. These are translations from the Greek, and bear the evident marks of being versions on their face. It is thus not a large body of Aramaic which has come down to us; and it is in this language we are told to believe the original Gospel was written; for as Mrs. Lewis graciously tells us, there are some who hold that the mother-tongue of Jesus was Greek, "because" forsooth "three out of the four Gospels are *supposed* to have been written in that language."¹

Now as to the evidence that Jesus used Aramaic in his public discourses, we are not shown one scrap of testimony outside of certain considerations hinging on textual exegesis. There is the bare fact that Aramaic was in use in Palestine, which no one will dispute; but the early fathers of the church are silent or dumb. Not one scrap of evidence—historic evidence—has come to show that there ever was an original Aramaic Gospel or written

¹ Is the concurrent testimony of the whole history of the canon to be called supposition? Is there a scrap of evidence—testimony—anywhere to connect the Gospels of Mark, Luke, and John with any language but Greek? Are we to throw away the writings of the fathers and the transmission of the Greek text in favor of precarious exegetic expedients?

Aramaic collection of the discourses of Jesus. The vague sentence of Papias is the single source of all the fathers have to say on the subject, and the dubious ἐβραϊστὴ the sole point of attachment of the theory to the record. We hear it is true of a "Gospel according to the Hebrews," but any one who will turn up the first part of Eichhorn's *Repertorium für Biblische und Morgen, ländische Litteratur*, 1777, can readily satisfy himself that that is not what the theory requires. Now Papias may refer to something else than words of our Lord as is shown in the anonymous book, *The Oracles ascribed to Matthew, by Papias of Hierapolis*, whose author is now known to be the brilliant young scholar, F. C. Conybeare. And even if he means to speak of Matthew's Gospel, the words quoted from Delitzsch make it evident that we cannot incontinently claim it as Aramaic. Beyond this dubious scrap we have no record that can even be twisted to prove an Aramaic source; and the silence is inexplicable if such original Gospel there was. For even these fragments of the Palestinian version, of which we have just spoken, are translations from the Greek—universally admitted such—and no satisfactory explanation has been adduced to show why such a translation was made in the second century if our Lord's own Aramaic words were current in the original Gospel in the first. It is the Greek Gospels in their present form of which we hear in all the patristic documents; and the multifarious writings of the fathers never attempt to go behind the current text to the alleged original source. More, there seems not to have been a written Aramaic Targum in use in those days even. For the first reference to an Aramaic Targum is to one on Job whose use the elder Gamaliel prohibited, and it is not until towards 200 A. D. that we find positive reference to their use. All of which means, to those who know how curious Jerome and Origen were in such matters, that such things were not in existence.

A. Embedded in the Greek text of the New Testament, however, are found quite a number of singular expressions and short sentences which bear on their face the evidence of being transliterations from the Semitic, of which we may cite: the "*Talitha cumi*" of Jesus, and his cry on the cross, "*Eloi, Eloi lama sa-*

bachthani," together with such words as *Abba*, *Akeldama*, *Gabbatha*, *Golgotha*, *Ephphatha*, *Mammon*, *Messiah*, *Rabbi*, *Rabboni*, *Raca*, *Moreh*, *Satan*, *Corban*, *πασα* (Matt. xxvi. 2), *σικερα* (Luke i. 15), Paul's *Maranatha*, and the *Σαουλ Σαουλ* (elsewhere *Σαῦλος*) which converted the apostle to the Gentiles on the way to Damascus. Some of these show the form of the emphatic state, and are unquestionably Aramaic; others are as distinctly Hebrew. *Rabboni* is more than likely a Galilean provincialism; and still others may be either Hebrew or Aramaic, for the exact derivation in some cases rests on too narrow a basis for dogmatism.

B. Many of the names of persons and places in the New Testament go back to the earliest times of the Hebrew nation; many are distinctly Aramaic, many are Greek and some are Latin. All the names in the family tree of our Lord seem to be Hebrew, for he was of the seed royal in the line of David; but Barabbas, Barsabbas, Bartholomew, Barjesus, Barjona, Bartimæus (which are all compounds with *בֶּרֶךְ* Hebrew *בֵּן* 'son'), Cephas, Martha, Tabitha are Aramaic. But it is a mixed state of affairs which confronts us, and argument, thence, is of no avail. The Greek Timæus' son is known as Bartimæus; Tabitha, after her introduction, figures as Dorcas, which is Greek; the high priest's immediate family included the Hebrew father, Annas, the Aramaic son, Caiaphas, a Hebrew grandson, John (form Greek), and a Greek grandson, Alexander; the Greek Timothy had a Greek father, and his mother was a Jewess, but her name, Eunice, is the Greek *Εὐ—νυχη*; Zebedee had two sons, John and James, but it is singular that the second is not called *Ιακωβ* but *Ιακωβος*; the twelve were a motley set of Hebrews (John, Matthew, Simon, and Judas), Aramaeans (Thomas, Bartholomew, Cephas, Matthias), and Greeks (Andrew, Philip and two James), while the rash Peter associated with the fickle Mark (Latin), and when he came out of the prison and knocked on the door, it was that same fickle John Mark's Greek sweetheart, Rhoda, who came to hearken. Peter healed a man of Latin name, Aeneas, at Lydda, just as his Lord had cast the demons out of a man named Legion. The whole church at Jerusalem came together, Jews and Grecian Jews, and elected seven deacons who were residents of Jerusalem, and every

one of these seven Jews had Greek names. There was also a ruler of the Jews and a distinguished member of the sect of the Pharisees who came to Jesus by night, Nicodemus (*Νικη—δημος*) by name; and when Paul's accusers came and informed the governor against Paul it was the Latin Tertullus who was their spokesman; the "prince of the air" figures before us as Beelzeboul (Hebrew), Satanias (Aramaic), and the Devil, *διαβολος*, and the place of his abode as Sheol (Hebrew), Gehenna (Aramaic) and Hades (Greek), out of which chaos no sure argument can come; certainly none for the Aramaic. The Aramaic names are admitted, but the preponderance is not Aramaic, only it is but fair to say that the evident traces of Greek association and Greek intermarriage in all social circles is not without bearing on the use of Greek in every day intercourse. From the days of Isaiah down, Galilee—whose speech was the speech of the Christ—was "Galilee of the Gentiles" a land of mixed population whose chief cities in the time of Christ were Tiberias and Ptolemais, cities of Greek influence. The Jews were certainly in the minority, and being less acquainted with the law and less strict than the Jews of Judea were little esteemed by them. The chief peculiarity of Galilean by which Peter was bewrayed was the confusion of the gutturals א, ה, ח, and ע, so that we are told in the Talmud that when a Galilean asked who has "Emar" to sell it was necessary to ask, "Thou dumb Galilean, what *do* you want? An ass רכמר to ride, or wine חמר to drink, or wool עמר for clothes, or a lamb אכמר to kill?" and it is an open question how it was that these Galileans came to know so little about Aramaic that they found it hard to make the Jews, who spoke it correctly, understand what they said. The writer has just the glimmer of an idea that it was non-use of the Aramaic or predominant use of something else (Hebrew or Latin, which, gentle reader?) that made them sloven in the articulation. Not to dwell longer on these names, it may be said that stress is not laid on them by the advocates of the Aramaic theory except as indicative of the presence of Aramaic in Galilee and Judea, which is not denied. The reason is, perhaps, not far to seek, viz.: that Jesus associated intimately from youth up with men whose Greek names assuredly

point to Greek business associations, and likely to Greek inter-marriage, and acquaintance with the Greek language. Only one name seems to deserve special notice, and perhaps may contribute something towards the question. It is the passage in Matt. xvi. 17, 18: "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjonah . . . thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church." (In the Greek, *Σὺ εἶ πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρῳ*.) Now John gives us in i. 42: "Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation Peter." Revised Version margin, "that is, rock or stone." Admit the possible paronomasia in both languages and we yet have to ask, if the words were uttered in Aramaic and the original Gospel was in Aramaic, how came Matthew, whose name alone is in any way connected with the Semitic source by the record, to give us that patent Greek paronomasia? The likelihood is that the ability thus and so to do carries with it knowledge of Greek of no mean order, especially if the pun is so far fetched as some commentators would have us believe.

C. When we compare the LXX. text and the Hebrew verity, we discover that the variations are, in large measure, due to, 1, The diverse vocalization of the same consonants; 2, Misreading of the same consonants; 3, Omission of a consonant; 4, Transposition of a consonant; and 5, Duplicate translation of the same word. And the central feature of the Aramaic theory is "the assumption which *seems* quite simple and reasonable that the same kinds of variations which occurred in different MSS. of the Hebrew Bible would find their way into MSS. of the Aramaic Gospel." The gist of the theory, then, is: If, when we translate the diverse Greek words into Aramaic we obtain Aramaic words bearing a very close resemblance to one another—such variations aside—we may be sure that we have the original source of the Gospels in the language of its original composition, and therefore the very words of the Lord Jesus in the language in which originally they were uttered.

Now, it is admitted that in many instances the retranslation into Aramaic is successful enough to shed light on the Gospel texts, just as it is admitted with Resch and Nestle that retranslation into Hebrew is of much service and great plausibility. The

whole evidence can be seen in the works cited; we may here cull a few specimens. In the "Lord's Prayer" we have (Matt. vi. 12), "forgive us our *debts*," (Luke x. 4), "forgive us our *sins*," where the Aramaic **חוב** may mean either *debt* or *sin*. How do we carry our cross? **λαμβάνω** (Matt. x. 38), **αιρώ** (Mark viii. 34), or **βασταζω** (Luke xiv. 27), "take," "take up," or "carry." The Aramaic is **כַּטֵּל**. Was Christ "transfigured" (Matt. xvii. 2), or did he become "different" (Luke ix. 29)? **שָׁבִי** if the former; **שִׁיבִי** the latter. In the parable of the sower (Matt. xiii. 4): "the fowls came" **דָּרִיךְ** (Luke viii. 5): "It was trodden" **דָּרִיךְ**. Is wisdom justified in her children (Luke v. 35) or in her works (Matt. v. 19)? If we say children of wisdom, doers of wisdom, we get **עוֹבְדֵי חָכְמָה** or **עֲבִידֵי חָכְמָה**. In the case of the demon-possessed boy, Mark says, "The spirit saw him" **אֵרָאָה**; Luke says, "the demon tore him" **אֵרָאָה**, where the words are similar but from different roots. We may now cite a few instances where the theory demands alterations in the original Aramaic gospel:

Matthew xiii. 6—They had no root. **שֵׁרֶשׁ**.

Luke viii. 6—They had no moisture. **שֵׁרֶשׁ**.

Matthew xvii. 1—Into a high mountain. **עֵלְאָה**.

Luke ix. 28—Into a mountain to pray. **עֵלְאָה**.

Mark x. 49—Said call ye him. **אֵתְקֵרְאָה**.

Luke xviii. 40—Ordered him to be brought. **אֵתְקֵרְבָהּ**.

Matthew xxiv. 23—Believe it not. **תִּתְרַחֲצוּן**.

Luke xvii. 23—Go not away. **תִּתְרַחֲקִין**.

Matthew vi. 20—Where thieves bore not through. **יִקְבּוּ**.

Luke xii. 33—Where thieves do not draw near. **יִקְרְבוּ**.

Matthew xiii. 21—He stumbleth. **אֵתְתַקֵּל**.

Luke viii. 13—They fall away. **אֵסְתַּלְקוּ**.

Mark is supposed to give us a few cases of double translation; and the cases are usually considered as proof that the later writers

used the work of their predecessors. This singular occurrence we are told is due to the translator's failure to know the exact translation, and in his desire to get it right he is supposed to have set down whatever permissible translations were in his head:

Matthew viii. 16—And it was evening.

Luke iv. 40—And when the sun was setting.

Mark i. 32—And it was evening when the sun was setting. All of which are supposed to reproduce the same Aramaic phrase, **רַכְרַךְ הָרָה עֶבְרִית**.

Matthew xvii. 1—A high mountain apart.

Mark ix. 2—A high mountain apart alone, where the Aramaic source has the solitary word **בְּלַחְדָּהוֹנ** or **לַחֹד**.

Matthew viii. 3—His leprosy was cleansed.

Luke v. 13—His leprosy departed.

Mark i. 42—His leprosy departed and was cleansed. Here the original reading was, "his leprosy was cleansed," **אֲתַכְכֵּת**. Luke reads this as **אֲתַכְרַת** "departed"; and finally "some worthy progenitor of Lucian, when transcribing the Second Gospel (Professor Marshall will not say Mark!) combined them."

In the parable of the sower Luke says, "The devil taketh away the word; Matthew, "*That which was sown*": Mark, "*The word that was sown.*" "Word" is **דְּבוּרָא** or **דְּבָרָא**; "that which was sown" is **דְּרִיָּא**. Mark did not know which was right and so sets down both.

"Nor are other indications wanting that our Lord spoke in Syriac (read Aramaic). Semitic peoples delight in puns and in assonances or jingles of words. We need not go far to prove this. . . . Babylonian royal decrees and Arabic legal documents are all enlivened by it." When the people spake of the serpent Moses lifted up in the wilderness, "Nahash," Hezekiah said "Nehush-tan," and smashed the "piece of brass." John viii. 34: "He that doeth (**עֲבָדָא**) sin is the slave (**עֲבָדָא**) of sin"; with the same play on the same words in Luke vii. 8: "I say to my slave 'Do this' and he doeth it." Matthew iii. 9: I say unto you that God is able of these stones (**אֲבָנִיא** Aramaic, **אֲבָנִים** Hebrew) to raise up children (**בְּנִיא** Aramaic, **בְּנִים** Hebrew) unto Abra-

ham.¹ And the difference between Matthew v. 9, $\delta\omicron\tilde{\xi}\eta\tau\epsilon$, and Luke iii. 8, $\alpha\rho\tilde{\xi}\eta\sigma\theta\epsilon$, vanishes when we consider that one is Aramaic תִּשְׁרוּן, the other תִּשְׁרוֹן; while we hear the children's babble in Matthew xi. 17 "We piped unto you and ye did not dance (רִקְדְּתוֹן), we wailed and ye did not mourn (אִרְקִידְתוֹן)" — Rakedtun and arkedtun.

With this we complete our survey of the evidence in favor of Aramaic as the language in which our Lord uttered his discourses. It is not exhaustive, for all the cases of retranslation are by no means given; but the best are given, and no kind or head of argument is unrepresented. Indeed, in our endeavor after fair dealing, some things have been adduced which might point to Aramaic that are not given in the literature on which this paper is based. In criticism we have to say:

(a), There are three objections which are fatal to the theory of an original Aramaic Gospel with which the use of Aramaic by our Lord goes hand in hand: *First*, It postulates the existence of two, three, or more primitive documents which have perished and left no trace behind; perished so rapidly that they were unknown in the second century. Men cling to the ancient and original, and it is inconceivable that a written document wherein were the very words of the Lord Jesus Christ should be studied, copied, and destroyed. "The loss of the primitive Gospel would have been a standing disgrace to the churches of Judea and the East." *Second*, Our Lord was crucified in A. D. 29 or 30 by the latest, and by A. D. 50, or thereabouts, Matthew's Gospel is generally admitted to have been in circulation. Paul arrived in Rome in 63 A. D. at the latest, and the last statement in Luke's second book, the Acts, is dated two years after that event. The evidence seems to show that the last event cited and the completion of the book are to be dated together. Luke's first book, the Gospel, is, therefore, to be set before A. D. 65, as otherwise Luke's own statements are empty words. Now the theory requires us to believe that these men did not understand their own

¹ Nestle asserts that this assonance is possible only in the Hebrew. Boanerges is also unquestionably Hebrew. כְּבִי רִגְוֹ

language, and that they could make school-boy mistakes in reading it. For the double translations of Mark, and Luke's failure to read consonants aright, cannot be laid on some "progenitor of Lucian" forsooth. The transmission of the text is dead against it, and the Greek Gospels are now substantially in the words written by their authors; there is no trace or record of editorial redaction. What stands written in the Greek Testament as printed by Tischendorf or Westcott and Hort was there when the men whose names the books bear dried their pens. These men are the responsible parties in this failure to reproduce the original Aramaic Gospel, and not some convenient scribe. Of these men, two were apostles; two were their disciples; all were competent to qualify as witnesses of the things recorded, and to supplement this Aramaic Gospel by their own information. Resch is right when he claims that the central feature of the Aramaic theory is entirely erroneous; the cases are not parallel. The men of the LXX. used copies of MSS. corrupted by hundreds of years of transmission; we have not more than thirty years for the corruptions to have gathered in this Aramaic source. The matter of the Hebrew text was often unintelligible by reason of antiquity (the titles to the Psalms, if you like); the Gospel writers were in the presence of the living witnesses, were themselves a part of what they wrote. The theory is no adequate account of the divergencies in the text of the various writers. It compels us to assume—and Professor Marshall has not challenged the assumption—that the original Aramaic document was not only so rubbed and obscured in twenty to thirty years as to be often hardly legible, but that the Aramaic was so apt to be misread by reason of its lack of vowels, and the similarity of some of its consonants, that an Aramaic letter could be read differently by different people, not once or occasionally, but as a regular thing; which means, if Matthew's *λογια* were the original document, that that ready scribe could not recognize his own signs manual. *Third*, The hypothesis does not begin to account for the omissions. Why should Mark, when he had the Sermon on the Mount before him, insert only a few verses of it in his text, verse at a time as suited, and leave out the Lord's Prayer besides? Why does Luke alone

contain the great "Parables of the Lost"? These discourses of our Lord are the very things most expected in such a document, the very things that called it into existence. Sure these were cobblers and patchers who hacked and carved and abused the original Aramaic Gospel. They were not men of heart and conscience. Did they omit because they thought the matter useless (for Mark could not know, on the hypothesis, what Luke and Matthew had incorporated in their work)? Who were they to pass judgment on the Lord who uttered these words?

(b), It is admitted that our Lord was perfectly acquainted with the Aramaic; the evidence is too large to deny that. It is admitted also that, in private with his own disciples, he may have used it as the regular medium of communication; nay, more, that at times he deliberately preferred it in order that his words might produce a deeper impression. But it is not admitted that when our Lord had the large mixed multitudes to address—the Sermon on the Mount, for instance—he would chose a means of communication in all likelihood not understood by numbers of those he addressed. Especially would this be true if our Lord's pronunciation of Aramaic were faulty, as we are told it was in Galilee. Consider, now, that the Passover season drew crowds to Jerusalem from every nation under heaven, so that Josephus can tell us that three millions were at times present, Parthians, Medes, Elamites . . . Cretes and Arabians, and that Jesus used these occasions for the utterance of very many of his discourses; it becomes, then, inconceivable that he should express the deep thoughts of God in a dialect whose use was circumscribed, especially when there was a language in use well known to almost all, to put it mildly, of his hearers. The passage of Josephus to which we are referred proves nothing. Josephus, indeed, confesses to the labor and delay experienced in rendering his *Jewish War* into Greek from the Aramaic in which it was first composed; and we are asked, "If a highly educated man as he was experienced this difficulty, how very unlikely is it that the fishermen of Bethsaida and the peasants of Galilee would have followed the Sermon on the Mount if addressed to them in Greek?" Well, it is conceivable that one can follow the simple Greek of the Master who

could not write the highly polished, sonorous, rhetorical, literary Greek of Josephus. My Greek testament I can read with my feet on the fender, but it is delay and a matter of Liddell and Scott when I tackle Philo of Alexandria or the comparatively easy Greek of the "Apostolic Fathers." But we must not forget another passage of Josephus which the Aramaic people do not care particularly to remember. He thus concludes his *Antiquities*: "Now, after having completed the work, I venture to say that no other person, whether he were a Jew or a foreigner, had he ever so great an inclination to do it, could so accurately deliver this history to the Greeks; for those of my own nation freely acknowledge that I far exceed them in the learning belonging to the Jews. I have also taken a great deal of pains to acquire the learning of the Greeks, and understand the elements of the Greek language, although on account of the habitual use of the paternal tongue I cannot pronounce Greek with sufficient accuracy; for with us those are not encouraged who learn the languages of many nations, and so adorn their discourses with the smoothness of their periods; *because this sort of accomplishment is regarded as common, not only to all sorts of freemen, but to as many of the servants as are inclined to learn them.*"

(c), The occasional use of Aramaic words and sentences in the Gospels does not in itself prove that the Gospels originally existed in Aramaic, or that our Lord uttered his discourses therein. The same line of argumentation would prove that the epistles of Paul are re-translations from the Aramaic, or that Josephus' *Antiquities* were composed therein; neither of which propositions can be proved. Neither, also, does the re-translation into Aramaic prove that our Lord habitually used that language. It is admitted that he did so occasionally. The New Testament lives and moves in a Semitic atmosphere, and the retranslation carries us into the atmosphere, nothing more; and the passages retranslated into Aramaic may be as successfully retranslated into Hebrew, as Nestle shows; for the only reason so large a number of cases has not been made out for Hebrew is the lack of such translations into Syriac and Aramaic as we have in our hands—the lack, in other words, of the needed lexical sources. In such an environment

the use of assonance is no more than the expected. In the story of "Susanna," appended to the original LXX. of Daniel, there is a double assonance which is only possible in the Greek, and was supposed by Porphyry to prove that the Greek was the original and the Hebrew the translation. So, also, Mark iv. 24 offers an assonance both in Greek and English, which reappears also in German: "With what measure ye measured, to you it shall be measured." Mark x. 38: "Baptized with the baptism I am baptized with." Many similar examples can be culled from the writings of Paul. It is not strange that he who turned the inscription on the Athenian altar into the text for a sermon should have given us many such expressions. Their use in the Gospels no more proves that Christ habitually spoke Aramaic than that Paul's epistles are translations. Any one who has associated with foreigners will know that the language in which one thinks does inevitably mould the choice of words in the language that is spoken. We submit, then, that it is sufficient explanation of all these several phenomena to recognize the Semitic environment, and to admit that on occasion our Lord used Aramaic in the circle of his intimate friends.

4. We thus align ourselves with Paulus, Hug, and Roberts in the belief that our Lord in his public discourses employed Greek, the language which was at that time the literary medium of the whole known world, the language in which the nation that then ruled the world transacted its business in the provinces, and to some extent in the capital itself. The considerations that point in that direction are numerous. Some have already been touched upon, and the deficiencies pointed out in the other hypotheses are all corroborative of this. Not to be tedious, we may mention: 1. The universal use of Greek throughout the whole known world is in itself presumption that when the time came for God to declare the universal gospel unto the nations, that language would be employed which was in general use among all the nations. 2. The known bilingual character of "Galilee of the Gentiles," a land of Greek cities and Greek influence, and the Greek associations which appear in the very names of the twelve, surely make it probable that our Lord was therewith acquainted. 3. When these

Galilean peasants and fishermen went forth to revolutionize the world, they were able to speak with every man they met without interpreters. The Master could speak at ease with the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well, with that woman that was a Greek, a Syrophenician by race, with the Greeks who came to see him by the hand of Philip, which same Philip could climb up into an Ethiopian's chariot, and with him read a common Greek Bible. And when the Master was on a trial, certainly conducted in Greek, John could go in to see and hear, while the soldiers about the gate could chaff the wretched Peter. 4. And when the wretched farce was over, and the innocent victim on that middle cross uttered the cry of anguish, "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani," the crowd that stood about—and we know it must have been a great one—in their ignorance of Hebrew or Aramaic thought he called Elijah. 5. When Paul stood on the castle stairs to make his defence to that mob that would rend him limb from limb, it was Greek they expected him to speak, and the unaccustomed words of their "Hebrew" tongue stilled them to greater silence than the presence of Rome's soldiers.

6. As to the prevalence of Greek, let us remember that from the days of Alexander down, Greek had been in the field. Under the Ptolemies and the Seleucid princes, an influence was exerted in the direct favor of Greek, and under that influence were produced quite a succession of Greek documents written by Palestinian Jews for Palestinian Jews. It was for their benefit that the "wisdom of Jesus, son of Sirach," was translated, expressly stated in the preface that the version was made in Palestine. All the other Old Testament Apocrypha were likewise written in Greek, except the First Book of Maccabees, Judith, part of Baruch, and probably Tobit. But there was another force in the field more powerful far than the influence of these books and commercial intercourse. That force was the translation of Holy Scripture into Greek made under the auspices of the Ptolemies, and known as the LXX. version. And the argument from that source as to the public language of our Lord, Professor Alexander Roberts regards so conclusive that he confidently rests the whole case on this one line of proof. The argument is fully drawn out

in *A Short Proof that Greek was the Language of Christ*, London, 1893, and may now be succinctly stated.¹

(a), *A "People's Bible" Circulated in Palestine in the Time of Christ*.—In his ministry our Lord frequently and freely appeals to the Scriptures as to a book well known and used by the people, and the people are represented as following his references. Thus Mark xii. 35–37: "David himself said in the Holy Spirit, 'The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet'; and the common people heard him gladly." Here the people at large understood and followed Christ, when he quoted and commented on a passage from the Old Testament. Again, Luke xxiv. 27: He expounded to the two disciples at Emmaus "in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself," where the words "in *all* the Scriptures" are especially noticeable, inasmuch as they imply that the disciples had the whole of the sacred volume at their command. They were not acquainted with random selections of Scripture, but with the prophecies in the various inspired books—ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς—from which our Lord could quote as he listed. The same intimate acquaintance is taken for granted in the oft-repeated question, "Have ye not read?" Matt. xii. 1–5 is an instance where two parts of the three divisions of the Hebrew canon are quoted, 'Have ye not read what David did?' "Have ye not read in the law?" and the express implication is that their knowledge of the Scriptures did not rest on synagogue reading and hearing. The people, for their part, were quite able and ready on occasion to quote from the Scriptures. Thus we are told, Luke xx. 27, 28: "Then came to him certain of the Sadducees, who asked him, Master, Moses *wrote* unto us," etc. Again, John ii. 17: "The disciples remembered that it was *written*, The zeal of thine house has eaten me up." Again, the common people introduce into their discourse with great naturalness a quotation from the Old Testament, John vi. 31: "As it is *written*, He gave them bread

¹ We follow Professor Roberts' order here closely. Only we have checked all the statements, added much new material of our own, and recast the argument into our own mould, so that we wish to assume complete responsibility for every and all statements made in the course of the argumentation.

out of heaven to eat." Paul, as we know well, possessed both books in papyrus and parchments. (2 Tim. iv. 13.) From all of which we rightly conclude that the sacred Scriptures were not in the exclusive possession of any one class. They were spread everywhere throughout the land, and could be appealed to by any public teacher with the assurance that they would be at once appreciated and understood. Every Jew had access to them in a written form, and could quote from them as occasion required, and it will be readily granted that the entire Scriptures of the Old Testament were then well known in Palestine. For the command, "Search the Scriptures," has no value if the men to whom it is addressed have no access thereto. Prof. F. A. Christie, of Meadville Seminary, Pennsylvania, has attempted to dispute the validity of the premise here established in *The Classical Review*, May, 1894, Vol. VIII., but it appears without success; for when Dr. Roberts replied to his criticism and pointed out that the argument of James in Acts xv. 6-21 depends entirely for its cogency on words that exist in the Greek version, but are not found in the Hebrew, he vouches the singular response, "I must add that some of us do not regard the fourth Gospel and the Book of Acts as accurate historical sources." Since, then, the conclusion can only be escaped by destruction of the documents that contain the evidence, we may regard it as proven that there was a people's Bible in circulation in Palestine at the time of Christ, a conclusion, be it said, which also forms the starting-point of Bohl's work.

(b), *The Hebrew Original was not the People's Bible in the Time of Christ.*—And was not for the very simple reason that the common people could not read it. That they could not, stands almost beyond doubt. Hebrew may have been used in literature, and perhaps read in the synagogues as it is read to-day; but it is generally agreed, and Professor Christie admits it, that Hebrew was not the vernacular. Ancient Hebrew was then a dead language so far as the people at large were concerned. It continued to be studied by experts as the tongue in which the Old Testament books had been composed, but beyond the circle of such scholars it was neither understood nor spoken. *The*

Wisdom of Jesus, Son of Sirach, is likely one of the latest works written in Hebrew. Certainly by 100 B. C. it had ceased to be used in writing as it had much earlier ceased to be used in familiar speech. The concurrent testimony of Ewald, De Wette, Bleek, Winer, Deutsch, Gesenius and W. Robertson Smith, may be accepted as conclusive on that point. Josephus tells us further in the passage heretofore quoted that, "Those of my own nation freely acknowledge that I far exceed them in the learning belonging to the Jews"; and it is certain that his bombast is, in the main, true. He should thus have been well acquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures. And yet this same Josephus had but a sorry acquaintance therewith; for in his writings he depends more on the Greek translation than on the original text of the Old Testament, and "his etymological and other blunders are of the grossest conceivable character." If, now, such a scholar as Josephus had so imperfect a knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures, we may conclude that they were sealed books to the people at large. The cost of Hebrew manuscripts, moreover, put them out of the reach of ordinary purses; and the same is, in a measure, true of Aramaic. The enormous labor and care involved in their production made them very dear. We have a statement from the third or fourth century—and the statement would be about true in Jesus' day—that a copy of the Psalms, Job, and torn pieces of Proverbs were together valued at eighty-five dollars—five Greek minas. This would, of course, put Hebrew manuscript out of common reach. The people's Bible was not the original Hebrew text.

(c), *An Aramaic Version of the Hebrew Original was not the People's Bible in the Time of Christ*.—And was not for the very simple reason that there is no evidence that such a version ever existed, much less at that time. We do not say that there were no written Targums on various parts of the Old Testament, but we do say that there was no complete Aramaic version in existence. The Jews in our Lord's time had access to the entire Scriptures of the Old Testament in a written form—that was well understood; but all the evidence that any Aramaic version of any book of the Old Testament existed in Christ's time is a state-

ment that a written Targum (which is something different from a translation) on Job was highly disapproved of by the elder Gamaliel (middle of first century, A. D.), who caused it to be buried out of sight. It is not likely, then, that the people would have what the authorities disapproved; and, indeed, all the Targums now in existence have come into a written existence since the end of the second century. The Targum of Jonathan on the prophets is, perhaps, to be dated somewhere near that time; but owing to greater reverence for the law the Targums on the Pentateuch cannot be dated earlier than the sixth century. The Talmud makes ample provision for oral targumisation in the synagogues, but it seems clear that permission to write or use a written Targum was not given until about 150 A. D. We conclude, therefore, that the people's Bible is not here, not even if we can stretch our imagination to make the word cover the very paraphrastic commentary called Targum. Of a pure Aramaic translation there is no evidence.

(d), *The Greek Version of the Old Testament was the People's Bible in the time of Christ.*—And was so because by the process of exhaustion the LXX. version is all that can remain. This version originated in Alexandria, and thence encompassed the whole known world, driving out the original Hebrew, and becoming itself the original for the earliest translations into Latin, Syriac, Arabic, Coptic, Ethiopic, and Gothic. Such was its use in Alexandria, that Philo, the great Jewish scholar of that place, seems to have known nothing else. Such was its use elsewhere, that men came to predicate inspiration of it. If our theory be correct, we shall find marks of the use of this version in the New Testament; and such there are. The argument of James in Acts xv. 6–21, as has been said, depends for its cogency on words that exist in this version, but are not found in the Hebrew text. The copy of Isaiah used by the Ethiopian as he rode in his chariot on the “desert road” from Jerusalem to Gaza has been very generally known to have been in the LXX. version, from the general agreement of the text with the words thereof, and by reason of the improbability of his reading Hebrew. Instances need not indefinitely be multiplied, nor need we thresh old straw. There

are two hundred and seventy-five cases of complete or partial quotation in the New Testament from the Old. One hundred and seventy-five of these are cases of quotation from memory, and agree neither with the original text nor with the LXX. version. Of the remainder, fifty-three agree with the Hebrew and with the LXX., which has rendered the passages with correctness; ten agree with the Hebrew against the incorrect LXX., while thirty-seven agree with the LXX. against the original text, which can certainly be counted as good evidence that the LXX. was the Bible of the men who wrote the New Testament. This evidence is the sounder because Acts xv. 6–21 is not the only place where the correctness of the argument depends on the words of the version, Romans iii. 10–18, for instance, a Scripture which once completely staggered the illustrious Jerome. The cost of Greek books can be added as further proof to the express testimony of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Tertullian, who cite the version as common authority in their disputes with the Jews. Indeed, it was the very discovery that the LXX. which they used was an ally of the Christians in their disputes over Messianic prophecies which caused the Jews to neglect it, to have made the versions of Aquila and Symmachus, and finally to encamp behind the battlements of the Hebrew verity. Now, as to cost, we can get a fair idea of the cheapness of Greek manuscripts from the price of books at Rome about this time. One man dictated, hundreds of slaves wrote; large editions were published, and “it would be safe to compute that as much matter as would cover sixteen pages of small print might be sold at the rate of about six pence, and in that ratio.” We may fairly conclude, then, that in the LXX. version we have the desired “People’s Bible.”

(e), *Greek then was the Public Language of our Lord, in which Ordinarily His Discourses were Uttered.*—If his Bible and their Bible was in Greek, there can be no reasonable doubt that in Greek he revealed to men the principles of the kingdom of God, and taught the way, the truth, and the life. The universal gospel was delivered to men in the universal language, and we now have it in the very language, and substantially in the words, of its first utterance. We do not have to see through the veil of a

translation darkly, but we do see face to face. We believe, therefore, that we have the right to argue from these words as from a document of last resort, and that the words as they stand written are the very words of the Lord Jesus, able to make us wise unto salvation.

R. B. WOODWORTH.

BURLINGTON, W. VA.

V. A DIVINE MANUAL FOR ALL CHRISTIAN WORKERS.

THE most useful of all the books of the New Testament to the church under this dispensation is the Acts of the Apostles. This treatise is of such supreme value to the church that she could dispense with any other book of the New Testament more easily than with this. For it is not, as many suppose, a thoughtless collection of fragments, of disjointed and disconnected incidents and events, but a thoroughly scientific and logical history. It grows naturally out of the gospel history as contained in the four evangelists, and it furnishes the historical germs and forces of all the subsequent Epistles and the Revelation, and of the entire development of the church until the bodily return of our blessed Lord.

Traditional history and internal evidences concur in the statement that this apostolic record was written by an accomplished Gentile physician named Luke, the author of the third Gospel, and one of the companions of the Apostle Paul.

In his first treatise Luke tells what Jesus began to do and to teach; in this second treatise he tells what Jesus continues to do and to teach; in the first, what Jesus did in his bodily presence; in the second, what Jesus continues to do by his Spirit, his word, and his witnesses. In both, the work is one, and Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ, is the living actor.

The scope of this book, or the main object had in view by the author, is the establishment and extension of the gospel, or the Christian church, from Jerusalem outward and onward to the ends of the earth. This is the one great thought ever present to the mind and heart of the historian, and from this he never turns aside.

The first twelve chapters narrate the spread of the gospel among the Jews; the other sixteen chapters are occupied with the spread of the same gospel among the Gentiles.

Peter is the chief apostolic figure in the first part; Paul is the prominent person in the second part. The first part begins and

ends in the holy city, Jerusalem; the second begins in the Syrian Antioch, and ends in the imperial Rome, the head and heart of the Gentile world.

The period covered by this work begins with the bodily ascension into heaven of the Christ of gospel history, and ends with the bodily return of this same Jesus to the earth. The entire period of church history is between these two points—his departure, his return. How much belongs to the past we know; how much belongs to the future, who can tell? The work of the world's evangelization is ours; the times and the seasons belong to God.

In view of the magnitude and difficulty of this work, our Lord furnished his blood-bought church with this precious book of facts, precedents, principles, and examples to guide her in her difficult and dangerous pathway until the King himself shall descend in glory at the end of the age to give her the kingdom.

THE COMMISSION AND THE ENDUEMENT WITH POWER FOR THE WORK.

In this book the church finds her authoritative commission from her risen Lord: "Ye shall be my witnesses"; "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation"; "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you." The church is commanded to "*go*," not to abide; to push out into new fields, not to remain forever in the old ones. By the express terms of her constitution and commission, the church is an active, aggressive, missionary institute. When she ceases to "*go*" she will cease to live; when she refrains from preaching she has forfeited her right to exist. Witnessing to the facts and the truths of the Old and New Testaments is, according to the mind of the Master, the one supreme work of the church in this dark and ruined world.

THE ORDER OF THE MARCH.

"Beginning here, at and from Jerusalem; thence to Judea; then on to Samaria; then to the uttermost ends of the earth."

"Begin" in this venerable and holy city, the place of my death and resurrection. *"Begin"* here with those who knew and hated me.

The gospel rests on an impregnable foundation of facts. If the facts cannot be ascertained and established, then the church has no message from a gracious God to guilty men. Eliminate the facts from Bible history, and the gospel is reduced to a dream and a delusion.

The disciples, led by the apostles, proceeded at once to prove the facts concerning Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ of God. They testified of him, and with such power that thousands were convinced, convicted of sin, and converted to the Lord.

In the city where the events took place they must be proved; in the presence of the people among whom they occurred they must be established. After this is done, not before, the witnesses must move on to Judea, then to Samaria, the bridge to the great Gentile world; and after this, to the utmost ends of the earth.

This commission was at no time or place given exclusively to the apostles, exclusively to bishops, exclusively to ministers; it was given to the whole body of believers; to each and every disciple to the end of the world. Every believer must be a witness; every disciple must testify; and the witnessing must never cease. These disciples never attempted to "bring the world to Christ"; but they did take Christ to the world; they never proclaimed the conversion of the world, but the evangelization of the world. Well would it be if the church of this generation would recall and remember these facts of apostolic history.

The general conditions of the human race will continue essentially the same until the end of the age and the return of the Lord; meanwhile the witness-bearing goes on.

The witnessing church saw the empire of pagan Rome cease her cruel persecutions and become Christian in name, but not in spirit. She saw that empire dismembered by barbarians from the north, but the witnesses went on with their testimony; and their voice has never failed to be heard in the earth.

The work of testifying for Christ goes on through all the centuries, north, south, east, west; through all countries, to the

hermit nations, to the islands of the seas. "Ye are my witnesses; I am with you to the end of the age," saith the Lord.

I. THE ACTS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

God's revelation of himself to men made at sundry times and in divers manners was given as men were able to receive, and the revelation was always continuous and progressive; the "Progress of Doctrine" is now an accepted canon of Biblical interpretation.

In the Old Testament the unity and spirituality of God are revealed with the utmost clearness and power; there is one only living and true God, and he is a Spirit. In the four Gospels we have the Word made flesh, the Son of God in human form, God incarnate; and witnesses see and hear and handle the Word of Life. He is Son, beloved of the Father, Lord of the Sabbath, cleanser of his Father's house, always about his Father's business, with power on earth to forgive sin. He is the theme of gospel history, and of him the evangelists testify. But before this Son of man goes back into heaven from whence he came, he tells his followers of another divine Person who will come to them when he departs; a spirit of truth to lead them into truth; an advocate to plead his cause on earth while he pleads theirs in heaven; one who will abide with them, will baptize them, will fill them, will lead them and endue them with more than human power for their work of witnessing.

The Book of Acts differs immeasurably from the Gospels in the presentation of the personality, presence and power of the Holy Spirit, so that it would be no misnomer to call this book *The Gospel of the Holy Ghost*. Jesus still carries on his blessed work of salvation, but not in bodily presence; but (a), *By his Spirit*; (b), *By his word*; (c), *By his witnesses*.

Not until the day of Pentecost was fully come did the Spirit come in all the plenitude of his power. Then the promise of the Father was fulfilled; there was the sound as of a mighty, rushing wind; there were tongues as of fire; there was the felt power of God in Jerusalem; and the words of the prophet Joel were fulfilled. The Holy Spirit descended equally and alike upon all disciples—not upon the apostles only, but on old men and

young men; on daughters and on handmaidens. The prophecy was fulfilled but *not exhausted*, and that same spirit must "be poured out on *all flesh*." From that moment the Spirit assumed his rightful administration of all the affairs of the church: (a), *He presides in all the assemblies for worship.* (b), *He brings the words of Christ to remembrance.* (c), *He leads the disciples into all truth unto salvation.* (d), *He administers discipline.* (e), *He calls and qualifies witnesses and sends them to their fields of labor.* (f), *By his gifts and works he bears testimony to and with the human witnesses.* Henceforth he is to abide with the church and bear witness for Christ until his return in glory at the end of the age.

It is flippantly and thoughtlessly asserted that these mighty gifts and works of the Spirit ceased absolutely with the apostolic church. The New Testament will be searched in vain for one single word to confirm this reckless assertion; and the challenge is boldly made that God has nowhere in his word placed any limitation on these gifts of the Spirit as to time and place. Only unbelief relegates these powers and gifts of the Spirit to a past age. God intends them to continue to the end of the world.

Under this administration of the Spirit in the church (the pattern and model for all churches in all time), there was no elaborate human machinery, no manipulation of earthly forces, no bazaars, no festivals, no concerts, no feasts, no excursions, no boys' brigades, no athletic clubs, no junior endeavors, no civic centres, no good citizenship committees, no betterment of earthly conditions, in short, not one of the approved and popular methods of evangelization of our day and generation.

II. A BOOK OF APPLIED CHRISTIANITY.

The demand of the day is not for creed, but for life; not dogma, but practice; not faith, but works. The demand may be very silly, but, nevertheless, it exists. Very well, here is not only a book, but *the* book of applied Christianity. If the religion of Christ was ever applied in this world, then we have the record of it here in these Acts of the Apostles.

Let us get a clear idea of *what was applied*. What do men mean by the phrase "*applied Christianity*"?

In this book there are no views, opinions, theories, speculations, experiments of men on any subject whatsoever; no conventions held to inaugurate social and economic reforms; no pulpit discussion of financial systems and methods; no plans for the better city government of Athens or Antioch; no midnight visits to tenderloin precincts in Corinth or Ephesus to secure legal evidence to change the personnel of the police; no massing of the moral forces of the Christian brotherhood against particularly obnoxious classes of citizens; no combinations with unbelievers to secure political supremacy; no compromise with the world for the sake of a majority; no prodding the government to interfere in the affairs of other nations; no invitations to Felix, Festus, or Agrippa to preside at religious meetings; no parliament of comparative religions to decide who was the true God by a popular vote; no exaltation of the evils of environment above the hatefulness and ill-desert of sin in the soul.

In vain do you search this wonderful book to find any of the modern methods of the so-called Applied Christianity of our day. If these are the best methods of aggressive Christianity, how culpable was the Holy Spirit in not revealing them to the disciples of the first century. But what did these disciples *apply*? Nothing other than the *facts* of biblical and gospel history, and the truth revealed by God—and these they applied with the earnestness of profound conviction and in the power of the Holy Spirit.

The witnesses told what they had seen and heard and handled and knew of the Logos life that was manifested to men full of grace and truth; the gospel message of those days was simple testimony; and these facts and truths were "applied" to the individual heart and conscience of all ranks, classes, and conditions; it was an individual rescue work; all the ills and evils that afflict men now existed then: slavery, polygamy, licentiousness, drunkenness, theft, disease, poverty, oppression; but the witnesses never turned aside from the paramount work of testifying. Salvation from sin and hell by the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ was their one and only remedy for all the miseries of men. Every man renewed and redeemed by the Spirit and the word was lifted above his environments; his earthly conditions were glorified

by heavenly light, and he became a power for righteousness and healing.

"This testimony was effectual to the salvation of sinners in Jerusalem, Samaria, Paphos, Corinth, and Rome. Believers were added to the Lord: the crucifiers of Christ in the holy city, the bewitched people of Samaria, the licentious inhabitants of Cyprus, high officials from far-off Ethiopia, the barbarous people of Malta, centurions and soldiers of Rome, sellers of purple from Thyatira, prison-keepers of Philippi, and slaves of Cæsar's household."

The Scriptures were read and explained; the facts concerning Christ were stated and established; believers were baptized; disciples were enrolled; churches were organized; and the witnesses passed on to preach the gospel in the "regions beyond."

III. THE CHURCH'S MANUAL OF MISSIONS.

The administration of the Spirit begins with the ascension, and ends with the advent; the bodily departure, the bodily return, of Jesus the Christ; between these points, the calling and completion of the church.

Since the departure of our Lord, more than fifty generations of the race have passed from these earthly scenes to other shores; after eighteen centuries, the church of this day finds herself still engaged in the evangelization of the world.

We call this the era of universal missions, and many questions of urgent interest and importance are pressing upon the church for solution: the sphere and functions of missionary boards; the powers of the evangelist; the relations between the home and foreign churches; the status of heathen converts and ministers; the necessity and use of creeds; the founding of schools and colleges; how to treat the great propagandist religions of the non-Christian world; questions of demonology, of polygamy, of the opium habit; the sale of spirits and of fire-arms to the natives; foot-binding; slavery; self-support of native churches—these and like matters are burning problems in all denominations; and who is sufficient for these things?

But the ascended Lord has not left his church without a book of instructions to meet these and all possible emergencies that may

arise until his second advent in power and glory. He does not send out his servants unfurnished for their work. This book is the authoritative manual of missions, placed in the hands of the church to direct her in all the exigencies of her earthly career, not classified and numbered rules, not minute details of legislation, but great principles, concrete cases, precedents, illustrations, so that the careful student of this book will always find direction amid all the difficulties of the vast missionary field.

All the elements in the problem of the world's evangelization are precisely the same to-day that they were in the apostolic period of the church; there is here no new thing under the sun.

The gospel proclaimed by these witnesses came in contact with every phase and form of life and civilization. The church of that era met the bigotry of Jerusalem, the idolatry of Athens, the luxury of Corinth, the licentiousness of Cyprus, the magic of Ephesus, the barbarism of Lystra, the brutality of Rome. The word and witnesses of our Lord came in conflict with race prejudice and hatred; with many forms of comparative religions, false, corrupt, debasing; with science, so-called, and philosophers of all degrees, Stoics, Epicureans, and agnostics; with magistrates, centurions, and kings; with slavery, polygamy, impurity, drunkenness, gambling, and godlessness; in short, with all the ills, evils, miseries, and sins of this mortal existence; and in this book we have the record of the results of the contact, and we find principles and precedents to guide in every difficult and doubtful case. Nothing will emerge in the future that has not already been in the past, and that is not provided for in this manual.

A. W. PITZER.

Washington, D. C.

VI. W. K. MARSHALL, D. D.,

A MISSIONARY PIONEER OF THE SOUTHWEST.

THIS nineteenth century has been prolific—prolific in lines of thought, in types of humanity, in systems of government, philosophy, and religious belief. It has been the century, not so much of the warrior, as of the statesman; not so much of the man of physical prowess, as of the man of intellectual action. It has, moreover, been an age when the head has triumphed over the heart—so much so that the great Georgian poet but voiced the mind of all the seers when he cried out, “The time needs Heart—’tis tired of Head!” Further, it has been an age of rationalism—an age ushered in by Shelley’s defiant challenge of almighty law, by Paine’s *Age of Reason*, and Channing’s *Unitarianism*; an age when the pernicious influence of the French infidelity of the preceding century was rife and abounded in fruit on American soil; an age when Ingersoll could say, “I don’t know!” and be applauded to the echo; an age that produced the Brook Farm, the Oneida community, and the Mormon Tabernacle; an age, in short, when every crank has had his following, and every delusion its apostle.

An inevitable effect of it all has been to arouse thinking men to resolute thinking, and resolute thinkers to vigorous action. The unsettled condition of affairs—economic, social, religious—called for men. And no decade in the world’s history has witnessed the birthyears of more and stronger men than the opening decade of this nineteenth century. In England, there were Cardinal Newman, John Stuart Mill, Darwin, Hugh Miller, Tennyson; in America, Poe, Emerson, Hawthorne, Longfellow, Lincoln, Jefferson Davis, Lee, Maury; in the church, James Alexander, Addison Alexander, Boardman, Bushnell, Plumer.

Each section of the country had its own peculiar demands to be met. But most of all was the call strong in the west and southwest. The tide of immigration was sweeping everything before

it. New States were being formed, and where there was a forest or prairie yesterday is an incorporated town to-day. Churches were to be organized, schools to be established, and all this arm in arm with the material development.

Successful men are the product of the times, and in proportion as the demand is urgent is the supply abundant. The southwest needed men of education, men of respectability, men of consecration; and just as Sergeant Smith Prentiss came to fill a political want, Stephen F. Austin to voice the demand for freedom from papal shackles, John Newton Waddel to look after educational interests, so did Rev. William K. Marshall come to supply the word of God to those calling on their brothers of the east to come over and help.

To these prefatory statements one other must be added. The Scotch-Irish element has been a powerful factor in our national development. It contains the requisites of growth and permanence to a far greater degree than does the Puritan element, for the reason that it is broader, more liberal, and more profound. It commends itself to all classes of people, being adapted to emergency and to the rough life of the pioneer as well as to urban culture. Hence it was that this bold yeomanry scattered rapidly and broadly over the newer sections of the country, and they now form a very stable portion of the population of the southwest. It was no chance that, years ago, directed the steps of such men as Baker, Palmer, Marshall, McGregor, across the great Father of Waters.

Dr. William Kirkpatrick Marshall, the subject of this sketch, sprung from that division of the Scotch-Irish that settled in Pennsylvania in the closing years of the last century. His father, William Marshall, married Mary Kirkpatrick. They were living in Indiana county, Pennsylvania, at the birth of their son, July 19, 1808. Shortly after they moved to Westmoreland county, and settled at a place twenty-five miles east of Pittsburg. Spending his boyhood here and making use of such opportunities of preparing himself as the country afforded, he entered Jefferson College, Canonsburg, when he was twenty-one years of age. The four years that he spent here under the administration of the

revered Matthew Brown were of supreme importance to him. Few men impressed him so profoundly. In his senior year he made a profession of religion, joined the church, and decided to enter the gospel ministry. Accordingly, in the fall of 1833, he entered the Western Theological Seminary at Pittsburg, where he spent three years—having made himself ready for his lifework by the time he was twenty-eight years of age. This fact demands the careful consideration of our candidates for the ministry who, having caught the spirit of the age, are rushing through college and curtailing their seminary course, in order to begin their chosen work by the time they are ready to cast their first ballot.

Another fact should be coupled with this. By the time he was ready to enter the field, he had decided in his own mind where that field awaited him. Nor is it a very inviting one, from a worldly point of view. He declines the call to Minersville church in Pittsburg, having resolved to push out west. He accepts a call, and at once enters upon his pastoral charge at La Porte, a growing town in a rich and populous section in North Indiana. Being ordained and installed May, 1838, he labors here until 1845. This pastorate marks one of the most important epochs of his life, and probably none was fraught with richer life experiences—heart lessons, the more deeply impressed because the outgrowth of his first and fiercest contest on the world's battle-field for the cause of humanity. His journey from his paternal home was made on horseback, those were the days of saddle-bag itineracy. He found at La Porte a port but not a haven, an organization but not a church, no temple but a warehouse. And yet in his first year there were sixty additions during one series of meetings. A church building was erected, and, in the following year, there were thirty more additions as the result of a single revival. He writes of these: "It is worthy of note that these revivals occurred without any extraordinary measures, under the ordinary preaching of the word by the pastor." This statement comes with somewhat startling force in these days of sensational revivalism. It must have sounded strange even then, for those were the days of camp-meeting, of exhorting and shouting. It was not in the tempest, but in the "still small voice" that God spoke to his prophet Elijah.

Mr. Marshall was married in 1839 to Miss Sarah Morrison, also of Scotch-Irish descent; and for nearly sixty years they lived in the enjoyment of conjugal felicity. Seven children blessed the union. His wife and three children survive him—two daughters and their mother in Texas, and a son in Mexico. His well-stored mind, cheerful disposition, and consistent life, made his home one of exceptional happiness and left an impress upon all with whom he came in contact.

As a result of the schism of 1837, there were two bodies in the Presbyterian Church—the “Old School,” and the “New School”—holding contrary views as to the expediency of the “plan of union” with the Congregationalists. The “Old School,” according to Robert Kerr in his *People's History of Presbyterianism*, was more conservative, adhering to the policy of union with the other church, opposing the New England theology which was not strictly Calvinistic, and being less extreme on the subject of African slavery. Giant minds were arrayed on either side, and the contest was violent and bitter. The excitement probably reached its highest at the meetings of the respective assemblies in 1839. Mr. Marshall was a commissioner to the “Old School” Assembly which convened in Philadelphia in May. Familiar as we are with the coolness, prudence, tact, and resolution of his later years, it would be interesting to know what part he took in the deliberations. But the records tell us not, and his own modesty has omitted it from his diary. But if his voice was silent, we may be sure that down in his heart of hearts there welled forth the petition that the great Master of assemblies would guide them to the best results, and allay bitterness and strife. If so, his prayer was heard, so far as this division was concerned, for ere long the two divisions worked together side by side, and in the South were finally merged into one organization, the Presbyterian Church of the United States.

With the termination of his pastorate at La Porte in 1845, we pass to the second period of Dr. Marshall's ministerial career. His wife's health failing to such an extent that she could no longer endure the severe winters of Northern Indiana, they decided to go farther south. Here, again, the records are silent as to why

he selected the wilds of Arkansas instead of a cultured and remunerative pastorate in the eastern Gulf States. Did he not owe it to his family to seek a wealthy church, where he could command a salary more commensurate with his ability, and where his children would have the best social and educational advantages? Time has proved that he made no mistake. The Lord careth for his own.

His new task was a difficult one. During his first year he had charge of domestic missions in Arkansas. His field, then, was a large state—a state without railroads; a state of forests and swamps, and many streams easily over-swollen; a state sparsely settled and heterogeneous in its civilization; a state in which *town* was not an important feature, and religion was at a sad discount, if not, indeed, a foreign currency. And, yet, this may be a hard saying. More appreciative pioneers have never marked out the way for civilization in any state. None have had more difficulties to contend with, and none have achieved more signal triumph over obstacles. No State in the Union has more successfully carved out her destiny in so short a time, and none have brighter possibilities for the future.

However, Mr. Marshall's labors here were exceedingly trying, and called for unusual courage and patience. But he had chosen his field of labor deliberately, he was prepared for any sacrifice. The soil promised rich results for the tilling, and the man of God was cheered by seeing the work prosper in his hands. After one year of general work, he took charge of the churches of Van Buren and Fort Smith. These villages were on the confines of the reservations for the Indians who had, just before this, been removed from their homes in Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and East Tennessee. This was a rare opportunity offered to a minister of the gospel; and well did Mr. Marshall use it. He had been in western pioneer work now for ten years, was possessed of tact, an indomitable will, and presence of mind for any emergency. At one revival in Van Buren there were over five hundred professions of religion! For ten years did this faithful sentinel guard these outposts with sleepless vigilance; and to his intrepidity and perseverance during these long years of uncertainty is due in a large measure the success of Presbyterianism in Arkansas to-day.

Though far out in the West and in a land of strangers, he was not forgotten by his old-time friends of the East. A pleasant little diversion was given to his life when, in 1846, the College of Indiana conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Divinity; and again, three years later, when his *Alma Mater* created him Master of Arts.

A decade in the West represents a century of progress in the East. New towns spring up, new railroads are built, more prairie and woodland converted into lovely homes and well-tilled farms, and various industries show the enterprise and thrift of a busy, home-loving people; but it is not ease, it is stir. The spirit that masters the world is abroad, and Dickens' Ghost of the Christmas Future has already become the Shadow of the Christmas Past.

To such a man as Dr. Marshall, with robust constitution, untiring energy, strong intellectual acumen, and the power of coming into sympathetic touch with the masses of the people, this western life was full of interest. Ten of the best years of his life had been spent in successful labor in Arkansas. But he, like many others, had been watching the rise of the Lone Star republic; its success in shaking off the fetters of Mexican thralldom; its settlement by a strong, bold, intelligent citizenship; its admission into the sisterhood of States, and the establishment of a firm constitutional government. Above all was he impressed with the Macedonian cry, "Come over and help us!" He felt that the new State, the cynosure of wealth and talent and industry, was in danger, if material progress outstripped intellectual and spiritual development. The situation was peculiarly critical because, in the rush for advantageous location, many broke aloof from family ties and came alone; many young men, tired of parental restraint and despairing of the slow process of money-making in the older States, were flocking into Texas to make their fortune and their fame, to the neglect of character-making.

Having labored in adjacent territory, he realized better than did others farther away that while other denominations were aggressive in their movements in the new State, Presbyterianism was in imminent danger of being crowded out or, at least, neglected. He realized, in addition to all this, that it was not the lame, the halt,

the blind, that were needed as laborers in this new vineyard—but the rather that it was the men who could do full day's work, and could do it for a penny a day. Understanding the situation as he did, he felt that his time in Arkansas had been spent. The pathway had been blazed out and the work shaped for his successors. Henceforth duty called him to the new field—to a new untried field—called him when nearly fifty years of age to go up and possess Hebron. But he could say with Caleb of old, "As my strength was then, even so is my strength now, both to go out, and to come in. . . . If so be that the Lord will be with me, I shall be able to drive them out."

Accordingly, in the fall of 1854, he moved his family to Texas. Of this change, which marks the beginning of the third period of his ministry, he writes: "I felt that I was now entering on my life work, and that Texas was to be my future field of labor." What the move meant to him can best be given in his own words: "Our journey to Texas was in wagon, and through the Indian Nation; there were then no railroads. We camped out at night, and it took us some four weeks to make the trip. We came first to Rush, Cherokee county, where we arrived the night before Christmas. We went into an open house, unfurnished, and the night was fearfully cold; we suffered, but we were all well and happy."

After preaching about a year at Rush, Larissa, and Alto, he moved to Henderson, where he spent the next twenty years of his missionary life, travelling over almost the entire State on horseback. During the revival at Henderson in 1858, when he was fifty years old, he preached continuously, two and three sermons a day, for four weeks. The result was sixty or more conversions. In 1875 he moved to Marshall, from which point he continued his missionary labors to the day of his death. For several years he supplied churches about his home, doing evangelistic work in Beaumont, Orange, Nacogdoches, etc. During these last twenty years of his life he did a work for Presbyterianism in Texas that can hardly be overestimated. Practical results characterized his labors; churches were organized, strengthened, and set to active work; young men led to consecrate their lives to the Master's ser-

vice; and the masses of the people brought to a more intimate knowledge of the great fundamental truths of the gospel. He attended the meeting of the General Assembly at Dallas, May, 1895, where he met with a painful accident which came near costing his life; but a strong constitution triumphed, and after eight weeks of confinement he was restored to health.

A person travelling over the Eastern Texas of to-day finds considerable difficulty in realizing the appearance of the country forty years ago. Settlements were few and far between. Churches and school-houses were very scarce, the "adobe" and temporary "ranch" being then pretentious objects. A very graphic description of the country in the fifties is given in the correspondence of Dr. Daniel Baker as published by his son. Dr. Baker came to Texas as a missionary in 1840, preceding Dr. Marshall by about fourteen years. He soon recognized the peculiar needs of the people, and became assured that the East could not supply the field. It was evident that the kind of laborer needed in the western field was the very one who would not willingly give up his charge in the East. Hence, he came to the conclusion that it behooved Texas Presbyterians to educate their own ministers, infuse into their lives the inspiration of the western prairie, and have them imbibe the stirring push and determination of frontier life. The result was Austin College, located at Huntsville in 1849—probably the first chartered institution in the Lone Star State. It ante-dates the State University by many years, and has been a power in the civilization of the southwest.

To a man of Dr. Marshall's training, experience, and tastes, the educational conditions of a country would at once present themselves for consideration. A ripe scholar, a man of capacious memory, possessing analytical sagacity of a high order, he would very naturally find his sympathies going out to the young institution. During all the days of the civil war and reconstruction period, he was an ardent supporter of the college, which, so far as I have been able to learn, was never reduced to the necessity of closing its doors to students. He and Dr. Baker became intimate co-workers in the great cause; and on the death of the latter, Dr. Marshall was appointed by synod to prepare a

memorial. His tender affection for that venerable pioneer of education extended to the family and was kept up until Dr. Marshall's death.

When the transformation of Stewart College, at Clarksville, Tennessee, into the Southwestern Presbyterian University, was finally effected in 1879, under the control of the six Synods of Alabama, Arkansas, Memphis, Mississippi, Nashville, and Texas, we find present at the May meeting of the Board of Trustees Rev. Dr. Marshall as one of the representatives of the Synod of Texas. Here he was associated with such men as Rev. Thomas R. Welch, Rev. John N. Waddel, Rev. B. M. Palmer, Rev. J. B. Shearer, Rev. Joseph Bardwell, Rev. R. F. Bunting, and others, prominent in the Southern church both for their keen intellectual acumen and their consecrated Christian characters. When, in 1884, it was decided by the Board of Trustees to add the department of theology to the University at Clarksville, Rev. R. L. Dabney was selected to take charge of this important branch. So grave a question must be carefully met. The matter must be presented to Dr. Dabney in as forcible a light as possible. Dr. Marshall was selected as the person best fitted for this duty. He was a cogent reasoner, a man of deep emotion, and strong in his influence over his coadjutors.

At the meeting of the Synod of Texas, in 1886, it was decided to sever connection with the Southwestern Presbyterian University. With reference to this separation, Dr. Waddel, Chancellor of the University, in his *Memorials of Academic Life*, wrote: "The names of two most beloved and highly-esteemed directors, and two whose ardent devotion and zealous, active work for its prosperity had never been excelled, appear no more recorded upon our annual catalogue. Their absence from the annual meetings of the Board of Trustees was a significant event in our history, as it was known to all our friends that on no occasion of the assembly of directors had either of them ever been absent, save when unable to attend by reason of sickness, and this had occurred on only a single occasion in the case of Rev. Dr. King; while in the experience of the venerable Dr. W. K. Marshall, dating his membership from the very origin of the institution, his

attendance at Clarksville was never known to fail. These gentlemen were surrendered by us with the deepest regret, for the additional reason that their wisdom and experience had contributed greatly to the establishment of those grand fundamental principles which lie at the basis of true Christian education, to which, indeed, this institution is so largely indebted for its solid prosperity." When the Synod of Texas resumed its connection with the University, in 1895, Dr. Marshall would probably again have been appointed a Director but for his great age.

In 1888 Dr. Marshall consented to serve as trustee for Austin College, and from that time to his death his venerable figure was never absent from the annual meetings of the board. He had before this for many years been closely identified with the college, as he was usually one of the committee on the college. His judgment was quickly reached, and was conservative and practical. He was a man of liberal views and broad policy, with the rare power of tracing out a tendency to its probable results and testing it in all its bearings. The senior class felt that the ceremony of graduation was hardly complete without the words of wisdom and counsel from this patriarch of the board. His dignified demeanor, bent form, halting step, but bright eye and smiling face as he came forward to the front of the rostrum constitute a picture that will be long in passing from the memories of the faculty and visitors of the college. He wept with the institution in its darker hours, he rejoiced in its success and progress, and his loss to the Board of Trustees is well-nigh irreparable.

He left the Commencement of 1896 exhausted, but after a short rest was again at hard work. The last five months were the busiest of a busy life—a life too busy, in fact, for much literary relaxation. With the exception of a newspaper article now and then, or a lecture or sermon printed, he had no time for the press; and yet, what brilliant achievements lay out before him in this direction with his wonderful memory, polished style, vivid imagination?

"On his eighty-eighth birthday, July 19, 1896," writes a friend, "he preached at Marshall a sermon grandly eloquent, reviewing his ministerial career and full of reminiscences of his life work;

at that time he gave in figures the following synopsis of his work for the past sixty years: 8,140 sermons, 2,110 accessions to the church, 1,210 baptisms of children, 840 marriages, 240 burials; 31 churches organized, and the erection of 28 church buildings superintended." What a showing! He writes on his birthday: "I now enter my eighty-ninth year and am hale and healthy, and am able to do full work. I here record my profound gratitude and thankfulness to Almighty God for his love and goodness, and here devote my remaining strength and years to his service." After his eighty-eighth birthday he preached, according to his diary, sixty sermons, held protracted meetings at several places and received a number of persons into the church.

His expressed wish was "to die in harness." This was granted, for his last sermon was preached at Elysian Fields on the closing Sabbath of the year, just ten days before his death. In his last hours he was sustained by an unfaltering faith, for he was ready, having fought a good fight. He died on January 6, 1897, and was buried on the 8th, the funeral services being conducted by Rev. J. E. McLean, of Marshall, assisted by Rev. Dr. Riggs, of Dallas.

In Dr. Marshall the youth of our country, especially those considering the gospel ministry, have a most interesting character study. We are enabled, by a review of his life, to discover the constituent elements of a successful Christian character; a cultivated intellect, regularity of habit, the strictest punctuality, courage of conviction, inexhaustible energy, guided by an unwavering trust in an over-ruling Providence. The record is that "he missed but one ecclesiastical meeting during his sixty years and more of constant preaching, and then he had brain fever!" Being dead, he yet speaketh; and his works do follow him.

D. F. EAGLETON.

Austin College.

VII. A PLEA FOR UNITY.

A SECT is a body of persons distinguished, by certain peculiarities of belief or practice, from other bodies adhering to the same general system; and sectarianism is an excessive zeal for a particular sect zeal overshadows the devotion due to the interests of the whole body of which the sect is a part.

Denominationalism may be perfectly justifiable, and often is, when the members of a denomination acknowledge that their denomination is but a part of the greater whole, and not the whole itself, and when it places the interests of the church catholic above those of any part, making its own life and work a means for the advancement of the great body of which Christ is the head. This kind of denominationalism can be justified before God, in most cases, but sectarianism never. Sectarianism is one of the greatest disappointments of Christian history, and is productive of very great injury to the progress and spiritual power as well as influence of the church of God.

The spectacle afforded by the sectarianism of Christians is one which must gratify the church's enemies, and be most humiliating to the church itself. We see sects claiming to be the whole church of Christ, unchurching all other sects, denying communion to their members, and refusing to acknowledge the validity of their sacraments and ordination.

The cause of this is the elevation of non-essentials to the high position of essentials in belief or practice, and making non-essentials tests of churchship. Many non-essentials are important to the most symmetrical development of the church and of individual character, but they are not necessary to the existence of the church, or any part of it. For example, some sects believe in divine predestination, and some deny it; but both classes are parts of the church of God, owned and blessed with the presence and power of his Spirit by the great Head of the church. Others differ as to the nature of the Lord's supper, a part holding that in the elements we have but symbols of the body and blood of

Christ; another part, that they are this, and also seals of divine grace; another, that with the bread and wine is actually present the body of Christ. Some claim that water baptism can be only performed by immersion of the whole body in water, and others, that it is rightly done by affusion or sprinkling. A few hold that the praise of God may be sung only in the use of certain translations or paraphrases of the inspired psalms. There is a great denomination of Christians who stand for apostolical succession, teaching that a body can be a church only by actual succession of bishops running from apostolic hands, in unbroken line, to the present time.

These dogmas belong to the class of beliefs and practices called "non-essentials," and the acceptance of them is not claimed to be essential to the salvation of the soul. Now, if they be not necessary for admittance into the favor of God, and to heaven, why should they be made essential to membership or communion in the church of God on earth? Shall the visible church, imperfect by its own admission, set up a higher standard of membership than Christ has established for membership in the invisible church? Is it reasonable? Is it scriptural?

It is not reasonable, because it is manifestly impossible, with the diversities of human disposition and environment, to have absolute uniformity of belief or practice, in all particulars, in any organization of human beings. There are no two persons in the same sect who agree on everything. Men's minds are constituted differently, as are the trees of the wood, the flowers of the field, and the birds of the air. They must differ, because they are different. The attempt to establish uniformity in social customs, in business methods, in civic matters, in literature or art, has always failed; and now, after two thousands of years, Christianity has also failed to secure uniformity. It is impossible; it is undesirable. God did not make the world that way, and we cannot make it over again.

Nor is uniformity scriptural. The apostles differed about many things, as we know by the inspired record of their lives, and yet they acknowledged one another's apostleship. The teachings of the inspired record show most plainly that non-essentials cannot

properly be made tests of membership in the church. Christ said, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; he that believeth not the Son of God cannot see life"; and on the cross he acknowledged as saved a poor malefactor, who had not been baptized, could not be, had not even seen the sacrament of the Lord's supper, and who was doubtless absolutely ignorant of all forms of Christian church worship or government. The Lord set up faith in himself as the one test of salvation, and, by inference, of membership in the church. So the Apostle Paul, when asked, "What must I do to be saved?" replied, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." The same hour of the night, the inquirer and his household were baptized. It is incredible that, if there had been anything besides faith in Christ necessary to salvation, Paul could have omitted it, or that it should not have been put down in the inspired history, which was intended to be an infallible guide for the church of subsequent ages; and the argument is, that what was sufficient for the salvation of the soul is sufficient qualification for churchship in the visible church.

The elevation of non-essentials into the place of essentials has the effect of obscuring the one great truth, that the soul is saved by faith in Christ alone, and it places stumbling-blocks in the way of sinners trying to find their way to God. It is also the cause of all sectarianism. Let us see what would be the effect of acting on the principle that faith in Christ is the only reasonable and scriptural test of churchship.

It would make evident what is true, that the real bond of unity among Christians is their common union with Christ. We are one, in any real and effective unity, only because we are united to him by a common faith. It is not an artificial unity, made by man, or the effect of certain rules of government, worship, or belief, external bonds, but a spiritual tie which connects each soul with its Saviour. It is the same difference which obtains between an ordinary organization among men, like a society, an association, or a corporation, and the family tie. The family is God's symbol of the church, and we read of "the whole family in heaven and earth." One is a member of a family, not by any agreement,

compact, or set of rules, but by a common relation to one father. So we are one in Christ for the single reason that we are his children. This makes all Christians brothers, and this brotherhood cannot be destroyed. Its gracious consequences and privileges may be marred or obscured; brothers may refuse to acknowledge one another; but the fact of brotherhood remains.

Now, it may be objected that this is true of the invisible church, the body of those who are regenerated by the Holy Ghost, and that it cannot be made to apply to membership in the visible church. To this the reply is, that there is no hint in the Scriptures of such a difference between the principles of the invisible and the visible church, but the whole meaning of Scripture is the other way. The invisible church is invisible; we have no judgment to pronounce upon its membership. It is known only to God. The Bible is the constitution of the visible church, and its rules and examples are for the church which we see. If faith in Christ makes a man a member of the invisible church, a credible profession of such faith ought to entitle him to membership in the visible church. All Scripture example agrees with this. When Philip said to the Ethiopian treasurer who applied for membership by baptism, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest," the applicant replied, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," and Philip admitted him at once by baptism. It cannot be justly objected that Philip and other early preachers were inspired, could read human hearts, and, therefore, knew that applicants did truly believe, and were really members of the invisible church; for men were found, regularly admitted by the apostles, who were impenitent and unregenerate. The test of church membership was a profession of faith in Christ.

To accept this as the one test of churchship would have the effect of eliminating much of denominational rivalry and consequent scandal to Christianity. It would result in an enormous increase of spiritual power in the whole church, would bring about a condition infinitely more favorable to the work of the Holy Ghost, and it would be a means of saving a prodigious amount of money and labor which is largely wasted in keeping up more organizations than are needed in tens of thousands of communities.

Another result would probably be the reduction in number of the sects of Christendom. It would certainly not lead to the consolidation of all denominations, at least in the near future, if ever; but it would make the church of God one in feeling, and one in its standing before the world. Sectarianism is one of the greatest obstacles to the conversion of mankind to Christ, and the general acknowledgment, by all, of the churchship of all would silence the most effective cavils, as well as commend the church to the favor of God.

It is a mistake to seek consolidation of all organizations, and absolute uniformity of forms of creed, sacrament, worship, and government. It is based upon a misunderstanding of what Christian unity is. It is not the acceptance of a form; it is a common union with Christ. If this be true, we have already the thing we seek. We are one. What, then, is needed? The manifestation and practice of unity. We are simply to strive to live up to the fact. Just as with any other spiritual fact in the case of an individual or a collection of individuals, we are to live up to it.

I appeal to psalm-singing Presbyterian close-unionists: Have you a right to refuse church fellowship to those who sing uninspired hymns? And to the Baptists: Have you a right to deny communion to non-immersionists, and to rebaptize members of other denominations when they come to you, and to rebaptize and reordain their ministers when they ask orders in your denomination, when you acknowledge that they are Christians? I appeal to the Episcopalians: Though you accept the baptism of other denominations, have you a right to treat those going from us to you as if they had never been church members, and to refuse the admittance of ministers of other sects into your pulpits? Do you not cordially concede that we are Christians; and do you not declare that when we die we go to heaven? How, then, can you say that we are not a church, and that our ministers are not ministers at all? Can this be justified before Christ? or would the great apostle to the Gentiles approve it?

We are one family; let us acknowledge it; so far from being ashamed, let us all glory in it. Any denomination may declare that it is the nearest to the Scripture model, and lovingly endeavor

to persuade all others to believe all which itself believes, and yet cordially acknowledge that we are all one family in Christ, and members one of another.

We are named for Christ. He is declared to be the one "of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." We are named "Christians." Let us not say, "I am of Paul," "I am of Apollos," or "I am of Cephas." Paul was not crucified for you. *Christian* is a nobler name than that of any denomination. The proudest title which any man on earth or any saint in heaven can wear is that derived from the name of his Saviour and King; and the grandest of all confessions is, "I believe in Christ; I am a Christian." Let us look more upon the things which we all hold in common. We have one God the Father, one Holy Spirit the Sanctifier, one Christ the Saviour, one Bible, one gospel, and one everlasting home; a house of many mansions, but one house, one building of God, eternal in the heavens.

In view of these great things which we hold in common, let us love and acknowledge one another. Let us preach the gospel in each other's pulpits, join in a common communion at our several tables of the Lord. Let us assemble around one common mercy-seat in prayer. Let us coöperate in all evangelical missions, and let us thus show to the world, to each other, and to Christ, in every way, that his prayer is being answered, in which he asked for his people that they might be one.

ROBERT P. KERR.

Richmond, Virginia.

VIII. THE SOUTHERN GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 1897.

The Assembly met in the First Church, Charlotte, N. C., on May 20th at 11 A. M. The city was celebrating the anniversary of the Mechlenburg Declaration of Independence with great pomp and parade, when the commissioners gathered in that beautiful church, in that most historic town of the Old North State, to hear the opening sermon of the retiring moderator, and to organize themselves into what has proved to be the most memorable and important Assembly in the history of the church since the first one in 1861, at Augusta, Ga.

The opening sermon by Rev. R. Q. Mallard, D. D., of New Orleans, was on the text, "And it came to pass when the ark of God set forward, that Moses said, Rise up, Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered, and let them that hate thee, flee before thee. And when it rested he said, Return, O Lord, unto the many thousands of Israel." He announced as his subject, "The camping and the marching of Israel." He described the position of the tribes, and the arrangements for marching, each being where, and moving as, God intended it to. It was the march of the church, the tribes corresponding to the denominations of modern times. He then showed that church unity is that of the Spirit, and that separate denominations in no way interfere with true unity. He closed by giving some of the distinctive principles of our Southern Presbyterian Church: (1), A positive written creed resting upon the bedrock of the Scriptures alone, subscribed *ex animo* by all officers, and unblushingly proclaimed in the ears of a mocking world. (2), Utter, entire, everlasting separation of church and state. (3), The rulers in the church are permanent, educated, divinely ordained, of the male sex, and are divided into two classes, teaching and ruling elders. The close of Dr. Mallard's sermon plainly indicated that there are reasons still for the separate existence of the Southern Presbyterian Church; and the mood of the Assembly was

just as plainly against "organic union" with anything on earth, as was shown later, when the Reformed Dutch Church was up for consideration.

"Who will be moderator?" was a question often asked that morning; and "friends" were urging reasons for one man, and reasons against another. It was a pity. Electioneering should never enter a church court. It was unhappy in this case, and will always prove so. Some one moved to enter upon the election of moderator without nominations, following the precedent of the Memphis Assembly. This was very properly tabled. The Holy Spirit can "inspire" a nomination as well as a secret ballot. Four men were nominated: two professors, Dr. Robert Price, of Southwestern Presbyterian University, and Dr. F. R. Beattie, of Louisville Theological Seminary, and two pastors, Dr. S. M. Neel, of Kansas City, and Dr. George T. Goetchius, of Rome, Ga. The race was between the two pastors. They were classmates and bosom friends. Dr. Goetchius received the most votes and he was then unanimously elected, and his friend and class-mate, Dr. Neel, escorted him to the chair.

Dr. Goetchius proved himself to be a moderator of whom no man need be ashamed. Perhaps few men have upheld the dignity of that highest office in our church better than he. A thorough parliamentarian, he kept the Assembly out of "tangles," and pushed forward its business. Not once was a single ruling of his reversed or even appealed from. He was a moderator who *was* a moderator. On the last day, as the Assembly was about to close, many took occasion to express their high appreciation of the way in which he had discharged his onerous duties. It was a hard Assembly to manage. There were amendments, amendments to amendments, substitutes, and amendments to substitutes, till a less able moderator would have been utterly lost, and the Assembly with him. But not so with our moderator. He always knew where we were, and could instantly state the very matter before the house with its relation to all that had gone before, and he kept the Assembly at work on the very thing then before the house. It is to be hoped that in all future Assemblies the example of this Assembly will be followed in

selecting a moderator for his ability as a moderator, and not merely to honor some good brother grown gray in service, but utterly unable "to hold down" an Assembly at work.

There were many notable men on the floor of this Assembly. A body more thoroughly representative of the distinctive principles for which the Southern Church stands perhaps never gathered together before since its formation. The old leaders, the men whom the church delights to honor, were there in force. Five ex-moderators—Drs. Dabney, Hoge, Smoot, King, and Mallard—were on the floor as commissioners; two others, Drs. Wilson and Farris, are permanent officers of the Assembly; two others, Drs. Witherspoon and Strickler, took part in the Westminster celebration; and two others, Drs. Hemphill and Hill, were present as visitors. Thus there were present at this Assembly eleven ex-moderators. Also there were present twelve professors in our colleges and seminaries—leading men, every one.

It was an old man's Assembly. The old leaders were always heard with appreciation. They shaped its legislation. This was right. Age gives counsel worthy of a hearing. It was not a talking Assembly. Many men never opened their mouths to speak. Of course, there were a few who talked so much that the Assembly grew impatient of them, and often repeated to itself, when listening, the words of Eliphaz the Temanite: "Should a wise man utter vain knowledge, and fill his belly with the east wind? Should he reason with unprofitable talk? or with speeches wherewith he can do no good?" Alas! no; a *wise* man should not!

It was a working Assembly. It was at work from 9:30 o'clock A. M. to 10 P. M. all the time. The committees were prompt in their work, and the docket was never cleared till the gavel dropped at the close on the last day. The moderator had no lack of excellent material for chairmen of the important committees; and the committees were prompt in shaping the matters referred to them for the Assembly's action.

While the commissioners were being enrolled, a tall, spare, nervous man arose and said: "Moderator, *I* desire to be enrolled. I could not, for reasons not interesting to the Assembly, put my hands on my certificate from my presbytery; but I desire now to

be enrolled." He then sat down. Dr. Mallard: "Will the brother please state his name?" Dr. Wilson, the stated clerk, with a roar: "M. D. Hoge, D. D.!" The Assembly enjoyed it. On whom was the joke?

Some twenty-five or more overtures were read, and referred to the proper committees. Some of them were important, and some were not. *Query*: Why burden the Assembly's docket with overtures asking for *in thesi* deliverances? When such an overture is answered, the answer is not law, but only opinion. Is the time of the Assembly well employed in giving merely opinions? If it be a matter of importance, a judicial case by appeal or complaint would settle the law.

This Assembly had no judicial case. The brethren seem to have been law-abiding and dwelling in peace throughout our entire bounds.

The first breeze in the Assembly was caused by a communication from the Prohibition party of North Carolina. Dr. Smoot, very correctly, moved to return it respectfully to the parties sending it, on the ground that the Assembly, as an Assembly, had nothing to do with politics. This motion was lost, however, and the communication was read, and referred to the Committee on Bills and Overtures. Later in the session, that committee reported the following answer, which was adopted: "We are forbidden to intermeddle with political parties or questions, and the constant and scriptural attitude of our beloved church on temperance and intemperance is shown in past deliverances, on record in Alexander's *Digest*, pp. 365, 366." Many were opposed to giving any answer to a "political party"; and Dr. Walden, on the next day, introduced the following explanatory paper, which was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That in the action taken by the Assembly in adopting the report of the Committee on Bills and Overtures, in reply to a communication from the committee of the Prohibition party of North Carolina, this Assembly is not to be construed as intending to commit the church to the political theory of prohibition, either *pro* or *con*."

If the political party can get any comfort out of that, let it.

WOMAN QUESTION.

An overture from West Lexington Presbytery brought the public speaking of women before the Assembly. The overture was as follows:

"Shall our pulpits be occupied by women to lecture or make addresses to mixed audiences of men and women?"

"Shall the ministers of the presbytery read from their pulpits notices of such lectures and addresses to be made in other churches?"

The committee answered the first question in the negative, and the second, "that it is improper to advertise lectures of women from the pulpit."

This brought on "much disputation." Every man proclaimed that he was, *in toto*, opposed to *ordaining* women to speak in public; but some of them were in favor of letting them speak *unordained*. Notably, this was true of Dr. Pitzer, of Washington. This brought out two champions of absolute prohibition as to the public speaking of women to mixed audiences—Dr. J. W. Walden, of Athens, Georgia, and Dr. R. K. Smoot, of Austin, Texas. They were not only opposed to ordaining women to speak publicly, but were opposed to permitting unordained women to do what they would not ordain them to do. They based their arguments upon a "thus saith the Lord," the past deliverances of the church, and the God-ordained relations of the sexes. Dr. Smoot very neatly put the scriptural argument in a nutshell when he defied any advocate of woman's preaching to put his finger on a "thus saith the Lord" *requiring* it. He thus made the argument positive, not negative. The advocates of woman's preaching are always attempting to show that the Bible does *not forbid it*—striking, however, a blow at inspiration as they do so. Dr. Smoot turns the tables, and demands that they show in the Bible authority for women preaching, ordained or unordained; for "the word of God, as contained in the Old and New Testaments, is the only infallible rule of faith and practice." If allowed, then, it must be clearly taught in the Bible, a position which not even the wildest advocates of it will dare maintain.

Dr. F. R. Beattie, who proved himself the great compromiser and harmonizer of the Assembly, moved the following substitute

for the committee's answer: "In reply to the overture from West Lexington Presbytery, the Assembly refers the presbytery to the clear deliverances of former Assemblies, which settle the principles involved in the overture, and should guide all our church sessions in their procedure." This was adopted, but was amended so that the deliverances of past Assemblies should be reprinted with this reply, and especially that of 1832, which reads as follows:

"Meetings of pious women by themselves for conversation and prayer, whenever they can conveniently be held, we entirely approve. But let not the inspired prohibitions of the great apostle to the Gentiles, as found in his epistles to the Corinthians and to Timothy, be violated. To teach and exhort, or to lead in prayer, in public or promiscuous assemblies, is clearly forbidden to women in the holy oracles."

This is a stronger reply than that submitted by the committee. It amounts to a prohibition of woman's public speaking. This is the historic position of our church, the scriptural position, and it is now the latest deliverance of our highest church court. It is to be hoped that those brethren—very few in number—who have been permitting women to talk in prayer-meetings and in young people's societies, to read missionary papers, etc., before mixed audiences, will take heed to this almost unanimous deliverance of the Assembly. The Assembly was in no mood to tolerate women speaking to mixed audiences under any circumstances; and its deliverance has no uncertain sound.

THE EXECUTIVE AGENCIES.

The executive committees brought up gratifying reports, although the last year was one of financial distress all over the country. The Home Missions Committee has done good work in several States, notably Arkansas, Texas, and the Indian Territory. There was a slight decrease in the amount contributed to the Invalid Fund, and a strong appeal is made to the church for this fund during the coming year. The plan of a preceding Assembly, directing the endowment of the Invalid Fund, was abandoned by this Assembly. Many were afraid of church endowments. Well, we all are. To endow a church is to kill it; but

that is a very different thing from endowing this Invalid Fund. We wish that this cause had a permanent endowment of a half-million dollars at least. It ought to appeal most strongly to our church, but the cold fact is that it does not. An endowment may be the death of a church, but it would be the life of the Invalid Fund.

The Foreign Missions Committee received from all sources the past year \$143,741.79. This is \$1,782.34 more than the receipts for last year. Eleven new missionaries were sent to the field: five to China, one to Japan, three to Brazil, and two to the Congo Free State. All the fields need more missionaries; and the minimum financial *need*, according to the committee, to sustain the present work and send the new missionaries needed, is \$165,000. The total missionary roll now is 158. The church has great cause for thankfulness at the success of her foreign work. Ten years ago there were but 54 missionaries, now there are 158; ten years ago we gave but \$84,675, now \$143,741. The annual cost of supporting a missionary has been reduced from \$1,500 to about \$1,000.

The Committee on Education for the Ministry aided some 218 candidates during the past year, paying each of them from \$25 to \$75. The Assembly asks for \$30,000 for this cause for the ensuing year. This committee's affairs are now run very economically, and, since the reduction of the secretary's salary to about one-half of what it formerly was, there are not so many brethren in the church eager to serve the Lord by stirring up the churches on the great cause of education. Strange, but true! The Assembly revoked the action of the Dallas Assembly granting power to this committee, under certain conditions, to aid young women preparing for the foreign field.

The Committee on Colored Evangelization made an encouraging and hopeful report. It received during the year \$7,013, which is \$186 less than last year. The most encouraging feature was the success of the white evangelist to the colored people in his work. There are now 55 colored ministers, 3 licentiates, 28 candidates, 64 churches, 111 ruling elders, 72 deacons, 1,504 communicants, 191 added during the year, 1,501 Sabbath-school scholars. The

Standing Committee recommended that, if the colored ministers desire to form an independent colored Presbyterian Church, they be encouraged to do so, our church still aiding them till they are able to walk alone. A colored minister addressed the Assembly, and spoke strongly in favor of an independent negro Presbyterian Church. He said that he had learned that a negro was a negro, wherever he was, whether north or south, and that as a negro he must work out his own salvation. A man must be thrown overboard in order to swim; so the negro must be thrown on his own responsibilities, if he is ever to develop; therefore, said he, cut us loose, but still give us your aid.

There was an effort made to lower the salary of the Secretary of Foreign Missions from \$2,500 a year to \$2,000. The discussion was chiefly based on the cost of living, forgetting that there are some things for which a man cannot be paid. The present salary is little enough for the man who has the burden of the foreign field on his shoulders, and whose heart and brain is wholly in the work. There is retrenchment which is not reform. A man might be found who *could* live on \$500, but his administration would wreck the cause. A secretary with the record of our present one is cheap at the present salary. Business-men pay salaries according to a man's talents, and the work done, why not the church? A secretary with a salary so small that he could not be free from worldly care could not put heart and soul into his work. The Assembly wisely left this matter in the hands of the committee, but ordered an itemized statement of the salaries paid, for the information of the church.

THE COMMITTEE ON SABBATH-SCHOOLS.

This Assembly found the young people's societies, Westminster Leagues, &c., astray, belonging nowhere, and, like the cow-boys on the plains, lassoed the strays and corralled them in its Committee on Sabbath-Schools. The report was fiercely, almost angrily, assailed. The committee recommended that a section of the constitution of the Westminster Leagues be stricken out. It was the section granting the leagues permission, under certain circumstances, to affiliate with societies of

other denominations. The report simply struck this out and left the constitution silent on the subject, and left the leagues solely under the control of the sessions, where they ought to be. No harm was done by the Assembly when it adopted the report, but, on the contrary, the constitution of the leagues was made consistent with itself, and the legislation on the subject of young people's societies was lessened in amount—a very valuable thing. But many of the brethren were very apprehensive and prophesied doleful things to come because of the change in the constitution. Some of them, we think, went home thinking there was “a bug under that chip,” simply because of *that committee's* bringing the subject before the Assembly. We tried to look at it in a calm, judicial way, and it is our judgment that the constitution of the leagues has been improved, and that no evil effects whatever will follow. A little later in the session, the Assembly more than justified the action of this committee by changing its name (unanimously, we believe) to that of “The Committee on Sabbath-Schools and Westminster Leagues,” and ordered hereafter all matters touching young people's societies to be referred to it. This action of the Assembly in striking out the clause in the constitution of the Westminster Leagues, was the occasion for a mild dissent, led by Dr. F. R. Beattie, and signed by a number of others.

THE ASSEMBLY'S HOME AND SCHOOL.

The report of this committee, Dr. R. C. Reed, chairman, was radical. It recited the present financial condition of the school, and then recommended the severance of the Fredericksburg College from the Home and Training School, directed the trustees to dispose of the “college buildings and grounds,” to reduce the cost of supporting the Home and Training School, and commended the Home and Training School to the churches for their support after its severance from the Fredericksburg College. The committee stated that the report was made reluctantly, but that conscience drove them to it. But having made it, they clung to it like grim death, refusing all compromises or delay. The chairman fought for his report with great plainness of statement. He carried the majority of the Assembly with him. The venerable Dr.

M. D. Hoge, President of the Board of Trustees, plead with the Assembly not to strangle in its childhood this institution so dear to his heart. He plead for time, pledged his own name, that the Assembly should not be involved for another dollar's debt by waiting another year. He made it a personal plea. He said: "This meeting of the Assembly has been harmonious. It would be sad to mar it in any way. The Assembly can send me home the saddest man in christendom. If you do, I will say God has been pleased to afflict me, and I will bow in submission; but I don't believe the Assembly will do this." He plead for an *ad interim* committee to go on the ground and see for themselves. Dr. Saunders also pathetically plead for the life of the College till at least a committee could go to Fredericksburg and see the grand work done there. Dr. Walden asked for time, that it was hasty and dangerous to do what the committee desired. But the Assembly turned a deaf ear to all, and adopted the committee's report that ten thousand dollars given for the scholarships by the city of Fredericksburg over a year ago, was at the bottom of it all. The Fredericksburg College and the Home and Training School are now severed, and the latter alone is commended to the liberality of the churches. This gave occasion for another *dissent*, not *protest*, led by Dr. Walden, and signed by a number of others.

This Assembly reversed the action of the Memphis Assembly, which decided that one elder, when there is only one, was not the session, and proclaimed that one elder is the session *except in judicial cases*. This is a sensible decision, and corresponds to the *Book of Church Order* (see paragraph 16), which shows that church officers exercise ecclesiastical power *severally* and *jointly*. The "several power," of course, belongs to the one elder, but not the "joint power" in judicial cases. This is also a re-affirmation of the deliverances of previous Assemblies.

THE 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WESTMINSTER STANDARDS.

That which distinguished the Assembly of 1897 from all preceding Assemblies was the celebration of the 250th anniversary of the adoption of the Westminster Standards. Order was taken by the Memphis Assembly for this celebration. An able *ad*

interim committee, with Dr. Jacob Henry Smith as chairman, was appointed to arrange a programme and select the speakers. Their work was thoroughly done, and in no instance did they make a mistake. Under the general head of "Historical and Descriptive," three addresses were given; under "Expository and Critical" three were given, and five under the head, "Influences, Relations," &c.

Every address was conservative, and praised our historic standards. The Assembly was heart and soul with every speaker. It was Calvinistic first, Presbyterian next, and proud of its glorious record in the past. The Southern Church is absolutely satisfied with her historic symbols of faith, and she believes that the antidote to new theology and the moral laxness of the age is to be found wrapped up in the Westminster Standards. The Assembly heard the addresses one at a time (two, one night), day by day.

Dr. Henry A. White was the first speaker. He is comparatively a young man, still this side of forty, but one of the ablest of the younger scholars in the church. He is now Professor of History in Washington and Lee University. He is thus fitted to speak with authority on the subject assigned him, "The Social and Political Condition of Britain at the Time," with special reference to its influence upon the Westminster Assembly. Dr. White is a very pleasing speaker. He used no notes. It would be difficult for any man to handle the same theme in a more charming way. It was clear, classical, descriptive, popular, delightful.

He was followed the same night by Dr. Robert Price, of Clarksville, Tenn. Dr. Price is one of the fathers of our church, who has long sat in the professor's chair. He read a carefully-prepared paper on "The Religious Situation of Britain at the Time," dealing with the principles wrought into the minds and hearts of the people by the Reformation and the perpetual conflict with Rome which followed, that made the work of the Westminster Assembly not only possible but inevitable. These standards are a gift to us from the only age which could have produced them, and are to be held as a sacred trust. Dr. Price's paper was brief, but scholarly and profound.

At 11 A. M. the second day, Rev. T. D. Witherspoon, D. D., delivered the last address under the historical head. His theme was, "Description of the Assembly—its Personnel, Proceedings, and Place of Meeting." Dr. Witherspoon is, perhaps, one of the most popular and best-known men in the Southern Church. He is Professor of Theology in the Louisville Theological Seminary; old school, conservative, but intensely alive—alive enough to spend his vacation in evangelistic work in the mountains of Kentucky. His voice is not strong, but has a carrying power that enables all to hear distinctly. He described minutely the Abbey, the Jerusalem Chamber, even to the red roses on the window-shades; the fire-place, and the places where the members sat. He then briefly made a few of the great men walk before us: Dr. Twisse, John Selden, the Scotch commissioners, and others. He described the debate between Selden and Gillespie so vividly that we could almost imagine them present. He closed by comparing those grand, rugged men to the cliffs on the seashore which withstand the storms, while on the other side there are green grass, flowers, and peaceful homes. Those men were in the storm, and because of them the church now is in the sunshine. A good brother on the platform furtively wiped some big tears from his eyes. It was the way many felt.

That night, Dr. Dabney's paper was presented. His theme was, "The Doctrinal Contents of the Confession—Its Fundamental and Regulative Ideas, and the Necessity and Value of Creeds." No man living is prepared to handle that theme better than Robert L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D. He has been the teacher directly or indirectly of nearly every man in the Southern Presbyterian Church; he stands in the front rank of living theologians and Christian philosophers. Dr. Dabney is tall and commanding in person, fine silver hair crowns his noble brow, and a long snowy beard gives him the appearance of one of the old patriarchs. He is now totally blind, and this added a pathetic charm to the noblest thinker in our church. Every heart in that Assembly loved and admired him. It was beautiful to see the reverence with which they treated him. The moderator's, "Dr. Dabney has the floor!" silenced every voice and strained every

ear to catch his words of wisdom. Dr. Reed read Dr. Dabney's paper, expressing his regret that the Dabney thought would lose much of the Dabney flavor without the Dabney voice.

The system of doctrine in the Standards is not anthropocentric, nor christo-centric, but *theo-centric*. This is the point of view of the Westminster divines, and "for this reason the Confession will need no amendment until the Bible needs amendment." He dealt with the *scripturalness* and *moderation* of the Confession, showing how everything was brought to the test of God's word, and how extreme statements were avoided. Under a separate head he dealt with the necessity and value of creeds. This was the most valuable paper of them all to the preacher. The opinion of such a man, a man acquainted with all philosophies and theologies, that our Confession is built on the bed-rock of Scripture, and needs no revision till God's word needs it, is a heritage of great value to our church.

The next address was by Rev. Eugene Daniel, D. D., of Raleigh, N. C. His subject was, "Polity and Worship—Emphasizing their Relation to Doctrine." Dr. Daniel was the only alternate who spoke. His principal was Dr. B. M. Palmer, of New Orleans, who, on account of failing eye-sight, could not be present. Dr. Daniel briefly referred to this before beginning his lecture. Dr. Daniel is, in stature, perhaps the smallest preacher in the Southern pulpit, while in brain he is one of the largest. He showed that the sovereignty of God was not only the informing idea of the Confession, but also of our polity and worship. Christ is the King and Head of his church. We must look to him for all laws, and obey the voice of the King in all things. He has left a government in his church, and the Bible is the only rule of faith and practice.

The spiritual nature of the church was emphasized. Christ has ordained a government which is in the hands of officers, chosen and qualified by himself and distinct from the civil magistrate. He has appointed the Holy Ghost master of all worshipping assemblies, inspirer of all true prayer, the author of all effectual preaching, and he alone gives efficacy to the sacraments. Dr. Daniel is clear in thought and statement, and a born

ecclesiastical lawyer. He ought to be in some one of our seminaries teaching Presbyterian polity to our students. He would make them *de jure divino* Presbyterians.

Dr. G. B. Strickler was the speaker on Monday. His subject was "Nature, Value, and Special Utility of the Catechisms." Dr. Strickler is a man in the prime of life. His pose gives one the impression of calm, conscious strength. Many had never heard him before, though all knew him as the man the church had recently chosen to fill the Chair of Theology in our oldest theological seminary, a chair once filled by such leaders as Dabney and Peck. He is a man who cannot be satisfied with surface work, he must go down to fundamentals. He had thoroughly mastered his subject, and many pronounced his address as the one of all the others calculated to do the most good to the church at large. It is, perhaps, the ablest defence of the catechetical mode of instruction in the language. The Assembly emphasized the value it places upon this mode of instruction by directing its Committee of Publication to publish Dr. Strickler's address in pamphlet form, that it might thus be accessible to every family in the church. May it promote a widespread revival of catechetical study.

The first speaker under the third head, "Influences, Relations," &c., was Dr. J. D. Tadlock, of Columbia Seminary, S. C. His theme was, "The Churches that Hold the Westminster Symbols, and the Reformed Churches Generally." It was a wide, wide field, but Dr. Tadlock covered it with a carefully-prepared paper, much of it dealing with present statistics. It must have required long and patient research to have compiled so much information in so brief a space. It will be a thesaurus of information about the Reformed churches when published.

The next address was by Dr. M. D. Hoge, one of the two great orators of the Southern Church, the other being Dr. B. M. Palmer. His theme was "The Westminster Symbols in Relation to and Influence upon the Missionary Character and Activities of the Church." Dr. Hoge is a living refutation of the current books on oratory. He literally violates every canon laid down by them on delivery, unless it be that of distinctness; but in spite of it every one within the sound of his voice hangs greedily

on his every word. They never tire. He can speak by the hour, and they are all listening intently still. He showed that the Westminster Standards made men able and worthy to brave all dangers to carry the gospel of Christ to the ends of the earth. He paid a high tribute to Alexander Duff as the ideal man and missionary. Dr. Hoge's language is pure, classical, and elegant. The learned divine and the little child alike listened and were delighted for over an hour. He had the most barren theme assigned, but he also had the most rapt attention. He is indeed "Dr. Hoge of the Southern Church, Dr. Hoge of the world," with a power all his own to move men's hearts rarely granted to man.

"What shall a man do that cometh after the king?" But Dr. Samuel M. Smith, pastor of the First Church, Columbia, South Carolina, had no need to ask himself that question. His theme was, "The Westminster Symbols Considered in Relation to Current Popular Theology and the Needs of the Future." Dr. Smith is a pleasant speaker, an acute thinker, and a man of decided character. He knows his own ground and its strong points; he knows, also, the weak points in his opponent's position; and, like Job's warhorse, he sniffs the battle from afar with keen delight. He traced the new theology to Schleiermacher, who was a "theological paradox," a kind of religious chameleon, changing color according to the system under whose influence he came; now it was mysticism, then the pantheism of Spinoza, etc. The modern theology, rejecting the supernatural, was all begotten by Schleiermacher. A characteristic of the theologians of this school is their aversion to the *letter* of Scripture, though they are all ready enough to quote what they call its *spirit*. The relation of this theology to the Westminster Standards is one of *contrast at every point all along the line!* Could the new theology be induced to define its position in a catechism, Dr. Smith would be delighted to write the first question and answer for it. It would be this: "*Quest.* What is the chief end of God? *Ans.* God's chief end is to glorify man, and to develop him forever." Dr. Smith is a polemic of rare powers. He abounds in clear statement, and his thrusts are rapier-like in keenness.

Rev. J. F. Cannon, D. D., pastor of Grand Avenue Presbyterian

Church, St. Louis, Missouri, was the tenth speaker. His theme was "The Influence Exerted by the Westminster Standards on the Individual, the Family, and Society." Dr. Cannon is one of the more prominent of the younger men of the church, wise in counsel, and beloved as a pastor. He emphasized the fact that Presbyterianism makes the family and not the individual the unit in the church. The church, then, is a collection of families, not of individuals; and Presbyterianism alone does this. The glory of Presbyterianism will have departed when the fires go out on the family altars. The marriage relation is thus jealously guarded by our system, and along with it the Sabbath. These two institutions of Eden our standards exalt as no others do. The Assembly also took order for the publication of this address in pamphlet form.

The celebration was brought to an appropriate close on Friday by the address of Hon. W. M. Cox, of Baldwin, Mississippi. His theme was, "The Influence of the Westminster System of Doctrine, Worship, and Polity on Civil Liberty and Responsible Government." Many were looking for an old gray-haired man. They were disappointed. Mr. Cox is not yet in the prime of life. He was the only ruling elder appointed to deliver an address. He is an alumnus of the Southwestern Presbyterian University, and a rising lawyer in Mississippi. He is a masterly speaker. He showed that the "system" was older than the standards, and then traced its influence from the days of Luther, on the continent, in the British Isles, across the sea in our own land, down to the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. Calvinism and liberty go together. Mr. Cox used no notes, and often made long quotations from his authorities. Many pronounced it as "the best wine at the last." Said one eminent divine, "Only Calvinism could make a man like that!"

The Assembly took order to have these addresses all published in a single volume. It will make a heart-stirring volume for all Presbyterians. The celebration was a grand success, and the church will be prouder than ever of her historic symbols.

The Assembly had a pleasant "outing" to Davidson College. A special train carried the members to this institution, which has sent so many men into the ministry. Two hours were spent so-

cially on the beautiful campus Dr. Shearer, the president of the college, was one of the active men on the floor of the Assembly. The Assembly was also entertained from five to seven o'clock P. M. on Friday by the Presbyterian College for Women, situated in Charlotte. Dr. Junkin is its president.

Charlotte is a delightful place, and it was frequently remarked that Dr. Howerton had an ideal pastorate—a beautiful church building, a cultured Presbyterian congregation, and a pleasant home. But the Assembly was so busy that it had little time to enjoy the many courtesies extended by that hospitable people.

The Assembly appointed an *ad interim* committee to establish, if the way be clear, a summer school of theology.

The report of a special committee on hymnology, recommending that the Assembly prepare her own hymn-book, and appointing a committee thoroughly to canvass the matter as to cost, etc., was killed by the cry of injustice to Dr. Robert P. Kerr, of Richmond, who has a contract with the Assembly for ten years—six years yet before it expires—in favor of his hymn-book, *Hymns of the Ages*. It would take six years to prepare a hymn-book of the kind which the Assembly needs, and no injustice would be done Dr. Kerr by having the Assembly's book ready to publish when the contract with him expires. It is a pity that the committee's report was killed. Hymnology is too intimately connected with the life of the church to be neglected by it.

Perhaps the most dramatic incident of the Assembly was Dr. Dabney's defence of the Secretary of Home Missions when he was attacked by a representative of the Synod of North Carolina. It was the roar of the old lion again; and the restless, dissatisfied brethren of the synod, "now guilty of disobedience by taking away one of the monthly collections for Home Missions," will hardly have courage to come out of the brush again till they purge themselves of that charge. Dr. Craig was overwhelmingly reelected.

This was the greatest Assembly in the history of the church; and its distinguishing feature was the prominence which it gave to the doctrines, polity, and worship of our standards.

W. McF. ALEXANDER.

Memphis, Tennessee.

IX. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

FLOURNOY'S SEARCHLIGHT OF ST. HIPPOLYTUS.

THE SEARCHLIGHT OF ST. HIPPOLYTUS ; The Papacy and the New Testament in the Light of Discovery. *By Parke P. Flournoy, D. D.* With an Introduction by Professor Walter W. Moore, D. D., LL. D., of Union Theological Seminary, Va. New York : Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896.

The Romanists and Prelatists attach undue importance to the study of patristic literature, while by Presbyterians and other Protestant bodies it is too much neglected. The writings of the fathers are of little or no value as authority in either Christian doctrine or church polity. Their proximity to the times in which the Scriptures were written gave them no advantage over us in the interpretation of those Scriptures, as is sometimes falsely supposed, and these are the only infallible authority in faith and practice. But the *historical* value of the writings of the fathers cannot be overestimated. It is from them that we learn whatever we know about the history of the early church after the close of the canon of Scripture. Our Presbyterian scholars, therefore, are not to be excused for their neglect of those treasures of antiquity so rich in illustrations of the character and growth of the church, and the providences of God.

It is to be feared that a larger number of intelligent Christians derive their knowledge of the early church from the unfriendly misrepresentations of Gibbon than from the study of those reliable sources of knowledge which are now accessible to all readers.

The writer of this book makes an excursion into those fields of recondite learning, and returns with fruits, which to most readers possess all the charms of freshness and novelty, as well as of permanent value. It is, indeed, a remarkable work, both on account of the important historical facts which it presents, and the fundamental truths which it confirms, and the skilful arrangement and beautiful style in which it is clothed. It is commonly thought that studies in primitive church history are necessarily so dry as to be repulsive to all except professional students, whereas this book is as interesting as it is scholarly and instructive.

The work derives its unity from the fact that it is a study of the writings of Hippolytus in reference to the high pretensions of the Bishop of Rome, and the canonicity of the books of the New Testament. In regard to both these points the author has rendered valuable service to the cause of truth. Hippolytus died, perhaps suffered martyrdom, at an advanced age about 225 A. D. He was the disciple of Irenæus, who was the disciple of Polycarp, who was the disciple of the Apostle John, so that his connection with the writers of the New Testament was very near and very direct. A statue of Hippolytus, representing him seated in a chair, was discovered at Rome in 1551. On the back of the chair is a list of his writings, amongst others one entitled *Περὶ τοῦ Παντός*. By this he is identified as the author of the *Philosophumena*, a work which up to that time had been sup-

posed to be written by Origen. In 1842 a copy of the *περὶ τοῦ παντός* was discovered in the monastery of Mt. Athos, in which the *Philosophumena* appears as the first book. This work is described by Dr. Schaff as, next to the anti-gnostic work of Irenæus, the leading polemical theological production of the anti-Nicene church, and as shedding new light, not only upon the ancient heresies and the development of church doctrine, but also upon the history of philosophy and the condition of the Roman church in the beginning of the third century; and as affording valuable testimony to the genuineness of the Gospel of John, both from the mouth of the author himself, and through his quotations from the much earlier gnostic Basilides, who was a later contemporary of John. Another discovery (this is an age of discoveries in sacred and patristic literature) is that of a commentary on the Book of Daniel by Hippolytus, in which "he quotes the four Gospels as the very words and teachings of Christ."

These writings of Hippolytus bear testimony to the following facts: 1. The widespread prevalence of heresy in the latter part of the second and the early part of the third centuries, proving the utter worthlessness of that early period as an authority in Christian doctrine. 2. That two popes contemporary with the writer, namely, Zephyrinus and Callistus, were involved in these heresies, especially the Patripassian, a form of Unitarianism, thus overthrowing the claim of papal infallibility. 3. That the moral character of these two Romish saints rendered them unworthy of respect; Zephyrinus being "illiterate, unlearned, and a receiver of bribes," and Callistus "crafty in wickedness, and versatile in deception." 4. That the Bishop of Rome was not regarded by Hippolytus as having any precedence over him, though he was a mere presbyter; in fact, expressions are quoted from Hippolytus which seem clearly to imply that the so-called pope was only the pastor of a single congregation in the city of Rome, and Hippolytus the pastor of another.

The testimony of Hippolytus to the apostolic origin and divine authority of the books of the New Testament settles that question as far as it can be settled by historical evidence. He was born only fifty years after Christ, and quotes every book of the New Testament as sacred Scripture. Irenæus, his teacher, quotes every book of the New Testament except the third Epistle of John and the Epistle of Jude, seven hundred and sixty-seven times. Polycarp, nearly forty years contemporary with the Apostle John, quotes thirteen books of the New Testament in his one short Epistle to the Philippians. Moreover, in Hippolytus' *Refutation of All Heresies* we find that heretics of his day, and before his day, appealed to the Gospels in proof of their false doctrines, perverting their meaning of course, but recognizing their inspiration. In that work Tatian is classed among the heretics—perhaps his was a mild form of heresy—and yet Tatian about 150 A. D. wrote a harmony of the Gospels, a work which was supposed to be irrecoverably lost, but a copy of which has recently been discovered. But more wonderful still is the recent discovery in a monastery on Mt. Sinai of a Syrian version of the Gospels, made in the interests of the heresy of Cerinthus, who was a contemporary of the Apostle John. The Cerinthians are described by Hippolytus as denying the supernatural conception of the Son of Mary, and this version changes the original text in order to sustain their views.

These facts and others are adduced by our author to refute the infidel theories.

of Baur and Renan about the origin of the books of the New Testament; and it is difficult to understand how any person, with the slightest pretensions to candor, could rise from the perusal of this work without the conviction that the genuineness of the New Testament writings is better authenticated than that of any other writing of antiquity, authenticated, indeed, by all the evidence of which such a subject admits. As the work is written in a most agreeable style, we anticipate for it a large circulation among ministers and intelligent Christians, and are confident that it will strengthen their faith in the integrity and divine authority of the Christian Scriptures. The recognition of the author's scholarship and ability, and the value of his work as a contribution to an important department of sacred learning, by his election to membership in the Victoria Institute, a society of English scholars, is no more than his just due.

ROBERT PRICE.

Clarksville, Tenn.

McCLURE'S "ANOTHER COMFORTER."

"ANOTHER COMFORTER": A Study of the Mission of the Holy Ghost. *By Rev. A. D. McClure, Pastor of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Wilmington, N. C.* Fleming H. Revell Co., Chicago. 1897. 12mo, cloth, pp. 127. Price, 50 cts.

This choice little volume is from the pen of one of our best known, best loved, and most successful pastors. In the course of his stated ministry he is led into the study and exposition of the manifold work and offices of the Spirit. From the conviction that there is much neglect in our pulpits of faithful preaching on this subject, and much ignorance or vagueness of apprehension among Christians as to the nature, necessity, and preciousness of this work, he ventures to issue this brief volume as his contribution to the quickening of a deeper and livelier interest in the wide subject of the Spirit's office and operation. The earnest piety of the author breathes through every chapter, and every page is redolent of the fragrance of his zeal and consecration. It is clear and Calvinistic in its theology. It rightly conceives and places the work of the Spirit in relation to that of the Father and the Son and in relation to the agency and efficiency of man. It is comprehensive in its scope, but makes no attempt to be exhaustive. It gives the full doctrine of the church under each head, and presents in terse, popular style the standard arguments by which its positions are maintained or elucidated. A lady once grieved to me over the loss of a little pamphlet work on the Holy Spirit, as being the most prized of all the books in her library. Such as she will relish this volume from Mr. McClure. It is a book that the spiritual will read with delight and that will strengthen our young and growing disciples. Its brevity invites perusal. Its contents will stimulate study.

The author is not as clear in the seventeenth chapter as he might have been. He seems to teach that gifts of the Spirit to individuals to-day, to enrich and equip them for service, different and specific gifts to different individuals, are generically one with those "spiritual gifts" which marked the apostolic age. But these latter, though intended for edification, were, in our judgment, distinctly evidential, and as such are not perpetuated in this day.

The author further holds that the "gifts of the Spirit," emphasized by the apostles, are not the same as that endowment of power promised and waited for as the blessing of Pentecost, or the work of the Spirit in regeneration, or that in

sanctification, or the enduement of power and its effects. As gifts they are particular and individual, a clear display of the Spirit's power. They constitute the talent for which we are severally responsible. Every Christian has his special gift, some "qualification to serve." How far these gifts are innate and anticipatory, that is, natural, the author thinks we may not know. But of this he is sure, that every child of God has a gift, and some have several gifts, the bestowal and efficiency of which are alike of the Spirit. It is by reason of these "gifts" that some become specialists in experience and example, eminent in single lines, or distinguished for leadership, or for particular phases of work. By allowing and acknowledging manifest workings of these special gifts we are estopped from charging presumption on those who possess them, without at the same time encouraging in others what would in them be presumption. Here, our author says, is the secret of eminence. He adds (p. 99): "We may boldly say that such men as George Müller have the gift of faith and prayer for the needy and desolate; men like J. Hudson Taylor have the gift of faith for support and supply of all temporal wants, in venturing upon God's work without any visible means of securing what they need to go out into 'the regions beyond.' Their gift is to trust and go. To some the gift of faith and prayer for bodily healing is bestowed. In this way we shall find men and women with gifts, differing according to the grace that is given them, for some special service or testimony. Some of these may work as rebukes of those who fail in regular methods, for they do deeds of daring and bear heavy burdens, and suffer much, still bringing the helpless to Christ and crying after Christ, and taking Christ to the needy in irregular or unconventional methods, and by means not appointed by the doctors of the law." The exhortation of the apostle, "Quench not the Spirit," has reference, he says, not to the sinner's resisting the Spirit, but to Christians not using the gifts of the Spirit. It refers not "to the loss of eternal life, but the neglect or abuse of gifts and the depreciation of the Spirit's work." He distinguishes between the graces and the gifts of the Spirit. Gifts are qualifications or talents for use in service. Graces are the manifestations of personal religious experience. The latter commend to others the excellences of holy living. The former are made effective by the mighty power of the Spirit.

We do not question that the Spirit equips with ample gifts each chosen instrument for the sphere of service to which the purpose of God destines him, or that God chooses with discrimination his instruments for each work. But the spiritual equipment of such is general. We hesitate to say that the gifts to each are in character and operation as sharply differentiated from each other, and from the common graces of a holy life, as were the gift of tongues, the gift of healing and the gift of prophecy, or as these were from that indwelling of the Spirit which was to secure personal holiness and spiritual growth. So liable is man to mistake the promptings of his own zeal for the movements of the Spirit summoning him to a special line of work for which he has been called and furnished by the Spirit, that he is in danger of erecting his own ardent ideas into positive indications of the will of the Spirit within him, and will plead his inward call and his supposed "special gift" as authorization to act on his own ideas and notions. There is danger that such, misreading the mind of the Spirit, yet aiming to be loyal to the Spirit, will look lightly on ecclesiastical restraints and plead a mission superior to that of ordinary and ordained servants, a mission peculiarly their own. The pos-

essor of such gifts being human would be subjected to serious temptation to impatience, if not to bigotry and dogmatism. It would make him a specialist in his line who would chafe at the restraint, should others not gifted in that line seek to moderate his zeal. This is an age when ecclesiastical authority is lightly esteemed. The religious world abounds with independent workers who prefer directing their own labors apart from the agencies and machinery of the church. Lay-evangelists crop up on every hand who openly say that do not desire ordination, since they believe they can be more useful in preaching Christ unordained than if they were ordained. In assuming to have a better way they not only rebuke the regularly organized church as divinely constituted, but they foster a spirit of dissatisfaction with ordained agencies among the people and diminish the respect and reverence these should justly receive. The ultimate harvest of these extra-ecclesiastical efforts to do the work of the church is, we fear, a dearth that more than offsets the temporary splendors of the success which seems to follow upon such irregular workers, and to follow them in a measure because their work is advertized and regarded as extra-ecclesiastical. Is there not danger that this idea of a Spirit-call to each particular service with a gift of power and preparation definitely measured out and fitted to that particular service will run away with its possessor? The doctrine of a definite call to special work with corresponding "charismata" brings the Spirit and the work into such close contact as virtually to eliminate human efficiency and make the efficiency of our service to be that of God. We do not charge all these views and consequences on our author. He seems to see them and to feel the danger of abuse. He says, p. 100: "Irregulars may be more regular than regulars, if the latter follow only the letter and the former be led by the Spirit. These irregulars are not necessarily right. They are not thereby justified in self-assertiveness. They will prove the possession of gifts by humility and patience. They will not assert that all who work in a regular way are wrong. The regular way is normally the right way, and most are called to exercise their gifts in an orderly manner and under wholesome restraints. The exceptions are called to prove the rule, not to destroy it. The gifts of the Spirit are to make servants of all to the Lord Christ, so that the many may serve in the regular way, and the few may have place even in irregular ways."

Yet others less guarded and less grounded than our author will go the length of the tendency, and we cannot but deprecate the inculcation of an idea or mode of statement that we fear is more fanciful than scriptural or useful.

Mr. McClure has put the whole church under debt to him for his tender, spiritual, and comforting book. Its perusal brings the Spirit into our hearts. May we see further fruitage from his chaste and glowing pen.

Clarksville, Tenn.

W. A. ALEXANDER.

TERRY'S THE NEW APOLOGETIC.

THE NEW APOLOGETIC. Five Lectures on True and False Methods of Meeting Modern Philosophical and Critical Attacks upon the Christian Religion. *By Milton S. Terry, D. D., LL. D., Professor in Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.* New York: Eaton & Mains. 1897. 12mo, pp. 200. 85 cts.

The author declares his purpose in these lectures to be to guard against erroneous methods in apologetics, and to suggest a few outlines of arguments

which may prove useful. They are, therefore, of the nature of introduction to apologetics rather than apology itself. The first lecture deals with definitions of terms, the occasion for apologetics, and the nature and scope of the subject. In its historical aspects it is shown to have grown out of the struggle into which Christianity entered at its very beginning with certain kinds of philosophy, represented by Lucian, Celsus, Porphyry, and others in the earlier ages; English deism, French infidelity, and German philosophical rationalism in later years; out of the literary-critical movement, begun also by Porphyry in his attempt to discredit the Book of Daniel, and continuing down to the present-day activity of the rationalistic school of higher criticism; and to the contending claims of the so-called department or science of comparative religions. The next three lectures develop each of these lines of thought more elaborately. The fifth lecture is a more positive statement or suggestion of the arguments with which the defenders of the faith may overthrow their opponents. With the exception of here and there some disparagement of the methods which have been successfully used in the past, and an occasional corresponding conceit of the new over the old, the author's ideas and suggestions are timely and serviceable. In his last lecture he maintains that the Christian apologist can do more than merely stand on the defensive, that he can become aggressive, and boldly and persistently declare and urge the claims of the Christian faith, saying with the Master, "Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship." Among the considerations which he thinks we may duly urge are that Christianity is not simply one of the great religions of the world, but *the* religion, the only one which has in it all the elements essential to the spiritual needs of man; that it has survived the many errors and follies of its adherents; that it is the religion of freedom of thought; that it is the great missionary religion of the world; that it develops in its genuine disciple a life of inward peace and purity and outward activity and beneficence and holiness which no other religion claims to impart; that it has a marvellous and happy adaptation to the necessities and longings of man's spiritual nature; that it has blessed and elevated human society, and looks towards the regeneration and restitution of all things.

The author's selection of a title for his work is unfortunate in view of the fact that this title has been used quite recently by another eminent apologete, Dr. Watts, the learned and able Belfast professor, who died but a year or two ago. Dr. Watts uses the term, "The New Apologetic," which he gives as a title to his book (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1890), to describe the attempt of the various classes of writers and thinkers, philosophical, critical, and others, to adjust the Bible to the ideas and theories of those whom he characterizes as being on "the down grade" in criticism, theology, and science. Dr. Terry uses it to describe the method, which he calls new, which he advises in meeting these destructive or antagonistic positions.

JOHNSON'S SKETCH OF THE UNITED SYNOD.

A BRIEF SKETCH OF THE UNITED SYNOD. *By Rev. Thomas Cary Johnson, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Polity in Union Theological Seminary, Hampden-Sidney, Virginia.* Reprinted from Vol. VIII., American Society of Church History. 8vo, pp. 38. 1897.

This pamphlet, while small and unpretentious, preserves valuable history. The amalgamation of the New and Old School bodies in the South has been so-

thorough and complete, and the resultant so homogeneous, that a new generation may almost lose sight of the facts which are gathered together in this monograph. The author gives us first the literature which has been prepared on the subject of the United Synod, its doctrines, organization, history, and union with our Assembly. In the next chapter he gives a statement of the organization of the Synod and of its union with the Southern Church, and outlines the study which he will present in the following pages. This chapter should be in the preface or an introduction. The next chapter is on the source of the United Synod. In it Dr. Johnson discusses the causes leading to the disruption in 1838, showing that for several reasons very many adhered to the New School party who were not in sympathy with the theology current among the leaders or the majority of that party, and also showing how the New School party was influenced immediately after the disruption to become more Presbyterian, more churchly, more Calvinistic. The author then traces the history of the New School body, giving special attention to its repeated deliverances on the subject of slavery, out of which at last, in 1857, when its Assembly issued a deliverance specially aimed at the portion of the church in the South, grew the determination of the Southern brethren to withdraw from the body. In the fourth chapter he tells of the Convention of the Southern brethren, held in the summer of 1857, in Richmond, Va., at which it was determined to withdraw from the Assembly and form a separate organization, to be called the United Synod. At this Convention there was a strong disposition to unite at once with the Old School body. This measure was opposed by Rev. Dr. A. H. H. Boyd, and strongly advocated by Hon. J. Randolph Tucker, the one being the leading "antagonist" of the scheme, and the other its distinguished "protagonist," according to our author, in a somewhat unwarranted adaptation of words to express his meaning. The opponents of the measure prevailed, but the spirit of union manifested at the very beginning grew in strength, until within seven years the new body was one with the Southern Old School Church. This chapter also contains the substance of the declaration of principles of the new body. The next chapter describes the development and growth of the organization, and is followed by a full account of its union, with the various steps leading thereto, with the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, in 1864. In the last chapter the author shows that there has been no trace in the churches thus united of New Schoolism as it was known in the earlier days of the division. The whole work, while brief, is of great value as a bringing together and recording of facts and incidents which would otherwise be apt to be forgotten, and is a worthy contribution to the bibliography of our church.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF CHARLES FORCE DEEMS, D. D., LL. D., Pastor of the Church of the Strangers, New York City, and President of the American Institute of Christian Philosophy; and Memoir. *By his sons, Rev. Edward M. Deems, A. M., D. D., and Francis M. Deems, M. D., Ph. D.* New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. 8vo, 365 pages. \$1.50.

We rise from the reading, from beginning to end, of this fascinating autobiography and memoir refreshed and strengthened and glad. Dr. Deems' whole life was one of such devotion, earnestness, success, and yet simplicity, that we could wish all might read its story and catch something of its spirit. Some little lack of unity in the parts, and of clearness here and there in the details, especially of

dates, does not detract from the power which this volume will have. Its story is that of a man who gave a life of rare length and ability to the service of Christ, and who never flinched in the presence of duty or quailed before hardship. By his intense zeal and consecration he made himself felt in a constantly enlarging circle, and he was always on the side of truth and righteousness. In church work he proved himself a master in wisdom and discretion; in wider fields he contributed more largely perhaps than any man of the past two decades to the setting forth and practical propagation of sound Christian philosophy. These two departments centre the one around the Church of the Strangers, in New York—whose pulpit was by his ministry made synonymous with spiritual fervor and scriptural teaching—and the other around the American Institute of Christian Philosophy, which he organized and made efficient, and whose organ, *Christian Thought*, was the expression of the best that was in him and in the company of able men whom he gathered about him. We trust that the book will have a large circulation, not only among Dr. Deems' friends in the South and in the North, but among all who love the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ and the cause of a true Christian philosophy.

The volume is made up, in part, of a life of himself prepared for his children, and in part of a memoir prepared by his sons. In the latter part, however, the father is made to express himself as much as possible through his letters or other writings. As most of our readers already know, Dr. Deems was born in Maryland, but came South almost at the beginning of his youthful ministry as general agent of the American Bible Society, and remained in the South until after the close of the war between the States, a period of twenty-four years, which he spent as a travelling Methodist preacher, university professor, head of a girls' college, and as an evangelist and orator of wide reputation. After the war he went to New York and established a paper in the interests of peace and reconciliation, and conducted it for about a year, when it failed. He then threw himself into the work of a pastor and preacher to the strangers in the city, and soon gathered around himself the great congregation to which he ministered so long and so well. The generosity of Commodore Vanderbilt provided him with a spacious and eligibly-located church, and here he carried on the great work of his life, making this church the centre of an aggregation of Christian activities which has linked his name with the greatest and best of his compeers in religion and reform. In his busy life, Dr. Deems found time to travel and write. His most permanent work, perhaps, will be his *Jesus*. His *Gospel of Common Sense*, a commentary on the Epistle of James, will also keep his memory green.

STEARNS' EVIDENCE OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE.

THE EVIDENCE OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE; being the Ely Lectures for 1890. *By Lewis French Stearns, Professor of Christian Theology in Bangor Theological Seminary.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1893.

If nothing more shall be accomplished by the Ely Lectureship in Union Theological Seminary, New York, than the production of McCosh's *Positivism and Christianity* and this work of Dr. Stearns, it will have proved of signal service to the cause of Christian truth. Dr. Stearns' Lectures are more interesting, more original, and altogether more valuable than are Dr. McCosh's. He has all the advantage of concentrating his force upon one point, and that the most important

in the defence of our faith, the evidence of the personal, spiritual experience of the regenerated heart.

Doubtless the most striking Lecture in the volume is that entitled, "The Verification of the Evidence," in which he shows that the evidence of personal experience meets exactly the demand of this scientific age, in giving us proof by experimentation.

There are some imperfections: a false psychology of the will, an exaggerated natural theology, an underrating of other evidences, and extravagant claims for his own selected proof, but, despite all these, it is the most satisfactory presentation of the claims of Christianity upon our intelligent credence that this writer knows. He recommends it to every thoughtful Christian, as well as to every minister of the gospel and every teacher of apologetics.

Lexington, Va.

JAMES A. QUARLES.

HADLEY'S ECONOMICS.

ECONOMICS: An Account of the Relations between Private Property and Public Wealth. *By Arthur Twining Hadley, Professor of Political Economy in Yale University, etc.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1896.

This is not a comprehensive treatise on economics, designed to present all its principles. Its characteristics are that it limits itself to the discussion of the most important and vexed questions connected with the subject, and that it treats them under their twofold relation to private property and to public wealth. By public wealth is not meant government property, nor the aggregate of private property, but the enjoyments or useful things possessed by the people.

It favors individualism as opposed to socialism, the Malthusian theory, gold monometallism, bank paper money rather than treasury notes, machinery, private property in land, free trade, and national, not state, banks.

One of the most interesting points made is that values are determined by consumers; that this is the barrier to monopoly and is the chief benefit of increased production to the laborer. The greatest profit to the capitalist is found in so cheapening his product as to bring it within the reach of the largest possible number of consumers.

This is not a work for beginners, but is admirable for those who have a knowledge of the elementary principles of the science.

Lexington, Va.

JAMES A. QUARLES.

WEBER'S HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY. *By Alfred Weber, Professor of the University of Strasbourg.* Authorized Translation by Frank Thilly, A. M., Ph. D., Professor of Philosophy in the University of Missouri. From the Fifth French Edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1896.

For the general student of philosophy and for those colleges that desire a short course, this is the most valuable *History of Philosophy* that I know. It is clearly the work of a mind that has mastered the various systems and that knows how to present them intelligibly to others. He regards the course of philosophy as a stream, with some eddies and islands that temporarily divide or even turn it back, but, on the whole, gathering volume and moving on towards the sea of absolute truth. The translation is remarkably smooth and natural.

Lexington, Va.

JAMES A. QUARLES.

X. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE BIBLICAL ILLUSTRATOR; or Anecdotes, Similes, Emblems, Illustrations; Expository, Scientific, Geographical, Historical, and Homiletic; Gathered from a Wide Range of Home and Foreign Literature, on the Verses of the Bible. *By Rev. Joseph S. Ezell, M. A.* SECOND CORINTHIANS. New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896. 8vo, pp. xii., 542. \$2.00.

This volume of the *Biblical Illustrator* series, which we have noticed before, contains first, an Introduction to the Second Epistle, the discussion of the topics usually considered in special introduction being drawn from the writings of well-known scholars, such as Professor Findlay, Dean Stanley, Dr. Charles Hodge, Dean Plumptre, and others. Then follow illustrations of the words of the text, combined with a large amount of homiletic material, especially in the form of analyses of passages or practically outlines of discourses. The value of such a work, properly used, is great, and this series offers about the best that is to be found of its kind, but there is always danger of a misuse of such a publication, especially by those who have not yet learned to think for themselves. Ready-made analyses destroy intellectual vigor and independent thought, and when relied upon or too freely used speedily render one incapable of developing for himself a proper interpretation or enforcement of the word.

DISCOURSES ON THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE PHILIPPIANS. *By Rev. Frederick A. Noble, D. D., Pastor Union Park Congregational Church, Chicago.* New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. 12mo, pp. 385. \$1.25.

In twenty-three discourses Dr. Noble gives us the salient features of the Epistle to the Philippians. The first, entitled "Opening Words," recounts the circumstances under which the epistle was written, together with the nature of his work in Philippi and some of the characteristics and features of the church and people there, thus preparing the way for the more thorough understanding of the epistle. The succeeding discourses take up the leading topics or thoughts of the epistle, and in a delightful expository method unfold the meaning and spirit of the great apostle in these words of love and encouragement. Dr. Noble is a graceful and forceful writer and full of unction. Among the topics of these admirable discourses are such as these, Living to Serve, Unity Through Love, Fellowship and Sympathy, Christian Aspiration, Our Heavenly Citizenship, High Ideals, Fullness of Supply in God.

THE SOUL WINNER. *By Rev. Edward O. Guerrant, D. D.* Lexington, Ky.: John B. Morton & Co. 1896. 12mo, pp. 252.

All who are familiar with the fervid oratory, deep spirituality, and mental gifts of the author of this little work, and his friends and admirers are found all

over the South, will rejoice in its publication. It consists of two parts. The first, which gives the name to the book, is a series of crisp, practical discussions of such aspects of the preacher's life and work as are not usually discussed in the books which young ministers use in preparation for their calling. They are published at the request of several young men who listened to a series of lectures by Dr. Guerrant on the subject of Evangelistic Work. Among the topics discussed are, Who is the Preacher? How to Preach, What to Preach, The Morning Service, The Evening Service, The Singing, The Inquirer, Punctuality, The Voice, The Ushers, The Sexton, The Weather, When to Close, etc. All these chapters are intensely practical and suggestive, and they should be read by every young man who is about to enter the ministry. Besides being full of common sense and based upon a wide and successful experience, they glow with spiritual warmth and show how the most trivial duties may be invested with the supremest glory when performed as a means of winning souls to Christ. The second part of the book gives an account of Dr. Guerrant's evangelistic work in the mountains of Kentucky. The chapters are thrillingly interesting and inspiring. As a whole, the book is one to be heartily commended, for the good it will do as well as for the encouragement which it gives to Christian workers. The first edition of it is, we hear, about exhausted. We trust that the next edition will be put in a form more worthy of such striking and valuable discussions, in typography, paper, and arrangement.

A MANUAL FOR RULING ELDERS. Containing the Laws and Usages of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, in Relation to Ruling Elders and Other Church Officers, Church Sessions, Churches, and Congregations. With Introductory Matter, Notes and Suggestions. *By the Rev. Wm. Henry Roberts, D. D., LL. D.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1897. 16mo, 459 pages. \$1.00.

This volume is very fully described in the sub-title. In it the compiler has gathered all the paragraphs in the church Standards relating to the officers of the church, all the decisions of various kinds, or regulations adopted, by the two Assemblies of which the present church is composed, as well as of the reunited Assembly, and the rules adopted for the conduct of judicatories. The Introduction, which contains more original matter than the rest of the book, gives a history of the Standards, an account of the Presbyterian system, in its theology, its views on human duty, its worship, and its government, a statement of its principles of church government and of its organization, a study of the nature and terms and obligation of subscription to the Standards, and an outline of the history of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. The following chapters are entitled, The Office of the Ruling Elder, The Session, The Church and Congregation, General Rules for Judicatories, and Forms for Sessions. A complete Index, very minute and exhaustive, is a specially useful feature. The whole forms a most valuable reference book for the ruling elder. There is hardly a question which is likely to rise in the session or in the individual elder's experience or duties as an elder that is not here fully answered, in the words of the Standards or in the decisions or deliverances of the church courts. The book, we should add, has been prepared by Dr. Roberts on the recommendation of the Assembly of which he is the Stated Clerk.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ELDER'S DIARY. *Edited by Rev. Joseph B. Stratton, D. D. Natchez, Miss.* Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1896. 12mo, 171 pages. 75 cents.

The experiences of ministers are often found on record, but we recall no single book or booklet that tells us of the experience and work of a ruling elder. That before us therefore fills a gap. It fills it well. It is the faithful record of a faithful ruler in God's house. Everything that is of a personal nature is eliminated, and we do not even know who the elder is. The work is edited by Dr. Stratton, which it a guarantee of its worth and good taste. It begins with the elder's election, tells of his struggles in deciding, of his sense of the obligations assumed, of the difficulties he encountered in the duties of public prayer, conducting services in the pastor's absence, etc., and describes many incidents in his life as a ruling elder. We commend it most heartily to every elder in the church.

CHAMPIONS OF CHRISTIANITY. *By Silas Farmer, Author of "History of Detroit and Michigan," "The Royal Railroad," "The Truth Teller," "The Teacher's Toolchest," etc.* New York: Eaton & Mains. 1897. 16mo, pp. 139. 60 cents.

This little work gives in brief form, in the very words of the great thinkers and actors quoted, their testimony to the truth of the Christian religion, the authority of the Scriptures, the power of a godly life. The list of names from which these testimonies are taken embraces the great leaders in the governmental world, as Bismarck, Gladstone, Blackstone; in the social and business world, as Howard, Cooper, Jenner, Simpson; in the artistic world, as Michael Angelo, Wren, Scott, Handel, Haydn; in the literary world, as Caxton, Holland, Bryant, Müller, Carlyle, Milton; and in the scientific world, as Galileo, Herschell, Henry, Lyell, Dawson, Faraday, Linnæus, Agassiz, and others. The whole makes a valuable compend of striking witness for Christ and our faith.

THE WILL OF GOD TO MAN AND MAN'S DUTY TO GOD. Arranged by George Allen. 16mo, pp. 20. Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1897.

This is a booklet containing simply the answers to the questions of the Shorter Catechism, under such heads or in such classification as to show the logical order and practical relation of its truths. As it is thus arranged and printed one can more readily appreciate the matchless power and comprehensiveness of this venerable standard of the church, and can more readily account for its great hold upon the minds and hearts of those to whom it is faithfully taught.

POSSIBILITIES. *By James G. K. McClure.* Chicago, New York, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. 12mo, 127 pages. 75 cents.

Eight striking and helpful discourses on, Finding Our Possibilities, Asserting Our Possibilities, Protecting Our Possibilities, the Possibility of Being Like Our Heroes, the Possibility of Living Aright Anywhere, the Possibility of Our Time, the Possibility of a New and Blessed Life.

OUT OF THE CAIN-LIFE INTO THE CHRIST-LIFE. *By Rev. Henry Ostrom, Evangelist.* Chicago, New York, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. 12mo, pp. 343. \$1.25.

The title of this book is derived from the words of John, in his first epistle, "Not as Cain," and of Paul, in writing to the Galatians, "Christ liveth in me."

The author's fundamental position is that while Adam sinned directly against God, Cain sinned directly against man. The one was a rebel, the other a murderer. The Cain-spirit is that which arrays itself against the great law of love, starting from the root of self-assertion or self-independence and developing into grosser forms of worldliness, vain-glory, jealousy, spitefulness, resistance of Christ and the Holy Spirit. The chapters are simply fervid discourses, not specially marked by logical connection or development, and somewhat wanting in grace and theological precision, but quite suggestive and containing many apt illustrations of truth. The author is an evangelist, and something of the methods of an evangelist appear in this work. We imagine that the discourses are more effective when delivered than when read.

A PRIMER OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM; or the Doctrines of the Church of Rome Briefly Examined in the Light of Scripture. *By the Rev. Charles H. H. Wright, D. D., Trinity College, Dublin, M. A. Exeter College, Oxford, Ph. D of Leipzig, Donnellan Lecturer (1880), University of Dublin, etc., etc.* New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. 18mo, 160 pages. Flexible cloth. 40 cents net.

This little work is one of a series issued by the publishers under the name of "Present Day Primers." The title is somewhat misleading, as the work is a primer of polemics rather than of Roman Catholicism, and its characterizations of the Roman church, while all true and deserved, are such as to suggest only the controversial side of the subject. The sub-title is far more accurate as a description and title of the work. The discussion is very brief, but comprehensive, and deals with the Roman Catholic view of the rule of faith, of the church and its authority and organization, of the sacraments, of the sacrifice of the mass, of the doctrine of the church, the priesthood, the headship of Peter, penance, indulgence, and persecutions, of the church's teachings on points of doctrine, as original sin, justification, the immaculate conception and worship of the Virgin, the invocation of saints and angels, etc. To one desiring to learn the views of the Roman Catholic church from a purely controversial standpoint, and at the same time to examine them in the light of the Scriptures, this little book will be desirable. The citations of Scripture are most numerous and apt, and will furnish the most abundant material for disproving the assumptions of the Church of Rome.

THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE, AND THE SEMI-CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE MINISTRY OF JAMES PARK, D. D. Knoxville: Bean, Warters & Gant. 1897.

We congratulate the venerable First Church, of Knoxville, on its centennial, and the vigorous, active pastor on his ministerial semi-centennial. It is a well-mated pair, and the story of their lives and of their more than thirty years' union, as told in this pamphlet, is one of intense interest and profit.

A MAN'S VALUE TO SOCIETY. Studies in Self-Culture and Character. *By Newell Dwight Hillis.* New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896. 12mo, pp. 327. Vellum cloth. \$1.25.

The author is the well-known Chicago independent pastor. The style is striking, at times epigrammatic, and always brilliant. He does not attempt to

count or trace all the elements which go to make up character, but brings together "a few reminders of great duties and enduring rewards," stating, in his fine language, that "ours is a world in which a single cluster acquaints the husbandman with the quality of the vine, while one golden bough interprets the beauty of the entire forest." Good ancestry, an original endowment of physical strength, good training or knowledge, proper adjustment to one's natural place in life, skill in maintaining smooth relations with one's fellows, integrity, the enlargement and enrichment of one's personality, are some of the elements of worth in the individual which the author sets forth and emphasizes. After the preliminary chapter, dealing with these elements, he studies such topics, bearing upon self-culture and the formation of character, as Materials and External Teachers, Aspirations and Ideals, the Physical Basis of Character, the Mind and Duty of Right Thinking, the Moral Uses of Memory, Imagination as the Architect of Manhood, Uses of Books and Reading, etc.

CHRISTIAN LIFE IN GERMANY ; As Seen in the State and the Church. *By Edward F. Williams, D. D., Western Editor of the Congregationalist.* New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896. 12mo, pp. 320. \$1.50.

We cannot better set forth the plan and purpose of this most interesting book than to transcribe the author's own words: "First, to describe some of the methods by which the German people are trained for their duties in church and state, and to show how the character of the government, the military and aristocratic spirit of the nation, affect Christian activity; secondly, to furnish material for determining the actual condition of the spiritual life of the national churches by setting forth in some detail what their members are doing, through Foreign Missions, for the world at large, and, through the Inner Mission, for the needy at home; thirdly, to describe the forces and their training by which this home work is carried on; and, finally, to sketch the social and moral conditions of the country, and to point out their effect on Christian life, and upon the influence of the church." In the development of this plan, and for the accomplishment of the ends in view, the author describes with great fulness the intellectual training of the people, their moral and religious life, their social and industrial movements, their efforts in spreading the gospel abroad and in strengthening its power at home, their care for the defective and sick and deprived, their circulation of Christian literature, their efforts to meet the special dangers of the times. The period considered is from 1860 to the present day. Altogether, the book tells us of phases of life in Germany with which very few of us in this land are familiar, and which will greatly aid in forming a correct estimate of a people whose name is too often coupled only with that kind of learning and development which leads away from spiritual growth and grace and reverence for God's word and law.

SELECTED LIST OF SABBATH-SCHOOL BOOKS. *Prepared by Rev. W. A. Campbell, D. D.* New and Enlarged Edition. Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication.

We again call attention to this most admirable guide to pastors, superintendents, committees, and others in the selection of libraries for the Sabbath-school or

additions to libraries already had. Every book on the list, and the list embraces the publications of the leading houses in this country and Great Britain, has been carefully examined, and no one is on the list which cannot be safely recommended. The books are classified in those suitable for the primary, the intermediate, and the advanced classes or scholars. The governing principles in the choice of books to enter upon the list are that gospel truth in its application to the heart and life shall be prominent, that unsoundness in doctrine, partisan politics and objectionable social views shall be excluded, and that there be the best literary style and character attainable. With such a faithfully and carefully prepared list the collector of a young people's library has nearly all his work done for him.

LETTERS FROM THE SCENES OF THE RECENT MASSACRES IN ARMENIA. *By J. Rendel Harris and Helen B. Harris.* With Maps and Other Illustrations. New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. 12mo, pp. xiv. 254. \$1.25.

The authors, Professor Harris, of Cambridge, and his wife, in searching for Syriac manuscripts in the monasteries and churches of Eastern Turkey and Mesopotamia, and in carrying relief to the sufferers of that region, last year went into the distressed and bloody regions of Armenia. They were the almoners of the Friends in England. They enjoyed exceptional advantages for seeing and knowing the true condition of things. The results of their observations and experiences are embodied in this volume, which is composed of the letters written by them, during their journey, to friends in England. These letters furnish a good sketch of the Armenian life and character as well as show something of the gravity of the issues involved in the Armenian question. The writers saw much of the missionary force at work in that region, but in addition, being specially accredited to the foreign consuls, had more than the usual opportunities for the study of the conditions prevalent. The letters are full of interest as well as of information.

ULISSES S. GRANT. *Conversations and Unpublished Letters.* *By M. J. Cramer, D. D., LL. D., Ex-United States Minister to Denmark and to Switzerland.* New York: Eaton & Mains. 1897. 16mo, pp. 207. 90 cents.

As his brother-in-law, and as the holder of a prominent diplomatic position, Dr. Cramer enjoyed special opportunities of knowing General Grant. In the small volume before us the author records the substance of many conversations with his distinguished relative, and gives a number of letters of a personal kind which have not hitherto been published. These show more than is usually known of General Grant's inner and domestic life.

THE ENGLISH DIALECT DICTIONARY. *Edited by Joseph Wright, M. A., Ph. D., Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Oxford (Honorable Secretary and Literary Director of the English Dialect Society).* Parts I. and II. Oxford. 1897. One guinea a year.

This work will continue to be issued in half-yearly parts of about one hundred and forty-four pages each until it is completed, which will be, it is hoped, within

about eight years. As indicated by the first two numbers, it will be a complete vocabulary, with historical or other origin or association, of all dialect words now in use or that are known to have been in use during the past two hundred years. The investigations and references seem to be confined to the language as used in Great Britain and Ireland. The work is founded mainly on the publications of the English Dialect Society, of which the editor is a distinguished and active officer. It indicates vast labor and research, and when completed will be a valuable thesaurus of literary and philological lore.

THE REVIEW OF REVIEWS, June, 1897.—One finds the expected variety in the contents of the *American Monthly Review of Reviews* for June. The subjects of the sugar tariff, a sixty years' retrospect of the British Empire, the recent visit to the United States of M. Brunetiere, the French critic, the defective eyesight lately developed among American children, and the movement for the pensioning of school teachers, are treated in special articles. The editorial department entitled "The Progress of the World," covers such topics as American intervention in Cuba, the relation of Hawaii to the sugar question, the use of money in politics by corporations, the enlarged metropolis of New York, the fate of the arbitration treaty, European alliances and the Greco-Turkish war, the future of Greece, etc.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 42.—OCTOBER, 1897.

I. THE FACT OF THE TRINITY AND THE FACTS OF EXPERIENCE.

PRESENT-DAY philosophy may be characterized as an attempted explanation of the whole of human experience through a synthesis of its fundamental facts, on the basis of one ultimate and supreme fact. These fundamental facts, or principles, constituting the subject-matter of philosophy, are elucidated by a twofold method of procedure. First, an analysis of consciousness must disclose such principles, implicated in all experience as its necessary conditions, the *sine quibus non* of the very existence of human experience.

Next, the perils of faulty, incomplete, or fanciful analysis, and of the inadequate interpretation of the true and full significance of first principles, must be safeguarded by a supplementary and objective method. The evidences presented by the various aspects and successive phases of human experience, touching the character and significance of all ultimate facts must be scrutinized, and, if convincing, must be allowed due weight in the philosophical interpretation and reconstruction of experience as a whole. So far as may be competent to human intelligence, the sum-total of the results of the twofold method, must be brought into relations of harmonious adjustment.

Let us assume that through application of the methods indicated to human experience, including, of course, man's religious experience as an essential and supreme aspect of universal experience, a unitary conception of the ultimate principle of the uni-

verse has been attained. Let us, assume again, that the highest type of the religious experience of the race, well attested and based upon an equally well-attested, infallible record of a divine and redemptive self-revelation, demands for its adequate explanation and interpretation the reality of the triune personality of its author and object. Evidently philosophy, in the light of such evidence, if true to her ideal of an all-embracing unity, must seek the adjustment of her views touching the fundamental character of human nature, with the attested fact of the triune nature of the supreme principle of unity. Correspondence between fundamental facts and the triunity of the ultimate fact must be assumed *a priori*, and a reasonable expectation should be cherished of a better understanding and a richer interpretation, in the light of this supreme fact, of man's nature and experience.

Rightly interpreted, the facts of our human experience, and the revealed fact of the triune personality of the God of nature and of grace, must be characterized not merely by the absence of contradiction, but equally by the presence of positive agreement. All real facts as constituting directly or indirectly self-revelations of the one living and true God must be congruent. "For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things; to whom be glory forever. Amen."

The sense of sin, for example, implies at least potential consciousness of the existence and presence of a holy, personal God.

Sin as representing voluntary antagonism on the part of the creature to the law, will and character of the supreme and omnipresent Ruler of the universe has for its object God alone; apart from the existence of a holy God there could be no sin, and apart from some consciousness of his being and character there could be no sense of sin. Both facts may be ignored, suppressed or misinterpreted; yet the facts remain and carry with them the possibility of a right rendering of their significance.

Conceding, then, a relation of correspondence between all finite facts and the supreme fact, the presumption is neither violent nor unreasonable that the revealed fact of a tri-personal God should prove easier of acceptance than the abstract conception of a uni-personal God; that once revealed, it should find response in the

several aspects of human nature and experience; that it should present itself as a fact of paramount practical importance—*not* merely as an abstract doctrine demanding intellectual assent, theological formulation, and shelving in the pious memory; but as a vital concrete truth of ever present and eternal heart-interest. Contemplating the sublime mystery of the triune personality of the Godhead from an experiential point of view:

I. It may be confidently affirmed that there is nothing in a truly interpreted mental experience rendering assent to this supreme fact impossible or even difficult.

The antiquated criticism of the trinitarian conception as involving intrinsic contradiction and mathematical absurdity merits simply the counter-criticism of childish absurdity. All that is needful here is to reiterate the oft-repeated rejoinder that the doctrine as disclosed in Scripture and formulated in ecclesiastical symbols represents the divine being not as three and one in the same sense, not at once as three Gods and one God, but as three personal agents subsisting in the one divine essence or substance. The latter statement is not a whit more absurd than to say that a triangle is three as to its sides and yet represents one geometrical figure, and is thus one only because it is three; or to say that man is one as to his individual being and yet three as to the distinct yet inseparable elements of his personality, and that he is thus one only because of the threefold aspects of his mysterious nature. Our inability to comprehend the inscrutable mystery, how three divine persons, co-equal and co-eternal, reside in and partake of one divine essence with all its infinite perfections, presents no hindrance to our apprehension and appreciation of the fact.

Truly interpreted, experience teaches that we understand fully nothing. Inscrutability pertains to all things finite; much more to the infinite God. We fully understand not even a grain of sand, a blade of grass; much less self and fellows; infinitely more the less the Maker of all. If the works are incomprehensible, much more the worker. The time order of our knowledge seems to be, first, knowledge of the outer world, then of fellows, next of self, last of God; and the manner of our knowing in respect to all these objects seems essentially the same. All knowledge comes

through self-revelation of its object, immediate or mediate, to consciousness, and gives certainty as to facts, relations, qualities, attributes, but in the nature of the case imparts no full understanding of these self-revealing objects in all their relations or in respect to their inmost nature. Unfathomable mysteries are implicated in the trinity of body, mind, spirit; in the trinity of thought, feeling, will; touching neither their genesis nor their interrelations are these indubitable facts of consciousness intelligible in the fulness of their significance. So far the evidence of experience is purely negative; it simply forbids the denial of the possibility of the trinity on the ground of inscrutability. But there is a large fact of our general experience seemingly of more positive and helpful force. In the entire range of our actual knowledge we find not a single instance of unity without plurality. Bare undistinguished unity is absolutely foreign to human experience. Simple, isolated oneness or unicuity represents merely a mental abstraction. In the inorganic realm a drop of water figures as a miniature ocean, the habitat of innumerable miniature monsters; the smallest visible portion of matter represents a microcosm composed of millions of material particles held in mutual relation by attracting and repelling forces corresponding to the centripetal and centrifugal forces of the solar system. Organic unity accentuates the fact under consideration. An organism consists of many parts or elements distinct yet inseparable and interdependent, bound together by one inner common principle of life; all the organic members participate equally in the one vital essence.

The higher the ascent in the scale of being the more complex, subtle, and inexplicable are the unities presented. In man, figuring as a personality whose constituent elements of soul and body are distinct and antithetic, yet vitally united and permanently related, we find the highest, the most complex and mysterious type of unity, a hierarchy of unified unities.

Confining our attention to the spiritual element of human personality, we detect a unity of a unique kind, to which the term organic can be applied only by way of distant and frequently misleading analogy. Self-consciousness and its contents represent

not a bare numerical identity, figures not as a simple monad, but as a vital organic unity of an absolutely unique character. As a complex, yet original unity, marked at once by oneness of essence and plurality of function, spiritual oneness and breadth, a containing, all-embracing, all-conditioning sphere of activity, it presents a signal contrast to all other unities. The conception of a self-conscious and synthetic subject, the centre and the sphere of intelligent, emotional, and voluntary activity, of all individual experiences, cannot be derived from the idea of mathematical oneness, or from the simple unity of a single sensuous impression. Not only are the implied analogies inadequate, but the ideas themselves are the late products of analytic abstraction. Indeed, as already noted, no example of absolute unrelated oneness or singleness can be found either in our outer or inner experience. Even the analogy of organic unity must be regarded simply as an approximate symbol of our conscious life. Consciousness, as a complex unity, must be not only compared, but also contrasted with physical organisms, not merely as the condition of all perception of such organism, but equally as in its very nature a self-distinguishing unity, whose principle of unity and constituent elements are wholly incommensurable with the principle and parts of all material objects. Itself the supreme condition of the application of all temporal and spatial predicates, it forbids the application of such predicates to itself, and presents itself as a timeless and spaceless unity, through its power of annihilating such distinctions in the manipulation of its sensuous modifications, and supra-sensuous contents.

The fact that the original self-conscious subject is not an abstract undifferentiated numerical unit, but a genuine synthetic unity, is implicated in the facts that the self is natively endowed with diverse "faculties," or functions, and is constituted of diverse elements, no one of which can be reduced to absolute identity with any other, though all are inseparably related and mutually condition one another.

Kant's trio of critiques in their unity stand as relatively accordant witnesses to the complex unity of consciousness as constituted by a triplicity of original, coördinate, reciprocally-conditioning

aspects or elements. The progress of speculative thought, since Kant, bears equal witness to the fundamental importance of each of three factors of mental life, since each in turn has been viewed as an original basis upon which the others must be reduced, not to a genuine unity indeed, but to an abstract identity.

Ignoring the realistic element of the critical philosophy, refusing to elucidate and complete the synthesis suggested by the three-fold critique, Kant's most eminent successors present us with a series of idealistic systems, each of which accentuates one aspect of consciousness—the emotional, the voluntary, the cognitive, thereby doing good service in calling attention to its originality and intrinsic significance, yet exaggerating its importance by representing its coördinates as its derivatives.

No one of the threefold functions of mental life can be the product of the other, for all are equally interdependent and reciprocally related as vital functions of the one conscious subject. If sensation as the primitive and crude material of sensuous knowledge conditions the threefold activity of mind, they, in turn, condition both the objective and ideal significance of sensation. If thought affords objective scope for the definite activities of feeling and will, serves as the indispensable agent of their development and interpretation, they in turn condition equally the development of thought as affording definite motive and direction and supersensuous material for cognitive processes. And if feeling as motive imparts moral character to choice, the power of voluntary attention and deliberation determines the specific character of the feeling expressed in every act of choice. The procedure of current idealism is wholly unwarranted when it abstracts from the distinctive characteristics of the vital energies of feeling and will and identifies the abstraction with thought energy; *i. e.*, confounds the distinct mental functions of feeling and will with their idealized representations constructed by thought, and then represents the spontaneity of thought as exhausting the essential nature of the self. The surreptitious introduction of certain elements of "otherness" into every system of pure thought betrays its confessed inadequacy, and witnesses to the fact that pure thought and the pure self are pure abstractions. Our main

point relates to the fact that consciousness as a complex of synthetic activities mutually implying and conditioning each other necessarily implicates a genuine synthetic subject. Our emotional and voluntary energies not only stimulate thought, but equally with sensation supply content, moral and religious material for thought. Thought again not only provides for the development of feeling and will by constructive interpretation of sensation, but also constructs a moral and religious aspect of the "cosmos of experience" by its interpretations of the deeper elements of the inner life. Consequently our application of the principle of synthesis cannot terminate with the discovery of a finite synthetic subject.

The ultimate principle of unity of a vitally synthetic agent and its vitally related cosmos can be neither absolutely unknowable, nor absolutely knowable as a principle of analytic thought. A truly synthetic subject implicates a kindred and vitally related supreme synthetic subject. If the non-sensuous phenomena of consciousness, as equally objects of perception with the sensuous, imply a non-sensuous, self-determining, complex spontaneity, this again as consciously interrupted, imperfect, dependent, must imply an independent, absolutely self-determining, truly complex, supreme spontaneity. To reach a merely abstract universal we must do violence to the irreducible, original, and vital elements of our own conscious unity. To conclude from a real unity, diversified, and living, to a dead, formal, abstract unity is surely the height of logical absurdity.

Any adequate interpretation of ethical and religious feeling must develop an earnest protest against every phase of a formal and abstract universalism. In feeling we find the very root of the religious consciousness, and an immediate witness not only to the reality, but equally to the synthetic character of an absolutely original self. The feeling of absolute dependence for *being* implicates the presence of an absolute being upon whom we are absolutely dependent. The constituent elements of this generic feeling of dependence point analogically to the relative character of this absolute being. The feeling of fear or reverence implies conscious dependence on absolute power; the feeling of oughtness

or moral obligation, implicating dependent independence, points to supreme and righteous authority; the feeling of sympathy or love, the attractive element apart from which there could be no semblance of religion, indicates dependence upon a relatively kindred, heart-responsive being. According to the relative ascendancy of one or the other of these specific feelings, the Supreme Being will necessarily be conceived under the character of Master, Ruler, Father; and the religious subject will assume the corresponding attitude of slave, subject, or child.

So, too, the reciprocal dependence of man on man, based upon unity of nature and sympathy, indicates a common kindred ground of unity, a common and supreme bond of sympathy. Since, then, the individual unity of consciousness cannot, either in whole or in part, be absolutely ultimate, it necessarily implies a perfect and all-sustaining unity of like character with itself as the basis and source of its dependent, complex unity.

The Supreme Self, equally with the dependent self, must be a genuine synthetic subject, in order to the very existence of a finite self and a complex natural order. We know nothing of any conscious being apart from the essential and characteristic conditions of our own conscious life; and the synthetic character of our consciousness both in its constitution and its processes, its synthetic unifying both of the complex aspects of the me, and of the me and the not-me, implicates a supreme, all-embracing, all-conditioning, synthetic, self-conscious subject.

The analogy betwixt the unity of consciousness and the divine trinitarian unity, though faint and partial, as all resemblances between the finite and the infinite must be, is yet real and helpful. At the very least, it indicates the irrational character of the hypothesis of an absolute and abstract identity of being, exclusive of all real distinction. It does more: in conjunction with the analogy of our entire experience it prepares us to find in the divine self-revelation not merely a like spiritual unity, but equally a more complex unity, the highest and most perfect type of spiritual unity. The revealed fact accords with this expectation, for while the human individual, the highest and most complex of finite beings, constitutes but a single personality, a threefold and distinct

personality is embraced in the unity of the one divine essence. The trinal personality of the divine being becomes thus a help rather than a hindrance to the acceptance of God's highest self-revelation on the part of a truly interpreted experience. Such an experience inevitably leads us to believe that the highest and ultimate of all beings shall also be the most complex of all, characterized by a unity the most intimate and mysterious, a unity not merely of attributes, functions, and modes of activity, but also an essential and substantial union of coequal personal agents. The analogy of man's spiritual nature shadows forth a divine unity, supreme, perfect, ideal; yet most inscrutable in its constitution and mode of subsistence, because God in his essential nature as the self-existent one is most inscrutable. Here we find the ultimate, all-embracing, and overwhelming mystery, being without beginning, having the ground of his own existence eternally within himself. And yet the fact of self-existence, as the ground and explanation of all dependent existence, is all but universally recognized. Bathed in the meridian splendor of the Sun of Righteousness, our hearts flooded with the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, it yet becomes us, touching the problem of God's essential being, and the essential relation of the persons of the Godhead to each other, and to the divine essence, to appropriate the language of the patriarch of Uz: "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do? Deeper than hell; what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea."

If, however, presumption appears in the claim of knowledge, where knowledge is unattainable, it equally appears in the denial of the possibility of knowledge in the face of the divine self-revelation.

If, then, experience rightly understood presents no barrier to the acceptance of the revealed fact of the divine triunity, but rather affords strong presumption of its truth, how may we account for the *a priori* repudiation of the doctrine on the part of men eminent in the realms of thought and scholarship?

The absence of a gospel experience, the repugnance of the un-

renewed mind to all of God's gracious self-revelations obviously explains the anomaly, but only in part. Since any man of ordinary intelligence, though unregenerate, may appreciate the fact of the absence of conflict between genuine human experience and the revealed fact of the trinity, the lack of such appreciation finds adequate explanation only in a certain one-sided and unfair interpretation of experience as a whole from the standpoint, *e. g.*, of an abstract rationalistic philosophy, or of a positivistic and anti-spiritual science.

The remarkable confession of the late eminent scientist and philosopher, George John Romanes, in his posthumous *Thoughts on Religion*, affords a striking endorsement of this indication of the causes of intellectual unbelief touching the trinity. Accentuating the absence of rational antecedent presumption against the fundamental facts of Christianity, he remarks, "The doctrines of the incarnation and the trinity seemed to me most absurd in my agnostic days; but now (as a *pure* agnostic) I see in them no rational difficulty at all. As to the trinity, the plurality of persons is necessarily implied in the common doctrine of the incarnation. So that at best there is here but one difficulty, since duality being predicated in the doctrine of the incarnation, there is no further difficulty (for pure agnosticism) in the doctrine of plurality. Now, at one time it seemed to be impossible that any proposition, verbally intelligible as such, could be more violently absurd than that of the doctrine of the incarnation. Now I see that this standpoint is wholly irrational, due only to the blindness of reason itself, promoted by purely scientific habits of thought. On antecedent grounds there must be mysteries unintelligible to reason as to the nature of God, etc., supposing a revelation to be made at all. Therefore their occurrence in Christianity is no proper objection to Christianity. Why again stumble *a priori* over the doctrine of the trinity, especially as man himself is a triune being, of body, mind (*i. e.*, reason) and spirit (*i. e.*, moral, æsthetic and religious faculties)?

"The unquestionable union of these no less unquestionable distinct orders of being in man is known immediately as a fact of experience, but is as unintelligible by any process of logic or reason as is the alleged triunity of God." (Pp. 174-176.)

So far we have dwelt mainly on the negative aspects of our subject. We have seen that there is nothing in human experience incompatible with the fact of the tri-personal unity of God save blindness and prejudice, a refusal to consider the significance of the facts and all of the facts of our many-sided experience.

Let us now turn to certain aspects of experience which are positively and immediately responsive to the supreme fact of supernatural revelation and render easy our rational assent.

II. The triune personality of God appeals to the facts of man's social experience. It is needless to insist upon the obvious fact that man is not an isolated individual unit, but essentially a social being; that his relations to others of his kind condition his individual existence, and the development of his distinctively human traits. Social relations in their intimacy and universality, the recognition of the universal kinship and brotherhood of man, are accentuated and appreciated to-day as never before in the history of our race. Society in its normal estate, viewed from an ideal standpoint, is defined as a coöperative organism, a universal co-partnership, in which the well-being and happiness of the individual man depends upon his free and spontaneous self-subordination to the well-being of the social whole.

But man's social nature links him not merely to his fellows, but equally to his God; represents an essential element of the divine likeness impressed upon man at his making. "And God said, Let us make man in our image, and after our likeness." The interpretation here implied is vindicated by the significance of the new creation; when the man is "created anew in Christ Jesus after the image of God," an essential element in the inscrutable process consists in the impartation of the social attribute of supreme love to God and self-equal love to fellows. Again, man comes from the moulding hand and vitalizing breath of his Maker not as a mere individual, but as potentially a dual and even a trinal being. Man's making was completed only on the emergence of woman, his counter-part and helpmeet, the half of the whole man, his finer half. Man's home, the organic unit of church and state, the epitome of civil and ecclesiastical relations, reveals a social trinity of fatherhood, motherhood, and childhood. The "charm that

hallows home" is "from the skies" in a sense ideal and divine. Neither the idea nor the reality of a home was man's creation; nor was it originated with or for man. Man's home was modeled after God's home. The home above, consisting in the holy social relations, the reciprocal activities, the eternal unity of ineffable love of the triune personality of the Godhead, figures as the archetype of the home below, the faint reflection, the finite and imperfect realization of the home-life of eternal love. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God (face to face with, at home with God)—in the bosom of the Father."

Abstract monotheism, on the other hand, the doctrine of a merely uni-personal God, excluding from the Godhead all social relations, means the absolute self-isolation of the divine being, the absence of a truly divine fellowship, and consequently the absence of all real conditions of God's fellowship and fatherly sympathy with man. Divine fatherhood manward seems to imply more than a temporal assumption of that character, even a genuine, original, eternal fatherhood. At least the contention is justified that the revelation of eternal fatherhood appeals more powerfully to man's social consciousness than the revelation of a merely uni-personal God could possibly do. This position may be fortified by indicating how:

III. The facts of man's ethical experience answer to the fact of the divine trinal personality. Human society stands for more than the herding together of animals of the highest type; represents more than an instinctive and utilitarian association of the highest class of sentient and intelligent creatures. It represents a community of moral agents, bound together, indeed, by common interests and sympathies, but eminently united by mutual moral obligations. Man is under bond "to do justly, to love mercy, to walk humbly with his God." Now, why? Assuming the immutability of ethical distinctions, it is clear that the ultimate ground of virtue cannot be found in abstract conceptions or abstract will, either human or divine. Moral conceptions and a moral will imply equally a moral nature in which the deep-rooted sense of the moral necessity of moral sympathy resides, and which expresses itself in righteous character, attitude, actions. Again, man can-

not be the author of the moral necessity under which he finds himself, the eternal and unchanging obligation to right being and right doing; cannot find in himself either supreme standard or ultimate ground of righteousness. The righteous will of God, disclosing itself in the inerrant word and in man's quickened conscience, constitutes the sole standard of morals; yet a will not changeful and arbitrary, but determined absolutely by his own infinitely holy nature. He commands his children to do righteousness, to be holy, to love one another, not merely because he wills it, but because *he* is righteous, *he* is holy, *he* is love.

The true basis and source, therefore, of ethical distinctions, vital, immutable, and eternal, must be found alone in the nature of God as a triune personality; that is, in the concrete holy relations, the reciprocal righteous activities, the mutual and ineffable love of the holy Three in One. Justice, truth, and love in the divine being cannot be bare abstractions, but must represent the eternal attitude and action, the reciprocal self-giving energy, the holy fellowship of love of a divine and eternal community of persons.

The unspeakable enormity of sin here comes into view as a violation not merely of the individual or public conscience, or of the moral order of the universe, or the supreme edict of an infinite autocrat, but as antagonizing the fundamental law of God's being and nature. The very essence of sin consists in the practical denial of the essential character of God as a holy, social being, in whose tri-personal relations ethical distinctions find their ultimate and vital ground and supreme exemplification. Sin aims a blow at the heart and home of the moral universe; it means universal anarchy; its language is, "Let divine love be annihilated; let hellish hate prevail."

IV. The facts of man's religious experience pre-eminently respond to the supreme fact of the existence of a triune God.

Modern ethics accentuates self-renunciation as the consummation and the crown of moral character. The idea in its purity and fulness is essentially Christian. The Master enjoins as the prime prerequisite of discipleship the absolute denial of self itself, the repudiation of our sinful, self-centered, godless self for his sake, and the affirmation of himself as the life and sovereign of our new,

Spirit-born self. Such self-denial constitutes the starting-point and continuous basis of Christian experience, which accordingly manifests itself in an abiding service of self-sacrificing love towards God and man for Christ's sake. But the ethics of to-day in the writings of some of its most prominent representatives equally exhibits a strong tendency towards the exaggeration of self-renouncing love into a literal self-obliteration, and the consequent denial of the genuine selfhood of God and man. It seems clear, however, that the possibility of real self-renunciation depends upon the possession of a true and permanent selfhood, the power of free, intelligent, individual choice. If man has no real selfhood to begin with, real self-sacrifice becomes impossible. If such a real self ceases to exist, the power of self-sacrifice ceases also. Surely the giving of ourself to another cannot mean the involuntary merging of a fictitious self into some general quantum of being, the pure abstraction of a universal and impersonal life. On the contrary, true self-giving can signify only the continuous impartation to other selves in loving thoughts and deeds of a self that is real and abides, a permanent subject and centre of intelligent, voluntary, love-pervaded activity. Self-annihilation, were it possible, would certainly be an immoral act, since it would put a period to our personal existence, and consequently to all self-sacrificing service. The consciousness of true selfhood or personality on the part of man and man's belief in a personal God stand or fall together. If God is a personal being, I cannot know or appreciate the fact unless I likewise am a person and have thus intimate experience of some of the essential characteristics of a real selfhood. If, on the other hand, I am conscious of a true personality, I must attribute the same to God in an infinite degree, or be guilty of the blasphemous assumption that God is lower in the scale of being than I his creature. Equally, if self-giving love is the crown of moral being, an essential characteristic of perfect human selfhood, but not of the divine selfhood, then the monstrous conclusion obtains, that man may be more moral than his Maker. Since this cannot be, and since unselfish love is the crowning glory of man, it must be in a pre-eminent degree the crowning glory of man's Maker. Thus the ethical dogma of the

moral supremacy of human self-sacrifice implicates the theological dogma of the moral supremacy of divine self-communicating love, and this again carries with it the dogma of a more than uni-personal, self-isolated God, in whom such love is never merely potential but an eternal reality, and renders the exhibition of such love in the person of the God-man and its communication to man in the form of redeeming mercy most reasonable. The Bible represents true self-giving love as the very heart of morals and religion and their essential bond of union.

True religion is indeed the only genuine and supreme altruism, since its essence consists in supreme love for the Supreme Other, and self-equal love for all others as equally sustaining to him a relation of absolute dependence. All true other-regarding love must find its basis and its source in religion. And, equally, religion must find its source and basis, its origin and counterpart, in the great original love, in an essentially other-regarding and self-giving God, in whom moral and social attributes exist, not as dormant susceptibilities, but as vital and unceasing energies.

The self-sufficiency of a God of infinite and eternal love implies the presence of an adequate and eternal object of love, and the presence of eternal personal distinctions in the essential Godhead alone meets the implied condition. If there be no self-equal and eternal object, there can be no eternal self-communicating love; but only eternal singleness and self-isolation somewhat akin to absolute selfishness. But the God of Bible Christianity reveals himself in Christ as the eternal fellowship of holy love, the vital moral relations subsisting between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit constituting the living and eternal basis, not only of immutable moral distinctions, but also of a most gracious and glorious redemption.

V. The facts of man's redemptive or Christian experience not only respond to but immediately implicate the supreme fact of the divine triunity. A truly gospel experience finds its source in the eternal co-operation of tri-personal self-sacrificing love; for the redemption disclosed in the word as the only possible one, and experienced as such in the heart of the believer, embodies as its

essential constituents the triple co-operation of the ordaining Father, the acquiring Son, and the applying Spirit. The atoning self-sacrifice of the incarnate Son, rendering complete satisfaction to the holy love of the triune God, becomes the all-sufficient channel whereby that holy love is communicated to guilty man. Thus the influence Christ exerts upon man corresponds in its absolutely unique character to the sacrifice he made for man. The law of holy love, the law of God's being as essentially a fellowship of holy love and of man's true nature as made in the image of a God of holy love, he fulfils for us by obedience to its precept and penalty, before us by perfect exhibition of holy love as the law of his life and being, in us by implanting in our slavish and rebellious hearts the vital germ of holy love as the principle of a new obedience and filial service.

Redemption by the atoning power of self-sacrificing love has for its sequel redemption by the transforming power of self-communicating love. The lifeless, loveless sense of absolute dependence, the root of man's religious nature, but apart from Jesus either suppressed or prostituted to a godless service and idolatrous worship of the creature, is quickened into newness of life, and manifests itself as childlike trust, holy sympathy, and the spirit of free and filial obedience. Christ realizes his redemption manward, not merely by influence akin to man's suasive power over man, but by action from within, by an immediate personal operation upon the human spirit, the dynamic, creative energy of love of his Holy Spirit. Thus Christian experience is trinitarian in its character as well as in its source. The revealed fact is realized and thus verified by actual experience of immediate personal relations to, and fellowship with, the triune God of redemption.

The believer is conscious of a new and God-given life—a life which he knows to be by the Spirit, in the Christ, and from the Father. In the love-light of the Spirit he beholds the Christ, and in the face of the Son he beholds the Father.

"The evidence, perhaps," says Dr. Thornwell, "upon which the large majority of Christians receive this article of faith is the spiritual experiences of their own hearts. They know, because

they have felt the love of the Father, the grace of the Son and the communion of the Holy Spirit. Their minds are established in the truth, because they distinctly perceive that however unsearchable and mysterious the doctrine of the Trinity may be, it is a doctrine which is *obliged* to be true. The phenomena of grace demand it. They can no more permit themselves to doubt it than call into question the reality of their daily food, or deny the separate existence of external objects as the causes of the constant changes which they experience in the history of their own minds. Ingenuity may torture, and under pretext of profound interpretation explain away, detached and isolated texts; the dexterity of criticism may perplex with unreasonable doubts or confound with learned plausibilities the minds of the simple and illiterate; and the subtlety of logical skill may raise such a cloud of dust that language shall appear like a riddle and truth be lost in the distinctions of sophistry; but the argument from *experience*, from the indisputable wants of our own nature and the provisions which alone can be adequate to meet them, is clear as consciousness, palpable as sense, and irresistible as light."

If, then, the experience of the individual believer is trinitarian in its ultimate source, immediate basis, and essential character, it follows that the fellowship subsisting between individual believers rests upon their common and conscious relations to the triune personality of the God of grace. Through Christ they have access by one Spirit unto the Father. Christ is the common way, his Spirit their common guide, the Father's home their common goal. Christian fellowship thus implies an essential fellowship in the divine Being; it has its basis and its source in fellowship eternal and divine; it consists in the joint communion of the saints, not with a solitary God, but with a divine society of persons in the Trinity of the Godhead.

"We declare unto you," writes the beloved disciple, "that eternal life which was at home with the Father, . . . that ye may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ."

The redemptive experience of God's children thus contemplates and implicates a perfect society of holy love, having its eternal

archetype and source, its basis and its bond, its pattern and its pledge, its ultimate and eternal realization, in the fellowship of the holy Three in One, the home-life of eternal love.

“Glory be unto the Father, glory be unto the Son, glory be unto the Holy Ghost, as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end.”

JAMES E. FOGARTIE.

Clarksville, Tennessee.

II. THE OLD TESTAMENT ELDERSHIP—ITS ORIGIN AND FUNCTIONS.

“And Joseph went up to bury his father: and with him went up all the servants of Pharaoh, the elders of his house, and all the elders of the land of Egypt.”—GENESIS l. 7.

THE text quoted contains the first reference to elders in the Old Testament, and my design is to trace the references to the office and its functions in the Old Testament Scriptures, and to show how the New Testament elder is the true successor to the Israelitish elder. The claim has been often advanced that Presbyterianism is simply the continuance of the synagogue system, and that Presbyterian ruling elders are the successors of the synagogue governing board. But there is a great deal of vagueness in the minds of many as to how this may be proven the case. I have ventured on this line of study to see whether the claim has been well-founded.

First, let us look at the word used in the original and translated almost uniformly “elder,” or “elders,” as the case may be.

The word זָקֵן is from a root, זָקַן, meaning “the bearded chin,” in Arabic, “the chin.” Hence זָקַן came to mean “to be or become old, to grow old, to be aged.” The word is used of vigorous old age in Genesis xviii. 12, 13; xix. 31; xxiv. 1; xxvii. 1; 1 Samuel ii. 22, and elsewhere.

זָקֵן, the noun, meant “an old, aged man.” By and by the idea or notion of aged was neglected, and the noun was applied to young men of superior wisdom, and so became an official title, “elders,” “proceres,” and is once translated “senators.” (Psalm cv. 22; Rev. Ver., margin.) Gesenius shows that the same idea is contained in the Arabic word for “sheikh, an old man, then, chief of a tribe.” The term corresponds in a way with the Italian “signor,” French “seigneur,” Spanish “señor,” English “sir.” All of these words are from the Latin word senior, elder. We

may compare with our word the German, "graf, count," primarily from "graw, krawo, gray-headed."

We must not fail to note, with special emphasis, the fact that the translators of the Septuagint, who began their work about 285 B. C., translate our Hebrew word "presbuteros," or "presbuteroi," as it may be used in the singular or plural.

We must notice another fact bearing upon the use of the Hebrew and the Greek words. In Luke xxii. 66 we read, "as soon as it was day, the elders of the people and the chief priests and scribes came together and led him (that is, Jesus) into their council." The word in the original is the singular noun, "the presbytery," the assembly of the elders, and, as we shall see later on, refers to a well-known body of men of Israel. In one other place, Acts xxii. 5, the word presbytery is used of the Sanhedrin, and is translated in our version "the estate of the elders."

Returning now to our text, Genesis i. 7, we find evidences of an office well known to the people of that day, both Israelites and Egyptians. That was in the year 1689 B. C., Usher's chronology. A careful study of the words "*the* elders," indicates that the office was not a new one then, but constituted an important part of the civil and ecclesiastical organization even in heathen Egypt. The same word is applied to Egyptian elders in Psalm cv. 22. (See Alexander *in loc.*) It was so, also, when Moses was commanded of God to "go, gather together the elders of Israel." (Ex. iii. 16.) In fact, Moses is shown to have retained this form of organization unaltered in its essential features, when he gave the people from God their constitution at Mount Sinai. It was a patriarchal form of government, well suited to the people. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were the heads of their respective families. The twelve sons of Jacob ruled each his own family. As their families increased, and were divided into tribes, each tribe had its prince or ruler. The office was probably at first hereditary, but later became elective. Then the tribes were divided into households, and a collection of these was called a house of fathers, or a thousand, and corresponded to what our Scottish forefathers called the clans. (Judges vi. 15; 1 Sam. x. 10-21; xxiii. 23; Numb. xxvi. 5-20.) These clans chose their chiefs,

who were called "heads of houses of fathers, heads of thousands, sometimes simply heads." (Numb. xvii. 3; xxv. 15; Joshua xxii. 14; xxiii. 2.) While yet in Egypt these heads of tribes and heads of clans were both called "elders." (Ex. iii. 16; iv. 29.) The title had probably by that time become one not so much of age as of honor and authority. We may judge from the prominence given them at the time of Jacob's funeral, and at the time when Moses was sent to call them together, to give them God's message, that their functions up to that time consisted in watching over the general good of the community or tribe, and governing according to the principles of natural justice, until God gave them a written constitution and code of laws.

This patriarchal form of government was oriental throughout. Ishmael, Edom, and Israel all followed it. For example, the Ishmaelites had twelve princes who governed them, according to the number of the sons of Ishmael. (Gen. xxv. 16.) The Bedouin Arabs, who have sprung from them, are said to have the same form of government to-day. Their princes are "emirs," and their heads of clans are "sheikhs, elders." The Edomites, also, had a similar governing body. Genesis xxxvi. contains a long list of descendants of Esau, called "dukes" in our common version; more properly, as in the margin of the revision, "chiefs," meaning heads of families, or princes. So we find the same in Israel. Each tribe had its prince, but each tribe was also sub-divided into clans, or families grouped together, their heads being called heads of families, or chiefs, and both classes of rulers being called in common "the elders of Israel." This is very evident from a careful reading and comparison of Numbers i.; Exodus iii. 16; iv. 29; vi. 14, 15.

Moses found another order of officers among the Israelites in Egypt called "shoterim, officers," A. V., as appears from Exodus v. 6, 10, 14, 15. He continued this set of officials also, as is evident from Deuteronomy xvi. 18. Their duties seem to have been to keep the family registers, which were highly valued by the people of those days, recording therein marriages, births, and deaths. One writer has suggested that they also probably apportioned the public duties and taxes of the people; for these men

were employed in Egypt to assist the overseers to press forward the people in their slavish labors for their masters. It may possibly be that it was one of these "officers" whom Moses saw smiting his Hebrew brother, when he stepped in to separate them and defend the weaker. (Ex. ii. 13.)

The elders, however, were the magistrates, heads, or rulers of the people. When Moses led the people to Sinai, he gave them a theocratic form of government, in which they freely chose God to be their king (Ex. xix. 7-9), this constitution being ratified by the elders of the people themselves. He did not, in fact, disturb the patriarchal form of government by tribes and clans at all, but retained it unaltered. If we read carefully Numb. xxvi. and Ex. xxiv. 1, we will find that the old divisions were unchanged. At the exodus, exclusive of the tribe of Levi, which was set apart for the priesthood, there were fifty-eight larger clans, each with its chief. These fifty-eight chiefs, with the twelve princes, or heads of tribes, formed what later was called the great Sanhedrin, or council of seventy. These were the representatives of the people, and acted as the magistrates of the people. Some one has suggested that they are alluded to in the song of Deborah as those who "ride on white asses and sit in judgment." (Judges v. 10.) The number of seventy who ruled and judged in Israel was not a new thing to the people. God rather confirmed an institution which he found already in existence. So was it when Moses went with Aaron and gathered the elders of the children of Israel. It is, therefore, hardly to be questioned that even in Egypt there was this council, who were regarded as the persons of chief dignity and authority among the tribes. Coupled with the princes were the heads of clans, and all in common called "elders." That they had some kind of authority, and exercised some kind of power, is evident from the passages we have been considering. Others yet to be considered will show us that the same authority and the same power was continued in the desert, in the land of Canaan, and down to our Lord's own day. The bearing of this will appear later, if it should also appear that this same authority and power were continued in apostolic times, and have been continued until to-day in the Christian church. Has presbyterial government, in

other words, been found to exist in the year 1689 B. C., in Egypt, in 1492 in the desert, and on until the apostles appropriated it in the founding of the early Christian churches? Did Moses in laying his case before the elders of Israel, in asking of them an investigation as to his divinely-conferred authority, and in bidding them, when convinced thereof, to follow him into the desert and to liberty, illustrate and confirm a presbyterial authority which should continue for all ages? Have his courts, called the greater and lesser Sanhedrin, the "congregation," and the "great congregation," any parallel or successors to-day?

The word "elder" or "elders" is found some one hundred times in the Old Testament. It would be asking too much of you to go over each of these references. We append a list of them in their order. Let us, however, ask you to notice a few of the more important a little more closely. After hearing God's command to go to the elders of Israel in Egypt, and obeying that command, Moses works the miracles of the nine plagues. At last comes the greatest of all, the slaying of the first born of the Egyptians by the hand of the angel of the Lord. In preparation for this, Moses again comes before the elders of the people (Ex. xii. 21) and gives them directions concerning the passover. The elders here as before are evidently the representatives and official organs of the people. After escaping from Egypt, the people come to Rephidim (Ex. xvii. 1-7), where they murmur for water. Here Moses works the miracle of bringing the water from the rock, the elders being the only eye-witnesses of the smiting of the rock. A little later the elders, with Moses and Aaron, eat bread with Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, before the Lord. (Ex. xviii. 12.) Then we come to the most important step yet taken by the elders as recorded in Ex. xix. 7. The elders make the covenant with God to obey him, they evidently standing in this for "all the people" of verse 8.

In Ex. xxiv. 1, 9 seventy of the elders of the people went up with others and "saw God, and did eat and drink." These were doubtless the heads of the twelve tribes, together with the fifty-eight heads of clans, whose names are given to us later. (Numb. xxvi.) As rulers of the people they were made witnesses of the

glorious appearance of God then made, and had a special communion with God on the mount. Shortly after this, these same elders are left on the mountain side while Moses and Joshua (verse 13) climb yet higher, and Moses going on alone is hidden from sight in the cloud where God appeared to him and gave him the tables of stone containing the law he had previously spoken (Ex. xx. 1), and other laws for the people's guidance. During these forty days the elders were bidden to tarry on the mountain side. (Verse 14.)

One of the laws then given provided that the elders should, as representatives of all the people, lay their hands upon the head of the bullock in the offering of the sacrifice for the sin of ignorance on the part of the people. (Lev. iv. 15.) The twenty-second verse speaks also of the way in which the ruler or elder himself could be freed from guilt in case of his committing a sin of ignorance.

Numbers xi. 16, 17: Seventy are recognized as elders, and are finally organized at Sinai, at God's command. Their duties are to share with Moses the burden of managing the affairs of Israel. To this end, God gave them a special endowment of his Spirit to qualify them for their work and office. Verses 24, 25, 30: Two other men, Eldad and Medad, remained in the camp and prophesied there, whereat the people complained. Moses defended their act in prophesying, and thus was endorsed the great truth that God gives, at times, exceptional calls to whomsoever he will. Like Paul, these men "were born out of time." Who does not see the same divine ordination to exceptional service in Spurgeon and Moody, both of whom received their ordination from on high as the only ordination ever given them?

This tribunal of the seventy elders, instituted at this time, became the supreme senate; later it was continued in, or developed into, the Sanhedrin of the Jews.

The next mention of elders is in Deuteronomy xix. 12, where wilful murderers are to be brought before the elders of the city, and delivered to the avenger, even if the accused had fled to a city of refuge. Unintentional murderers were acquitted by the bench or court of the elders, as we read in Joshua xx. 1-6.

Deuteronomy xxi. 1-9: The elders represent the congregation at sacrifices for expiating the guilt of one found murdered by an unknown hand.

Deuteronomy xxi. 18-21: Elders are made vindicators of parents disobeyed by children.

Deuteronomy xxii. 13-21: Elders punished him who slandered his wife, and also punished the adulteress.

Deuteronomy xxv. 5-10: Elders sit in court to try the case of a brother's widow, as a moral as well as a civil question, and to render a decision thereon.

Deuteronomy xxvii. 1: Moses, with the elders, commands the people to write the ceremonial and civil law upon plastered stones.

Deuteronomy xxix. 10: The final covenant is made by all—"captains of tribes, elders, and officers," and all the congregation.

Deuteronomy xxxi. 9-14: The law is delivered unto the priests and elders to be read every seven years, and old and young are to be officially taught the law by them.

Deuteronomy xxxi. 28, 29: Moses protests to the elders and officers that the time is coming when the people shall turn aside from the law just given them, through the neglect of these very elders and officers to teach it to the people.

Deuteronomy xxxii. 7: Moses sings his farewell song of praise. The elders are to be looked to by the people as their teachers in all the dealings of God with the people, and in God's law itself.

We come now to the practical fulfilment of the duties laid upon the elders, and to the history of the performance of those duties in various ways.

Joshua vii. 6: After the defeat at Ai, Joshua and the elders lament the great defeat, and seek light upon its cause, which is finally revealed to have been the sin of Achan in having stolen the devoted things, the Babylonish mantle, and silver, and a wedge of gold, all of which God had commanded should be wholly set apart to himself. Joshua xx. 1-6 is the repetition of the law of the city of refuge, and the part which the elders were to have in judging accused persons, as already alluded to above, in Deuteronomy xix. 12.

Joshua xxiv. 31: The elders who survived Joshua, and knew all the work of the Lord, by their influence and instructions kept the people faithful to God during their own lifetimes.

Judges ii. 7: A repetition of the preceding.

Judges viii. 13-17: The elders of the Israelites who refused to aid Gideon's army are punished as representatives of the people.

Ruth iv. 2, 4-12: Ruth is redeemed by Boaz to be his wife, before the elders of the gate, and is blessed by them therein.

1 Samuel xv. 30: Saul, the king, repents, and prays Samuel to restore him to honor before the elders; a very significant passage, showing the superior place assigned to elders, even as compared with the king himself.

1 Samuel xvi. 4: The elders of Bethlehem tremble at Samuel's coming to choose David king.

1 Samuel xxx. 26: David recovers from the Amalekites the spoil taken at Ziklag, and restores it to "the elders of Judah."

2 Samuel v. 3: The elders of Israel negotiate with David, and anoint him king, thus ratifying the choice of Samuel, made before. 1 Chronicles xi. 3 repeats this statement.

2 Samuel xvii. 4: Absalom and the elders of Israel approve Ahithophel's scheme to slay David, the king. Verse 17: David is warned against Absalom, the elders, and Ahithophel.

1 Kings viii. 1-3; 2 Chronicles v. 4: The elders have a very prominent part at the dedication of the temple by Solomon.

1 Kings xx. 7, 8: Ahab asks official advice of the elders upon a question of public policy, and sends the answer they direct to Ben-hadad.

1 Kings xxi. 8-14: The elders of Jezreel, at Jezebel's instigation, wrongfully punish Naboth on false charges of killing, stealing, and false-witnessing, all of which went under the charge of "blasphemy."

2 Kings vi. 32: Elisha and the elders, sitting in Elisha's house in consultation, during the famine, receive threats sent by Ahab against them.

2 Kings x. 1: The elders of Jezreel kill Ahab's seventy sons, at Jehu's demand.

2 Kings xix. 2: Rabshakeh reviles Hezekiah, who sends the

elders and others to Isaiah, beseeching him to pray for the people. This is repeated in Isaiah xxxvii. 2.

1 Chronicles xi. 3: See above, 2 Samuel v. 3.

1 Chronicles xxi. 16: David and the elders, in sackcloth, pray that the plague may be stopped.

2 Chronicles v. 2, 4: See 1 Kings viii. 1-3, above.

Ezra v. 5: The elders of the Jews, encouraged by God's eye upon them, rebuild the temple. This is very significant, as showing that the organization of the board of elders—the presbytery of the Jews, in fact—had been maintained throughout the captivity.

Ezra vi. 14: The elders of the Jews “builted and prospered,” and so the temple was finished.

Ezra x. 8: The elders, as counsellors with Ezra and the princes of Judah, settle the penalty for strange marriages, that is, marriages with unbelievers. Ezra x. 14: The elders, with others, make solemn promises of amendment for this sin. These elders are spoken of as “of every city.”

Psalms cv. 22: Joseph is said to have been appointed by Pharaoh to teach the Egyptian “senators” (Hebrew, “elders”) wisdom. (Compare Genesis l. 7.)

Psalms cvii. 32: God is praised in the assembly of the elders (Revised Version, “seat of the elders,” no doubt referring to “the gate,” where the bench of elders were accustomed to hold their court).

Proverbs xxxi. 23, 31: The good wife is so well known for her works that she is herself praised in the gates, and her husband has his seat as an elder among the other elders of the city.

Isaiah xxxvii. 2: See above, on 2 Kings xix. 2.

Lamentations i. 18: The elders and priests of Jerusalem are represented as dying because of Jerusalem's sad state.

Lamentations ii. 19: The elders lament in silence, in sackcloth and ashes.

Lamentations iv. 16: Zion confesses her sins against the elders whom God had appointed over her.

Lamentations v. 12: A statement similar to that in iv. 16.

Lamentations v. 14: Great sorrow is felt because, in the sad state of Zion, no more elders sit in the gate.

Ezekiel viii. 1: While the elders of Judah are with the prophet in his house, he has a vision from the Lord.

Ezekiel xiv. 1: Certain elders are rebuked of God for having become idolaters, and are threatened with punishment.

Ezekiel xx. 1, 3, etc.: God will not be inquired of by false and idolatrous elders.

Joel i. 14: The elders (margin, Revised Version) are commanded to come up to God's house and fast for their sins and for the sins of the people.

Joel ii. 16: A second solemn and public fast is commanded the elders, who are to take charge of the proceedings, as before.

We have now been over the various passages of Scripture in which זִקְנִי, the word for "elder," or its equivalent, occurs in the original. In the earlier references, in the Septuagint, *gerousia*, eldership, is used in Exodus iii. 16; iv. 29; xii. 21; Deuteronomy xix. 12; xxi. 1-9, 19; xxii. 15-19; xxv. 7-9; xxvii. 1; xxix. 10; except in Genesis l. 7; Exodus xvii. 5, and xviii. 12, where *presbuteroi* is used. In the Hebrew it is *ziknei*, or kindred forms from the same root. As a translation of the same Hebrew, the Septuagint uses more frequently the word *presbuteroi*. In fact, this is the case in every other passage except two in Lamentations (chapters iv. 16; v. 14), where *presbutai* or *presbutas* is used. In the former case (Lamentations iv. 16), *presbutas* is the reading in the Septuagint of the Alexandrian and of the Complutensian Polyglott (A., F., X.), while the Vatican (B.) gives *prophetas*. In all these cases, however, both where *gerousia* is used and where *presbuteroi* or *presbutas* is used, the Hebrew word is *ziknei*, or its variations. In two rather singular cases we have in the Hebrew *sabhei*, elders. In one of these cases (Ezra v. 5) the Septuagint has *aichmalosian*, captivity; in the other (Ezra vi. 14), *presbuteroi*.

Thus in at least fifty-three instances we have in the Septuagint *presbuteroi* or *presbutai*. In thirteen instances we have *gerousia*. And in one instance we have *aichmalosian*. Evidently *presbuteroi* and its kindred word were familiar to the Alexandrian Jews, and stood for the eldership or, as we should say, the presbytery of the Old Testament. And this familiar word is transferred by

the Jewish Christians from the Old Testament Septuagint to the New Testament with great ease, and in a way so natural as to argue a continuance as well of what the word stood for in Jewish circles. What that was is the object of this paper to discover. The use of the word in the New Testament, as referring to the Jewish Sanhedrin, is referred to at the opening of this paper, and will be towards the end.

A careful reading and examination of the context will show that where the word "elders" is used in the Old Testament it is as frequently used of ecclesiastical functions as of the civil. It is beyond our purpose to inquire with any detail as to what the civil functions of the Jewish elders were. The theocracy is passed away, the church remains. This being so, it remains to be shown that the ecclesiastical functions of the New Testament elder are, as a matter of fact, simply the continuation of those exercised by the elder of the Old Testament. It will be manifest, we think, that the order of men known in ancient Israel as elders of the congregation, an order which existed from the earliest organization of that church, was substantially the same as the order of elders now known in the Christian church.

Let us briefly review the Mosaic constitution as we have it set forth in the Pentateuch and in later allusions to or illustrations of it. We shall see that it was the polity which Moses found already established to some extent in Egypt on his return from Midian. It was no doubt in part inherited from the patriarchal period; and it is probable also that it was similar to the organized governments found among neighboring oriental tribes and nations. The great advance made now in some of the details is due to the fact that Israel in Canaan is to be no longer a nomadic tribe like their ancestors, but is to become a nation dwelling in the land God had promised to their fathers. Hence they are to have ingrafted upon the old patriarchal forms some new political forms fitted to the fixed abode they are to possess.

1. The first and most important fact of all is that they now renew their covenant with the one and only God of their fathers. In Exodus xix. the tribes freely choose God as their king and sovereign, and they determine by solemn vows to become his peo-

ple in a newer and fuller sense than even the patriarchs were. Upon this foundation rests all that is built up as their constitutional and national political life. To them the one God is to be henceforth not only *the* object of worship, but the supreme *civil* ruler of his people. That this is true is plain from the complaint Moses made, that some day they should desire another king than God, and also from the words recorded in connection with the choice of Saul as the first king of Israel in later days.

The Old Testament church maintained, and the civil constitution enforced, the fact of this supreme headship of Jehovah, who, in New Testament times, is the incarnate Christ, head over all things to his church as well as king of nations. God is taken by Israel to be the king, law-giver and head. To him alone Israel, both as a church and a nation, was to be responsible.

2. In accordance with the new constitution, a form or forms of public worship being established, a priesthood is made necessary. Ministers are appointed to preside over these services of religious kinds. The splendid ceremonial of sacrifices and offerings is instituted. With it all, however, God plainly teaches them that the worship of the heart is the chief thing in his sight, and without this all the rest is void and even becomes blasphemous. He is to be recognized as the one upon whom both in heart and life the people are dependent. And the love of the heart he demands in order that their obedience may be both reverent and complete.

But the introduction of the ceremonial law and the appointment of the priesthood did not do away with, or even weaken, the influence and authority of the bench of elders. The eldership existed before the priesthood and was to continue after it was done away or changed in the New Testament doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers. The elders and the ministers of the synagogue, as found in each of the towns and villages of the Jews, were to continue. (Cf. Luke iv. 20.)

3. It was fundamental to the new constitution that all Israelites should be "free and equal." This was absolute and complete. The citizens of Israel, it might be shown, were fully as equal, in all political rights, as any citizens of any nation, either in those times or ours. It was so from the moment they entered the

Promised Land. Every one of the six hundred thousand free Israelite men was to have full property rights to the lands, according to an equitable and even equal principle of division. (Num. xxxiii. 54.) And this land was held by an inalienable tenure, and the estates descended in families by an indefeasible entail. "The land was not to be sold in perpetuity." (Lev. xxv. 23.) The elder Mr. Adams in his *Defence*, Letter 29, held that civil sovereignty is inseparable from territorial property. He maintained that when the soil was owned by the people as individuals, and was widely divided up among them as individuals, it would be impossible to establish a nobility or a kingdom for any length of time. "The sovereignty, then, in fact as well as theory, must reside in the whole body of the people." Property and sovereignty are wrapped up the one in the other. The one relic of feudalism which Europe has not yet been able to get rid of is the entailment of immense estates for many generations. When that is abolished individual ownership will take a great leap forward, and with it the political equality of the citizens of European states. When every member of the state has an interest in the soil, he will have a like interest in the maintenance of order, and with that will go power to enforce the supremacy of law. And not only did the laws of property as established by Moses tend in this direction of political equality, but especial care was taken that no Israelite should enslave himself. The Sabbatical and Jubilee years were in order to periodically release Israelites from the least approach to the condition of slavery. Property in land was to be restored then to the original owners or heirs free of all incumbrance. The rich could not gain possession of all the land. Leases could not run beyond the Year of Jubilee. Chains no longer held the man who for a time had enslaved himself. Equality reappeared among all as at the first entrance into the land. (Lev. xxv. 10, 13-17.) Thus it came about that there was not possible a class of nobles or of peasants as we find such in the Middle Ages. The Israelitish people were at first established, not as a monarchy, except as God was king, but as a commonwealth. The spirit of the Israelitish constitution was powerfully for equality. Moses warned the people against a monarchy,

even while he acknowledged the fact that as a free people they would likely want and choose a king some day, and he provided safeguards for this in his laws. (Deut. xvii. 14-20.) But Gideon and Samuel are put before us as two strong men who refused the crown, each in his own time and way. And Samuel warned the people that if they took to themselves a king, they would some day find themselves under an iron rule that they could not throw off as easily as they would like.

But political equality could not be maintained long, because the oriental mind seems inclined to despotism. The notion of popular freedom was beyond their comprehension and almost beyond their liking. Moses, as remarked above, foreseeing the change that would come, provided in Deut. xvii. that it should be a constitutional monarchy, at least, and subject to the election and will of the people. We have dwelt upon this, because, as we shall see, the king himself was often overruled and restrained by the authority of the very body of men whose functions we are considering, namely, the elders of the congregation. Their king was to be what Louis Philippe called himself, a "citizen king." (Deut. xvii. 15.) He should be limited in his power. It should be a part of the genius of Judaism that the people, through their regularly chosen representatives, should maintain themselves against all tyranny, and in case of extreme need should even depose one king and set up another.

4. We learn from the Scriptures that there were several departments of the Israelitish commonwealth and its government. The old patriarchal divisions continued in large measure.

(1), There was a class of rulers called princes, who were the heads of the twelve tribes. As shown above, there were associated with these the heads of the great clans, exclusive of those of Levi, fifty-eight in all, these and the twelve making the supreme council of the Jews, afterwards called the Sanhedrin. (Numbers xxvi.; Ex. xxiv. 1.) These became the chief magistrates of the government. They were the captains of Israel in war, and their counsellors in peace.

(2), Another class were the *shoterim*, officers, whose chief work seems to have been to keep the genealogical tables. Attention

has been called by writers to the fact that the historical notices contained in 1 Chronicles, and not found in Moses' writings, were, perhaps, derived from these tables. (1 Chron. iv. 21-23, 39-43; v. 10, 19-22; vii. 20-24. Compare Num. xi. 16; and Deut. xxix. 10; xvi. 18.) The shoterim were even employed in Egypt, under the direction of the Hebrew overseers, and probably kept tally as the work was done day by day. (Ex. v. 6, 10, 14, 15.) They wrote out the discharges for such Israelites as were free from military service. (Deut. xx. 5-9.) They acted as aides to the commanding general throughout the camp. (Joshua i. 10.) They were some of them also elders, for part of the original seventy chosen at God's command to be with Moses in governing the people were officers or shoterim. (Num. xi. 16.) They again and again shared in the work of the legislative bodies of the people. (Deut. xxix. 10; xxxi. 28; Josh. viii. 3; xxiii. 2.) In the time of Uzziah, Maaseiah, the "chief officer," had a part in the superintendence of the army affairs, doubtless having charge of the register. (2 Chron. xxvi. 11.) In 1 Chron. xxiv. 6; Jer. lii. 25, we read of the scribe of the captain of the host, who mustered the people of the land. He was, doubtless, the chief officer or shoter.

(3), What appears to have been an entirely new order, the judges, was established by Moses by the advice of Jethro, and confirmed by God. (Ex. xviii. 13-26; Deut. i. 13-18.) In bondage the Israelites had no judges, for they needed none. They were bondsmen, and could try no civil cases. These judges were to be for thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens. (Ex. xviii. 25.) There seems, from this and other hints, to have been a regular series of inferior and superior courts, for matters to be carried up by appeal or by reference. The judges of thousands, that is, those at the highest grade, referred matters too hard for them directly to Moses, or to his successor, the chief judge of the people, who in later times was the king himself. (Deut. xvii. 8, 9.) The judges were associated with shoterim, or officers, in every city. (Deut. xvi. 18.) In later times the Levites, who came to be the class learned in the law, were chiefly chosen as the judges. (1 Chron. xxiii. 4; xxvi. 29-32; 2 Chron. xix. 8-11.) The

shoterim also shared at times in legislative acts. (Joshua xxiii. 2; xxiv. 1.)

In certain matters each tribe was sovereign. No other tribe was permitted to interfere. Each tribe was in dignities and rights the equal of the others. It was on this ground of tribal equality that the question was asked of God by Israel, "Who shall go up for us first against the Canaanites?" (Judges i. 1.) And God himself assigned to Judah a precedence or leadership in this conquest of Canaan. (Vs. 2.) As separate tribes they had large powers. Joshua urged the children of Joseph to make war on their own account with the Perizzites and the Rephaimites. (Joshua xvii. 15.) And Zebulon and Naphtali made war against Jabin, king of Canaan, in Hazor. (Judg. iv. 10.) Dan attacked and destroyed Laish. (Judg. xviii. 11-27.) The sons of Reuben, the Gadites and the half tribe of Manasseh unitedly made war on certain enemies who were in the way of their tribal progress. (1 Chron. v. 18-23.) This war, east of Jordan, concerned only those tribes there settled and their friends, and hence is not mentioned in the Book of Samuel, although it happened in the reign of Saul, and in magnitude, in booty gathered, and in general military character, is said to have excelled any of Saul's wars. In fact, the whole territory contested for was conquered by the tribes named. (Vs. 23.) In 1 Chron. iv. 41-43 we read of two wars, one against Gedor, and the other against the Amalekites, so late as in the time of Hezekiah.

In the midst of such regulations and practices, it was not at all unlikely that serious differences should occur. The rivalry of tribal interests would hinder at times the general or national advancement. Hence, wars sometimes occurred between the tribes. (Judg. xii. 1-6; xx. 1-48; 2 Sam. iii. 1; 1 Kings xii. 16-24.) It was to be only when Messiah should come that this state of envy and jealousy should cease. (Isa. xi. 13.) Judah had had precedence in the wilderness. (Num. ii. 3; x. 14.) And later Ephraim had furnished the nation with Joshua as their chief captain, and in Canaan Shiloh in Ephraim was for a long time the place of the tabernacle. Messiah's coming alone could do away with rivalries growing out of these and similar causes. Ephraim did

not like to be slighted. (Judg. viii. 1; xii. 1.) They were jealous of David and Judah. (2 Sam. ii. 8, 9.) They followed Absalom in his revolt. (2 Sam. xviii. 6.) They joined in the rebellion of Jeroboam, the Ephraimite. (1 Kings xi. 26; xii. 16.) Ephraim is spoken of in the seventy-eighth Psalm as rejected of God because of their sins, and the choice fell upon Judah. (Vs. 9–11, 60, 67, 68.) And it is worth noting that any assumed or attained tribal preëminence was disregarded by God when he chose David king out of the smallest tribe of all, Benjamin.

For these and like troubles between the tribes, and for questions arising as to foreign relations, there was needed a national assembly, or *comitia*, a states-general, a federal council. A local assembly would not do. (Deut. xix. 12; xxv. 8, 9; Judges viii. 14; xi. 5; 1 Sam. xvi. 4.) And this brings us to the point we have had in mind in the discussion of the Hebrew constitution thus far, namely, that this national assembly, with its representatives from the tribes as such, was made up, as we shall soon see, of those who were called the elders of Israel. Such a national assembly alone was competent to decide in so grave a matter as the dispute between Judah and Ephraim on the one hand, and Gibeah in Benjamin on the other. (Judges xix. and xx.) Appeal was taken to all the tribes of Israel in national assembly met. That body met at Mizpeh, heard the case, examined into the facts, and decided that the crime was not only a dreadful breach of order and right, but a violation of the right of a citizen of any one tribe to pass through the territory of any of the other tribes. The national council thereupon ordered Benjamin to deliver up the accused parties. Benjamin refused. Their attempted rebellion against the decree of the supreme authorities in the nation was finally crushed out at the point of the sword. From this history it is clear that there was a strong bond of union between the tribes, a central body representing the nation at large in all national and inter-tribal questions at issue. It was counted high treason to disobey the supreme authority vested in this body, as was shown in the case just alluded to, Judges xix. and xx. It was to this council that Manasseh appealed in reference to a law referred to in Numbers xxvii. A law was thereupon enacted touching

the matter of the petition. And in the case of Benjamin above considered, Judges xix. and xx., it should be noted that the decision was not given as a matter of advice, or in faltering terms, but was enforced with the rapidity of a supreme authority which had the right and the power to enforce its decrees.

This national assembly consisted of two bodies, the upper and the lower house, the senate and congress as they might be termed. This appears from Numbers x. 2-4, where the upper house, consisting of the princes, or heads of thousands, were to be called together with but one trumpet, but the whole congregation, the larger or popular assembly, the lower house, was to be called together with the two trumpets. It was to the upper house that Joshua made his farewell address. (Joshua xxiii. 2; xxiv. 1.) To these elders Moses delivered the law. (Exodus xix. 7.) It was the people, by their representatives, who made the covenant with God at the mouth of Moses, and were sprinkled by his hand. (Exodus xxiv. 3-8.) These rulers of the congregation received the words of Moses. (Exodus xxxiv. 31; xxxv. 1.) Joshua made a covenant with certain peoples, which covenant the princes of the congregation ratified. (Joshua ix. 15-21.) It was this body that asked Samuel for a king (1 Sam. viii. 4), and that was to make David king. (2 Samuel iii. 17-21; v. 1-3; 1 Kings xii.) It was this body also that had the sole right to declare war upon national issues. (Judges xx. 1-13, 18-28; xxi. 13.) It was this assembly that ratified the choice of Saul as king. (1 Samuel x. 24; xi. 14, 15.)

How were these local assemblies of "the elders of every city," and these two houses of the great national assembly, chosen? This is an important question bearing upon the comparison we are instituting between the Old Testament and the New Testament church organizations.

While the children of Israel were yet no nation, but only a family, evidently the patriarchal simplicity of Abraham's time continued. The heads of the twelve families were the princes, or sovereign rulers of those families as such. The patriarchs themselves made war, formed alliances, and gathered revenues. (Genesis xxi. 22-32; xiv. 17-24; xxxiv. 6-19; xiv. 13-16.) They even had the power of capital punishment. (Genesis xxxiv. 24, 25.)

But after a time the tribes became a composite collection of many families. Each tribe had its prince. (Numbers. i. 1-54.) After a time this princeship became elective instead of hereditary. Collections of families were combined into what was technically called a family, a house of fathers, a thousand, or, as the Scotch term means, a clan. These clans had in turn their heads. Thus the princes, or chiefs of tribes, and these associated heads of clans, together called by the general term "elders," were the seventy who later were called the Sanhedrin, or, as the word means, "the seventy." Compare, as evidence of this, Exodus iii. 16; iv. 29; vi. 14, 15. These were "the elders of Israel." This was the supreme council, the senate of Israel.

Each tribe in its turn had a similar organization. And the model was carried further, to the cities, whose chosen elders sat in the gates. These correspond to municipal assemblies in our own times. (Compare Deuteronomy xxi., etc.; Judges xi. 5, 6, 11; viii. 6, 14; Ruth iv. 4, 9; Ezra x. 14; Deuteronomy xvi. 18; Deuteronomy xxi. 2.) The apocryphal Book of Judith refers to a similar bench of elders. (Judith vi. 14-21.)

In the choice of the seventy who were to aid Moses (Numbers xi.), the people also, as well as God, had a part. The names, we are told, were "written." (Verse 26.) It has been well argued that this must mean, not that Moses wrote them down, for that would have deprived each tribe of fundamental rights in the selection of its own rulers, and Moses was told not to choose, but to "gather," this body of men. But it seems most reasonable to hold that the people themselves chose these men, known to them as wise rulers or elders already, for the seventy were to be chosen "from the elders of the people." (Verse 1.) A similar occurrence is narrated in Acts vi. 3, where men were chosen deacons, who were "of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom." Here the people made the choice and the apostles confirmed it. The Hebrew council of seventy had the highest influence in matters both of church and state in that ancient government, which then included both church and state in its care. From this time on the Israelites delegated to their representatives full authority to act for them, for it is difficult to believe that an assembly of

six hundred thousand men must be gathered together every time Moses or Joshua or subsequent leaders desired advice or decisions. The leader, as, for example, Moses, could not possibly have been heard by such a body. So that when we read that the whole congregation of the people were gathered together, we are to understand that this meant by their representatives. It was "the people, in convention assembled," by their representatives. This is asserted, in so many words, in Numbers i. 16, where we read that the term "congregation" is to be the official title of the representatives, whose names follow. In Numbers xvi. 2 certain princes of the congregation are named as being "called to the assembly." In Deuteronomy xxix. 10 the chief men are mentioned for the two and a half million, who could not possibly have been gathered in the space reached by the voice of Moses.

It is very evident from Numbers xi., and other passages, that these elders or rulers must have been men of the people, tried men, known to be qualified for the place filled by them, with experience in the affairs they would have in hand, and we have seen that in the case of the highest body, the seventy, they were chosen from the elders already in office. What is that but a forecast of Presbytery, Synod, and General Assembly, made up of men already elders, and known to be wise and experienced in their office and work?

We venture to ask the reader to review, as briefly as possible, some of the points already alluded to, and to study somewhat in detail the *functions* of the bench of elders, whether local, tribal, or national. And in pursuance of the primary object we have in view we will confine ourselves to the functions more directly ecclesiastical, and pass by those which were more strictly civil, which we already know were abolished when the theocracy came to an end at the destruction of the temple and the downfall of the remnant of authority then left to the Jewish people by their conquerors, the Romans.

We may classify their functions as administrative and judicial. The upper house, or great Sanhedrin, had charge of the general welfare of those under their charge. They legislated in matters relating to the body of the people whom they represented. The

local Sanhedrin managed all affairs belonging to the city or neighborhood thereof respectively. The tribal Sanhedrin cared for tribal matters and other internal affairs. The great Sanhedrin legislated for all the tribes conjointly. The office became one, therefore, of great dignity and authority. There is no hint of any salary attached to the office in any of its grades.

The great Sanhedrin bound together all the body politic, the Israelitish church-nation. Associated with these bodies, as we have seen, in each city, tribe, or in the nation at large, was the more popular assembly, and every reference to the elders is of such a nature as to indicate that the nation was more bound into one by the eldership than by any other or tribal relation. For when it was time to appoint the first passover, Moses came, not to the leaders as princes of tribes, but as elders "of Israel." (Ex. xii. 21, 28.) Thus, in perhaps the first and most important exercise of their functions, they acted as the spiritual representatives of the people. The seventy, later appointed by the Lord and the people jointly, were to stand by the tabernacle, were solemnly inaugurated into office (Num. xi.), were consecrated to their office by a peculiarly sacred ceremony, and received of God's own Spirit in the fulfilment of their duties. This gift of the Spirit was intended to convey to them all needed wisdom, grace, judgment and courage for their future important and serious work.

In fine, the ordinance of God as given to Moses and the people, in one view continued, and in another view instituted, a council or body of men, larger or smaller, local or more extended in sphere, and did it, not of the priests, who were for a definite purpose, and were to continue only for a definite time, namely, the coming of Jesus the great high priest, when in him all believers were made priests unto God; not of the wealthy or great or specially privileged classes; not even of the learned class of the Levites, primarily; but of men of the people, noted for wisdom, prudence, and skill in affairs, of good repute, apt to teach, and lovers of God and of his people and of his house.

When we look still more closely into their functions as exercised, according to the Scripture record, we find a great similarity between them and the functions of any presbytery to-day. The

authority of Moses himself to be their leader, the proofs of his own divine call to be their leader, must first be passed upon by the elders before they would heed his voice and obey or follow his leadership. (Ex. iii. 13-18.) And this, let us note, by God's special command. (Vs. 16.)

The elders at large were to be men capable of keeping in the minds and hearts of the people the law of God. (Deut. xxxi. 9-14.) They were commanded to teach that law to both old and young, no light matter when we consider the lack of manuscripts for their use. (Deut. xxvii. 1-3.) Surely it was necessary for them in this extremity to be men whose own hearts and minds were charged with the word of God, and enlightened by the indwelling of God's Spirit. Indeed, that such was not always to be the case is evident from the prediction of Moses, that in a coming time the people were to turn away from that law, and mainly, if not entirely, because the elders had failed to so teach it to the people as to incline them to unfailing obedience thereto. Moses impresses this truth upon their minds repeatedly, and in his farewell song (Deut. xxxii. 7) he urges the people not to cease coming to the elders for instruction in the history of God's redeeming grace, and of all the mighty dealings whereby he had shown himself to be their God, and them to be his people. (Josh. xxiv. 31.) It would not be too much to assert that it was, in part at least, due to the failure of the elders of the people to do this that Israel saw such grievous times (compare Lam. i. 18), fell into such gross idolatry, and even lost the book of the law from sight and from mind until it was found again in the time of good king Josiah. The responsibility resting upon them is no less than that resting upon the elders of to-day, as the conservators of divine truth in the church, and among both old and young. There was then, and there is to-day, no more important demand made upon all elders than that they be "apt to teach."

The judicial functions of the Old Testament eldership were both civil and religious. They were, on the one hand, to judge those accused of murder. (Deut. xix. 12.) They were to inquire into the cases of children charged with the sin of disobeying their parents, and hence, were themselves to be men who ruled

well their own households. (Deut. xxi. 18–21.) Slander and grosser forms of sin were also to be judicially investigated by them. (Deut. xxii. 13–21.)

Sin caused the defeat at Ai. Thereupon the elders were to seek out the sinner and punish as God should indicate. (Joshua vii. 6.)

Allusion has already been made to the fact that the elders occupied a position before the people superior even to the king himself. Saul finds himself dependent upon them for a restoration to his place of honorable regard in the minds of the people. (1 Sam. xv. 30.) So extensive was their authority that the people did not question their acts, even when they disapproved of them. (Joshua ix. 18.)

When the temple was dedicated the elders were very prominent in the service, as the representatives of the people on that solemn occasion of religious joy.

Blasphemy, as a very heinous sin against the holy God of Israel, was judicially dealt with by the elders of Jezreel, although in that particular case they were judging one falsely accused. The point, however, is the same. The duty of judging in cases of alleged blasphemy rested upon the bench of elders in the locality where the sin was said to have been committed.

It was incumbent upon the elders to decide upon the penalties in cases of Israelites who married unbelievers. (Ezra x. 5, 8.)

It has already appeared above that the elders were organized as a series of courts of God's people, from the elders "in every city" to those who stood beside Moses and heard cases that were "too hard" for the inferior courts to decide. (Ex. xviii. 21–25; Num. xi. 16–25; Ex. xxiv. 1.) The right of appeal was thus a right recognized from the very earliest times in the Jewish church. We have in the *Life of Josephus*, section 12, a remarkable illustration of this, where appeal was taken from Galilee to the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem, and a decision was duly rendered. Compare with this the appeal and decree narrated in Acts xv. and xvi. 4. Not only was the right of appeal recognized, but these courts had other duties besides those of issuing cases on appeal, or of deciding cases of more consequence than a lesser court could

fairly determine. The Sanhedrin were to be Moses' advisers in all matters pertaining to the general welfare. And a very natural result of such a mode of procedure would be, that the decisions of the supreme body among the people, of men chosen by themselves for such a purpose, and by reason of their wisdom, would presumably have large weight with those affected by their decisions. In at least one case, as we have seen (Josh. ix. 18), the people felt bound to submit to the decision of their representatives.

It is important, therefore, that we should keep in mind the position held by the Israelitish elder. He, as has been said, received no salary for his office. He was as much bound by the laws made by the court of which he was a member as were any other Israelites. Apart from his official acts and position, he was no more than any other Israelite. He and his were no greater, no less, in the eye of the law, than the greatest or the humblest of the people; and yet, by virtue of his office, he was expected, and rightly, to be the guardian of the dignity of the law, and to see that all who were committed to his oversight should be properly impressed with their duties as well. He was thus "to be no respecter of persons." He was to deal as strictly and as positively with his own son as with the lowliest person in the church-nation who might be subject to his authority.

Of instances of the controlling authority of the elders in strictly ecclesiastical matters, we may note one. The time came when King David desired to remove the ark from Shiloh to Jerusalem. Before doing so, however, he secures a formal approval of his purpose from the rulers, whom he consults in formal assembly. (1 Chron. xiii. 1-4.) On a later occasion, not only did the rulers, or elders, set the example of willingly offering their substance unto the Lord for his house (1 Chron. xxix. 6), but in verses 20-22 we have the statement that the congregation, the great assembly of the people's representatives, approved of the raising of Zadok to the high-priesthood, and, as a step thereto, the deposition of Abiathar from that high office; and, indeed, the elders seem also to have anointed Zadok to be high priest, thus sharing in the solemn ceremonial whereby he was set apart or ordained to his office.

And so it appears that in every instance wherein judicial or administrative duties were to be performed the elders had a part. Both authority and discipline were thus committed to their hands. They were the divinely-appointed and recognized rulers of the Israelitish church-nation.

“It is true,” says Dr. Witherspoon (in his tract entitled *An Appeal to the Baptized Children of the Church*, published by the Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Virginia), “that these elders had many civil duties to perform, because at that time the church and the state were temporarily united. But their functions as civil officers, resulting from this temporary connection, were only incidental and temporary. Their highest functions were spiritual. They were eminently ecclesiastical rulers.”¹

We think that we have established several points bearing closely upon the subject of this paper:

1. There was, beyond question, a class of officials in the Israelitish church-nation called, variously, “elders,” “elders of Israel,” “elders of the people.” And so well known were these officials as a class that from the very first every mention of them is preceded by the definite article “the,” pointing to a beginning far back in the patriarchal times of the people of God, and even of other eastern nations.

2. It is equally beyond question that these “elders” had some kind of power and authority from the very first. What the nature and extent of that authority and power was, it has been one of the aims of the writer to show. However faint the references at times, it appears to be very clear, from the view of the whole study of these references, that this authority and power was not merely civil, but, to a large degree, and in the highest and most important sense, ecclesiastical. To advert to but one illustration of this, found in Leviticus iv. 13: there we find the elders laying their hands upon the bullock of the offering for sins of ignorance, therein representing the people in the *confession* of their sins of ignorance; and then the priest takes that offering and brings it

¹ It would be an interesting study to see how many of the Hebrew laws were for ecclesiastical errors or offences, and were to be enforced by the bench of elders.

before the Lord upon the holy altar. No more solemn, spiritual, and representative act can be imagined.

In the foregoing pages we have sought, by investigation of the Scriptures, to show what is there taught with reference to the history, the method of appointment, and the functions of the Old Testament eldership. It remains to be shown, if possible, that this Old Testament eldership continued, not only during the time when the Old Testament canon was forming, but during the interval between the close of the Old Testament canon and the opening of the New; and thus to show also that the New Testament eldership is not only substantially, but actually and precisely, what the Old Testament eldership was, in so far as its spiritual and ecclesiastical functions are concerned, since these are the only ones that *could* have been permanent, as history in the New Testament church was being made.

The fullest organization of the elders of Israel was accomplished in the introduction of the synagogue system, which was, in substance, a series of courts ecclesiastical, ascending from the local or parochial synagogue, and until it reached the great synagogue or Sanhedrin at Jerusalem.

In every Jewish town of sufficient size there was to be seen, in the period between the captivity of Israel and the coming of Christ, a synagogue or meeting-house of the Jews. Greek writers became accustomed to call the synagogue the *ecclesia*, the church. The synagogue was also to be found, even in Gentile cities, wherever ten adult Hebrews were to be found. Each of these synagogues had its bench of elders, who had charge of the worship of the people in their assemblies, and of the discipline of its members.

The exact date of the formation of the synagogues has been uncertain. Vitranga and other scholars have brought to light many facts with regard to it, and yet it has never been clearly settled just when they were fully established. The germ of them, no doubt, is to be found in the bench of elders who sat "in the gates" of every town. When the temple was destroyed, and the people were taken away into captivity, they were compelled to worship wherever they could do so with safety and any degree of

comfort. It is agreed among writers that the summary of facts given by Dr. Samuel Miller in his *Essay on the Warrant, Nature, and Duties of the Ruling Elder in the Presbyterian Church* is correct. Dr. Miller uses these words: "Whatever might have been its origin, nothing can be more certain than that, from the earliest notices we have of the institution, and through its whole history, its leading officers consisted of a bench of elders, who were appointed to bear rule in the congregation; who formed a kind of consistory or ecclesiastical judicatory, to receive applicants for admission into the church; to watch over the people, as well in reference to their morals as their obedience to ceremonial and ecclesiastical order; to administer discipline when necessary; and, in short, as the representatives of the church or the congregation, to act in their name and behalf; to 'bind' or 'loose'; and to see that everything was 'done decently and in order.'"

Dr. Miller also states that the number of elders in each synagogue was not governed by any absolute rule. In the smallest synagogues there were never less than three, to guard against an equal division of the judicatory; while in the large cities there were many members of the bench of elders in single churches.

Bishop Burnet in his "Observations on the First and Second Canons," Glasgow, 1673, pages 82-85, uses the following language: "Among the Jews, he who was the chief of the synagogue was called *chazan hakeneseth*, that is, the bishop of the congregation, and *sheliach tsibbor*, the angel of the church. And the Christian church being modelled as near the form of the synagogue as could be, as they retained many of the rites, so the form of their government was continued, and the names remained the same. . . . In the synagogues there was first one that was called the *chazan hakeneseth*; next, the three orderers and judges of everything about the synagogue, who were called זקנים, and by the Greeks, *presbuteroi* or *gerontes*. These ordered and determined everything that concerned the synagogue, or the persons in it. Next to them were the three *parnassim*, or deacons, whose charge was to gather the collections of the rich and distribute them to the poor. . . . The term elder was generally given to all their judges, but chiefly to those of the great Sanhedrin.

So we have it in Matthew xvi. 21; Mark viii. 31; xiv. 43; xv. 1, and in Acts xxviii. 14-16. . . . From all which it seems well-grounded and rational to assume that the first constitution of the Christian church was taken from the model of the synagogue, in which these elders were separated, for the discharge of their employments, by the imposition of hands, as all Jewish writers do clearly testify."

Bishop Lightfoot, whose fairness is only equalled by his rabbinical learning, says in his "Works," Volume I., page 308; Volume II., pages 138 and 755: "The service and worship of the temple being abolished as being ceremonial, God transplanted the worship and public adoration of God used in the synagogues, which were moral, into the Christian church, namely, the public ministry, public prayers, reading God's word, and preaching, etc. Hence, the names of the ministers of the gospel were the very same, the angel of the church, and the bishop, which belonged to the ministers in the synagogues. There was in every synagogue a bench of three. This bench consisted of three elders, rightly, and by imposition of hands, preferred to the eldership. There were also three deacons, or almoners, on which was the care of the poor."

Neander, the great professor of history of the University of Berlin, a man descended from the Jews and familiar with their writings, says: "There happened to be in the Jewish synagogue a system of government, not monarchical, but rather aristocratical, or a government of the most venerable and excellent. A council of elders, *presbuteroi*, conducted all the affairs of that body. . . . Besides the common name of these overseers of the church, to-wit, *presbuteroi*, there were many other names given, according to the peculiar situation occupied by the individual, or rather his particular field of labor, as *poimenes*, shepherds; *ēgoumenoi*, leaders; *proestōtes tōn adelphōn*, rulers of the brethren; and *episcopoi*, overseers." (Kirchengeschichte, Vol. I., pages 283-285.)

Archbishop Whately, in his book, *The Kingdom of Christ Delineated*, Carter and Brothers, page 29, says: "It appears highly probable, I might say, almost certain, that wherever a Jewish synagogue existed, that was brought, the whole or the

chief part of it, to embrace the gospel, the apostles did not there so much form a Christian church—or congregation, ecclesia—as make an existing congregation Christian, by introducing the Christian sacraments and worship, and establishing whatever regulations were necessary for the newly adopted faith, leaving the machinery, if I may so speak, of government unchanged; the rulers of the synagogues, elders, and other officers, whether spiritual, or ecclesiastical, or both, being already provided in the existing constitutions.”

The Scriptures show that these elders of the synagogue were officials in the time of Christ. Compare Matthew v. 22; xxvi. 3; Luke vii. 3; Acts iv. 8, 23; vi. 12; xxiii. 14; xxiv. 1; xxv. 15. And not only did converted synagogues retain this form of government, but new churches were formed after the same model. Compare Acts xiv. 23; xx. 17; 1 Timothy v. 1, 17, 19; Titus i. 5; James v. 14; 1 Peter v. 1, 5.

The single question that remains in this branch of our subject is this: Did the Mosaic eldership, or rather the patriarchal eldership as developed and established by Moses, remain substantially the same to the coming of Christ? And, especially, was this true of the theocracy, *the spiritual* aspect of the Israelitish government, as a church as well as a nation, remaining practically unchanged. This, Warburton has, we think, conclusively shown in his *Divine Legation*, Book V., Section 3. Notwithstanding all the changes that occurred from the time of Moses to the coming of Christ, in which period it was in turn democratical, monarchical, and aristocratical, it retained this government, especially in ecclesiastical matters, as at the beginning. We have already traced the history through the Scripture canon, showing that the elders “of Israel” and the elders “of the gates,” and “of every city,” were well-known features of the government of the church-nation, from Moses to Hezekiah, 700 B. C., to Ezekiel and Jeremiah, 580 B. C., and to Ezra, 450 B. C. And in support of this view we have not only the opinion of Warburton, referred to above, but of Bossuet (*Commentary*, article 50), who says: “To maintain the law in its vigor, Moses formed an assembly of seventy counsellors, which may be termed the senate of Israel, and the perpet-

ual council of the nation." And De Fleury, in his *Manners of the Ancient Israelites*, chapter 21, says: "As often as mention is made in the Scripture of assemblies and public affairs, the elders, or senators, are put in the first place, and sometimes named alone. Thence comes the expression in the Psalms, exhorting to praise God in the congregation of the people, and in the seat of the elders, that is, the public council." And if such a body of men were needed while Moses was still alive, it surely would be needed at least as much all through the later experiences of Israel.

We find just such references to the Sanhedrin, under the name of the *gerousia*, or eldership, in the books of the Old Testament Apocrypha, dating between the time of Malachi and the coming of Christ. (Judith iv. 8; vi. 20, "All the ancients"; viii. 9, "The ancients, Chabri and Charmi"; viii. 28, "Ozias and the ancients"; xiii. 14, "The ancients of the city"; xv. 8; 1 Maccabees xii. 6, "The ancients of the nation," *et al.*)

But the concluding proof that this was no new thing in the time of Christ we find in the New Testament itself, in Acts v. 21, where a literal translation is: "The Sanhedrin and the whole eldership [*gerousian*] of the children of Israel," that is, all the elders, as being members of the Sanhedrin. A similar reference is that in Acts iv. 5, "their rulers, and elders [*presbuterous*], and scribes gathered together in Jerusalem," who are, in verse 8, addressed by Peter as "ye rulers of the people, and elders [*presbuteroi*] of Israel," being the exact Greek equivalent for the Hebrew term used far back in the earlier books of the Old Testament, and by the Septuagint translators thereof 285 years before Christ. The same expression is used in Acts xxv. 15: "The chief priests and the [article repeated] elders of the Jews," as if to say that these elders were as familiarly known to Paul and Festus and Agrippa and Felix and the public generally as to the Maccabees, and to the Jews of Ezra's time, and to the Israelites of Saul's time, and to the Hebrews of Moses' time; and, as if to make the argument still stronger and more conclusive, we find the very expression, "the presbytery of the people," used in the Greek, in Luke xxii. 66, in the account of Christ's own trial, and also in the defence of Paul (Acts xxii. 5), himself, some argue, a

member of that very body at one time, and now speaking of it in the familiar way of one addressing the people about a body that they also well know, "the chief priest and *all the presbytery*"; by which readers can hardly fail to understand the Sanhedrin, or highest representative court of the Jewish church.

We have attempted in the foregoing argument to afford proofs from Scripture, as the final authority, that the Old Testament eldership and the New were substantially one, and that the same form of government which was in vogue ecclesiastically in Christ's time and in Paul's is that which was continued in the early Christian church, and until to-day. The constitution of the ancient people of God was accepted at least twice in the wilderness, and most solemnly again in the Promised Land between the mountains of Ebal and Gerizim; Ebal, the mount of cursing, a bleak, unattractive, frowning peak, on the one side, and Gerizim, beautiful, verdant, lovely, on the other. Was not the scene prophetic of the coming day when the constitution, accepted and obeyed more or less fully by the people under the old *regime* and dispensation, should also, in its essential features, be accepted and obeyed in the new dispensation as well, so full of beauty and peace and loveliness? If the ancient people of God should not disregard that constitution amid its comparative barrenness and bleakness, no less should the church of Christ, the people of the living God, in our own day disregard or turn away from those permanent and essential features of that constitution, which, we have seen, survived all the changes and sufferings and captivities and backslidings of olden times, and has been passed on by Christ and his apostles to be the beautiful and fruitful Gerizim, or mount of blessing, in all ages of the church. Whoever considers carefully this question as touching permanent parts of the covenants of the old and the new dispensations will see that what God gave to ancient Israel as binding and authoritative is intended to be just as binding and authoritative, in its essential features, upon us of the Christian church. As the fundamental principles of the Israelitish and Christian ecclesiastical governments are the same, it becomes the duty of the Christian to carefully guard those principles as he would guard the word of God itself. The laws which

God laid down *for his church in all ages*, apart from those priestly or ceremonial laws which were fulfilled in Christ himself, our great high priest, are still binding; and among these we may surely include those that he, in his providence, has preserved intact through all the times of tribulation through which his church has passed, and which the Lord and his apostles themselves have handed down to us as the present heritage of his people, for three thousand years and more.¹

The Hebrew system of government in the church (and the early Christian for that very reason, as its successor) has been given to us as a system of *self*-government, under divinely revealed and established principles. Individual independence was as carefully guarded as was the authority of the church as such. There was just enough of central control to preserve ecclesiastical unity, and to provide for the general welfare and growth. There was that wise, and shall we not say also that divine, commingling of local government with central government which has been the boon of not only our churches since the Reformation times, but was preserved in its germs all through the Dark Ages by Culdees and Waldenses and similar groups of faithful men, until the same principles should be adopted by the best of modern governments, as a prophecy of the final acceptance of them by all the world, and until we come to that time when the church of the living God, the great divine republic among men, shall be coterminous with the political and universal republic under which in the second coming of Messiah we shall be blessed forever. Then, in church as well as in state, shall be found peace, justice, equality, liberty and order, righteousness and gospel law.

The New Testament church is the lawful continuation of that of the Old Testament. The priestly or ceremonial features have disappeared. (Matt. v. 17-20; xi. 13; xxii. 2.) But the essen-

¹ Even Milner (*History of the Church of Christ*, edition of Longman, 1847, p. 444) admits that "the Presbyterian system seems to be scriptural and primitive, so far as the institution of the clergy is concerned," although he adds, "it is defective for want of a bishop"! Scriptural, yet defective! Presbyterians glory in the fact that it *is* scriptural, and *therefore* sufficient and "inspired as the rule of faith and practice." Can Episcopacy, which Milner above admits to be, at its best, *non-scriptural*, claim as much?

tial things remain; of these the chief is the doctrine and fact of the one and only headship of Jesus Christ, he being our one Master, and all we being brethren, as heirs of the Old Testament church, inherit the promises as well. (Luke xx. 16; Matt. xvi. 16–19; xviii. 20; John xvii.) And especially are we blessed with a yet more intimate and close presence of the head of the church than was the Israelitish dispensation (Matt. xviii. 20; John xiv. 16–26; xv. 26; xvi. 13), as contrasted with the presence of God among his people, as revealed in the Old Testament times. (Ex. xxxii. 34.)

And next in importance to the immediate presence of Christ (Matt. xviii. 20) is the absolute oneness and equality of all believers in him, and their government by divinely authorized and appointed representatives through all time. (John xvii. 20–22; Matt. xx. 25; xxiii. 11, etc.)

Presbyterians, therefore, boast not merely of *apostolic* succession, great as that is; we boast as well of Mosaic, yes, patriarchal succession. There were elders long before Paul and Christ; there were Presbyterians before Peter called himself a presbyter. Moses went before the presbytery of his people in Egypt to have his credentials examined and approved before he set about his mighty life-work. Presbytery is, by thousands of years, older than prelacy or popery; and by authority the presbyters governed the early church, for we read that the great presbytery at Jerusalem (Acts xv.) sent down to the churches “decrees” for them to “keep.” (Acts xvi. 4.) It is the holy boast of Presbyterians that they can trace a visible Protestant and Presbyterian succession down through the centuries; even in the morally corrupted church of Rome there was a succession of presbyters, although the papist “wrote the word small” and made it “priests.”

The system is seen to be scriptural, historical, and logical. We can do no better than conclude this paper with the glowing words of Prof. Samuel J. Wilson: “Presbyterianism is not a mere form, or badge, but a system of doctrines and principles, the form being appropriate to the doctrines, the history of which can be traced back along a line of fire to the Apostle Paul, and thence to the burning bush at Horeb. The true line of succession does not

consist in the unbroken continuity of empty, extra-scriptural forms and ceremonies, but in the continuous holding forth and passing forward of the vital doctrines of the gospel, accompanied by the spirit and power of true godliness. The line passes on from Abel, the first martyr, to Enoch, the seventh from Adam; from Enoch to Noah, the preacher of righteousness; from Noah to Abraham, from Abraham to Moses, from Moses to Paul, from Paul to Augustine, from Augustine to Claudius of Turin, from Claudius to the Waldenses, in their Alpine fastnesses, to Succat, commonly known as St. Patrick, a good sound Presbyterian; from Succat through the Culdees, thence through every witness of the truth during the Middle Ages, thence through the Reformers. Along the whole line stakes and faggots have blazed, and along the whole line Presbyterian blood has been sprinkled, and ashes of martyred Presbyterians have been scattered.

“ ‘Kings, prophets, patriarchs, all have part
Along the sacred line.’ ”

And so, as prelacy cannot go back beyond the middle of the second century without the aid of forged or doubtful documents, and is even then very undeveloped compared with what prelacy is to-day, and as popery cannot go back even as far as prelacy, we who believe in the patriarchal and Mosaic eldership may turn to those who boast of their long line of succession, and tell them of a succession which goes back of theirs sixteen hundred years at least, and has, besides, the indubitable testimony of the word of God, both to its ancient beginning and its divine authority and its unbroken continuity through all the ages of the Israelitish church-nation, the Maccabean period, the apostolic period, and down, down from then till now. We may confidently point to this history and providential continuance thus far, as the warrant and ground for believing that it shall continue until we shall behold the Lamb standing in the midst of the elders (Rev. v. 6), and sing the new song before the throne and the elders (Rev. xiv. 3) as we come to the General Assembly and church of the firstborn in heaven.

HARRIS R. SCHENCK.

Chambersburg, Pa.

III. THE MAIN MARK OF THE CHURCH; AND SOME PRACTICAL DEDUCTIONS.

By "the church" is meant here the "visible church." That is, that institution in human society which is visible to the eyes of men, and which is made up of "all those persons in every nation, together with their children, who make profession of the holy religion of Christ, and of submission to his laws." (See our Form of Government, Chapter I., paragraph 3.)

Again, by "the church" is meant here the visible catholic church in permanent and organized form. The church can "exist" for a time without organization. We can conceive of this as true of the "church universal" or "catholic." That is, of the church in its broadest form, for this may have been the case with it during the sojourn in Egypt, the latter part of the time especially. And we know it is true of the church as a local institution; for several such churches do "exist" in our own (Southern) Assembly, without officers of any kind, and the Synod of Virginia (not to speak of other authorities), recognizes them as "churches." But neither the "church universal" nor the "local church" can continue, can be a permanent institution in human society, can, in other words, fulfil the design of its great head in instituting it, without organization. And, therefore (to be practical), when we speak of "the church" here, we mean the permanent organization called the "visible church."

By the "main mark" of the church is meant: 1. That mark which is common to all branches of the true church universal. In other words, that mark which is found among all "those persons in every nation, together with their children, who make profession of the holy religion of Christ, and of submission to his laws." It must be a mark which is found wherever the true church is found, in every branch thereof, in every age, and in every nation.

2. That which is the *sine qua non* of its existence, which "mainly" marks it as the "true" church in contradistinction from

a "false" church; by which we are to identify it as the true church, by which we are to distinguish it from the false. Of course, the true church has many "marks." But what we are now concerned to find out is, what is her "*main* mark"; that mark which is vital to her very existence, which differentiates her from all other churches; the mark which we can take as a test to every organization called "a church," and by it tell whether it is true or false, a part of God's church or a part of something else. And, *above all, that mark which makes it, not merely preëminently but exclusively the saving institution, without which it cannot be an agency for saving men, body and soul.* What, then, is this "main mark" of the church?

I. *What it is not.*

The "main mark of the church" is not

(a), The outward form of the church as to anything. (1), For example, as to public or church worship.

The Jews of our Saviour's time observed, no doubt, the correct forms of public or church worship, as then required. Indeed, they were scrupulously faithful in the observance thereof. The Lord Jesus himself seems to recognize this on more than one occasion. To the woman of Samaria he said, "Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship" (*i. e.*, "we Jews"). To the Jews themselves he said: "The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all, therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do." (See John iv. 22; Matthew xxiii. 1-3) And yet the Jews of his day were, as a church, apostate.

On the other hand, he lays down as fundamental to true and acceptable worship itself a principle which ignores, and, indeed, repudiates the mere outward form of public or church worship as essential thereto. He does this when he says to the woman of Samaria, "The hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." (John iv. 23, 24.)

(2), Nor is the "main mark of the church" in her "form of church government." This is another "outward form" per-

taining to her; but here, too, the search for her "main mark" is not to be successful.

If the "main mark" of the church was in her "form of church government," then her "form of church government" would have been the same in all ages. But this, as is well known, has not been the case. And even although it may be claimed that the form of the church's government has been in its *essential features* one and the same in all ages, yet all such claimants would, no doubt, be among the first to confess that the church's mere form of government cannot stand the last and the essential test by which her "main mark" is to be discovered; namely, that it is the mark which gives it its saving power; which makes it the one institution in human society divinely organized for the purpose of saving men. No Presbyterian, at least, ought to claim *that* mark for the church's mere form of government. To do so would be against the very "genius of Presbyterianism," and, indeed, against the express language of the Standards to which we have subscribed. (See, for instance, Form of Government, Chapter I., paragraph 7.) And yet, in the Presbyterian heavens, some signs have appeared which may develop and take shape in just such a claim.

(3), Once more, the "main mark" of the church does not seem to be found even in her two sacraments, that is, in themselves considered.

As great "object lessons" on the two central doctrines of the gospel, viz: the atonement and regeneration, their relationship indeed to the main mark becomes apparent. And yet if our own church's practice be any guide in this matter, the sacraments seem hardly to have even this proximity to the main mark. For, not to mention other illustrations, the sacraments of the Baptist brethren ("Missionary Baptists") do not body forth "atonement and regeneration, the two central doctrines of the gospel," and yet the Presbyterian Church recognizes readily their sacraments as valid (although "irregular.")

These considerations throw an element of uncertainty, to say the least, into the claims of the church's sacraments to furnish, *per se*, the main mark of the church of God. They may have a

relationship thereto, but they do not, themselves, constitute that "mark."

The church's main mark, then, is not to be sought for, it would seem, in her outward forms; neither in her public worship, nor in her government, nor in her sacraments

(b), Nor are we to find it in some non-visible, internal "characteristic," such as the "indwelling of the Holy Spirit." Of course the abiding indwelling of the Holy Spirit is the main mark of Christ's mystical body, the invisible church. But we are seeking now the main mark of his "visible church," and that which is itself non-visible, cannot be the essential and fundamental feature by which its visible existence is to be identified.

(c), The true church has a form of church worship, of course, and that form of church worship must be scriptural in order to be necessary to its perfection. The same remark can be made as to its form of government, and as to its sacraments. But a church may have all three of these "marks," in the most scriptural and perfect form, and yet, if she has not another "mark," which is the "main mark," she is not a true church of God. The same statement cannot be applied to the indwelling Spirit; that is, it cannot be said of a permanent, visible church organization blessed with the indwelling Spirit, that unless it has also the other "mark," which is the main mark, it is not a true church of God; for the reason that although the indwelling Spirit is not the "main mark" of the visible church, yet he never "dwells" or abides with the saving power where the "main mark" is not found. A true scriptural form of church worship, of church government, and of church sacraments may be present, and yet if the main mark be not also there, the Holy Spirit will not be there. And, therefore, that church cannot be a "saving institution," for "it is the Spirit that giveth life." The main mark and the indwelling Spirit are always found together.

II. *What, then, is the "main mark" of the church of God?*

(a), The answer, no doubt, has been anticipated. The main mark of the church of God is *the word of God in its fundamental integrity, maintained by the public ministry thereof.*

This seems to be the meaning of the words of our Book of

Church Order. (See Chapter II., section 2, paragraph 13.) "All those which maintain the word and sacraments in their fundamental integrity are to be recognized as true branches of the church of Jesus Christ."

Th's no doubt means (1), Its maintenance by the public preaching thereof. The mere possession of "the word," or the mere reading of it, either private or public, or the mere teaching of it in the family, or the Sabbath-school, or the Bible class, can hardly be what is meant here as the thing which marks churches as "true branches of the church of Jesus Christ." For we know that as a simple matter of fact neither one of these things constitutes the mark by which churches are recognized as branches of the church of Jesus Christ. And neither one has ever done so. What is meant, no doubt, is the "maintaining the word by the public preaching of it in its fundamental integrity."

It is not to be denied, of course, that the saving character of a church may be maintained by these other agencies alone for a time. But we are now seeking for that main mark which belongs to the church as a permanent organization, which has always belonged to it, which is always and everywhere discoverable in it, which has always differentiated it, and will always differentiate it, as a saving institution. And the answer of our book seems plainly to mean the "public ministry of the word," in the sense in which it has always been understood; that is, in the sense in which the sacred Scriptures, Old Testament as well as New, constantly use and illustrate it; in the sense in which Protestantism in the sixteenth century rescued and restored it; in the sense in which Protestantism ever since has made it its distinctive badge, its distinctive glory, its distinctive defence, and its distinctive agency for saving men.

(2), In including "the sacraments" as furnishing, in part, at least, the main mark of the church, our book can only refer to them thus in view of their relationship to the "main mark"; being, as it were, great "object lessons," publicly set forth, as to the two central doctrines of the word, the gospel in act, the gospel epitomized. The public ministry of the sacraments, in short, is only a summarized and dramatized form of the "public ministry of the word."

(3), It is the public ministry of *the word in its fundamental integrity* which constitutes the main mark of the church; that is, the public setting forth of those doctrines, the belief of which is necessary to salvation, such as the inspiration and infallibility of the sacred Scriptures, the trinity of persons in the Godhead, the lost and helpless condition of man as regards self-salvation, the substitutionary atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ, and his resurrection from the dead, regeneration and sanctification by the Holy Spirit, justification by faith alone, a future and eternal state of rewards and punishments, etc. All of these doctrines are implied in "saving faith," and in a credible profession thereof, and are set forth in the holy Scripture as vital to salvation.

It may be said that this is not in accordance with facts; that thousands make a credible profession of faith, and live Christian lives, and are saved at death, who have little or no knowledge of many of these doctrines.

The answer is, that it is one thing to have a full, formal, and accurate knowledge of each of these doctrines as distinct propositions; it is quite another thing to deny them. A true believer may be ignorant of many of these propositions, simply from want of proper instruction; but he will never deny them when they are presented to his spiritual apprehension. His knowledge of "saving truth" may be limited to two simple articles, namely, "I am a poor sinner, and nothing at all, but Jesus Christ is my all in all"; yet such a man will never deny these other propositions; and the reason is, that they are all implied in the two simple articles of his creed. He has received the truth as a mere babe, and in the form of "milk"; but the "milk of the word," like all milk, has all the properties suited to nourish and save life, just as truly as "strong meat"; and the "milk of the word" is "sincere," that is, "genuine"; it will not disappoint, nor will it differ essentially in ingredients from that form of the word given to "strong men."

So, too, here may be seen the justification for that lenient judgment exercised by our church towards some religious organizations which have no written creed, such as, for instance, the Missionary Baptists, and, notably, the "Disciples," or "Campbellites." Take the latter case for a strong illustration. The "Campbell-

ites," or "Disciples," (1), Have no written creed; (2), Are congregational in form, each local church being independent of the others; (3), Are, therefore, hard to get at as to doctrinal belief; (4), Furthermore, are of unquestionably suspicious, if not positively objectionable, antecedents as to fundamental heresy. And yet the last official utterance of our church as to "Campbellite" or "Disciples" baptism (delivered by the General Assembly of 1882, and reaffirmed in 1893) is to the following effect, namely: "To affirm that no minister of that denomination ever administers Christian baptism is a proposition that this Assembly is not prepared to accept; and the decision of the question of how far the certificates and sacraments of the churches of that denomination are to be recognized and received must be left to the sessions and presbyteries immediately interested in the subject." And the reasons given for the above action are as follows: "The organization known as the Campbellite, or Christian, Church professes to receive the Scriptures as the word of God, but has no authoritative exposition thereof, or confession of faith; further, as each church is absolutely independent of all the other churches, the greatest variety of doctrine must, of necessity, prevail. It seems difficult, therefore, to deal with the denomination as a unit or organic whole—difficult to affirm or deny anything as true or false of the whole body." (See our General Assembly's Minutes for 1882, page 573.) It is to be noted that our Assembly does not proceed, for the benefit of "sessions and presbyteries," to state that in each concrete case the soundness of the particular local church as to the essential or fundamental doctrines enumerated above is to be ascertained. A broad charity is, therefore, exercised here. The individual church, like the individual person, may be ignorant, indeed, as a church, of most, if not all, of these doctrines as distinct and formulated propositions. Nevertheless, the "faith" of that body, to be a "saving faith," must imply and involve these vital truths. Its conception of the sinner and his needs, on the one hand, and of the Lord Jesus as a Saviour, on the other hand, must be such as that it cannot and will not deny these doctrines; otherwise, it is to be feared that the "charity" of our Assembly's deliverance is a charity which she had no right to exercise.

But while such concessions can be made as to the minimum of belief necessary to salvation, not only in the case of an individual believer, but also in the case even of a church such as has just been described, and, therefore, such a church can, in the judgment of charity, be said to teach enough truth to save, yet, when we come to consider the question in its practical bearings, we find that such concessions are hardly to the point, because they concern only abnormal cases. When we consider the church of God as a "visible, permanent organization in society," organized by God himself for the purpose of saving men, and when we consider that the main mark thereof must be "the maintenance of the public ministry of the word in its fundamental integrity," then both of these cases, the case of the man and the case of the church, seem hardly legitimate illustrations; for it is not conceivable that such a church could remain a "permanent organization," constantly, from age to age, studying God's word, constantly expounding God's word, and yet continue possessed only of the two elemental factors of saving truth, namely, that "I am a poor sinner, and nothing at all, but Jesus Christ is my all in all"!—never, in other words, coming to the fuller knowledge of "the truth as it is in Jesus," never discovering all those distinct and essential doctrines which have been cited, which are involved in its more elemental teachings, and which are so evidently set forth in God's word. Such a case, indeed, would be a case of "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." (2 Timothy iii. 7.) Such a case would throw doubt on that church's having the truth even in its elemental form. Hence, the true solution of our Assembly's action in this case probably is, that signs were discernible in the religious body known as the Campbellite, or Disciples, Church of their already coming more and more into a knowledge of the truth, and that, therefore, its existence in the future as a "permanent organization" gave good promise of its holding forth the "whole counsel" of the word "in its fundamental integrity."

And so, too, in the case of the individual believer. It is not to be conceived—that is, in the light of Scripture teaching—that a true believer, a man truly born of the Spirit by the word, either could or would remain stationary in growth, either as to growth

in knowledge or growth in grace, a spiritual petrification, and that, too, a mere babe, possessed, throughout life, of truth and piety only in its most elemental form. Abnormal, exceptional cases are not now spoken of; we are speaking of a true believer living under the normal conditions of a true believer's life, with access to the ordinary means of grace appointed of God "for the perfecting of the saints; for the edifying of the body of Christ"; for their growing "unto a perfect man," etc. And the statement is repeated that the rule not only is, but must be, in the normal life and teachings of the true church of God as a permanent organization in society; that the individual believer not only ought to be, but will be, possessed of a knowledge of these essential truths of his religion by which his Christian character must be developed, rounded, and perfected. The life that does not show forth this essential "mark" of life, namely, growth, must, of necessity, be looked upon with suspicion; and the church which does not produce such fruits in its members must also, of necessity, show the one thing lacking; for the "word of God" cannot be "maintained," that is, permanently set forth, "in its *fundamental integrity*," either in the lives of individual believers or in the teachings of a church, by the mere proclamation that man is a great sinner, but Christ is a great Saviour. To say that would be to impugn the wisdom of God in revealing the great body of truth which makes up the Christian system, as well as his wisdom in commanding us to teach it "all" — "all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matt. xxviii. 20.) To say that would be to repudiate the testimony of all Presbyterianism, if not of all Protestantism, to reject the witness of the highest and most reliable Christian experience, and wilfully to shut eye and ear to the solemn and fearful facts and warnings of church history.

(4), Another valuable truth in connection with this subject is this, viz.: That this "main mark" of the true church, *i. e.*, "the maintenance by the public ministry thereof of the word in its fundamental integrity," gives shape to and conserves, either directly or indirectly, every other (proper) "mark" of the "church visible."

Indeed, the church that gives most prominence and pre-emi-

nence to "preaching," that is, to the "preaching of fundamental truth," will have other "marks," of course, but those other marks will be helps thereto and not hindrances, will be subordinated in spirit and in form to the chief design of the "main mark" itself, which is to let the gospel have free course and be glorified. And the more a church makes the public preaching of fundamental truth the main thing in her corporate life, the more will all her other marks be affected thereby.

We have seen already how her two sacraments, baptism and the Lord's supper, are affected, both in form and spirit, by the "preaching of the word." The same fact is observable also in her government and in her worship. If in the worship of a particular church, preaching is the principal ordinance, the preaching, that is, of the essentials of the gospel, the other elements of her worship, the songs, the prayers, the offerings, etc., will be marked by simplicity and fidelity to the truth. If, on the other hand, that same church becomes in course of time unfaithful in the presentation of the word in its fundamental integrity, then the other elements of her worship will be almost certain also to depart from "the simplicity which is in Christ Jesus." They will become overdressed and lifeless formalism, breeding hypocrisy, pharisaism, and soul destruction. True, a pure gospel may subsist along with an ornate and ritualistic worship for a time; true, a lifeless formalism may mark the church's worship in its simplest, purest form, and may accompany for a time the dispensation of the gospel in its most faithful ministration, for all human effort is marked with imperfection, and is liable to decay; nevertheless in a permanent organization such as is the church, organized and set in society by divine wisdom, in order to save men and in order therein to abide, the only real guarantee of a permanently pure worship is a pure gospel. The preaching of God's essential truth, this it is which is, and has been, and must ever be, the sheet-anchor of the church in the storm of ritualism as well as in every other storm, keeping her to her moorings, or, at least, preventing her from drifting upon the rocks of permanent apostasy, holding her until God's sovereign Spirit comes and revives his work within her heart anew. And so, too, as to government. True, indeed,

it may be that the very "pattern of the house" may not be given in detail in the New Testament, as it was given God's ancient people in the Old. But one principle can be laid down as impregnable. It is this, that that form of church government is nearest to the mind of God which gives greatest honor, greatest place, greatest and freest course to the preaching of the gospel in its fundamental integrity, and which in all of its rules, requirements, customs, and discipline, subordinates everything to the propagation and conservation in the individual soul, in the body corporate of the church itself, and in the world at large, of God's essential, vital, and precious truth. If, for instance, the breaking down of the distinction between the preaching and the ruling elder, and the transforming the present "bench of elders" into a bench of preachers, in each local church, giving to each one a commission along with "the minister" to "preach" as well as "rule," will best retain the "main mark" of the church, viz., "the maintenance of the word in its fundamental integrity," well and good; that is, if not inconsistent with other teachings of God's word. If, on the other hand, the maintaining a high standard of theological training as preparatory to "preaching the gospel" will best retain the "main mark" in our own beloved branch of Zion, then, once more, well and good. The latter course enjoys the advantage of the endorsement of experience. Our church's whole past, the history, indeed, of Presbyterianism in all of its branches (save one), bears unbroken testimony to the efficacy of this latter custom. For whatever charges the impatience of the present age may bring against our church on the score of non-aggressiveness, not a breath or whisper of accusation has ever been raised against her for not maintaining the "main mark" of God's true church. But whatever course may be adopted, and whatever changes may take place in our Form of Government, the change, if change there be, must, in order to be valid, scriptural, and abiding, be brought to the "main mark," as to a test. For the "main mark" is the touchstone by which all things must be tried and proven, in church government, as well as in all things else in Zion.

(b), It is when we turn our thoughts to the Foreign Mission field and work that this whole subject, in all its bearings, takes an added and a most absorbing interest.

We have all read of Macaulay's New Zealander sitting centuries hence upon the ruins of London Bridge, with the wreck of the mighty city about him, and meditating upon the vanity and mutability of human affairs. The picture is drawn from the fancy, yet justified by facts. The history of the human race is a history of the shifting of the centres of human civilization and power. And this is true as to the church and religion, as well as to society and the state. It is not at all improbable that a few centuries hence the centre of power (ecclesiastical) may shift to where our Foreign Missions now are doing foundation work. Who, of the "seven churches of Asia" in the apostles' day would have dreamed that in a few centuries the candlestick would be removed therefrom and transplanted to the wilderness to the west of them, now called Europe, and to peoples steeped in all manner of strange, ferocious, and abominable pagan practices and rites? Who, in Christopher Columbus' day would have believed that four hundred years from that time, in this year, 1897, the light of Christianity would stream as almost from its chiefest centre from that vast, unknown, new, and savage world which he was then revealing? And so, too, judging the future by the past, the present fields of Foreign Mission work may become in future, not merely strong, co-ordinate, self-sustaining representatives of the Christian faith, but actually the chief centres thereof.

But be this as it may, one thing is certain; and it is a certainty so solemn and so fraught with issues of the most prodigious kind, that all who love the truth as it is in Jesus, all who believe in it as a vital necessity to the soul's salvation, and all who love their fellowmen, must awaken to the importance of the question and the perils of the moment. The certainty is this, viz.: that if the heathen are really to be saved, if the true church of God is to be transplanted and perpetuated on heathen soil, if what now represents and what is to continue to represent God's true church there is to be and is to continue a "saving institution," then the "main mark" of the true church must be present. Nay, not only must be present there; it must be dominant there. It must be in our Foreign Mission work just what it must be everywhere, an actual existence, in actual operation, the chief moulding influence at

work on the as yet crude, formless, but plastic material which is to constitute the "church of the future" in heathen lands. Otherwise the something that is to be in the future in heathen lands the final product of missionary effort, may be, indeed, a visible organism, may be a religious institution, may even possess some of the minor marks, and may profess to do and even strive to do the saving work of God's true church; *but it will not be the true church of God, nor a part of the true church of God.* Its work will prove to be "wood, hay, stubble"; it will not stand the test of the judgment day, "for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire."

And this is true and shall continue to be true, no matter how effectively the many insidious, plausible, powerful influences now in operation may do their work against the truth. Materialism, rationalism, universalism may masquerade indefinitely under a Christian nomenclature, an emasculated doctrine of Christian love and fellowship may beget a zealous and showy outward union of Christian forces, a widespread, motley, irresponsible army of evangelists, male and female, may thrill the heart of the home church with the glowing announcements of the wholesale fruits of their self-denying ministry, time-honored and time-tested creeds may be shorn like Samson of all their strength, or abolished altogether, and the net results of all of these things may be a great, a rapid and an apparently triumphant impetus to the Foreign Mission work, giving promise of a speedy "conquest of the world for Christ." Nevertheless, it is to be repeated, and continually repeated, that it is all the "play of Hamlet with the part of Hamlet left out." The church "can do *nothing against the truth but for the truth.*" The heathen must be "sanctified by *the truth*" and by "*the truth*" alone, just as truly as we ourselves here in the home field. The church is not only to "go" but to "teach." The church is to see to it not only that it "goes," but that it takes that along with it which is the alone reason *for* its "going," and for which alone it has any commission *to* "go," and that is, *God's fundamental truth.* Nothing else can take its place. Nothing else has saving power. Nothing else has promise of God's saving blessing. Zeal cannot take its place, nor "Chris-

tian unity," nor "love," nor anything; for it is the "main mark" of God's true saving church; it and it alone.

III. This paper is already longer than was intended, and must now be brought rapidly to a close. One word, by way of a half explanation, and, if need be, half apology, and then let us conclude with two deductions.

There has been no attempt to "prove" the "main mark" of the church. It was the original intention of the writer to do so, but rapidly diminishing space forbade. It has been assumed that "the maintenance of the public ministry of the word in its fundamental integrity, and especially by preaching," is the "main mark" of God's true church. Yet, although "assumed," it is assumed with confidence. It is not expected that this article will meet any but Presbyterian eyes, for the most part, and Presbyterian hearts will of course be loyal to the definition of their own Book of Church Order. The "proof," however, if proof be needed, is easily forthcoming. Turning, then, to "deductions," although many can, of course, be drawn from so "central" a subject, two only will be mentioned.

(a), If the "maintenance of the word in its fundamental integrity by the public ministry thereof" is the "main mark" of the church, then it would seem to follow that that "public ministry" should be carried on by a special class of men specially set apart for that purpose; and, therefore, that our Book of Church Order is right, in its classification of church officers, in placing "ministers of the word" as "first," and in a distinct class to themselves.

This "deduction" is mentioned here solely as a deduction. The idea is not intended to be conveyed that the above classification has no other scriptural support. The writer endorses fully the language of our book when it states that this classification is "according to the Scriptures." Abundant Scripture proof, both direct and indirect, can be found to sustain it.

And, of course, it is recognized by our book that this classification does not make the "minister of the word" any more than a "teaching elder," nor destroy the equality existing between him and the "ruling elder" in *matters of government*. Nevertheless, if the "maintenance of the word in its fundamental integrity by

the public ministry thereof" be the main mark of God's church, then that main mark ought to have a distinct and special class of men specially set apart for its defence and preservation. The conclusion seems irresistible. It is inconceivable that God should appoint a distinct class of officers to "deacon" for him in temporal and material things; that he should appoint a distinct class of officers to "deacon" for him in matters of government, and *yet that he should not have a distinct class of officers to "deacon" for him in the dispensation of the main mark of his church.* Hence, the Rev. Dr. John M. Mason, in his noble work on the *Church of God* (Mason's Works, Volume II., paragraph 470), coincides completely with this deduction. Thus: "The common sense of mankind in all ages and countries has taught them that no system of religion can be maintained and perpetuated without an order of religious teachers." This fact "is founded upon a principle which includes the cardinal secret of human improvement—the *division of labor*. In other words, that to ensure excellence in any occupation whatever, it must be confined to a particular class of men, and these men must be confined to it." And, therefore, "the division of labor" in God's church, the ministers of the word, the ruling elders, and the deacons.

(b), The second deduction is this: That *the true basis for Christian unity* is the "maintenance of the word in its fundamental integrity by the public ministry thereof." For surely, if this be the main mark of God's church, then this and this alone must be the common ground on which his people of every name can loyally stand. To stand on any other ground will be to make that other ground the main mark of the church, and that, of course, can never meet the approval of him who is her head. A theory of "comparative religions," therefore, will not do; a doctrine of one of the sacraments, such as baptism, will not do; a doctrine of church government, such as the "historic episcopacy," will not do. The only basis for a true Christian unity is that which is the main mark of the church, and the main mark of the church is the "maintenance of the word in its fundamental integrity by the public ministry thereof."

P. D. STEPHENSON.

Woodstock, Va.

IV. THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN.

THE difference in spirit between the Old Testament and the New is reflected by the difference in form. Of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament, twenty-one are letters, and of these fifteen are directed to particular churches or to individual believers; while the Gospel of Luke, the Acts, and the Apocalypse are prefaced with personal address, and the Gospel of John again and again sets writer and readers face to face. By the manner as well as by the substance of its teaching the New Testament is thus distinguished from all other sacred books. Like the prophets of the Old Testament, the apostles claim to speak by immediate inspiration of God, and set forth truth ordinarily in its relation to present needs, dealing with general principles in their application to particular instances. They differ from the prophets in two important respects: (*a*), The prophets commonly spoke to the nation; the apostles speak to the individual church, or believer. The state held the foremost place in antiquity; Christ gave the foremost place to man. Many of his profoundest teachings were addressed to a single hearer. (*b*), Generally speaking, antagonism marked the attitude of the prophets toward Israel; fellowship marks the attitude of the apostles toward the church. The prophets were sent to a people wayward and rebellious, and the burden of their message was warning and judgment; the apostles ministered to those "who have obtained the like precious faith with us." (2 Peter i. 1) This change of relation is characterized by a new spirit of freedom and familiarity of personal intimacy and affection, such as becomes the intercourse of brethren.¹

Among the apostolic writings none are more thoroughly individual in character and style than those of John. The Gospel throbs throughout with the passionate ardor of the son of thunder. Unlike the earlier Gospels, the narrative is interwoven with the comments of the evangelist, so that it is sometimes diffi-

¹ See Bernard's *Progress of Doctrine in N. T.*, Lecture VI.

cult to distinguish the words of the speaker from the reflections of the writer. John nowhere names himself, but it is evident that he maintains his reserve with difficulty, and as the story draws to its close, he can restrain himself no longer, and comes forward to bear his personal testimony. (John xix. 35; xx. 30, 31; xxi. 24, 25.) The Gospel and the Epistles are closely knit together, and widely as the Gospel and Apocalypse differ in form, they are one in doctrine, and bear the marks of the same hand.

The interest of the Second and Third Epistles is not dogmatic, but historical. They throw a clear and beautiful light upon the old age of the beloved disciple, and they are almost the only memorials of the Christian church which have come down to us from the closing years of the first century.¹

That these letters were written by the apostle is attested by sufficient evidence. They are contained in the most ancient manuscripts: the Vatican and the Sinaitic, of the fourth century; the Alexandrian, of the fifth, and the greater part of the Third Epistle is preserved among the fragments of Codex Ephraem, of the fifth century.

With a single exception, they are found in the most ancient versions: the old Latin, probably of the second century, and the Vulgate, of the close of the fourth; the Egyptian Memphitic and Thebaic versions, of the second and third century; the Ethiopic of the fourth or fifth; and the Armenian, of the fifth. Of the Gothic version of Ulflas, of the fourth century, a large part has been lost; but as the translation of the New Testament was made from the Greek, we may presume that it contained all the catholic epistles, though no portion of any of them has been recovered.

The sole exception to the witness of the early versions is the Syriac Peshito, which represents the canon of the Syrian church at the earliest period of which we have knowledge, probably not later than the second century, whatever may be the date at which the Peshito assumed its present form. Of the catholic

¹ From the destruction of Jerusalem in 70, to the close of the century, the only writings of the Christian church that remain to us, besides the writings of John, are the Epistle of Clement, of Rome, to the Corinthians, and perhaps the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas. Some authors add the Gospel of Luke. See Plummer's *Commentary*.

epistles, it omits Second Peter, Second and Third John, and Jude, together with the Apocalypse. The attempt is made to break the force of this testimony by showing that these epistles are quoted by early Syrian writers. This, it is urged, indicates that the Peshito does not represent the Syriac canon in its original form, but is a later revision, from which these epistles have been excluded on critical grounds. Theophilus of Antioch (A. D. 175), Malchion (A. D. 275), and Pamphilus (A. D. 300) are cited as making use of certain of these epistles; but, as they were all familiar with Greek, they cannot be relied upon as witnesses to the native Syrian canon.

The stress of the argument is laid upon the witness of Ephraem Syrus, of the fourth century. It is affirmed that he quotes from all the catholic epistles, and as he was not acquainted with Greek, he clearly attests that they were contained in the Syriac canon of his time, and must originally have had a place in the Peshito. (See Hug, *Introd. to N. T.*, § 65.) The argument, however, is highly precarious. (a), It is said that Ephraem's citations from these epistles are found, with the exception of a possible reference to Second Peter, only in the Greek translation of his writings, of which the trustworthiness is doubtful. (Westcott, *Canon of the New Testament*, Part III., Chap. II., p. 444.) (b), It cannot be shown that Ephraem was entirely unacquainted with Greek. Sozomen (*Hist. Eccles.*, III., 16) says that he was ignorant of Grecian learning, and Theodoret bears the same testimony. (*Hist. Eccles.*, IV., 26.) The *Life of Basil*, ascribed to Amphilochius (Migne, 73, 60), says that in visiting Basil Ephraem conversed with him through an interpreter. But that he was unable to converse in Greek is no evidence that he was totally ignorant of the language; and he occasionally makes use of Greek words in his writings. (See article in Smith & Wace's *Dict. of Christian Biography*.) (c), And further, if the citations may be trusted, and if he was wholly ignorant of Greek, he may have obtained his knowledge of these epistles through Syrian versions of later date than the Peshito, or from an interpreter, or from friends. Add to this the extreme improbability that writings once received should afterwards have been excluded from

the canon at a time when they had won general recognition throughout the church, and we cannot avoid the conclusion that the native Syrian canon did not contain these books.

This conclusion is confirmed by Chrysostom, who makes use of three catholic epistles only. Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium (A. D. 380), and Junilius (A. D. 550) attest that in their times opinions in the Syrian church were divided. Cosmas Indicopleustes (sixth century) says that the Syrian church received only three catholic epistles; but his account is full of inaccuracies. So late as the thirteenth century, Ebed Jesu, Bishop of Nisibis, included three catholic epistles only in his catalogue of New Testament writings. It is plain that the native Syrian, as distinguished from the Greek, church did not receive Second and Third John when the Peshito was framed.

The Muratorian canon, probably of the second century, quotes from the First Epistle of John and afterwards speaks of two epistles of John. The reference is probably to I. and II., though it may be to II. and III. Irenæus, near the close of the second century, quotes II. 7, 8, and refers the passage to the first epistle. (*Adv. Haer.*, iii. 16, 8.) Again, he cites II. 10, 11 as the words of John, the disciple of the Lord. (*Id.* i. 16, 3.) Clement, of Alexandria, about the same time, refers to the *larger* Epistle of John. (*Strom.*, ii. 15.) Eusebius says of Clement that "he has given in the *Hypotyposes* abridged accounts of all canonical Scripture, not omitting the disputed books. I refer to Jude and the other catholic epistles, and Barnabas, and the so-called apocalypse of Peter." (*Hist. Eccles.*, vi. 14.) This statement is confirmed, so far as the catholic epistles are concerned, by Photius of the ninth century (*Codez*, 109); and Cassiodorus, of the eighth century, says that Clement commented on I. and II. John.

Origen, in the third century, in his *Homilies on Joshua vii.*, extant only in the Latin translation, says that John sounded the trumpet in his epistles. He made no use of II. and III.; and Eusebius says, that in the fifth book of his *Expositions of John's Gospel*, Origen referred to the Gospel and Apocalypse as the work of John, and added, "He has left also an epistle of very few lines; perhaps, also, a second and third; but not all consider them gen

uine, and together they do not contain a hundred lines. (*Hist. Eccles.*, vi. 25.) In the seventh council of Carthage (A. D. 256) Aurelius, bishop of Chullabi, quoted II. 10, 11 as the words of John the apostle. (Routh, *Rel. Sacr.*, iii. 130.) Dionysius of Alexandria, in the third century, arguing that the Apocalypse is not the work of the apostle "by whom the Gospel of John and the catholic epistle were written," finds proof in the fact that John never names himself in his writings, as the author of the Apocalypse does. "But the evangelist did not prefix his name even to the catholic epistle. . . . But neither in the reputed Second or Third Epistle of John, though they are very short, does the name John appear; but there is written the anonymous phrase, 'the elder.'" (Euseb., *Hist. Eccles.*, vii. 25.) This is often cited as evidence that Dionysius accepted these epistles as John's; but considering how slight is the reference to II. and III., in contrast to the emphasis laid throughout the passage upon I., though the minor epistles would equally serve his purpose, and further the distinction indicated by the term *reputed*,¹ we must admit that he followed his master Origen, and regarded them as doubtful.

Alexander of Alexandria (A. D. 325), cites II. 10, 11, as the words of the blessed John. (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.*, i. 6.) Eusebius, of the fourth century, says that John in his epistles does not name himself, or calls himself elder, never apostle or evangelist. (*Demonst. Evang.*, iii. 5.) In his *History* (iii. 25) he says: "Among the disputed writings, which are, nevertheless, recognized by many, are extant the so-called Epistle of James and that of Jude, also the Second Epistle of Peter, and those that are called the Second and Third of John, whether they belong to the evangelist or to another person of the same name." (Comp. *Id.* iii. 24.) Jerome, at the close of the fourth century and the opening of the fifth, ascribes the second epistle (Letter cxxiii. 12), and again both epistles (Letter liii. 8; cxlvi. 1) to the Apostle John. Elsewhere he notes that both epistles "are said to be the work of John the presbyter, to the memory of whom another sepulchre is

¹ The word does not of itself necessarily convey the idea of doubt. It is the connection that gives it that force here.

shown at Ephesus to the present day, though some think that there are two memorials of this same John the evangelist." (*De Vir. Ill. c. g.*; comp. c. 18.)

That both epistles were generally accepted by the church as the work of John, the apostle, after the time of Eusebius, is attested by Athanasius (*Festal Letters*, 39), by Augustine (*Christian Doctrine*, II., 8), by Gregory Nazianzen (cited by Westcott, *Canon of N. T. App. D.*), by Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catechet. Lect.*, iv. 36), by Philastrius (*Haer.*, 86), by Epiphanius (*Haer.*, 76), and by the Councils of Laodicea (A. D. 363) and Carthage (A. D. 397). These witnesses cover the latter half of the fourth century. A thousand years later, doubts of the apostolic authorship of the epistles were revived by Erasmus, who attributed them to John the presbyter, and has been followed by many scholars. (See Ebrard on *Epistles of John*.)

Thus it appears that among ante-Nicene writers the second epistle is attested by Irenæus, the Muratorian canon, Clement of Alexandria, Aurelius, and Alexander of Alexandria. For the third epistle there is no explicit testimony, though it may have been among the catholic epistles on which Clement of Alexandria commented. No other writing of the New Testament is so slenderly supported by external evidence. That is not surprising, in view of the private, personal character of the letter; and it is worthy of note that the only portion of the *second* epistle cited by ante-Nicene writers is the single passage that might serve a controversial purpose (verses 7-11). Routh has stated the case correctly: "I must acknowledge that I have met with no ante-Nicene writer, perhaps because of the brevity of the epistle, who has made use of the third epistle without at the same time, after making mention of it, adding his own doubt, or that of others at least, regarding the genuineness of this and the second epistle." (*Rel. Sacr.*, i., 423.)

If we turn to consider the evidence which the epistles themselves afford, we observe, (a), That they are evidently from the same hand. They present the same title, the same mode of address, the same conclusion, the same style throughout. Jerome aptly styled them "twin sisters." (b), It is plain that they are

the work of the writer of the first epistle. They are marked by the same style, and, in a large degree, by the same forms of expression. The smaller letters apply to individual cases the principles which the larger letter affirms. The false teachers denounced in the second epistle belong to the class described in the first (chapter iv. 1, 2, 3; ii. 26), and specific directions are given for their treatment by believers. In the third epistle the love of the brethren and the practical expression of it, which fill so large a space in the first letter, are commended in a particular instance. (c), It is further evident that the first epistle is nearly related to the Gospel, so that the three epistles and the Gospel are manifestly the work of the same hand.¹

That these letters were not the work of a forger is plain, apart from the difficulty of counterfeiting the most intensely individual style which the New Testament presents; for what could be the motive of fabricating a writing with no dogmatic or controversial interest to serve? And what forger would adopt an ambiguous title, or represent the authority of the apostle whose place he sought to assume as openly defied and resisted within the church?

The main objections urged against the apostolic authorship of these epistles are three in number:

(a), The title *presbyter* is said to distinguish the writer from the apostle. Papias, speaking of the sources from which he derived the material for his *Expositions of Oracles of the Lord*, says: "If, then, any one came who had been a follower of the elders, I questioned him in regard to the words of the elders—what Andrew or what Peter said, or what was said by Philip, or by Thomas, or by James, or by John, or by Matthew, or by any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what things Aristion and the presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, say." (Euseb. *II. E.* iii. 39.) Eusebius interprets Papias as making a clear distinction between John the Presbyter and John the Apostle, and it is

¹ For a comparison of the three epistles with the Gospel, see *Speaker's Commentary*, Introduction to second edition, note; and DeWette, *Introduction to the New Testament*, § 180, b. For a comparison of the first epistle and the Gospel, see DeWette, § 177, a; Weiss, *Introduction to New Testament*, §§ 42-45, note 1.

difficult to attach any other meaning to his words. Many scholars maintain that Eusebius is mistaken, that Papias speaks of one John only, the apostle, and that there is no evidence of the existence of the presbyter. (See article in Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, "John the Presbyter." Farrar, *Early Days of Christianity*, excursus XIV. Schaff, *Church History*, ii. 697, note.) But to deny the distinction is to do violence to the words of Papias; and that the presbyter does not appear elsewhere in history is accounted for by the overshadowing reputation of the apostle. What do we know of Aristion, whom Papias sets side by side with the presbyter, as of equal authority, for "he mentions them frequently by name, and gives their traditions in his writings"? (Euseb. *Hist.* iii. 39.) Yet the memory of them both is preserved only in this passage of Papias. A reminiscence of the presbyter may, perhaps, be found in Dionysius of Alexandria, of the third century, who gave his opinion that the author of the Apocalypse was not the apostle, "but some other one of those in Asia, as they say that there are two monuments in Ephesus, each bearing the name of John." (*Id.* vii 25.)¹ It may further be noted that a passage in the Apostolic Constitutions, probably of the fourth century, names among the bishops ordained by the apostles "of Ephesus, Timotheus, ordained by Paul; and John, by me John." (vii. 46.) We may, therefore, regard the separate identity of John the presbyter as probable, though it cannot be established with certainty.

The earliest distinct suggestion that the second and third epistles may be ascribed to the presbyter is due to Jerome. In a passage already cited, they "are said to be the work of John the presbyter, to the memory of whom another sepulchre is shown at Ephesus to the present day, though some think that there are two memorials of this same John the Evangelist." (*De Vir.*, *Ill. c. g.*; compare chapter 18.) Considering, however, how closely these epistles are linked with the first, and that the title *presbyter* was as aptly worn by John as by Peter (1 Peter v. 5), and giving due weight to the external evidence, we need have no hesitation in attributing both epistles to the apostle. That they found a place

¹ Compare Jerome *De Vir. Ill. c. g.*, cited above.

in the canon is most readily explained upon the assumption that the church regarded them as his, and their position among the catholic epistles is probably due to the recognition of their relation to the first epistle.

The term *presbyter* is commonly employed in the New Testament as a title of authority, and in that sense it should be understood here. John assumes an official title because he asserts official authority. Why this particular title was chosen cannot be determined, though it may have been to designate a closer relation to the individual church and its members than the broader term *apostle*.

(b), The second objection is drawn from the passage relating to false teachers (II. 7-10), which is said to be inconsistent with the character of John, and even with the spirit of Christianity. But it should be observed that those of whom he speaks are false *teachers*, engaged in the specific work of propagating error; that their error is fundamental, threatening destruction to the faith; that they had once been in fellowship with the church, but had gone out from it and cut themselves off from the communion of saints (I. ii, 19), and that they were characterized not merely by intellectual error, but by moral perversity, as is indicated by the terms liar (i. 2-22), deceiver, anti-Christ. To welcome the teacher is to give countenance to his doctrine, and to further his work. Moreover, John uses language as severe in his First Epistle. (I. ii. 18-27; iv. 1-6.) To love truth is to hate falsehood. To love men is to hate the error that destroys them. It is truth that constitutes the bond of fellowship, truth that gives loveliness to life. He loves "in truth," "for the truth's sake." (II. 1; III. 1.) And if this be not in accord with the spirit of Christ, what shall be said of Paul? "Though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema. As we have said before, so say I now again, if any man preacheth unto you any gospel other than that which ye received, let him be anathema." (Gal. i. 8, 9; compare Gal. v. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 4, 13-15.) Peter (II. ii. 1-3) and Jude (4) speak with equal plainness, and Christ himself scourged the false teachers of his time with words of righteous wrath: thieves and

robbers, hirelings, hypocrites, serpents, offspring of vipers, sons of hell.¹

(c), It is said to be highly improbable that the authority of the apostle should be defied within the church. But it is easier to explain the conduct of Diotrephes as a fact than as a forgery, for who would fabricate so strange a tale? It has been shown that there is no reason to attribute the epistle to the presbyter. It was the work of the apostle, or of an imitator who reproduced his characteristic modes of thought and speech with marvellous skill but without apparent motive.

We conclude without hesitation from this review of the evidence that the Second and Third Epistles were written by the Apostle John, probably in the closing years of his life at his home in Ephesus.

Let us turn to consider the contents of the letters:

II. The question to whom the Second Epistle is addressed is variously answered. Is the term *lady* (*κυρία*) to be literally or figuratively interpreted? Does the apostle address an individual or a church?

(a), Some suppose that by *κυρία* is meant the universal church. (*Jerome Letters*, cxxiii. 12.) But this the personal tone of the letter forbids: the reference to *certain of thy children* (4), the purpose *to come unto you and to speak face to face* (12), and the greeting of *the children of thine elect sister* (13).

(b), Many scholars interpret the word as indicating a particular church, and the churches of Jerusalem, Ephesus, and Corinth are among those that have been suggested. It is argued that no individual could be said to be loved of *all them that know the truth* (1); but why not? Demetrius is said to have *the witness of all men, and of the truth itself* (III. 12); and Paul speaks of *the brother whose praise in the gospel is spread through all the churches*. (2 Cor. viii. 18.) It is further urged that *συνεκλητή* in 1 Peter v. 13 designates a church, and that the same meaning should be assigned to *ἐκκλησίᾳ* here. It is doubtful, however, whether that is the true sense of the word in that passage, and in any case it can

¹ See the story of the meeting of John with Cerinthus in the bath. (Euseb. *H. E.*, iii. 28; iv. 14; compare *Teaching of Twelve Apostles*, xi.

only be shown that the term is appropriate to a church, as Romans xvi. 13 shows that it is appropriate to an individual.

(c), As there is no reason to forsake the natural and obvious meaning of the word, we conclude that the letter was written to a Christian matron and her children. The question then arises, Is she addressed by name? And again various answers are returned.

(a), In a fragment preserved by Cassiodorus, Clement of Alexandria remarks, "The Second Epistle of John, which is written to virgins, is very simple. It was written to a Babylonian lady, by name Electa, and indicates the election of the holy church." As no instance has been found of the use of *Electa* as a proper name at this time, and as it is highly improbable that two sisters should bear the same name (13, τῆς ἀδελφῆς σου τῆς ἐκλεκτῆς), this opinion has no support and few supporters.

(b), It is maintained that her name was Electa Cyria. But to this the same objections apply. (W. and H. give ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ in the text, with Ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ in the margin.)

(c), Many scholars render, *to elect Cyria*, and without doubt that is the name, if the name is given. A serious grammatical difficulty lies in the way. We should certainly expect κυρία τῇ ἐκλεκτῇ, as we find in III. 1, Γαίῳ Γῶ ἀγαπῆτω. On the other hand, the name was usually employed in correspondence; the name *Cyria* was in use at the time (Lücke on the Epistles of John); and the omission of the article with κυρία is more easily accounted for if it is a proper noun. (Winer, *New Testament Grammar*, § 18, 6, note 4.)

(d), It is held that no name is given, and that κυρία signifies lady, a term which Epictetus says was applied to women from their fourteenth year. (Euchir. 62.) The article may be omitted, it is suggested, because, following the analogy of κύριος, κυρία is regarded grammatically as a proper name. The choice lies between *a* or *the elect lady* and *elect Cyria*. The American revisers would place *Cyria* in the margin; their judgment should be accepted, and then it remains an open question whether text and margin should not exchange places.

The term *elect* signifies in general *chosen of God*; when spe-

cially applied to an individual, it designates him as distinguished for Christian gifts and graces. To a woman of this character and to her children the letter is addressed with words of cordial greeting: "Whom I love in truth; and not I only, but also all they that know the truth." Fellowship in the truth is the true fellowship of love. The purpose of the letter is to warn them against certain false teachers. Error follows always upon the heels of truth. A definite body of truth is recognized. The main doctrines of the Christian faith have been clearly defined, and the believer is in possession of a standard wherewith to "prove the spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world." (1 John iv. 1.) This truth is traced to Christ, "the teaching of Christ." (2 John 9.) It proceeds from him whether he speaks in his own person or through his apostles, as God spake in old time through the prophets. During his earthly ministry he *began* both to do and to teach (Acts i. 1); he continues his work in the ministry of men inspired by his Spirit, so that the Book of the Acts is the gospel of the risen Christ. (Comp. Heb. ii. 3: "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation? which having at the first been spoken through the Lord, was confirmed unto us by them that heard.") This truth is not merely an intellectual creed; it is the law of life in which men must walk. (2 John 4; 3 John 3, 4.) The gospel is both creed and commandment. Doctrine issues in duty, and the end of the commandment is love. (Comp. Rom. xiii. 10; 1 Tim. i. 15.) The commandment is one (2 John 5), but it branches into many commandments (2 John 6) as it is applied to the varying circumstances of life. It is as old as the law of Moses. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second like unto it is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hangeth the whole law and the prophets." (Matt. xxii. 38-40. R. V.) While Jesus thus recognized that the central principle of the Mosaic law was love, he enjoined it upon his disciples as a new commandment. (John xiii. 34; xv. 12.) In the light of his life and death love has a new measure, a new motive, a new example, "Even as I

have loved you, that ye also love one another." (John xiii. 34.) (Comp. "As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you." John xvi. 9.) Love and obedience are united. Mark the reciprocal relation, "This is love, that we should walk after his commandment"; "This is the commandment . . . that ye should walk in (love)" (2 John 6). Love is the motive of obedience, obedience is the fruit of love. Obedience is love in action.

The teaching of Christ marks the limits of thought and life which it is not lawful to transgress. All spiritual truth is the unfolding of his word though his Spirit, whose office it is to lead men into all truth by testifying of him; all true life is obedience to his commandments. "Whosoever goeth onward," oversteps this boundary, "and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God."¹ To forsake the word of Christ is to turn away from God, for "he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God" (John iii. 34), and "he that is of God heareth the words of God." (John viii. 47.) The condition of progress is abiding in the truth. *Μὴ ὑπὲρ ὃ γέγραπται*—not beyond what is written—is the law that Paul enjoins. (1 Cor. iv. 6.) The principle has a special application to those gnostic teachers who boasted of their superior knowledge, while yet they knew not the deep things of God, but the depths of Satan. (Rev. ii. 24.) Their error was vital because it concerned the person of Christ. There are three truths regarding him which John teaches in his first epistle that men must believe: 1. That he is the Christ. "Who is the liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ?" (Chap. ii. 22.) "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God." (Chap. v. 1.) 2. That he is come in the flesh. "Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God." (Chap. iv. 2.) 3. That he is the Son of God. "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God abideth in him, and he in God." (Chap. iv. 15.) "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he

¹ Some render *προάγων* by *goeth before, taketh the lead* (Revised Version, margin), sets himself up as a teacher. The received text has *παράβαίνων* (Authorized Version, *transgresseth*), probably an early gloss, conveying a correct interpretation.

that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" (Chap. v. 5.) To lead men to this faith is the purpose of the gospel. "These are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name." (John xx. 31.)

The false teachers whom John here condemns denied that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh. The present participle (ἐρχόμενον; in I., iv. 2, ἐληλυθότα) may be chosen to call attention, not to the simple fact, but rather to the abiding nature of the incarnation. He not only became man, he continues to be God and man in two natures and one person forever.¹ This dual nature these men denied. Denial of the true humanity of Christ was one of the characteristic errors of gnosticism. That this subtle form of heresy took its rise in apostolic times is evident from the Epistle to the Colossians (see Lightfoot), 1 and 2 Timothy, 1 John, and the Apocalypse.² Assuming as a fundamental principle that matter is intrinsically evil, and that God can have no contact with it, the gnostics were forced to deny the divinity or the true humanity of Christ. If he be God he cannot take to himself a material body. Sometimes his body was held to be only a phantom, a spectral form, assumed simply to render him visible to the eyes of men. Cerinthus, a contemporary of John, taught that Jesus was "the Son of Joseph and Mary, according to the ordinary course of human generation, while he, nevertheless, was more righteous, prudent, and wise than other men. Moreover, after his baptism Christ descended upon him in the form of a dove from the Supreme Ruler, and then he proclaimed the unknown Father and performed miracles. But at last Christ departed from Jesus, and then Jesus suffered and rose again, while Christ remained impassible, inasmuch as he was a spiritual being." (Irenæus, *Adv. Haer.*, i. 26.) (Comp. Hippolytus, *Refutation* vii. 21; Euseb. *Hist.*, iii. 28.³) Thus he maintained that

¹ See Westcott on *Epistles of John*; additional note, I., iii. 5.

² "When the blood of Christ was but lately shed, and the apostles were still in Judea, the Lord's body was asserted to be a phantom."—*Jerome Adv. Lucif.* 23.

³ Irenæus says that John wrote his Gospel to refute Cerinthus and his predecessors, the Nicolaitans, while curiously enough within the next century both the Gospel and the Apocalypse were ascribed to Cerinthus. (Euseb. *Hist.*, vii. 25; see article *Alogi* in Smith and Wace.)

it was the man Jesus, not the God-man Jesus Christ, who suffered and died, because the divine and the human were merely associated for a time, not united in one person in him. Jesus came in the flesh, but not Jesus Christ. That this was felt by the early church to be a matter of vital importance many witnesses attest. Ignatius, whom a late tradition represents as a pupil of John, insists with vehement earnestness upon the reality of the passion. "But if it were, as certain persons who are godless, that is, unbelievers, say, that he suffered only in semblance, being themselves mere semblance, why am I in bonds? and why, also, do I desire to fight with wild beasts? So I die in vain. Truly, then, I lie against the Lord." (Trall. 10.) (Comp. Ephes. inscription, Trall. 9, with Lightfoot's notes; Magnes. 11, Smyrn. 2, 6; Polycarp to the Phil. vii.) Irenæus remarks: "Matthew might certainly have said, 'Now the birth of *Jesus* was on this wise'; but the Holy Ghost, foreseeing the corrupters (of the truth), and guarding by anticipation against their deceit, says by Matthew, 'But the birth of *Christ* was on this wise'; and that he is Emmanuel, lest perchance we might consider him as a mere man, . . . and that we should not imagine that Jesus was one and Christ another, but should know them to be one and the same." (*Adv. Hæc.*, iii. 16, 2.)

In thus denying either the divinity of Jesus or the humanity of Christ, gnosticism broke away from historical Christianity. It rejected the testimony of evangelists and apostles, and swept away the foundation of faith. Christianity is a historical religion. Its great doctrines are facts, attested by witnesses chosen of God. His disciples proved that he was both God and man, by showing that the prophecies relating to the Messiah were fulfilled in him, and by setting side by side the divine and the human features of his character and life. John testified that he was the eternal Word, because in him appeared the attributes of God; he testified that he became flesh, because we have heard, we have seen with our eyes, we beheld, and our hands handled the Word of life. (1 John i. 1.) He leaned upon the Master's breast; saw the blood and water that flowed from his wounded side; ate with him after he rose from the dead. This testimony gnosticism set

aside, yet sought to retain the Christ of faith while rejecting the Christ of history, to keep the truth while denying the fact, to preserve the fruits of faith while destroying the roots.¹

Moreover, to deny the dual nature of Christ is to set aside his atoning work. The Redeemer is the God-man. His humanity made it possible for him to suffer; his divinity gave infinite value to his suffering. If he were only God, he could not die; if he were only man, his death could not avail. The price of redemption is the blood of the Son of God.² If it was only the man Jesus that hung upon the cross, he may be a martyr, an example; he is not a Saviour.

Those who bring this doctrine, denying that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh, John condemns in unsparing terms. They reject the cardinal truth of Christianity. They are deceivers of men, enemies of Christ. Believers must hold no fellowship with them, lest they be corrupted, and lose the reward promised to the faithful.³ The term "antichrist" is peculiar to John, who uses it only in his epistles. (1 John ii. 18, 22; iv. 3; 2 John 7.) He speaks of many antichrists. Every one is antichrist who denies that Jesus is the Christ, or that he is come in the flesh. Whether the

¹ Observe the singular reading, *λύει* for *μὴ ὁμολογῇ*, in 1 John iv. 3. So W. H., in margin. Margin of Revised Version, *annulleth*; Vulgate, *solvit*. Socrates says that it was found in the ancient copies, and adds: "The mutilation of this passage is attributable to those who desired to separate the divine nature from the human economy, or, to use the very language of the early interpreters, some persons have corrupted this epistle, aiming at 'separating the manhood of Christ from his deity.' But the humanity is united to the divinity in the Saviour, so as to constitute, not two persons, but one only." (*Hist. Eccles.*, vii. 32.) This reading is attested also by Irenæus (*Haer.*, iii. 16, 8), by Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.*, v. 16), by Origen (on Matthew xxv. 14, Latin translation), by Augustine (*in loco*), and by Cassian (*Seven Books on the Incarnation*, v. 10). Lightfoot (*Essays on Supernatural Religion*, 118, note) and Farrar (*Early Days of Christianity*, *in loco*) incline to accept it. It is probably an ancient gloss, and indicates the sense in which the early church understood the words of the apostle.

² Acts xx. 28: "The church of God, which he purchased with his blood." (So W. H. and Revised Version, text. Many authorities for *θεοῦ* read *χριστοῦ*.) The phrase *blood of God* is used by Ignatius (Ephes. i.), by Tertullian (*Ad Uxor.* ii. 3), and the *blood of God the Son* by Clement of Alexandria (*Quis Div. Salv.* c. 34). "Permit me to be an imitator of the passion of my God." (Ignatius, Rom. vi.)

³ "If any man walketh in strange doctrine, he hath no fellowship with the passion." (Ignatius, Phil. iii.)

spirit of antichrist shall finally be embodied in a single person or power, as Paul teaches, John in his epistles neither affirms nor denies; but he refers to the coming of the antichrist as a truth already familiar to his readers: "As ye heard that antichrist cometh" (1 John ii. 18); "This is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come" (1 John iv. 3): and his teaching must, therefore, be interpreted in harmony with that of Christ and of Paul. The several antichrists are types and organs of the antichrist who is to come; and the Apocalypse shows that the ultimate representative of the spirit of antichrist shall be a person or power in whom the might of Satan shall be concentrated, and in whom it shall be destroyed. There are many false prophets (1 John iv. 1; Matt. xxiv. 5, 24; Mark xiii. 6), yet there is one false prophet. (Rev. xiii. 11-18; xix. 20.) Antichrist is many, yet one, and in this regard his kingdom is the counterfeit of the church of Christ, which consists of many members with one head, animated by one spirit, and forming one body. (1 Cor. xii. 12.)

III. The third epistle is addressed to Gaius, or in the Latin form Caius. Three persons of this name are mentioned elsewhere in the New Testament: (*a*), A man of Macedonia, Paul's companion in travel. (Acts xix. 29.) (*b*), Gaius, of Derbe, one of those who accompanied Paul from Macedonia "as far as Asia."¹ (Acts xx. 4.) (*c*), Gaius of Corinth, "my host, and of the whole church." (Rom. xvi. 23.) "I thank God that I baptized none of you, save Crispus and Gaius." (1 Cor. i. 14.) With him Bishop Alexander thinks it not improbable that the Gaius of this epistle may be identified, on the ground, (1), That he was noted for hospitality; (2), That there were dissensions in the church to which he belonged, as there were in the church at Corinth. (1 Cor. i. 10-15; *Clem. Rom. to the Cors.*, sections 44-48.) (3), That they are identified by the synopsis of sacred Scripture ascribed to Athanasius.² But it is highly improbable that the aged apostle should have contemplated a journey to Corinth (2 John 10, 14), and the name Gaius was in common use.³

¹ Many authorities omit these words.

² *Speaker's Commentary*, Introduction to Third Epistle.

³ One of this name is said to have been ordained Bishop of Pergamus by the apostle. (*Apostolic Constitutions*, vii. 46.)

The noble character of Gaius is indicated by the prayer of the apostle: "Beloved, I pray that in all things thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth." Elsewhere, in the letters of the New Testament, *grace and peace*, or, *grace, mercy, and peace*, as in Second John, are invoked. This is the only instance of apostolic salutation in which *temporal* blessings are asked, health and prosperity. John prays for Gaius that his body may be as healthful as his soul, that his circumstances may reflect his character. The words point to a far-reaching principle of the divine government, which here seems often to be suspended or baffled, but shall be vindicated hereafter. What men are determines what they have. Condition waits on character.

The letter is written to commend to the kindness of Gaius certain brethren, to whom he has already ministered, and who have now further need of his hospitality. "Brethren and strangers withal." Christ established a new relation of brotherhood, and men may be brethren in faith, though they be unknown by face. These men were evangelists,¹ itinerant preachers, missionaries sent out under the direction of the apostle to preach the gospel, and prepare the way for the settled pastor. "For the sake of the name they went forth," the name that is above every name. In the Old Testament, the word is employed to signify *the name of Jehovah*. (Lev. xxiv. 11, 16.) In the New Testament, *the name* is the name of Christ. (Acts v. 41, where the true reading is simply, as here, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος.) Similar is the use of *the way* (Acts ix. 2; xix. 9, 23; xxiv. 14, 22) for the Christian faith. (Compare *Ignat. Ephes.*, 3, Lightfoot's note; Euseb. *History*, v. 18.) In the spirit of Paul, they took nothing from the Gentiles,² unbelievers, lest they should give offence. Thus they were thrown upon the care of the church. The grace of hospitality is often commended in the New Testament. It springs naturally from

¹ The term evangelist occurs thrice only in the New Testament (Acts xxi. 8; Eph. iv. 11; 2 Tim. iv. 5), and has the meaning indicated above. (Compare Euseb. *History*. iii. 37.) The application of it to those by whom the Gospels were written is of later origin. (Euseb. *History*, iii. 39.)

² Some render, *they went forth from the Gentiles, taking nothing*, cast out and stripped of all they had.

the relation which believers sustain toward one another as brethren in Christ, and in the early days of the church it played an important part in the furtherance of the gospel. In both these epistles its importance is recognized; to brethren it must be accorded, to false teachers it must be denied. John affirms that he had already written to the church, but his letter had been suppressed or disregarded by Diotrephes. That letter some suppose to be his first or second epistle. Certain authorities insert *ἀν* after *ἔγραψα*, and the Vulgate reads, *scripsissem forsitan*. But if few of the words of the Master have been preserved, it is not strange that many of the writings of the apostles have perished. Diotrephes was an officer or a man of commanding influence in the church. He not only refused to obey the word of the apostle and receive the brethren whom he commended, but them that would obey he cast out of the church. It is a strange picture. The authority of the last of the apostles is openly defied and resisted within the church. The enemies of Paul withstood him upon the ground that he was not one of the twelve, and had no right to the title of apostle. Now the authority of John is set at naught, the last of those who had seen Christ in the flesh. Diotrephes brought malicious charges against him, "prating against us with wicked words." Of the nature of these charges no intimation is given; but the motive that actuated his conduct is made plain, he "loveth to have the pre-eminence among them." The love of place and power is deeply imbedded in human nature. It was one of the sins for which Christ most sternly rebuked the Jews. (Matt. vi. 1-5, 16; xxiii. 1-12.) Repeatedly he warned his disciples against it (Matt. xviii. 1-4; Mark xiii. 38-40; Luke xiv. 7-11; John xiii. 12-17), yet all the weight of his authority and his example could not repress the spirit of ambition. The sons of Zebedee desired that they might sit one on his right hand and one on his left hand in his kingdom, and the ten when they heard it were moved with indignation. (Matt. xx. 20-28.) At the table on which were spread the emblems of his body and his blood, beneath the shadow of the cross, "there arose a contention among them, which of them is accounted to be greatest." (Luke xxii. 24.) The spirit of self-seeking

which John had once shared is now directed against himself. Diotrephes regarded the government of the church as his peculiar province, with which not even an apostle should be suffered to interfere. The epistle thus affords an early and striking instance of that spirit of ambition which has wrought such havoc in the history of the church. The most prolific source of schism is self-seeking.

Against Diotrephes John asserts his apostolic authority. As before in the realm of doctrine, so here in the realm of government, he claims the first place, and speaks with the calm consciousness of power, assured that his presence shall suffice to put his adversaries to shame. "If I come, I will bring to remembrance his works which he doeth."

In contrast with Diotrephes, Demetrius is commended. Bishop Alexander thinks that he may be identified with Demetrius, the silversmith of Ephesus (Acts xix. 24), but there is little to support the conjecture. He may have been sent with these brethren to convey the letter and act in the name of the apostle.¹ He is highly honored, having the witness of all men, of believers in general, and perhaps of "them that are without" (1 Tim. iii. 7); of the truth itself, to which his life was conformed, for "wisdom is justified of all her children" (Luke vii. 35); and of the apostle and those associated with him in the church.² Demetrius and Diotrephes are examples of the good that must be followed and the evil that must be shunned.

Much remains to be said, but writing has grown irksome to the old man, and this letter, like the second, concludes with the hope that "I" shall shortly "see thee, and we shall speak face to face," and with friendly salutations.

Thus these letters set before us a life-like portrait of the beloved disciple, sketched by his own hand, as his long life was drawing to a close. His anxious care of the churches, his personal regard

¹ In the *Apostolic Constitutions* (vii. 46) he is said to have been ordained bishop of Philadelphia by the apostle.

² John uses the term ἐκκλησία only in this epistle and in the Apocalypse, and always in the sense of a particular society of believers, never, as Paul, of the whole body of the faithful.

for the members of his flock, his love of the brethren, his firm grasp of truth, his zeal for righteousness, his abhorrence of falsehood, his watchful interest in the spread of the gospel, the decision with which he distinguishes between truth and error, his devotion to the name, his recognition of the absolute and all-embracing nature of the teaching of Christ, these are features of his character that stand out in bold relief. To draw near the disciple is to draw near the Master, and his lofty intuition, his tender emotion, his heavenly mindedness, his intense personal affection for his Lord, are destined to exercise a larger influence upon the theology and the life of the church. It is the element of personal love to Christ, which he supremely represents, that gives to Christianity its distinctive character and power.

Certain features of the life of the church, too, are portrayed. It has an established faith and polity, and is engaged in missionary labors, sending out and supporting evangelists. The first place in the local church has become an object of ambition. That there is no hint of persecution points to the reign of Nerva, or the early days of Trajan. The dangers that threaten lie within, and are the same that have marred the peace and unity and crippled the power of the church in every age, heresy and schism. The root of schism is personal ambition. Mark how soon heresy arose, how widely it spread, what fundamental doctrines it assailed. There is no deviation from the faith, no corruption of morals, which has stained the history of the church, that may not be traced to the days of the apostles. But over against error is set the truth, and over against self-seeking is set the might of love, and love and truth shall prevail, for Christ is the truth, and God is love.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Peekskill, New York.

V. LATTER-DAY JUDAISM.

REV. DR. CHARLES has published this year a book on prophecy which is itself a prophecy.¹ It is a readable book. It limits discussion to those passages in the word of God which, in his judgment, apply to the four topics set forth in his title. As an interpreter he is a literalist. In his eschatology he is a pre-millenarian. His aim is a practical exposition of prophecy for plain, thoughtful readers. He is not polemic. He does not combat opposing views or even argue the correctness of his mode of interpretation. His object is to give the result of his studies in prophecy and an exposition of the views of his school of thinkers. To one who questions his extreme literalism, and whose accepted order of eschatology is not pre-millenarian, this work will prove unsatisfactory, since it demonstrates nothing, and begs what it might reasonably be expected to prove. But concede the order of decrees which the author postulates, and grant his fundamental assumption—that all predictive prophecy which can, with any show of plausibility, be construed literally ought to be so construed—and we have a logical, luminous, though startling, volume, popular in style, devout in spirit, and marked by profound reverence for the infallible Scriptures. Its style is lucid, its discussions brief, and on every page intensely in earnest. It is a frank and a mathematical effort at the solution of mooted questions of prophecy. It sets out before us a programme of the times and seasons which the Father hath put in his own power, and which are not for us to know—a programme that for audacity equals the wildest dreams and fancies that have characterized the ill-starred speculations of millenarians of the past centuries. His diagram of the future will commend itself to such as have a capacity for belief without evidence. There is a fallacy in

¹ LECTURES ON PROPHECY: An Exposition of Certain Scriptures with Reference to the History and End of the Papacy; the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine, their Repentance, and Enlargement under the Reign of the Son of David; and the New State in the Millennium. *By Benjamin H. Charles, D. D.* Fleming H. Revell Co., Chicago. 12mo, cloth. Pp. 320. Price, \$1.25.

his primary assumptions, and the "key" which he applies to the symbols of prophecy will seem adequate only to those whose imagination is at once powerful and disordered. Almost every position which the author assumes is a controverted one. Yet he steers clear of controversy. He is fair and courteous to those whose views run counter to his; and no one can read these lectures without feeling a respect for the author's zeal and piety.

But let us see what Dr. Charles teaches. He identifies the "little horn" of Daniel with the "man of sin" of First Thessalonians, and declares that they represent the papacy, which also is represented by Babylon, the great whore, and the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, in the Apocalypse. "The ten horns" of Daniel are ten kingdoms into which the Roman empire was disrupted by the barbarian hordes from the north. The "three horns" which fell are the three sub-divisions of the old empire over which the Pope obtained civil jurisdiction, to-wit, the Exarchate of Ravenna, Lombardy, and the State of the Church or Rome. The second coming of Christ, which is to wipe out the foul blot of papacy from the earth, will usher in the millennium. The seven kings of the seventeenth chapter of Revelation, of whom five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come, and which præterists refer to as many Roman emperors, represent seven successive dynasties or forms of government which ancient Rome enjoyed. The five that were fallen are the kings, the consuls, the dictators, the decemvirs, and the military tribunes. The one that "is" is the government by emperors; the one "not yet come" is the dukedom which followed the transfer of the capital to Constantinople. This dukedom was, after two centuries, swallowed up by the papacy, which is to last from its beginning twelve hundred and sixty years. The end of the papacy is not to be converted but to be destroyed at Christ's coming, which, in this year of grace, is now near at hand.

The Apocalypses of Daniel and John are designed to give us the "history of the world." In Christ's saying in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, that "this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled," the author makes "generation" mean "dispensation," a meaning which the Greek word used has

neither here nor anywhere else in the New Testament. The author recognizes three dispensations. From the creation of the world to the coming of Christ he calls the dispensation of the Father. From the first to the second coming of our Lord is the dispensation of the Spirit. From the second advent to the end of the millennium is the dispensation of the Son. The great apostasy of Second Thessalonians he puts before, not after the millennium. The "doctrine of devils" of 1 Timothy iv. 1, to which many shall give heed, is by a queer process of exegesis, in which the worship of demons means worshipping demigods and distinguished heroes, declared to be specifically the popish worship of the saints. The Book of Revelation he conceives to be a compendium of ecclesiastical history from the days of our Lord to the end of time. The outpouring of the vials points to successive periods in the world's history. We to-day are living between the sixth and the seventh vials. The first vial was poured out on the French as the right arm of the papacy, and describes the Revolution of 1789 and subsequent direful events that scourged that ill-fated land until the death of the king in 1793. The second vial was the Reign of Terror, which lasted from the death of the king to the establishment of the Directory in 1795. The third vial dates from the establishment of the Directory to the consulship of Napoleon in 1799. The fourth vial was poured out on the sun, to whom power was given to scorch men with fire; that sun was the great Napoleon on the imperial throne. The fifth vial was poured out on the seat of the beast—that is, on the papacy itself. This points to the blow, to its influence and prestige, which the Vatican received as a result of the scorching and blasting power of Napoleon. The sixth vial was poured upon the great river Euphrates. By a tortuous process, in which "waters" is made to mean "peoples," and Babylon, situated on the Euphrates and sustained by it, to mean the papacy nurtured by the peoples of the Roman Catholic countries of the earth, the conclusion is reached that this sixth vial points to the great convulsions that began in 1848 and continued until 1870, and which were marked by republican outbursts against tyrannical governments, and which ended by giving the third blow to the papal power, since which time the papacy

has been greatly shorn of respect in Europe. After the sixth vial we have the arrival of the three unclean spirits in appearance like frogs. These are made to be (1), Modern spiritualism; (2), Nihilism, anarchism, or socialism; (3), Mormonism. After the battle of Armageddon, the exegesis of which is not given us, the seventh vial will be poured out and the Son of God shall come. This seventh vial will be poured upon Satan's kingdom, and is identical with the tribulation of Matthew xxiv. 29. Such is the fanciful scheme which our author prescribes without argument, and according to which the whole of the sixteenth chapter of Revelation is devoted to a prophetic portrayal of upheavals in France.

In common with all of his school, Dr. Charles holds that the world is not to be converted by the ministry of preaching or through the agency of the Spirit. The preaching of the gospel in all the earth is "merely for a witness," though it will be made effective in saving a seed to praise our God from every nation. One of the conditions precedent to the return of our Lord is the return of all the Jews to Palestine, to make it once more their national abode, and constitute there the central state over which our returned Lord and King shall reign as the King of the Jews. The millennial kingdom will be essentially a revival of Judaism. He says: "The theocracy of God which was driven from among men by the rebellion of his ancient people in the days of Samuel the prophet (in demanding a king to rule over them as other Gentile nations were governed) will be restored by the clamor of God's faithful servants crying out, 'We want no King but Jesus.'" (P. 25.) The Jews are still God's covenant people, still the Israel of the promises.

But after the Jews shall have been happily restored to their ancient land and rehabilitated into a nation, they are to suffer a disastrous blow (Ezekiel xxxviii., xxxix.) from an invasion by the Russians allied with the inhabitants of the region round about the Caucasus. These are to pour in upon the land and cover it as a cloud. Their purpose will be the pillage of all that accumulated wealth which the Jews shall carry with them to Palestine, and which to-day with unmistakable thrift they are in so many coun-

tries gathering together. These wicked invaders are to be driven back with crushing defeat, and that in such a way that they will recognize the Almighty as the author of their calamity. But after this re-occupancy of the land by the Jews, and before their spiritual conversion, there is to be a great destruction of the Jews at the hand of the above-named invading Slavs. In this affliction only one-third of the Jews are to escape. Two-thirds of them are to be destroyed. This will be because the Jews formerly rejected their Messiah in the flesh, and as a proof that God was the author of all their calamities endured since that day. But the condition precedent to all these great convulsions and this national uplifting is the return of the Jews to their ancient land. This migration, Dr. Charles thinks, has already perceptibly begun, and from this time on will experience rapid acceleration. Already the evil doom of the papacy is overtaking her. In the past thirty-five years, he says, a change has come over the world in regard to her. She is tolerated but despised by the nations that formerly sustained her. The whole false system is shortly to sink to perdition. The eighteenth chapter of Revelation lays down the measure of punishment that shall be visited on her: "Reward her even as she rewarded you, and double unto her double according to her works: in the cup which she hath filled, fill to her double." This, with conscientious literalness, our author declares is heaven's rule on this point, "If the punishment is to be in kind, then where she has quartered 10,000, 20,000 shall receive the same; where she has put to the torture 20,000, 40,000 shall suffer likewise. Where she has driven 30,000 to dens and caves of the earth to hide and save their lives, 60,000 shall drink of the same cup. Where 40,000 have been bound at the stake, 80,000 now take their places to atone for their blood." The estimate of a venerable and learned minister, that the martyrs under papal persecutions foot up to 50,000,000, our author thinks is an exaggeration. But whatever the total, two for one shall the retribution be against this blood-thirsty power for the saints who have perished by its wickedness. All these plagues are to come on the papacy suddenly and in one day, not one prophetic day, or geological day, but in one literal day of twenty-four hours, she shall be utterly

destroyed and in all likelihood burned with fire. To see how this may be possible, Dr. Charles cites as a fact that the whole country around Rome is underlaid with the proper element for destruction by volcanic action. Rome's fate is to be another Herculaneum, a second Sodom. In the twenty-sixth chapter of Leviticus God speaks of punishing the Hebrews seven times for their sins. Here our author clutches at a date and applies his "key." A "time" is a year of 360 days, and each day a year. "Seven times" are 2,520 years. Making these "times" begin with B. C. 606, the date of the captivity of Judah, this gives us 1914 A. D. as the end of the "seven times." Somewhere near this, doubtless that year, our Lord shall come and receive the kingdom and sit upon the throne of his father David; that is, we are within seventeen years of the millennium and of the resurrection of all the righteous dead that it is assumed will attend its inauguration. In the next seventeen years the rich Jews will have completed their re-occupancy of Canaan, the disastrous collision with the forces of the Czar and the troopers from the Caucasus, with its rivers of bloodshed, will be over, and the remnant of the Jews converted to the faith of the Crucified One.

With the regeneration of society then instituted will occur also the regeneration of external nature. Drouths and frosts will then be things of the past. Climatic and meteorological laws as now known will be superseded. Carnivorous animals, ceasing to bite and devour, will become herbivorous, even as, in Dr. Charles' opinion, they did not devour one another before the fall of Adam. The glowing prophecy of Isaiah ii. 6-9, as to the wolf dwelling with the lamb, and the leopard lying down with the kid, and the lion eating straw like the ox, refers not as figurative speech to the changes already introduced and realized under gospel influences, but literally to wolves, lambs, leopards, kids, lions, and oxen. Isaiah xxxv. 6, 7, and lv. 13, are construed with the same painful literalness. This delightful millennial state is to continue not one thousand years, but one thousand prophetic years, that is, three hundred and sixty-five thousand years. What is to come after that our author does not discuss.

Such is the scheme which these lectures unfold. It is pro-

pounded as a faithful effort to interpret what has been revealed for our faith and comfort. The author is not conscious of straining prophecy or of prying unduly into the hidden councils of God. The programme is shorn of some of the absurdities which have characterized past attempts of speculative and dreamy minds to work out the equations of prophecy. Concede its prime assumptions and the legitimacy of its exegetical method, and this programme is as good as any we have seen elaborated along these lines, and no less surely doomed to disappointment. No other scheme would be any more a fit or any less a guess. The trouble with his order is that it is a theory and not a demonstration. The world must move with speed, and racial movements be accelerated beyond anything of which history gives us knowledge, or the projected course of events is refuted ere it is published. An able though erratic lawyer once remarked to the writer, that here in our fair Southland was being fulfilled in our day one of the most ancient and remarkable prophecies of Scripture. He referred to Genesis ix. 27: "God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant." "For," says he, "the white man descended from Japheth has driven out the red man and dwells in his habitations, and has the black man, the descendants of Ham, to wait on him as his servant. God had his eye on the Gulf States of our Union in uttering this prophecy." That this was a prophecy of the conversion of the Japhetic races to a share in the true religion preserved in the line of Shem and Abraham was unknown to my friend. He seized upon a mere external surface resemblance, and that coincidence was sufficient to satisfy him that such was the import of the prophecy. So with all these speculations about Napoleon and the Directory and the Roman consuls, tribunes, and dictators. They are but painfully studied resemblances, and can claim no higher ground for our credence as the true meaning of the prophecies in hand. The question of what the Scriptures must and do mean yields in the hands of the literalist to the question of what they may be made to mean. The early fathers, according to Godet, dwelt with pleasure on the allegorical interpretation of the parable of the good Samaritan. The man wounded on the way from Jerusalem

down to Jericho represents, they say, humanity. The brigands among whom he fell represent the devil. The priest and the Levite represent the law and the prophets. The Samaritan is Jesus himself. The oil and wine represent divine grace; the ass, the body of Christ; the inn is the church; the inn-keeper, its bishop. Jerusalem is heaven, and the expected return of the Samaritan is the final advent of Christ. As a piece of ingenuity this is a striking exposition. If we concede the allegorical method of reading the word, we cannot say the parable does not mean just this. So with literalism. If, by electing among the many thousand events that exemplify the providence and judgment of God, we make to-day a happy selection of them so related as to harmonize with the outstanding angles and corners of prophecy, and to fit some key, or glossary, or measuring rod adopted for the solution of the symbols of prophecy, and so develop an order and chronology of events yet to be, no one can refute that chronology, or question it otherwise than by questioning the whole method of literal interpretation; by denying that prophecy was ever intended to be a syllabus of history anticipated, or the concealment of God's wondrous purposes only to be unravelled and disclosed by methods of guess work. The glossary of prophetic words given by Dr. Charles, and in high favor with the calculators of prophecy, and their right to apply it regardlessly to any and all passages, and measure from just any and every starting-point of history that their hasty judgment may settle upon, crossing from this nation's history to that, and finding intimations of events both mighty and minute, needs verification. He should prove his "key." He may be satisfied he has the "combination" which unlocks the great future. Others have been equally satisfied before him. The future alone can reveal the true measure of sagacity displayed in this latest guess. The key, however, gives out and is discarded when our author comes to expound the seventh vial.

The relation of events, causal and successive, in the pre-millennarian eschatology, while a favorite with many, and to some minds a very fascinating one, is not that usually held among Protestant Christians. It is not the prevalent view among Presbyterians.

It is not the view taught in the Catechisms or in the Confession of Faith of our church. On the other hand it is there expressly disavowed. Standard writers on systematic theology, who necessarily take the comprehensive view of God's gracious plan, almost to a man discard this order as one which cannot be made, in its varied elements, to square with itself or with the most definite teachings of Scripture. It assumes that the second advent will usher in the millennium, when our Lord will reign on the throne of Israel in Jerusalem as did King David. It foresees a brilliant reign whose splendors are to be sensuous and Jewish. It avoids those passages of Scripture which connect immediately the coming of Christ and the final judgment of all the world, and which affirms that this coming is a coming to judge. It holds to a separate resurrection of the righteous and the wicked, one at either end of the millennium, a doctrine that rests on one verse in the midst of a mysterious and symbolical passage, and on a construction of that verse that is not only not necessary but is in the highest degree improbable; since, in addition to being out of analogy with the rest of Scripture, it assumes without proof that the resurrection of the souls there spoken of is a resurrection of the body, and further, that it is a resurrection of all the righteous dead; a meaning not only not in the passage but expressly precluded by the fact that it is of certain martyrs who had been beheaded for the witness of Jesus that the evangelist in writing. The theory of two resurrections, that apex upon which the whole millenarian scheme, as an inverted pyramid, rests, is not an affirmation of Scripture but an unwarranted inference. The closing verses of the twentieth chapter of Revelation describe a general judgment of all the dead, small and great, as they stand before God and the great white throne, and a general resurrection of all the dead, to the end that they appear before that august tribunal. Now, I cannot place these events nor can I know what is meant by the last "great day," if I postulate the theory of two resurrections as it is usually held. A prominent editor of the church in commenting on this phase of the teachings of this book, says: "We note again, what has before been observed, that there is small place for the doctrine of the general judgment of the great

day, of which our Lord speaks in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew and his servant on Mars Hill. Page after page, chapter after chapter, are given to the description of his advent to crush the world powers and begin his personal reign in Jerusalem, and the imagery belonging to the judgment is indiscriminately appropriated to the description of his advent to rule, but the great day of the Lord seems to be put in a corner, and we are left in doubt as to whether our Lord is to come a third time in the clouds of heaven to publicly judge every creature in earth, heaven, and hell." In fact, so great difficulty is experienced by some premilenarians in finding a proper place for the last great day when all the quick and the dead shall be judged, that they make it begin with the first resurrection and the judgment of the righteous, extend all the way across the vast millennium and include the second resurrection and the judgment of the wicked. But if by any stretch of language this can be called a day, it is such a departure from the principle of literal interpretation which lies at the basis of the whole system as to utterly vitiate and refute the principle, and deprive the system built upon it of all claims upon our serious consideration. With how much greater difficulty must this protracted period be fitted to the words of our Saviour in John v. 28, 29, "*The hour is coming in which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth—they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation.*"

We would distinguish between the mediatorial kingdom to which our Lord was exalted after his resurrection, when all power in heaven and earth was committed to his hands, and the kingdom of glory which he will exercise on the earth after his personal return. With the former dominion, which extends over all principalities and powers, he was invested for the purpose of carrying on his work to its consummation, of gathering in the number of his elect. The latter will succeed the general resurrection and the final judgment, when having subdued all his enemies he will deliver up the former kingdom, as having now accomplished its office, and will no longer "reign over the universe as Mediator, but only as God." His headship over his people will endure for-

ever, and in that glorified office he will reign with the saints on the earth. We would put the millennium under the former reign, and distinguish between it and the kingdom of triumphal glory which will follow the second advent. But the premillennial advocates view the millennium as falling within our Lord's final reign of glory. In the view of some, the mediatorial work will not yet be past, nor his mediatorial reign terminated. The race will be propagated (though the risen saints may not marry), and souls continue to be saved and gathered into the kingdom that now fills the earth with blazing glory. Instead of enjoying at his return the unspeakable blessing of his completed kingdom with the whole number of his ransomed, the work of gathering home the elect will continue throughout his personal reign on the earth.

The number of the elect will not be complete at his return, but his return will be to set up and inaugurate more efficient methods of subduing the world to faith and holy living. But if, as others hold, the race will not be propagated in successive generations in the millennium, but all, the risen and those who did not taste of death, are to be as the angels, then the number of the elect will be complete at his coming, and as that event is assumed to be nigh at hand, is doubtless near completion now, with but a limited portion of the earth in subjection to its rightful king, and an abrupt terminus put to all further extension of his kingdom by his coming and calling halt to those spiritual and missionary agencies that are now daily expanding the number of his subjects. In either case, though our ascended Lord is to-day clothed with all power in heaven and on earth and is abundantly exercising his omnipotent resources to the accomplishment of all the divine and gracious purposes with reference to the church, yet his kingdom as administered to-day is soon to experience a change of methods. The dispensation of the Spirit will be succeeded by that of the Son. Present methods will be discarded and abandoned as futile or no longer necessary. The Holy Spirit must abandon his ministry with the greater part of that wondrous mission on which he was sent unaccomplished. In spite of all affirmations to the contrary, this scheme as presented by its advocates is dishonoring to the Holy Ghost and to the present dispensation

as administered by him, in that it is to terminate in confessed failure. There is to be no truly world-wide conquest save that which comes by slaughter and destruction of the enemies of the King. The gospel contending against the forces of evil is engaged in a woeful battle, which it will never triumphantly win, unless the Lord come and revise the methods of his administration. From gazing fondly on the glory that soon must dawn, the present comes to be pictured as days of darkness and gloom, and the church as enveloped in solitude and sorrows by reason of the absence of its Head, as though that Head were not now with us in conquering power and fulness of saving energy and grace, as though his kingdom were not now marching on with ever-increasing strides to the ultimate conquest of the world. The truth is not weak, but is proving, even under this lame ministration of the Spirit, effective to the salvation of myriads of the elect. The Crucified sees of the travail of his soul and is satisfied. Yet we hear brethren cry out for our Lord's return because the present dispensation is too slow and its victories too meagre—a return that will check further enlargement, save the conversion of the Jews. And this virtual imputation of failure to the blessed dispensation of the Holy Ghost can only be denied by minimizing the purposes of this dispensation and in holding, as Dr. Charles does, that the world is not to be converted by agencies now operative, and that the gospel is not to be preached to the ends of the earth with any expectation that it will convert the world. For its fullest power, for anything like adequate power, it will require the mighty miracle of the second advent, coming down upon men in millennial force and energy. Not to save and transform the world, but simply for a witness is the gospel to be preached among all nations. And this “preaching for a witness” is too generally spoken of as though designed simply to lay such a basis of knowledge of God and his gospel as will establish and consciously convict the nations of their guilt in rejecting Christ. It is to give such a knowledge of Christ as will make men fit subjects for condemnation for turning away from Christ. “The fulness of the Gentiles,” who must be brought in before blindness is lifted from Israel, is not, according to Dr. Charles, a general conversion

of the nations, but simply the ingathering of some, and by implication a few, incidentally to the preaching of the gospel in every land "for a witness"; which preaching itself is but a paving of the way for what is the great hope of the world and the most effective means of applying salvation readily to man, the visible presence of Christ returned to the earth. The gathering in of the Jews, in the interpretation of these latter-day Judaists, means all the Jews. The fulness of the Gentiles means a handful here and there. Evidently the Jews are still in the favored place, and will occupy the seats of honor in the kingdom. We think that this school, if it does not misconceive, yet by emphasis misrepresents, the design of preaching the gospel throughout the world. The duty of the apostles was to bear witness. It is the duty of the church to-day, and the design of such testimony is that men may believe and not that they may be made the more fit for judgment. Furthermore, we think there is here a great exaggeration of the importance of the Jew in the future of the church and of his prominence in dispensations to come, as taught in the Scripture. That the knowledge of the Lord is to cover the earth, that all nations and kindreds and tongues are to be brought to Messiah's feet, is taught in the word. But we see the Jew cast out by reason of his rejection of the Messiah. As an assurance of the universality of the Messiah's conquests and a conspicuous example of the divine forgiveness, we are told that the Jew also will ultimately be restored to the covenant and restored to the faith from which his fathers apostatized; but that he is to enjoy in the kingdom, when restored, a higher dignity or honor, that he will still be, *par excellence*, the chosen people of God, or have any special privileges by reason of his former station under the Abrahamic national covenant, we are not told. We are all one in the kingdom and so it will ever continue; no Jew, no Greek, but all one in Christ. The Jew now shut out will be restored to an equal place with the Gentile, but not to a higher, as though he and his country and his capital and his ancient theocracy in its pristine purity, are to be the nucleus of the glorified millennial kingdom, which will be so enlarged as to embrace all believers among the Gentiles. Why, then, this extra concern, this deeper grief at the present

apostasy of this ancient people? The condition of any people away from God excites our pity and should awaken yearnings for their salvation. But that the condition of one is more desperate or pitiable than another, we cannot believe; nor have we been able to feel a deeper concern for the welfare of the Jews than for the welfare of the Irish, or the Brazilians or the Coreans. If Scripture expressly says the Jews are to be reclaimed to their ancient faith, it equally teaches what is equally precious to us and equally a ground of heavenly joy, that these other races and peoples are to give in their loyal allegiance to our Redeemer and King. No, this prominence of the Jew in the premillenarian scheme is due to the fact that it is a sensuous, earthly and Judaistic scheme. It is because prophecies that apply to the church or the spiritual Israel are taken in a grossly literal sense and applied to Israel in the flesh, thus unwarrantedly magnifying the glory of the Jews in Christ's kingdom. As it is expressly said that the Jew must be converted before Christ's return, and as by construction and evaporation of their import, the other conditions prescribed as precedent to his return are all assumed to be virtually fulfilled, there remains to the immediate return of our Lord chiefly the hindrance of the continued apostasy of Abraham's natural children.* Hence anxiety goes out to these, and their importance rises in this stage of the economy of grace above all other nations, and the view is held that the paramount duty of the church to-day is to pray and labor for the saving of the Jews. But are the Jews still a people nearer to God and dearer to him in his covenant than all other peoples? Once more favored than the Gentiles, is it their destiny to be again more highly honored? When the Gentiles, as a class, were outside the covenant, prophecies ran that they should be gathered in to an equal place with the Jews. When the Jews, by rejecting their Messiah, were cast out, prophecy declared that they should be brought back to faith and allegiance. But do we read that it is to anything else than a place with believing Gentiles under the one ancient and eternal covenant? Are the promises of their recovery any more particular or rich than those under the old dispensation which foretell the conversion of the isles of the sea? No, it is to equal privi-

leges with the Gentiles as people of God, and not to their former theocratic conditions and superior advantages that they are to be restored. The tropes employed by the prophets and drawn from the symbolism of the existing economy only point to evangelical blessings and privileges for the Gentiles; and this is all Paul affirms of the Jews in their recovery. The middle wall once broken down is not to be re-erected at the outburst of the millenium. We Gentiles have to-day every privilege the Jews ever had. Nor will they have hereafter any station or honor denied as such to us. The end for which the Jew was promoted to special privilege has been accomplished. His importance in the future lies in the fact that having been cast out for rejecting Christ he is to be brought back after the nations have been evangelized, in order that all may be saved.

To find a warrant for the prominence he assigns the Jews in the kingdom of the future, our author is compelled to take as applying to the natural seed of Abraham that great wealth of prophecies in the Old Testament which are generally held to apply to the enlargement and prosperity of the church as the spiritual Israel. Gleaning through the ancient Scriptures, he throws all prophecies of special mercy to Israel, couched in theocratic terms, into one conglomerate pile, and assumes that they all literally refer to the conversion of the Jews to Christ. Blessings upon the church resulting from the universal outpouring of the Spirit, because foretold in figures and symbols current in the old economy, are without scruple taken as applying literally and solely to the ancient stock of Israel. Prophecies of enlargement after return from the Babylonish captivity, not exhaustively fulfilled in the increase and triumphs of the remnant that returned to Canaan, are understood to point to a further return of the Hebrew race to their former land and the re-erection of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine at some time yet future. But we claim that the Old Testament does not make any such plain statement of a Jewish apostasy resulting from their national rejection of Christ, with a subsequent conversion to their former covenant place, as would authorize us to apply the prophecies of Hosea and Ezekiel to a flourishing state populated by Jews restored to their land and their faith from their present dispersion throughout the earth and

the present infidelity of the great body of them. In fact, the Scripture does not warrant the expectation of a resettlement of Palestine by the Hebrew race, or the erection of his throne by our Lord at his return in Jerusalem. That David's greater Son shall receive an everlasting kingdom, and shall sit upon the throne and wield the sceptre of his father David, does not necessarily imply that that throne shall be literal and local, or that the sceptre shall be a Jewish one, waved over Jewish subjects residing amid the hills and valleys of modern Palestine. Such passages as Zech. xii. 10; Psa. xiv. 7; Jer. xxxi. 31-34; Isa. lix. 20; xxvii. 9, foretell their conversion after apostasy and their restoration to covenant privileges, but to nothing more. Hosea, after foretelling the complete destruction of the ten tribes, the exile of the people, and the desolation of the land, predicts four blessings in the remote future: (1), The immense multiplication of Israel as the sands of the sea. (2), Their return to God and enjoyment of his favor. (3), Union with Judah under King David, the lawful prince of David's line. (4), Their return thus united from the land of their captivity. Now it is conceded that these predictions of blessings were partially fulfilled and in a literal way before Christ. But we do not find what corresponds particularly and directly to the terms of these predictions. The entire body of Israel was not united to Judah or converted to God, nor did all of the captivity return. Zerubbabel was not king. There was no multitude like the sand of the sea and no such possession of the favor of God as proved permanent. The full realization of this and similar prophecies, not being found before the coming of Christ, must be sought since his coming. Now the literalist looks for this fulfilment in the lineal descendants of Abraham. These are to be converted to God, become once more his people, and become as numerous as the stars of heaven and the sand which is by the seashore. Christ, the theocratic king, must reign from an earthly throne. The prediction is a national one. We hold, however, that the blessings foretold are those to come upon the spiritual seed who inherit by a spiritual succession the privileges of Israel. The people of God under the new as well as the old dispensation are called Israel. They who are of faith, Paul argues with energy, are Abraham's seed. Believers to-day, not by a figure of

speech, but by a regular succession, are Israel. Over and over by the most abundant and explicit testimony the New Testament affirms this doctrine. These very predictions of Hosea are applied by two apostles to believing Gentiles. (Rom. ix. 25, 26; 1 Peter ii. 9, 10.) Canaan derives its significance from being the seat of God's worship. There was the temple where God's special presence was manifested. There were the priesthood, the sacrifices and the altar. To be expelled from this land was to be expelled from the presence and constituted worship of God. To be restored to it was to be restored to his favor. Since with the passing away of type and ceremonial all worship is now spiritual and unrestricted as to locality, every land is now become a Canaan to God's worshipping children. The lineal descendents of the patriarchs have now but little part in these blessings. At this time they are as truly aliens as ever the Gentiles were. But the fulfilment of these gracious promises does not for that reason tarry, nor are the blessings held in abeyance. There is no New Testament passage that authorizes the expectation that these striking figures are to be understood literally, or that affirms a future migration of the twelve tribes to Palestine. Paul in the eleventh chapter of Romans, which gives us our highest and ultimate knowledge of the purposes of God as to this ancient and honorable people, makes no such intimation. There may be such a reoccupancy of the land in the future, but if so, it falls outside the pale of clearly uttered prophecy. Yet Dr. Charles, in the singleness with which he centres his gaze upon the literal Israel, scarcely recognizes, if he alludes to it at all, that the church is the Israel contemplated in the prophetic outlook, and that Christians are the people "which are called by my name."

We have heretofore stated that, in magnifying the present need for the personal and visible return of our Lord, premillenarians seem to underrate the dispensation of the Spirit, whom our ascended Lord has left as his adequate representative in applying his work, in comparison with the more splendid work of world-wide conversion that is to mark, as they think, the reappearance of our Lord. We do not look upon his return as a means of gathering in the souls of the elect from a sinful world to a life of obedience, but as a coming into the midst of his completed church

at the end of the work of ingathering. Not only do we put highest honor, but all honor, on the Spirit as the efficient agent in gathering into one, throughout the world, the elect of our God. In true yearning for his coming, whether in spiritual grace, in millennial power, or in triumphs of final victory at the last crowning day, we do most heartily join. But in the sense of longing for a visible return as the great agency in the conversion of the elect, for want of which Zion now languishes and gropes in darkness, we cannot join, because we do not read that Christ has either authorized such an expectation, or constituted such a plan of gracious procedure. Nor do we cry out for the conversion of the Jews as the next step in the on-hastening of the decrees to their consummation. We would magnify the ingathering of the Gentiles as being a matter of as great moment, as precious in its results, and as universal and extensive in its scope, as the ingathering of the Jews; and as the former is, in the order of God's plan, to occur first, there, the great heathen world, without neglecting the Jews meanwhile, is the great objective point of our present missionary obligation and the designated sphere of our evangelistic activity. Without neglecting the seed of Jacob, let us labor for the ingathering of the Gentiles.

Dr. Charles thinks that this dispensation is drawing to a close. Many others similarly read the signs of the times. They see marks of the great apostasy on every hand. So some have thought in every century and decade since our Lord ascended to the skies. We cannot but believe, however, that this dispensation is yet in its infancy, and that its past exhibitions of grace and power are but a foretaste of the mighty fruitage that is to be realized in the millenniums which stretch out before us. It casts a reflection on the seriousness of missions to claim that the word has now been preached in the earth in any such sense as the Scriptures tell us that it must be before our Lord's personal return. We cannot clear our skirts of further concern for the Gentiles while directing henceforth our chief thought to the stock of Israel, as though its impeniteny were now the chief remaining hindrance to our Lord's return. A recent copy of *The Missionary* enumerates some regions on our globe in which the gospel is not preached at all, and whose heathenism is unrelieved and utter, and in which countries

there is an aggregate population of 140,000,000 souls. That same journal tells us that, in addition to this, there are 1,400 cities in China alone without missionaries, with an estimated population of 100,000,000, and that there are fully a million unevangelized villages in that kingdom. Yet Dr. Charles, on page 364, counts China, Japan, and the states along the Andes as sufficiently evangelized to come within the description of being preached to for a witness. With such an overwhelming preponderance of the earth's population yet heathen, we cannot feel that the times are ripe for the return of our Lord and King. His throne must still be in the heavens, and his mediatorial work engage his gracious activity. There is yet a wondrous mission for the Spirit in the earth, that shall surpass in magnitude and splendor all his mighty achievements thus far performed, and in its gracious blessing upon heart and society will fully equal aught that would flow from the presence of our returned Lord. No mightier change will mark the dawning of the millennium than that which is compassed in the regeneration and sanctification of the soul; and no joys shall the enraptured saints share in the kingdom of glory that are not the direct result of that work of the Holy Spirit by which he ministers to-day in the hearts of the chosen.

Writers like Dr. Charles, while not "higher critics," are yet "conjectural critics." They proceed by a system of guessing. But we doubt if guess work in the interpretation of the word of God is profitable. His guess that Mormonism is one of the frog-like beasts of the Apocalypse looks to a single country of the globe, remote from France, to a remote territory in that land, to a wave that relatively to other gigantic evils has affected the world at large and the progress of the church but little, and that in a half-century has spent its force, and overlooks the far grosser immorality of the same class that to-day abounds, and has for centuries abounded, all over the Christian and Mohammedan world. What is Salt Lake City to compare with Paris, or a score of other cities, for licentiousness? Then it is a fair question if the course of events in France has been any more momentous or intimately connected with the maintenance or degradation of the papacy than that in other countries in this and other centuries. It may also be questioned whether it is likely that prophecy is more inti-

mately concerned with the progress of affairs in Europe than with those in Asia, Africa and America in the past and the coming centuries. It may be questioned further whether the papacy has been so staggered and sunken by the convulsions of the past one hundred years in Europe as to weaken its influence and destroy its power to deceive, in any such degree as is here represented, and as forebodes its immediate downfall. Probing out hints, a year is fixed for our Lord's return. Is there not danger of again giving ground for the ancient cavil: "Where is the promise of his coming," and of thus bringing prophecy itself into contempt? Again, is there not danger of imputing to those who do not so understand the word as to think that the end of all things is at hand, a lack of interest in our Lord's kingdom, and slacker zeal for his glory among men? A recent circular which summoned the chieftains of the premillennial faith to a conference for study and prayer, and we may believe for propagandism, at Toccoa, Ga., runs: "We who love and look for his appearing and kingdom do unite in calling a conference," etc. While we admire and love these signers as brethren, zealous for the Master, and faithful in his work, we may rightly ask if in assuming to style themselves, as a party designation, those who love and look for his appearing and kingdom, there is not an intimation that their postmillennial brethren are behind them in love for the Master, and zeal for his kingdom, and as having fewer hopes centered in the blessed day of his return. If such be the fruitage of this doctrine in the hearts of its earnest advocates, may we not question whether this lively expectation is so powerful a promoter of holiness and piety as it is held by them to be. We believe that the consummation of the believer's blessedness will not be realized till our triumphant Lord and King shall come again, raise us up in holiness, and openly acknowledge us in the day of final judgment, and take us to be ever with him in his consummated kingdom. All our hopes rest in that wondrous appearance and kingdom. To render these hopes ardent, and this fond anticipation a stimulus to holy activity, we do not feel that there is any need of a reconstruction of the eschatology of the Scriptures and of the Westminster Standards.

W. A. ALEXANDER.

VI. "MAY KNOW THAT I AM JEHOVAH."—A BIBLE STUDY.

THESE words are of frequent occurrence and cannot fail to strike the attentive student as peculiar. The God of Israel evidently takes much pains to impress the truth that he is Jehovah. Much importance, then, must attach to this fact, and it behooves us to make diligent inquiry as to its meaning.

Obviously, he does not mean to remind them, as of a forgotten fact, that his *name* is Jehovah. Ezekiel made much use of these words when for many generations the Jews had known that the name of their God was Jehovah.

Neither did Jehovah mean merely to identify himself with the God of their fathers; to assure them that he was the God whom their fathers worshipped. Some plausibility attaches to this idea in view of Ex. vi. 2, 3: "And God spake unto Moses and said unto him, I am Jehovah: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I not known unto them." The patriarchs knew that his *name* was Jehovah, and this fact does not contradict the statement of Ex. vi. 3. Let us note a few passages in evidence. (Gen. xiv. 22)—"Abram said to the king of Sodom, I have lift up mine hand unto Jehovah, the most high God." (xv. 7)—"And he said unto him, I am Jehovah, that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it." (xxi. 33)—"And Abraham planted a grove in Beersheba, and called on the name of Jehovah, the everlasting God." (xxiv. 42)—Abraham's servant prayed: "O Jehovah, God of my master Abraham." (xxiv. 3)—Abraham said to his servant: "I will make thee swear by Jehovah, the God of the heaven, and the God of the earth." (xxviii. 13)—"And, behold, Jehovah stood above it, and said (to Jacob), I am Jehovah, God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac." The most indubitable evidence is to be found in Gen. xxii. 14: "Abraham called the name of that

place Jehovah-jireh: as it is said to this day, in the mount of Jehovah it shall be seen." These citations suffice to show that the name Jehovah was familiar to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

But how are they to be reconciled with Ex. vi. 3, which says: "But by my name Jehovah was I not known to them?" This inquiry introduces us to the real meaning of the phrase: "That ye may know that I am Jehovah." God's dealings with his people should prove to them and others that he is all that is implied in the name Jehovah. The name is significant. "God said to Moses, I am that I am: and he said, Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, I am hath sent me unto you"—(Ex. iii. 14.) He is, or will be, is the literal meaning of Jehovah. When he says I AM THAT I AM he obviously does not mean to assert self-existence of himself but constancy. That which he is, he ever is, without variableness or shadow of turning, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. Has he made a covenant with his people?—they may rely on its fulfilment. And so we read in Ezek. xvi. 62: "I will establish my covenant with thee; and thou shalt know that I am Jehovah"; in other words, they will know him in the *establishment* of his covenant, as faithful to his promises. "This is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations"—(Ex. iii. 15). "I will praise thee for thy loving-kindness and for thy *truth*, for thou hast exalted thy word (faithfulness) above all thy name"—(Psa. cxxxviii. 2)—*i. e.*, above every other revelation of himself by name.

The name Jehovah ought then to be peculiarly dear to us. It is much to be regretted that the Authorized Version, and even the Victorian Revision (the American committee dissenting) render the word Jehovah—Lord, in capitals. What excuse can be given for setting aside the name which the only true God declares to be his memorial unto all generations? Converts from heathenism in this, our day, distinguish him from their own vain gods by his name Jehovah. In our judgment this blemish alone should suffice for the rejection of any proposed new version. The old version needs revision, but no revision should be accounted satisfactory which retains this mistranslation.

But now the question will intrude: How does this explain the statement that the true God was not known to the patriarchs by

his name Jehovah? Surely the patriarchs had experimental knowledge of God not only as almighty but also as faithful. In the birth of Isaac, Abraham had experimental knowledge of the Almighty God as the God whose name is Jehovah. Let us turn again to the third chapter of Exodus and note the circumstances under which the true God was to manifest himself to Israel in Egypt not only as the Almighty God but as Jehovah. “I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land unto a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey”—(Ex. iii. 8.) The same is asserted in verse 17. Again, in chapter vi., after declaring himself to be Jehovah, and that by his name Jehovah he was not known to the patriarchs, he adds: “I have also established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, wherein they were strangers, and ye shall know that I am Jehovah your God, which bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will bring you into the land, concerning the which I did swear to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob; and I will give it to you for an heritage: I am Jehovah.” (Ex. vi. 4, 7, 8.) In Ezekiel xx. 5, 6 we have reference to this event: “Thus saith the Lord God, In the day when I chose Israel, and lifted up mine hand unto the seed of the house of Jacob, *and made myself known* unto them in the land of Egypt, when I lifted up mine hand unto them, *saying, I am Jehovah* your God; in the day that I lifted up mine hand unto them, *to bring them forth of the land of Egypt into a land that I had espied for them*, flowing with milk and honey.”

Obviously, then, it was not in the fulfilment of any and every promise that the Almighty was known as Jehovah. Obviously, the birth of Isaac was not the event which made God known as Jehovah, for we are expressly told that by that name he was not known to the patriarchs. It was in the fulfilment of a special promise that he was to be so known; and in the passages cited we are expressly told what that was, so emphatically that there is no room for error. He was known then, and could not have possibly been known as Jehovah before his fulfilment of his covenant with Abraham to put his seed in possession of the land of

Canaan. Israel in Egypt could not have known God as Jehovah with respect to the promised seed, who came in the person of Jesus centuries later. In the deliverance from Egypt the initial step was realized by all Israel; for Joshua, Caleb, the Levites, and the little ones the promise was fully realized. It was because Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob did not come into possession of the promised land that they did not know God as Jehovah; because Israel did, they knew him as Jehovah. In this connection, let us note the words of Stephen, as given in Acts vii. 4, 5: "He removed him into this land, wherein ye now dwell. And he gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on: yet he *promised* that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child."

Is it not now evident that it was with respect to the promise of Canaan that the patriarchs knew not God as Jehovah, and that it was in the fulfilment of this promise that Israel was now to recognize their fathers' God as Jehovah, the faithful promiser?

That this is correct a further examination of the phrase will thoroughly establish.

Turn now to Exodus vii. 5: "And the Egyptians shall know that I am Jehovah, *when* I stretch forth mine hand upon Egypt, and bring out the children of Israel from among them." They would know, because God had said to Abraham: "Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them: and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge; and afterward shall they come out with great substance." (Gen. xv. 13, 14.)

In the miracles wrought by Moses, Pharaoh was to see evidence that the God of Israel was faithful and able to fulfil his promises. "In this thou shalt know that I am Jehovah"—(Exod. vii. 17).

When the children of Israel murmured that God had brought them into the wilderness to kill the whole assembly with hunger, Jehovah spake by Moses: "At even ye shall eat flesh, and in the morning ye *shall* be filled with bread; and ye shall know that I am Jehovah your God"—(Exod. xvi. 12). These are but a few out of many passages which show that the knowledge of Jehovah

is the knowledge of a covenant-keeping God in the realization of his promises, with more or less direct reference to the land of promise.

And the phrase appears with greater frequency in the prophecies concerning the restoration of the Jews in the days of the Messiah. In the fact of their repossession of Canaan both Jew and Gentile will know that our God is Jehovah. "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people [Israel]: and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. . . . And thou shalt know that I am Jehovah: *for they shall not be ashamed that wait for me*"—(Isaiah xlix. 22, 23). "Whereas thou hast been forsaken and hated, so that no man went through thee, I will make thee an eternal excellence, a joy of many generations. . . . And thou shalt know that I Jehovah am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the Mighty One of Jacob"—(Isa. lx. 15, 16). "I will bring them again to this land: and I will build them, and *not pull* them down; and I will plant them, and *not pluck* them up. And I will give them a heart to know me, that I am Jehovah"—(Jer. xxiv. 6, 7).

The prophecies of Ezekiel are notable for this fact, that Israel was to know that their God was Jehovah, not in fulfilment of a promise alone respecting the land, but also of threats of dispossession. In the thirtieth chapter of Deuteronomy, Moses recites the promises and threats: "If thine heart turn away, . . . I denounce unto you this day, . . . that ye shall not prolong your days upon *the land*, whither thou passest over Jordan to go to possess it. . . . That thou mayest love Jehovah thy God, . . . that thou mayest dwell in *the land* which Jehovah swore unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give them." On Ebal and Gerizim, in the sight of all Israel, the promises and the threats were solemnly recited. Let us now note how it is prophesied that Israel should know Jehovah both in threats and promises concerning the *land*. "When ye shall be scattered through the countries ye shall remember me among the nations, and they shall loathe themselves for the evils which they have committed in all their abominations, and they shall know that I

am Jehovah, and that I have *not said in vain* that I would do this evil upon them; so will I stretch out my hand upon them and make the *land* desolate; and they shall know that I am Jehovah"—(Ezek. vi. 8-10, 14). On the other hand: "I will accept you with your sweet savor, when I gather you out of the countries wherein ye have been scattered, and ye shall know that I am Jehovah, *when I shall bring you into the land* of Israel, into the country for the which I lifted up mine hand to give it to your fathers"—(*Ib.* xx. 41, 42).

Let two other passages suffice: "*Then* shall they know that I am Jehovah when I have laid the *land* most desolate because of all their abominations which they have committed"—(Ezek. xxxiii. 29).

Surely the following has reference to a promise yet to be fulfilled: "So the house of Israel shall know that I am Jehovah their God from that day *forward*. And the heathen shall know that the house of Israel went into captivity for their iniquity, because they trespassed against me, therefore hid I my face from them. . . . *Then* shall they know that I am Jehovah their God, which caused them to be led into captivity among the heathen: but I have gathered them unto their *own land*. . . . Neither will I hide my face any more from them, for I have poured out my Spirit upon the house of Israel"—(Ezek. xxxix. 22, 23, 28, 29).

If this view of the phrase be correct, then the prophecies concerning the restoration of the land to Israel are to be interpreted literally, for in such restoration both Jew and Gentile will have signal proof that our God is Jehovah—a covenant-keeping God. Since there are promises yet awaiting the future, whose fulfilment is designed to prove to all generations that he is Jehovah, how inexcusable it is to hide that name in the word Lord. Jehovah is my name forever.

A satisfactory exposition of the statement in Exod. vi. 3, "By my name Jehovah was I not known unto them," renders nugatory much effort of the Higher Critics to prove a manifold authorship of the Pentateuch.

A question naturally arises here: Why has God chosen to make

the fulfilment of his promises concerning the *land* the especial proof of his character as Jehovah? And what special interest has this for Gentiles? The answer is not difficult:

1. The Jews in their deliverance from bondage and their settlement in Canaan are a type of all who are redeemed from the bondage of sin and translated out of the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of his dear Son.

2. The covenant with Abraham to put his seed in possession of the land of Canaan, is not a covenant with his literal seed only. The land of Canaan is itself a type of the earth wrested from the hands of Satan. All the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Anointed—the seed of Abraham. Had Joshua given them rest, then had not the Spirit spoken of another rest. The rest of the Messiah "shall be glorious."

In this connection let me quote a few sentences from a short article of Rev. Dr. E. C. Gordon in *The Religious Outlook* for July, 1897: "The great object of God in creation, so far as man is concerned, is shown to be expressed in the grant of dominion. (Gen. i. 26–30.) The object of the Eden covenant was to confirm man in the possession of God's image and the involved grant of dominion. This grant, temporarily inoperative, through sin, is renewed in the primeval gospel promises; is certified and sealed in the covenant made with *Abraham and Israel*; and is to be completely realized in the consummation of redemption, which consummation involves nothing less than an eternal and heavenly kingdom in a renewed earth, in which Messiah and his redeemed saints reign as sons of God."

The Old Testament saints themselves perceived that the promise of the land had a vastly wider reach than the possession of little Canaan. In Hebrews xi. 9, 13 we read: "By faith he (Abraham) sojourned in the land of promise as in a strange country; . . . he looked for a city . . . whose builder and maker is God. . . . These all died in faith, not having received the promises (things promised), but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth."

There is to be a redemption of the purchased possession. Then shall we know that our God is Jehovah. We know it now. It has been known ever since Moses led Israel out of Egypt. It seems that we shall have new proof when Israel is restored to the land. And in the great day of the Lord we shall have consummated proof when the meek shall inherit the earth. Surely Jehovah is his name forever; this is his memorial unto all generations.

JOHN W. PRIMROSE.

Greenville, Miss.

VII. AN INFALLIBLE REVELATION PRACTICABLE AND NECESSARY.

“CAN WE HAVE AND DO WE NEED AN INFALLIBLE REVELATION?”

THE above is the caption of an article in the November number of *The Arena*. It is signed by one who styles himself Rev. T. Ernest Allen, thus claiming himself to be an ambassador of the Lord Jesus Christ. He then proceeds to discredit his pretended commission, and to disprove the trustworthiness of his message, by an attempt to demonstrate, according to his own language, “That the dogma of Bible infallibility is not one entitled to be accepted as a postulate of Christianity.”

It is the purpose of this paper to expose the fallacy of his reasoning, and to show that such a position must lead not merely to the rejection of the infallibility of the Scriptures, but that it even involves the rejection of the idea of the “higher critics,” that the Bible contains an infallible revelation. According to the teaching of this new apostle it cannot be proved that one single statement of the Bible contains an infallible truth. His theory would not only permit us to consider the accounts of the fall and of the flood as probable myths, and to discredit the authenticity of the Pentateuch and Isaiah, but there could be no certainty that God had ever infallibly revealed to man a plan of salvation. There could be no proof of an infallible Christ. In fact, there could be no infallible truth. Thus we shall find that beneath the clerical coat there grins the ghastly skeleton of agnosticism, the rankest infidelity of the nineteenth century.

1. The first argument of the Rev. T. Ernest Allen is founded on “*the antecedent improbability that a man or book is infallible.*” This fact has always been recognized by those who claim an infallible Bible and an infallible Christ. Christians claim that it is the one infallible book, and the one infallible man; that the infallibility of the book is attested, as no other book has been, by the character of its revelation, the fulfilment of its prophecies, the

miraculous attestation of the authority of its writers. The infallibility of the Christ is manifested in that he possesses the only perfect character ever lived or portrayed, in that his teachings are wiser and better than all human philosophy, and his claims of infallibility are enforced by the miracles that he wrought, and by his resurrection from the dead. These and like facts we hold are sufficient to remove the antecedent improbabilities of the case.

2. The second and third arguments of this clerical agnostic are so near akin that we shall consider them together. He says: "*We have no test whatever which can discriminate between a finite authority not yet transcended and an infallible authority. Only an infallible being can apply the necessary tests to prove that a man or book is infallible.*" These illogical and truth-destroying propositions he endeavors to uphold by the following illustration: Scientist A is supposed to hold that "all x is y." After a time P comes along, and by greater knowledge discredits A, by finding that "in some cases x is not y." This formula of logic he applies to the Bible as follows: B supposes "the whole of the Bible is true," C, more unfolded than B, may at any time point out errors which will compel the restatement, "Some of the Bible is not true."

We acknowledge, in the case of the scientist, that in many instances his conclusions have been proven erroneous by later scientists, and therefore, the deductions of scientists are not all of them infallible; but the pseudo-preacher, in applying this principle to the Bible, does not claim at this point that C has ever proved that some of the Bible is not true, but only asserts that "C may point out errors." Neither A, nor B, nor C, nor D, nor E, down to the end of the alphabet, through many centuries, embracing the periods of man's highest development and greatest enlightenment, have ever proved the Bible to be erroneous, so that it is not probable that the proposition of B can ever be overthrown.

The Bible has endured successfully every test of fallibility known to man. Its prophecies have been unfailingly fulfilled; and every honest mind that admits these facts must exclaim, "thy testimonies are true," "thy word is truth," it is infallible.

To the statement that only an infallible being can apply the necessary tests to prove a man or book infallible, we might reply that an infallible God has attested the infallibility of the Bible and of the Christ, but in order to convince this incredulous believer it would be necessary to have some other infallible being to test the infallibility of the infallible God, and so on, *ad infinitum*.

If only an infallible being can decide as to the infallibility of a book, or of a man, then only an infallible being can judge of the infallibility of any statement of that book, or of any other book. In fact, none but an infallible being could judge of the infallibility of any fact, statement, or thought. Thus fallible man could know nothing infallible. He would be cast upon a sea of doubt, without chart or compass. He could not be certain as to the truth of any statement contained in the Bible, or any other book. What he thinks he knows to-day may prove false to-morrow. He cannot know infallibly that he himself exists, so that it is useless to speculate about God, or Christ, or heaven. Such is the dark abyss of agnosticism into which this would-be-spiritual guide would hurl us. May God deliver us and him from such a philosophy!

3. The fourth argument aimed by this modern theological Aristotle at the "dogma of Bible infallibility" is, that "*the fallibility of man necessarily involves a fallible interpretation and application, and so destroys that very certitude, the alleged need for which constitutes the raison d'être for such a revelation.*"

Under this head he endeavors to show that such is the weakness of some of our mental faculties, and so divergent the comprehension of men that even if we had an infallible revelation we could not comprehend it, nor agree as to its meaning. In proof, he cites us to the large number of creeds and sects which have sprung up in the church, and inquires, "If infallibility is worth anything in every-day life, how happens it that there are so many sects?"

(1), The mere fact that a truth or a book is infallible does not indicate necessarily that it is difficult for a fallible mind to comprehend it. Because $1 + 1 = 2$ is infallibly true, it is not, therefore, difficult to comprehend.

(2), The Bible, emanating from a divine source and treating of many spiritual things, must necessarily contain many things beyond human comprehension. This only proves its divine origin. His fourth argument, if true, would disprove the divine origin of a revelation as well as its infallibility.

(3), Granting an all-wise God, he could reveal an infallible truth so that it could be comprehended by the human mind, or he could reveal it so that every mind might comprehend as much of it as would be needful. This is all that has ever been claimed by those who hold the "dogma of Bible infallibility." God has given us an infallible book, which contains an infallible revelation of his will concerning our salvation, and every man may comprehend as much as is needful for salvation, and the book itself is sufficiently clear as to what is essential. "Seek and ye shall find."

(4), There are many infallible truths contained in the infallible Bible about which fallible men may differ. They are more or less important in their nature. By a consecrated life, and constant prayer for the illumination of the Spirit, some are brought to comprehend more of these truths than others, but this only makes our views the more divergent.

Who knows but that God, according to his purpose, has so revealed his truth that these diverse creeds might arise concerning many things, not essential to salvation, that he might so overrule these differences in his church as to perfect the whole body of Christ, and hasten the coming of his kingdom? Let no Christian in his earnest desire to unify the church destroy the infallible rock, Christ Jesus, upon which the church is built. The foundation of an infallible Christ revealed in an infallible Bible, together with "the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace," are far more essential to the life and existence of the church than any outward formal union.

4. Mr. Allen's fifth argument is that "*A consideration of the internal evidence shows the Bible not to be infallible.*" While he claims that there are many discrepancies in the Bible, yet he seems to stake this argument upon what appears to him "a clear case of contradiction" in the variations to be found as to the in-

scriptions on the cross, recorded by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. He arranges them thus: "This is Jesus the King of the Jews"; "The King of the Jews"; "This is the King of the Jews"; "Jesus of Nazareth the King of the Jews." He notes the fact that it was written in three languages—in Hebrew and in Latin and in Greek—but says, "Granting that it was different in the three languages, and that three of the evangelists took their records, one from each language, both of which suppositions are improbable, how are we to account for the fourth?" The variation only appears in the name or address. Now why should it be thought improbable that the inscription differed somewhat in the title which was prefixed to the accusation? The Jews would have been concerned to know not only the accusation, but the name of the man, and the place of his birth, that they might know his city and tribe, and for them Pilate may have written the longer inscription.

Romans might have been interested to know the name as well as the accusation, but the Greeks would care nothing about name nor lineage, only they would know of what he had been accused.

The fourth or shortest inscription might be accounted for by the fact that Mark quoted in Greek from the Latin, and that the slight variation was caused by the difference in the idioms of the language. To my mind, however, there is yet another and better explanation. Mr. Allen has failed to give a full statement of the case. It is recorded thus:

Matthew xxvii. 37: "And (they) set up over his head his *accusation* written, THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS."

Mark xv. 26: "And the *superscription* of his accusation was written over, THE KING OF THE JEWS."

Luke xxiii. 38: "And a *superscription* also was written over him in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew, THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS."

John xix. 19–22: "And Pilate wrote a *title*, and put it on the cross. And the writing was, JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS. This *title* then read many of the Jews; . . . and it was written in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin. Then said the chief priests of the Jews to Pilate, Write not, The King of the Jews;

but that he said, I am King of the Jews. Pilate answered, What I have written I have written."

Concerning these inscriptions note (1), That each of the evangelists includes the brief inscription of Mark, "The King of the Jews." The Jews had preferred the charge against him before Pilate, that he claimed to be the King of the Jews. Pilate had examined him as touching that point. It was upon that charge he had been condemned. The soldiers had mocked him, saying, "Hail! King of the Jews." The Jews derided him while on the cross, saying, "If he be the King of Israel"; and it was to these exact words in the inscription that the chief priests took exception when they said to Pilate, "Write not, The King of the Jews."

2. The remaining words of the inscription are, according to Luke, "This is"; Matthew adds, "This is Jesus"; and John records, "Jesus of Nazareth."

The words "this is" are implied in each inscription, and must be supplied, at least in the mind, in order to complete the grammatical construction of the sentence, and it is very natural to suppose that they were inserted in the title as it appeared in one or the other of the three languages. The other words, "Jesus" and "Jesus of Nazareth," only give the name and address of the person crucified, and do not form a part of the accusation at all. They were probably written above the accusation, according to ancient custom, and were omitted in whole or in part by the evangelists as they saw fit, without altering the real inscription.

3. Finally, it is evident from the language used by the various evangelists that each did not purpose to write out every word just as it appeared on the cross.

Matthew wrote, "his accusation" (*τὴν αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ*); Mark records, "the superscription of his accusation" (*ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένη*); Luke quotes, "a superscription" (*ἐπιγραφὴ*), and John gives, "a title" (*τίτλον*).

If, then, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John did not purpose each of them to quote the same thing, or to use the identical words, and all the words that appeared on the cross; and if the inscription quoted appeared in three languages, how, then, can they be made to contradict each other? Yet they all alike record the

same thing, using the identical words, except that three of them add words omitted by others which do not in the least alter or modify the meaning.

Surely Rev. T. Ernest Allen will find few Christians who can be convinced by this argument that "the dogma of Bible infallibility is not one to be accepted as a postulate of Christianity."

It seems to my mind that one who would thus destroy the certain foundation of the Christian's faith, which he has come professedly to establish, must prove a blind leader of the blind. Does he imagine that if he can destroy the "infallible book" and "the infallible man," that he can do away with creeds and sects and bring man nearer to God? Surely not! Religions would be multiplied and creeds would be as diverse as men. If the one infallible book and the one infallible plan of salvation do not unite the church of God, it will never be united. If we are not brought in close touch with God through the infallible man, Christ Jesus, and through the constant indwelling of his divine Spirit, it is not probable that we will be brought any nearer to him by our "religious environment," or by the "universality of revelation," which is the "new gospel" that this man preaches.

Conclusion: *We must have and we do need an infallible revelation.*

T. W. RAYMOND.

Holly Springs, Miss.

VIII. THE BIBLE STUDY UNION LESSONS.

IN the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY for April, 1897, is an article on "The Sunday-School; Its Present Peril." The object of this article seems to be, first, to discredit the statements and conclusions of a paper by President Hervey, of the Teacher's College, New York, which appeared in the *Review of Reviews* for December, 1896; and, secondly and principally, to use this paper as a basis of criticism on *The Bible Study Union Lessons*. It is to the latter portion only of the article that I wish to call attention.

In reading this article one can hardly fail to notice a singular inconsistency. After having shown that President Hervey's statements of fact regarding the origin of the Sunday school idea, the work of Robert Raikes, and the origin of the International Lesson system, are incorrect in many particulars, the writer comes to what he calls the "chief aim" of his article, which is in effect the disparagement of *The Bible Study Union Lessons*, and bases all his criticism of these lessons on President Hervey's statements regarding them. One would suppose that since those statements had been found so inaccurate regarding almost every other point touching Sunday-school matters, that portion of them relating to The Bible Study Union would have been received with caution; but, on the contrary, they are very mistakenly accepted in this article as "all that we need to know" on that subject.

The point in President Hervey's paper on which the writer in the QUARTERLY bases his principal objections to *The Bible Study Union Lessons* is the following: "Dr. Harper was also the supervising editor of the first published lessons of the series, and ever since the lessons have been edited by men of scholarship who are in sympathy with President Harper's spirit and method." This "spirit and method" seem to the writer in the QUARTERLY to be especially dangerous, and because by the above statement he is led to believe that *The Bible Study Union Lessons* embody this

“spirit and method” he feels it his duty to oppose them vigorously. “When we reflect for a moment,” he says, “on the cheek and push of the men of this school [that is, the school represented, as he thinks, by The Bible Study Union]; when we remember that behind the ‘five hundred distinguished college presidents,’ etc. [who form The Bible Study Union], is all the prestige of the University of Chicago with its millions of endowment, its vast printing presses, its multitudinous publications, etc., this proposal to substitute The Bible Study Union for the International Sunday-school Union is one to call for most serious consideration.”

This is an illustration of how far astray one may go by starting wrong. The plain facts in the case are as follows: President Harper has had nothing whatever to do with *The Bible Study Union Lessons* since 1st of July, 1891, at which time his six months’ editorial supervision of them ceased. The lessons that he edited contained nothing, so far as the present writer is aware, that ever aroused, or that was fitted to arouse, any objection whatever from even the most conservative theologian; and even were it otherwise, they have long since gone out of print. President Harper is not even included among the “five hundred distinguished college presidents,” etc., who form The Bible Study Union. The University of Chicago has absolutely nothing to do with *The Bible Study Union Lessons*, and the spectre raised of the direful consequences which may follow from its president’s connection with these lessons is wholly devoid of all reality.

But the objection in the *QUARTERLY* includes not only President Harper, but all the editors of the lessons, who are characterized in it as men of “cheek and push,” as well as of unsound views. Foremost among the gentlemen thus lightly spoken of is President Alvah Hovey, D. D., LL. D., for many years president of the Newton Theological Institution, the most important theological school of the Baptist denomination in America. It is hardly necessary to say that President Hovey is a gentleman whose modesty and dignified Christian character, whose reputation as a conservative scholar of large acquirements and sound judgment, have for a whole generation been recognized from the Atlantic to the Pacific. As author or editor of various standard theological

works and Scripture commentaries, as well as theological professor, he is too well and favorably known to require defence at my hands. For the past two years he has been consulting editor of *The Bible Study Union Lessons*. His oversight has been especially directed toward securing in them a thoroughly orthodox presentation of biblical truth covering all those great doctrines of Scripture on which the evangelical denominations are agreed. During this time not only has every view presented in the published lessons been endorsed by him, but such care has been taken by the office editors in working out the lessons that not a critical suggestion made by them in the copy has been disapproved by him. No better guarantee than this of the soundness of the lessons themselves could be either asked or secured.

President Hovey's editorship covers the years 1897 and 1896. The special editor in 1895 was Professor Charles Rufus Brown, D. D., also of the Newton Theological Institution, and a specialist in Old Testament studies. So careful was he regarding the outline of Old Testament history, which was prepared and published under his editorial supervision, that before its final adoption for use by The Bible Study Union it was submitted to about eighty Old Testament professors and experts of all denominations and shades of opinion in all parts of the country, every one of whom approved the outline as a satisfactory presentation of the principal facts in Old Testament history. Among these distinguished gentlemen were Professor William H. Green, D. D., of Princeton Theological Seminary; Professor Howard Osgood, D. D., of Rochester Theological Seminary; Professor Willis J. Beecher, D. D., of Auburn Theological Seminary; Professor Milton S. Terry, D. D., of Garrett Biblical Institute; and Rev. George Dana Boardman, D. D., of Philadelphia. Only one of the above named is a member of The Bible Study Union, but as fair-minded Christian scholars they could not refuse their approbation of the line of Old Testament work proposed by it.

The special editor for the course on "The History of the Apostolic Church," issued in 1894, was Professor Ernest De Witt Burton, D. D., who began his work with The Bible Study Union while holding the chair of New Testament interpretation in the

Newton Theological Institution, and continued it for a time after his transfer to the University of Chicago. The special editor for the course on "The Gospel History of Jesus Christ" issued in 1893, was Professor William Arnold Stevens, D. D., LL. D., of the Rochester Theological Seminary. Both Professor Stevens and Professor Burton are thoroughly evangelical scholars, of great reputation for accuracy and for good judgment. Extracts from their work on these lessons, in another part of this paper, show that on all the crucial doctrines relating to the person and work of Christ they are eminently sound. Did space allow, their soundness on all the other great doctrines of Scripture could easily be shown. It is certain that against neither of them can there lie any charges like those implied in the article in the April QUARTERLY.

In view of the suspicions that for various reasons have been industriously circulated against *The Bible Study Union Lessons*, and the many misrepresentations that have been made concerning them, the keenest and most critical eyes have searched through and through these lessons, vainly endeavoring to find some trace of unevangelical teaching, but with the result, repeatedly expressed to the present writer, of great satisfaction with the strength and clearness of their teachings regarding all the great doctrines of the gospel.

A letter on this subject comes to hand while writing this paragraph. It is from the Rev. Albert H. Plumb, D. D., for more than twenty-five years pastor of Walnut Avenue Congregational Church in this city, for many years a member of the Prudential Committee of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and everywhere recognized as one of the ablest and staunchest defenders of orthodoxy in the Congregational denomination. After a thorough use of these lessons in his own Bible class, Dr. Plumb writes: "I am so much gratified at the specially clear and scriptural teaching of *The Bible Study Union Lessons* that I feel constrained to express to the editors my hearty thanks. The special skill with which the great fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith—the deity of our Lord, the expiatory character of his work, the ruin of human nature, and

the necessity of the new birth—are continually inculcated in these lessons is seen in the easy and natural way in which the attention of pupils is turned to the specific and positive declarations of the Scriptures on these points. A wise way of asking questions and answering them by the definite statements of the Bible itself serves to imbue the minds of the learners with these vital truths just as they are given us by God. It is everywhere apparent that the sound evangelical faith is positively taught, not only in the very words of inspiration, but also by explicit statements in the interpretation of those words. Furthermore, the challenge can safely be made to any one, to find in these publications any false teaching on the leading facts and truths of the gospel. This judgment can be confirmed by abundant citations. The following may suffice: (1), The divinity of Christ as stated or implied in his own words (with texts under each head). (2), His pre-existence. (3), His unity with the Father. (4), His exercise of divine prerogatives in forgiving sin and in accepting divine worship. (5), His claim to power over life, over the resurrection, over paradise, over angels, over the Holy Spirit, over all things. (6), His claim to be the final judge of mankind.”

After many other similar references, covering most, if not all, of the great doctrines of the Bible, Dr. Plumb, with special reference to the use of Scripture in these lessons, concludes as follows: “Indeed, this constant and copious use of the Bible to explain and illustrate itself, comparing spiritual things with spiritual, and this firm grasp of the leading verities of the scheme of redemption, are so manifest throughout these lessons that I confess it is an astonishment to me that any lover of the old gospel at all familiar with them should fail to appreciate their excellence and efficiency as safe guides in the study of God’s word. I bespeak for them a more thorough acquaintance, assured that it will result in a growing satisfaction, not only with their thorough scholarship and wise adaptation to the purposes of biblical instruction, but also with the warm evangelical spirit by which they are pervaded.”

This question of the evangelical orthodoxy of these lessons is so very important, and so many minds have been poisoned with

suspensions regarding them on this point, that it will be well to quote from the lessons themselves enough at least to show some of their fundamental teachings regarding the person and work of Christ.

1. From the course on "The Gospel History of Jesus Christ," edited by Professor Stevens. In this course (Progressive Grade, Lesson II., "The Word Made Flesh") the study of Christ's life is introduced as follows:

"In this lesson we are introduced to the wonderful person of whom we are to study. The writers of the Synoptic Gospels (Matthew, Mark and Luke) introduce him to their readers as the child, or man, Jesus; but St. John, before beginning his story of the earthly life of Christ as he had witnessed it, goes back to speak of his previous divine life in the heavenly world. This course of lessons relates to the earthly history of Jesus, but by beginning our study of him in the way in which he was introduced by St. John, we get the key to much otherwise inexplicable in his early life, and are prepared for a sympathetic and appreciative study of it."

Following this note, the lesson first brings out clearly the Scripture statements regarding the Word made flesh, regarding the annunciation to Mary, and regarding the birth of Christ. Then, under the head of "Lesson Teachings," are the following questions:

15. With whom and where was our Lord from before the foundation of the world? (John i. 1; xvii. 5, 24.) Why did he come to earth? (Luke xix. 10) Whom did he reveal or declare to men? (John i. 18.)

16. What evidence have we in this lesson concerning the divine nature of Christ? What additional evidence was given at his baptism? (Matt. iii. 17.) What did he say of himself? (John v. 17-23; x. 28-30, etc.)

17. What evidence have we in this lesson concerning the human nature of Christ? How is the same fact spoken of in Heb. ii. 14-18?

18. What can you say of the importance to us of this union of the divine with the human in the person of Christ? May we or may we not reasonably expect miracles from such a person?

In the same grade, Lesson VI. (p. 19), under the title, "Jesus the Divine Redeemer of the World," are the following questions:

18. State the difference in meaning between John's characterization of Jesus as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, and his description of him in Matt. iii. 11, 12. What special experience of Jesus is thus indicated by John as the *most significant* characteristic of his work on earth? (1 Pet. ii. 24.)

19. Whom did John declare Jesus to be? (John i. 34.) What is thus indicated as the *most important* fact about his person? (John xx. 31; cf. 1 John v. 20.)

20. What two facts concerning Jesus are thus indicated as *essential* to his person and work as the Messiah? Why are they essential and not merely incidental?

2. From the course on "The History of the Apostolic Church," edited by Professor Burton. In the Progressive Grade, Lesson XXXVII., Appendix, p. xxxiv., under the title, "The Colossian Heresy," occurs the following:

"This alluring and high-sounding philosophy dethroned Christ from his supremacy as the only Son of God, creator of all things, and sole mediator between God and men. It also set aside the work of Christ as the Saviour from sin ; since if evil is only a property of matter, sin must have its seat in the flesh, and must be overcome by ascetic practices, such as abstinence from meat and drink (Col. ii. 16, 21, 22), and 'severity to the body' (vs. 23). It thus swept away the foundations of the gospel, and in its place gave to its deluded followers nothing but empty words and phrases."

In the same lesson, under the head, "The Supremacy and Sole Mediatorship of Christ," appear the following questions (p. 144) and explanatory notes (Appendix, p. xxxiv.):

6. In opposition to the false teachers, what does Paul show to be Christ's true relation to God, to the universe, and to the church? (Col. i. 15-18.)

7. How much of the wisdom, power and glory of God does Christ possess? (Vs. 19 ; comp. ii. 3, 9.)

8. What is God's way of restoring sinners to holiness and to fellowship with himself? (Vs. 20.)

9. On what sole condition could the Colossians finally receive the complete salvation that comes from God through Christ? (Vs. 21-23.)

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON THE ABOVE.

"**Col. i. 15-23.** (15), **Who is**, etc. : In verses 15-23 Paul meets the Colossian heresy by a remarkable exposition of the true dignity and work of Christ, which not only corrects all that was falsely affirmed of him by the errorists, but establishes positively and firmly the true doctrine. **Image** : 'The visible manifestation of that in God which is invisible.'—*Alford*. **Firstborn**, etc. : Holding to the whole creation the relation of first born, that is, superior to it by a right like that of primogeniture. (16), **In** (A. V., 'by') **him . . . created** : Christ was the divine being in whom all created things found the source of their existence (cf. John i. 3). **Through** (A. V., 'by') **him** : Through his instrumentality. **Unto** (A. V., 'for') **him** : To work out his purposes, which were the Father's purposes. (17), **Is before** : Is antecedent to. **In him . . . consist** : In him are held together as united parts of one whole. He is the creator and sustainer of the universe. (18), **The head of the body, the church** : The head guides and inspires the body, and without it the body would die. So of Christ and his church. (19), **All the fulness** : 'All the attributes, powers and blessings of God' taken together. (20), **Whether . . . heavens** : The reconciliation with God effected by Christ is to extend throughout the universe."

3. From the course on "Apostolic Teachings," edited by President Hovey. In Lesson XLI., entitled "The Person of Christ," occur the following questions (pp. 124, 125) and explanatory notes (Appendix, pp. xlix., l.):

TOPIC 1. THE INCARNATION OF CHRIST.

1. How did Paul describe the incarnation of Christ? (Phil. ii. 5-9.)
2. What is meant by the term "incarnation"?
3. What by the phrase "in the form of God"?
4. What did Paul elsewhere teach concerning the entrance of Christ into human life? (Gal. iv. 4; 2 Cor. viii. 9.)
5. How does the fourth Gospel sum up the doctrine of the incarnation? (Jno. i. 1-18.)
6. What two fundamental statements are contained in this passage?
7. How is the method of the incarnation stated in the first and third Gospels? (Matt. i. 18-25; Luke i. 26-38; ii. 1-7.)
8. How does a supernatural birth harmonize with the idea of an incarnation?
9. What does the fact of a divine incarnation prove concerning the nature of man?

TOPIC 2.—THE TWOFOLD NATURE OF CHRIST.

1. What did Paul say about Christ's divine nature? (Phil. ii. 6.)
2. What did he say elsewhere that implied Christ's divinity? (Rom. x. 6; 1 Cor. viii. 6; Col. i. 13-18.)
3. How did he teach the reality of Christ's human nature? (Phil. ii. 7.)
4. How did he elsewhere teach that Christ was truly man? (Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 21; 1 Tim. ii. 5.)
5. What kind of person resulted from the union of these two natures?
6. How does this twofold nature of Christ's affect his work as a Mediator?
7. Why is he able to continue this mediatorial work in heaven? (Heb. iv. 4-16; vii. 26-viii. 2.)

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON THE ABOVE.

"*Topic 1. THE INCARNATION OF CHRIST. Phil. ii. 5-9.* By the term incarnation is to be understood the entrance of God into human life in the form of man. The word is not found in the Scriptures, but the idea conveyed by it is identical with John's statement, 'The Word became flesh and dwelt among us.'

"The earliest traces [in the New Testament] of a doctrine of incarnation are found in suggestions that Christ entered this life from another. Of these, the earliest are those of Paul, and the most definite is that of Phil. ii. 5-9. Here it is said that 'Christ Jesus' existed 'in the form of God,' or in God's mode of existence; that he did not selfishly cling to that state, but left it and 'took the form of a servant, coming to be in the likeness of men'; that in doing this he 'emptied himself,' or deprived himself of what constituted or characterized the previous condition; that after entering the human lot by this self-emptying, he 'humbled himself' still further, and 'became obedient,' even as far as to death upon the

cross; and that in view of this God exalted him to sovereignty over all realms of life. Here is the assertion that Christ came into this life by unselfish surrender of an existence in God's own mode of being. . . .

"In the fourth Gospel, latest of the great New Testament writings, the same doctrine takes more definite form, and is characteristic of the book. . . . The doctrine is summed up in these sentences: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made through him. In him was life. And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of one only-begotten of a father.' Here are two fundamental statements: There is a divine Word, expression of God, medium of communication between God and what he has made; and this divine Word became flesh, or human, in Jesus, bringing and revealing the qualities of God. . . .

"The statements of the New Testament concerning the incarnation are completed by the narratives of the first and third Gospels concerning the supernatural conception and birth of Jesus.—*Clarke*. A birth occurring under such supernatural conditions is entirely harmonious with the idea of a supernatural being who is both divine and human. Such an incarnation, moreover, demonstrates the essential similarity between the natures of God and man, for if they were essentially unlike an incarnation would be inconceivable.

"*Topic 2. THE TWOFOLD NATURE OF CHRIST. Phil. ii. 6, 7.* That Christ was truly God is clearly taught by Paul in the statement that he 'was,' that is, pre-existed, 'in the form [Greek, *morphe*] of God.' This can only mean that in that pre-existent state he possessed every essential quality, power, and attribute of God. To this state he returned at his ascension, to the end that he might receive such worship as belongs to God alone. (Phil. ii 10, 11.)

"This being, who thus was perfect God, took also 'the form [*morphe*] of a servant, being (A. V., "and was") made in the likeness of men,' that is, becoming invested with the essential qualities of humanity, he became also perfect man. Being truly God and truly man, he became the unique God-man, who united in himself the life of God and the life of man. He therefore became qualified to act as a perfect Mediator, since he was able on the one hand to enter into complete sympathy with God, and on the other into complete sympathy with man. 'To God he is God's very self; to men he is God-with-us [Immanuel], even while he is the man. To a sinful humanity needing reconciliation with God, he is the captain of salvation. Hope hangs upon him. From his advent, since he stands as a living link between God and man, the sinful race may well take courage, being sure that the approach of so wonderful a person, God in man, cannot be without its gift of blessing.'—*Clarke*. In his heavenly glory he still remains the Mediator between God and man, because the union in him between deity and humanity was not limited to his earthly life, but is indissoluble and eternal."

Equally explicit and satisfactory citations could easily be made regarding the orthodoxy of these lessons on all the other great doctrines of Scripture; but believing that the above are amply sufficient to remove from *The Bible Study Union Lessons* all

suspicion of doctrinal unsoundness, I will only add that the citations above made strike the key-note of the teachings of these lessons in all their grades, the doctrinal points being brought out more or less fully in the several grades according to the design of that grade and the age and attainments of those using it.

But it is time to pass from the contents of the lessons to the theory of teaching contained in them. The article in the *QUARTERLY* very properly says that "Our old system [of Sunday-school Bible study] proceeded upon the idea that the Bible was a supernatural revelation from God; that it differed in this respect from all other books; that its truths were autopistic; that when it entered the mind and heart, a special and supernatural agency of the Holy Spirit accompanied it, engrafting it as a living germ, an 'incorruptible seed that liveth and abideth forever.' One of the first and most important works of the Sunday-school teacher, therefore, was to store the mind of the pupil with Scripture truth as far as practicable in Scripture language, looking to the Holy Spirit to take his own word and make it effectual to salvation."

I do not know how it would be possible to state more clearly the exact position of *The Bible Study Union Lessons* than in this admirable paragraph. The same truths in substance have been stated with almost tiresome iteration in the various papers and circulars of these lessons. From the very first the fundamental principle of the series has been to bring the pupils into the closest possible contact with the Scriptures, in perfect confidence that, if the mind and heart are informed regarding the truth, the Holy Spirit will use the truth unto salvation. That this confidence is well-founded is proved by the testimony of hundreds of Sunday-schools in which the happiest results have followed the study of these lessons, for the simple reason that they have brought the Scripture truth home to the spiritual nature of the pupils more clearly and forcibly than is possible with the International Lessons.

This agreement between the article in the *QUARTERLY* and *The Bible Study Union* as to the purpose of Sunday-school Bible study is still further seen in the hearty approbation which that article gives to the only extract from these lessons which it makes

from President Hervey's paper. The passage referred to is as follows: The QUARTERLY, after stating that "the fundamental principle of the old school, that of storing the child's mind with Scripture, . . . is the one which President Hervey most strongly antagonizes," gives an example of his criticism upon questions and answers, taken, I suppose, from the International Lessons, which questions and answers the article in the QUARTERLY approves as strongly as President Hervey condemns. It then continues:

"The same thing is true of a second set of questions which President Hervey mercilessly criticises, which are intended also for the little ones, but to which the answers are not given. The lesson is on the crucifixion, and the questions are as follows:

"'What had happened to Jesus on Thursday night? What did the soldiers do with Jesus Friday morning? Why did they get Simon to carry his cross for him? What prayer did Jesus make for the soldiers? How did the people standing about the cross treat Jesus? What did one of the thieves ask Jesus? What did Jesus say to his mother and to John?' etc.

"Now, you will notice that, with the exception possibly of the third question, every one of these calls for an answer in the exact words of the Scripture lesson. Of course, if the Bible is only like Shakespeare, or Homer, or Milton's *Paradise Lost*, all this would be as time thrown away; but if the Scripture is the inspired word of God; if the first object of the teacher is to see that this word is by the work of the parent at home lodged in the child's mind, and then that by suitable exercises in the class-room its lessons are impressed, the method becomes rational and suited to its purpose."

In thus finely defending these questions against what he calls the "merciless criticisms" of President Hervey, the writer of the article in the QUARTERLY does not seem to be aware that the questions themselves are taken bodily from one of the lower grades of *The Bible Study Union Lessons*, and that in so far as they show the purpose of these lessons to teach in the plainest possible way the great facts and truths of Scripture, they are a fair illustration of the "spirit and method" of these lessons. Yet such is the case.

We are glad of this hearty even though unintentional approval of the purpose and method of its system of Bible study. It is similar in kind to the endorsement that comes to it from pastors and Sunday-school superintendents of all denominations in all parts of the country, who have made personal use of these lessons.

Summing up what has been said, it appears that the criticisms of *The Bible Study Union Lessons*, because of their supposed relation to President Harper, are entirely unfounded; that the lessons themselves are thoroughly orthodox in their teachings; and that in "spirit and method" they are just what all earnest Christian pastors and teachers desire, namely, a clear, simple and full presentation of biblical truth, and are, therefore, worthy of the cordial support of all who believe in thorough biblical study.

ERASTUS BLAKESLEE.

21 Bromfield Street, Boston, Mass.

IX. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

FISHER'S HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. *By George Parke Fisher, D. D., LL. D., Titus Street Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale University.* Pp. xvi. and 583. 8vo. Price, \$2.50 net. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1897.

Though Dr. Fisher is one of the most distinguished historians in the United States, and his works widely spread, some reader may want a word or two concerning his life. He was "born at Wrentham, Mass., August 10, 1827; graduated at Brown University, Providence, R. I., 1847, and at Andover Theological Seminary, Massachusetts, 1851; became professor of divinity (college preacher) in Yale College, New Haven, Conn., 1854; and professor of ecclesiastical history, in 1861." He belongs to the Congregational body of Christians. In Yale and, generally, throughout New England, he has been looked upon as conservative. He has been much less ready to adopt new views than many of his fellows around him. The long and earnest study of the past has taught him the extreme folly of the hasty and inconsiderate adoption of the new. On the other hand, in Princeton and throughout the bounds of our own church, Dr. Fisher has been regarded as insufficiently conservative. While they have admired much in him, and feel grateful for his great labors in apologetical as well as in historical theology, they have deplored certain concessions to the radicals. They have seen in him, while a cautious and discriminating advocate of certain newer views, yet an advocate of views which they believe to be false in fact and very hurtful in tendency.

This volume belongs to the International Theological Library, under the general editorial supervision of the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D. D., and Stewart D. F. Salmond, D. D. The fact that these gentlemen selected Dr. Fisher to prepare a volume for the series is itself indicative of a certain amount of sympathy for the newer theology. Nor is there a little in the book pointing in the same direction.

As to the purpose and tone of the work, we learn from the author's preface that it is his aim to give us "the history of theological thought," including all attempts "at doctrinal constructions down to the present." In other words, he sets out to write the "history of *doctrine* as well as of *dogmas*." Nor is he to stop with the completion of the great historic creeds of the seventeenth century; he is to give an account of modern doctrinal theology as well—of modern views down to our own day.

The author has been decidedly influenced by Harnack, Loofs, and Thomasius. He states his attitude towards Ritschlianism as follows: "I deem the Ritschlian tendency to be justified so far as it lays stress on the fact that in the earlier centuries the types of Greek philosophy then current had no inconsiderable influence in

the formulating of doctrine. This, to be sure, is not a new discovery, but has been widely recognized by competent historians, like Neander. Yet it may be well that a new emphasis should be attached to it. Moreover, there is no room for question that the Reformers mingled in their teachings much that was drawn from scholastic sources. All that should be conceded to the Ritschlian movement, however large the dissent may be from specific conclusions concerning the extent and character of the modifications of Christian doctrine from extrinsic influences, concerning the real purport of New Testament teaching, and concerning the trustworthiness of the Gospel narratives."

Touching his aim and spirit the author further says: "The primary aim has been to present in an objective way and in an impartial spirit the course of theological thought respecting the religion of the gospel. Whatever faults or defects may belong to the work, the author can say with a good conscience that nothing has been consciously inserted or omitted under the impulse of personal bias or prejudice."

From what we know of Dr. Fisher we believe this asseveration. We believe that he is honest in his intentions, and that he desires to get at the truth and state it fairly for his readers.

As to the way in which the author has accomplished his purpose of giving us an impartial history of doctrine, we are much more pleased than we had expected to be. Dr. Fisher's weakest point as a historian is a feeble power of organization. His method is conspicuously bad in many parts of his *History of the Christian Church*. The average student fails often to catch the chief currents of the history as presented in that book. He floats around in a thousand little eddies. He despises them and is tempted to despise historical study generally, unless he is helped to a higher method. The effort to do everything in the fewest words may, in part, have occasioned this want of exposition of the currents of history; but we have been afraid that Dr. Fisher does not habitually regard history as "an organism with all its parts naturally, necessarily," and vitally connected; afraid that he does not look enough at the interrelations of events to one another as cause and effect. This volume is as well organized as any work of his with which we are acquainted. But it is not planned with that constant attention to the *development* which is essential to the best sort of historical work. In giving the doctrinal teaching of one man, Dr. Fisher tends to make too much of the man as an isolated unit. He seems, especially in the earlier part of his work, to aim to give a complete view of one man's whole doctrine; then to pass to another man. The relations between the two often deserve more attention than they get. An understanding of them is often absolutely necessary in order to the most important lessons of history. This jumping from man to man, with often only an obscure statement of the relations of their doctrinal views, makes the volume too much like one of historical essays. We fail of being impressed with the feeling that history is one mighty and living whole.

Hence, also, there is no extraordinarily luminous exposition of the rise and growth of any one great doctrine. The materials needed for such an exposition are here; but they are not properly marshalled and presented.

It may indeed be said that there is a fairly good exposition of the rise and growth of many doctrines, or of the doctrinal teaching of an age; but it remains true that our author gives no very luminous and impressive exhibition of such

doctrines. We think he does approximate this, however, in his exhibition of New England theology and modern European theology. The book is decidedly more attractive after we have approached the end of the seventeenth century. Here the author evidently felt that he was on relatively unworked ground. He could afford to touch on the larger features only, and trace those larger features from generation to generation. His pen becomes decidedly more lifelike. It moves as if he had gotten beyond the leading-strings of the masters. Back of 1650 there is an appearance of care that reverence to the masters must not be forgotten—an appearance of the consciousness that he was saying something that had been well said before. There is even an appearance of leaning on those who had worked the field before. Notwithstanding the numerous and learned footnotes, we had a taste as of encyclopædias as we read. We would not be understood to insinuate that Dr. Fisher ever uses encyclopædias in writing history; we do not have any good reason for believing this to be true; but we say that up to the later half of the seventeenth century we had more or less of the feeling that we were dealing with second-hand matter. This was probably due to the organization and style. After the beginning of the eighteenth century, there is less anxiety to exhaust a subject in a few words. Minor points in a system are passed over, and those of more importance are kept steadily before the reader's eye as they change in the hands of their several exponents. *E. g.*, The system of Jonathan Edwards as modified and developed by various of his more important disciples is clearly and effectively exhibited; and this not more so than that of Schleiermacher and his disciples. There are really fine characterizations, too, of such subordinate theological characters as Stanley and Matthew Arnold. Talking of Stanley's theological views, Fisher says: "The usual note of vagueness belongs to Stanley's statements respecting the Trinity. The name 'the Father' in the creed 'expresses to us the whole faith of what we call natural religion.' It represents to us God in nature, 'in the heavenly or ideal world.' The Son represents to us God in history. In Christ the kindness, wisdom, and tenderness of God are reflected. His life is the word, the speech that comes out of 'that eternal silence which surrounds the Unseen Divinity.' 'To believe in the name of Christ is to believe that no other approach to God exists except through the same qualities of justice, truth, and love which make up the mind of Christ.' 'The name of the Holy Ghost represents to us God in our own hearts and spirits and consciences.'" (P. 475.) This is an admirable bird's-eye view of the theology of the semi-pagan, if very lovable, Dean. There are many others in the book just as good.

Another defect in Dr. Fisher as a historian is his being neutral apparently on quite a number of subjects. Perhaps this may be esteemed a merit by some. They may esteem his writing as, therefore, more veracious. He may himself claim that he tries to make himself neutral in order that his work may be the more "impartial and objective." For ourselves, we believe that the personal equation of an apparently neutral man may be quite as great as that of a man who has taken his position openly on one or the other side of a controverted question. And when the position of a writer is decided, the reader knows how to allow for the personal equations of the writer. When the writer is neutral, the intelligent reader constantly feels the presence of an unknown quantity in the problem before him. We wish, *e. g.*, that we knew exactly what sort of a Calvinist Dr. Fisher is. Once we thought he was pretty much such a Calvinist as Charles Hodge; but ap-

parently he has a tolerant regard for a good many objections to even moderate *infra-lapsarian* Calvinism. We say "apparently" he sympathizes with certain current objections to Calvinism. This seems a fair inference from the concluding observations of the book; but we are not *certain*. As a historian he would please us better if he would let us know how *he* looks upon certain things of which he speaks. We wish again, *e. g.*, that we knew how far he thinks philosophy has entered into the construction of the great historic creeds; but we don't. We wish again, etc., etc.

But in spite of these defects the work before us is a great one, involving vast researches. The chapters are written in a clear and attractive style. It supplies a want, especially the part devoted to modern theology. It is a good guide-book through regions of study where before we had none.

Having so far tried to indicate the general character of the work, we shall now proceed to remark on certain minor features.

The following statements appear to us defective: On p. 3 it is said: "The result of the Protestant movement in the dogmatic field was threefold: the Lutheran theology, Socinianism, and the restatement of the Roman Catholic system at the Council of Trent; this last system being amplified in recent days, especially through the Vatican Council." Why is nothing said of the Reformed, or Calvinistic theology?

On page 7 the relation of theology to philosophy is stated. Apparently, the author thinks that he has done his work fully; really, he only states their relation in a negative way, and hence very partially.

On page 7 the relation of faith to theology is stated. It is said that "in faith as a practical experience are the materials of theology." This is a conception that springs out of the lessened regard for the word of God contained in the Scriptures, current in our day, and out of the magnification of the God-consciousness. It gives rein to the subjective theology current on the European continent, and even in Great Britain and this country.

On page 26 an insufficient distinction is made between the way in which uninspired Christian teachers and inspired Christian teachers were affected by the Greek philosophy.

On page 72 it is affirmed: "That is to say, there was no body of New Testament writings which were recognized as authoritative Scriptures" at the beginning of the second century. No proof is given for this. We do not know any satisfactory proof that can be given. It is a needless concession to destructive critics.

On page 76 Dr. Fisher says that, in the apostolic sees, "an uninterrupted succession was secured by a mixture of appointment and popular election." He evidently believes that men of weight sometimes appointed officers in the early church, even in the apostolic church. Dr. Schaff took the same view as to the Apostolic Age in his *History of the Apostolic Church*, but the evidence has always seemed to us insufficient. In every case on which we have full light the people elected their ordinary officers; and we know of no case in the apostolic church, or in the church of the second century, in which the right of election was certainly withheld from the people. It is assuming to say that sometimes presbyters or bishops were appointed by influential men in the church of the first and second centuries.

On pages 98 and 119 we read: "Christian theology, beginning with Justin

and the apologists, had taken up the conception of the Logos, blending together the Jewish and Platonic meanings associated with that term. On the basis of this conception the doctrine of the divinity of Christ was moulded." This is a concession to Ritschlianism. The doctrine of the divinity of Christ, as that doctrine was embodied in the Nicene Creed, had nothing in common with the Platonic Logos. Our author and the school by which he has been so much influenced confound the doctrine of the church with the doctrine of teachers. The result is a false impression. Justin Martyr's teaching was a mixture of Platonism and Christianity; but it cannot be shown that the church at large adopted his Platonism. Much less can it be shown that the doctrine of the Trinity, as set forth in the Nicene Creed, is revamped heathen philosophy.

On pages 155, 156 it is said: "Notwithstanding the deference paid by the Chalcedon fathers to Cyril's teaching, Nestorius might have signed the creed, including the title *θεοτοκος* as it was qualified by the words appended to it." This is a view often found in the histories; but we do not believe that the age of Nestorius was so far mistaken as to what he taught. His teaching, as it comes down to us in such fragments of his writings as are extant, clearly shows that he was logically committed to the view of two persons in Christ.

On page 159, in speaking of the work of the Sixth Ecumenical Council and its creed, our author says: "The creed was an addition to the Chalcedon symbol, and declared of the two wills just what that symbol had asserted of the two natures. Conformably to the accepted psychology of the time, according to which the will was a component attribute of the nature, the conclusion was a logical one. The Dyothelite opinion was thus converted into a dogma." Does the author mean to say that Dyothelitism rests simply on the psychology of the seventh century? It seems so. Many men will say, "No; but the Scriptures show that Jesus had two wills, a human and a divine will."

On page 205 we have a treatment of Adoptionism too brief to be an exposition. The reader not previously acquainted with the controversy would get no adequate idea either of the nature or the importance of the controversy from this account.

It has been the fashion for some time for the advocates of a low view of inspiration to use the great names of Luther and Calvin in support of the low view. Those who oppose "plenary" or "verbal" inspiration of Scripture frequently claim that both Luther and Calvin sided with them. Now, while Dr. Fisher does not make the rash statements about the views of inspiration maintained by these giants of the past, to be found in many writings of contemporaries, he does not begin to do justice to their real views of the word of God. (See pages 279, 299.) We understand him, indeed, to say that Calvin does not deviate from the traditional view of inspiration, "as does Luther." Calvin not only did not deviate from the traditional view, he *taught actively* a very high view, of inspiration; and it will not do for the advocates of a low view of inspiration to claim Luther. No historic injustice would be done Luther by representing his view of inspiration as being as high as that of Charles Hodge. His declarations from all periods of his history concerning the inspiration of Scripture, his way of dealing with seeming contradictions in the word of God, and the passages which have been commonly cited to prove his alleged liberal position, all prove that he looked upon the Scriptures as infallible. (See Francis Pieper's "Luther's Doctrine of Inspiration," in *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, Vol. IV.)

We deprecate an apparent claim that Calvin logically supports the doctrine of mediate imputation. See page 304: "It is clear that in Calvin's view, the first thing imputed to us as the ground of punishment is our own sinful nature." The controversy between the advocates of mediate and immediate imputation had not risen in Calvin's day. He was, in the words Dr. Fisher quotes from him, contending not over the question whether the guilt of Adam's sin is imputed immediately, without reference to the corrupt nature of the child of Adam. His contention was that the condemnation resting on our children at their birth is not due solely to the guilt of Adam's first sin imputed to us, but to inherent sin as well. It is unfair to Calvin to interpret him as if he had the later controversy in sight. Besides, he must be judged by his whole system, not by two or three isolated passages.

Dr. Fisher does not do justice to the Zwinglian view of the Lord's supper. On page 289, he says: "The chief thought in connection with the supper is that of a memorial. The elements are merely symbols." On page 306 some amends are made when it is said: "Zwingli, however, in his later days, had made room in his theory for a presence of Christ in connection with the supper, and had made more of the supper as a pledge of Christ's love." Even this does not do justice to Zwingli's view, which is about the view taught by old Charles Hodge, Dabney, and our sober American theologians generally. Zwingli's view grew with himself, and it was brought out now in one aspect and now in another, as circumstances prompted.

The change which went on in John Calvin's mind on the subject of the Lord's supper is not clearly set forth in this text-book. In his early years he tried to mediate between the Lutherans and the more sober view. He then set forth a view somewhat mystical with accidents, at least, now generally repudiated by the reformed part of Christendom. By 1549 Calvin had changed; had, in fact, adopted the later and perfected Zwinglian view. Hence his union with the Zurich pastors in that year in the *Consensus Tigurinus*, which sets forth his later and perfected view of the Lord's supper, and which expresses our own view in all essentials. We have, indeed, an account of this change on pages 306 and 307, but the account rather minimizes the change.

Such are some of the defects in this packed volume. They will serve to show that the reader must keep his eyes open.

There are some grave omissions. In the history of theological thought in America, hardly any attention is given to the work done by others than New Englanders. H. B. Smith, of New York, may be counted as an exception. Charles Hodge is mentioned. Nothing is said of either Thornwell or Dabney. Their names are not even mentioned. No man in the great Presbyterian body was more influential on Presbyterian polity in his day than Thornwell. Fisher's work takes cognizance of church polity. Thornwell's theological writings would entitle him at least to mention. Dabney has been pronounced, North and South, the "greatest writer on theological subjects which America has produced." The names of these gentlemen are not mentioned. Can it be possible that Dr. Fisher has never heard of either of them? Or is he afflicted with philo-New-Englandism?

There are slips of various kinds in the book due to carelessness in copying or proof-reading. Some of these are the following:

In note 2, bottom of page 129, the reference to Neander, *Church History*, II., 423 n., is wrong. The page should be 432.

On page 201, Nicholas I. is said to have renewed the ban against Photius in 882. Nicholas died in 867. The pope that renewed the ban against Photius was either John VIII. or Maximus I.

On page 335 we read: "Innocent III., in 1653, in the bull *cum occasione*, condemned five propositions purporting to be extracted from Jansenius' work." It was Innocent X.

On page 377 it is said: "Morgan's work was the revision of the composition of Warburton's once famous work," etc. The word *occasione* must be substituted for the word revision here, in order to either sense or truth.

Dr. Fisher, in the close of his work, represents Calvinism as dying out relatively. He attempts to explain its decadence. He calls attention to many facts painful to us. He betrays no large sympathy for thoroughgoing Calvinism. But these pages are worth reading. It might be profitable for all loyal Calvinists to ponder them.

In conclusion we advise every reader who can and will think for himself, and who wishes to study modern theology, to buy this book. It will introduce him well into this field.

THOS. C. JOHNSON.

Hampden-Sidney, Va.

GORDON'S "THE MINISTRY OF THE SPIRIT."

THE MINISTRY OF THE SPIRIT. *By A. J. Gordon, D. D.* With an Introduction by Rev. F. B. Meyer, Minister of Christ Church, London. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1896.

The late Dr. A. J. Gordon was well, widely, and favorably known as a prominent Baptist pastor of Boston, and a man of great spirituality. Rev. F. B. Meyer notes the many treatises which in these days have dealt with the sublime subject of this volume, and says: "Each of these treatises has brought out some new phase in respect to the person or mission of the Holy Spirit, but I cannot recall one that is so lucid, so suggestive, so scriptural, so deeply spiritual, as this by my beloved friend Dr. Gordon." Many, no doubt, will concur in this judgment.

Dr. Gordon having been one of the ablest and most lovable writers on a theme which at this time elicits general interest, we believe that copious extracts will be not only pardoned, but welcomed. The reader will encounter many passages which will strike him as unique, fanciful, and even startling.

In chapter vii., on The Administration of the Spirit, are many things to approve, and many that set the reader on reflection. The author regards the election of Matthias to the Apostolate as unauthorized.

"Doubtless the mistakes of God's servants, as given in Scripture, are as truly designed for our instruction and admonition as their obedient examples. . . . Now, he (Jesus) had gone away into heaven, and his administrator had not yet arrived to enter upon his office-work. Surely, if the divine order was to be, that having 'ascended on high,' he was 'to give some apostles,' it were better to await the coming of the Paraclete with his gifts. Not only so, but we are persuaded that, with Christ departed and the Holy Spirit not yet come, a valid election of an apostle were impossible."

He doubts seriously the validity of orders in established churches, and questions the divine appointment of the Methodist ministry, though he does not name the Methodist Church.

"But the office of pastor, elder, bishop, or teacher still remains. And the divine plan is that this office should be filled just as in the beginning, by the appointment of the Holy Ghost." On pages 138 and 139: "Is there any likelihood that that voice (of the Spirit) will be heard when the king or prime minister of a civil government holds the sole function of appointing the bishops, as in the case of state churches? Is there any certainty of it when an archbishop or bishop puts pastors over flocks by the action of his single will? We may congratulate ourselves that we are neither in a state church nor under an Episcopal bishop."

He admits that "some conclave of 'leading brethren' may also set aside the Spirit's appointment." Our author's view of the Lord's prayer may be surprising.

"'Lord, teach us how to pray as John also taught his disciples.' Jesus complied *literally* with this request of his followers. As John, under the law, could only give rules and rudiments, not yet having come to the dispensation of grace and of the Spirit, so did Jesus give a form of prayer, a lesson in the 'technique of worship.' But only when he reaches the eve of his passion, when he announces the coming of the Comforter, does he lead his disciples into the heart and mystery of the great theme, teaching to pray as John *could not* have taught his disciples." (Page 146, *italics his*.)

The Lord's prayer teaches only as John taught to pray! His explanation is that only after Pentecost did they pray "in his name." Then "we are in-willed by his will, because inspired by his Spirit . . . so that to ask what we desire of him is to ask what he desires for us."

"When is sanctification completed?" is asked on page 121. The answer follows:

"At death, is the answer which we find given in some creeds. This may be true, but we say it not because the Scripture saith it not. So far as we can infer from the Word of God, the date of our sanctification or perfection in holiness is definitely fixed at the appearing of the Lord a second time without sin unto salvation. . . . Because we have been made 'partakers of the Holy Ghost,' we have thereby 'tasted the powers of the age to come' (Heb. vi. 4, 5, Revised Version), that age of complete deliverance from sin, and sickness, and death. But at most, we have only tasted as yet."

This application of Heb. vi. 4, 5 to believers suggests some distrustfulness of Dr. Gordon as an exegete.

Another vagary of exposition we find on page 119:

"If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his 'Spirit that dwelleth in you.' (Rom. viii. 11.) It is not our dead bodies which are here spoken of as the objects of the Spirit's quickening, but our mortal bodies—bodies liable to death, and doomed to death if the Lord tarry, but not yet having experienced death. Hence the quickening referred to has to do rather with the vivifying of the living saints than the resurrection of the dead saints. Of course the consummation of this vivifying is at the Lord's coming. . . . but having the Spirit dwelling in us we have, even now, the first fruits of this transformation in the daily renewing of our inward man, in the helping, and healing, and strengthening which sometimes comes to *our bodies* through the hidden life of the Holy Ghost."

This kind of experience is too attenuated and subtile for verification.

Our author holds on page 165 that the apostles actually received authority to forgive sins. But we will make only one more random reference, and that on the subject of election. On pages 208 and 209:

"The present is the age of election and not of universal ingathering. Paul says that there is at this present time '*a remnant according to the election of grace,*'

and a little further on, '*all Israel shall be saved.*' . . . James says, 'God did visit the Gentiles *to take out of them a people for his name,*' and 'after this will I return,' etc., 'that the *residue* of men might seek after the Lord and *all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called.*' Here again is first an elective out-gathering and then a total in-gathering."

As was to be expected, Dr. Gordon was thoroughly wedded to Baptist principles. He will have it that there was no church prior to Pentecost. He insists as on page 56, upon translating *εν* by in, and misquotes the Revised Version in Matt. iii. 11 thus: "I indeed baptize you *in* water unto repentance, . . . he shall baptize you *in* the Holy Ghost and *in* fire." That Dr. Gordon should make the Revised Version responsible for this rendering surprises us. "*In* fire" is not recognized even in the margin. The word for *fire* is in the instrumental dative, as is the word *water* in three of the eight passages which speak of baptism with water. "With" is thus determined by the word itself to be the proper rendering of *εν* in the other five. "Purged *with* blood," of Heb. ix. 22, is *εν*, and this cleansing, we are told in verse 21, was by sprinkling.

The author will persist also in saying that the Holy Spirit's *presence* filled the room, though the sacred text, whose very words he holds to be inspired, says the *sound* filled the room.

We need scarcely forewarn the reader that his interpretation of the pentecostal baptism is in harmony with the immersionist theory that the baptism *in* the Spirit is a figurative and not a real baptism. His theory utterly flouts the doctrine of our Shorter Catechism, that water baptism symbolizes engrafting into Christ by real baptism *with* the Spirit. The Doctor's theory, accepted by many of our own people, is a strong ally of immersion. Let us confine ourselves now to that theory:

"Pentecost was the birth day of the Spirit," whose dispensation "begins with *Pentecost* and ends with the *Parousia.*" "It is according to literal Scripture that the body of the faithful is indwelt by the divine Spirit. *In this fact we have the distinguishing peculiarity of the present dispensation.* 'For he dwelleth with you and *shall be in you,*' said Jesus, speaking anticipatively of the coming of the Comforter; and so truly was this prediction fulfilled, that ever after the day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit is spoken of as being in the church. '*If so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you*' is the inspired assumption on which the deep teaching in Romans viii. proceeds." (Page 22.)

On page 25 he quotes Pastor Tophel with approval:

"In an admirable work on the Spirit, the distinction between the former and the present relation of the Spirit is thus stated: 'In the old dispensation the Holy Spirit wrought *upon* believers, but did not in his person dwell in believers and abide permanently in them. He appeared unto men; he did not incarnate himself in man. . . . Affianced of the soul, the Spirit went oft to see his betrothed, but was not yet one with her; the marriage was not consummated until the Pentecost, after the glorification of Jesus Christ.'

"It was impossible that Pentecost should have preceded Calvary, or that the outpouring of the Spirit should have anticipated the shedding of the blood." (Page 28.) And why? "It was not the earthly Christ whom the Holy Ghost was to communicate to the church, but the heavenly Christ—the Christ reinvested with his eternal power, re clothed with the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, and re-endowed with the infinite treasures of grace which he had purchased by his death on the cross." (Page 41.)

So far we find ourself in accord with Dr. Gordon. The last citation we commend heartily to our immersionist friends. That symbolism is not true which first baptizes into the dead Christ. "As many of us as were baptized into Christ.

(glorified) were baptized into his death"—into the righteousness which is due to his obedience unto death, and which is imputed to us. But it is imputed only because his life is first *imparted*. We are baptized into the living Christ, "who liveth and *was* dead, and is alive forevermore."

What, now, are the treasures of grace purchased by the death of Jesus which the Holy Spirit communicates in the baptism of Pentecost? A summary of these treasures we find truly given on page 62: "As by our natural spirit we are connected with the first Adam and made partakers of his fallen nature, so by the Holy Spirit we are now united with the second Adam and made partakers of his glorified nature." But alas! the rich meaning which these words suggest is not the meaning our author intends to convey. We would suppose that union with Christ meant "alive in Christ," acceptance in Christ, completeness in Christ. But not so. On the same page we have: "The baptism of the Holy Ghost into which we have been brought is designed to accomplish inwardly and spiritually what the baptism of water foreshadows outwardly and typically, viz., to *reproduce* in us the living and the dying of our Lord."

This baptism is "one baptism," according to our author, because it has been administered only once, on the day of Pentecost. On page 56 we find:

"His presence 'filled all the house where they were sitting,' and 'they were all filled with the Holy Ghost.' The baptistery would never need to be refilled, for Pentecost was once and for all, and the Spirit then came to abide in the church perpetually. But each believer throughout the ages would need to be infilled with that Spirit which dwells in the body of Christ. In other words, it seems clear that the baptism of the Spirit was given once for the whole church, extending from Pentecost to Parousia. 'There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism.' (Eph. iv. 5.) As there is one body reaching through the entire dispensation, so there is 'one baptism' for that body, given on the day of Pentecost."

On page 58: "To change the figure of baptism to another which is used synonymously," he refers to the anointing of Aaron as a typical illustration of the anointing of the Spirit. As the anointing oil ran down on the beard, and went down to the skirts of his garments, just so the baptism of the Spirit is the one baptism of the whole body. It occurs to him that the baptism of Cornelius presents a difficulty. It does not articulate with his theory. On this, therefore, he has to say something; but he has not, in our judgment, something to say that is pertinent: "It is true that in one instance subsequent to Pentecost the baptism in the Holy Ghost is spoken of. When the Spirit fell on the house of Cornelius, Peter is reminded of the word of the Lord, how that he said, 'John indeed baptized in water; but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Ghost.' (Acts xi. 16.)" We interrupt the quotation to remark that even the Revised Version says "*with* water," and gives in the margin no alternative "*or in*." To resume: "This was a great crisis in the history of the church, the opening of the door of faith to the Gentiles; and it would seem that these new subjects of grace now came into participation of an already present Spirit. Yet Pentecost still appears to have been the age-baptism of the church. As Calvary was once for all, so was the visitation of the upper room." Our comment is justified.

And so this baptism *with* the Spirit into Christ is converted into a baptism *of* the Spirit (subjective genitive?) into the church, the body of Christ; for in chapter iv. we have "The Embodying of the Spirit." In chapter v., as the practical result for the believer, we have "The Enduement of [by] the Spirit."

And this baptism is *not for every believer*. Chapter v. opens thus: "We have maintained in the previous chapter that the baptism in the Holy Ghost was given once for all on the day of Pentecost, when the Paraclete came in person to make his abode in the church. It does not follow, therefore, that every believer has received this baptism. God's gift is one thing; our appropriation of that gift is quite another thing." How, then, do some believers appropriate this baptism? "It seems clear from the Scriptures that it is still the duty and privilege of believers to receive the Holy Spirit by a conscious, definite act of appropriating faith, just as they receive Jesus Christ." (Page 68.) We have, on page 74, a form of acceptance: "O Holy Spirit, I yield to thee now in humble surrender. I receive thee as my Teacher, my Comforter, my Sanctifier, and my Guide." We fear that the influence of this good man's name will open the door to much error. It were well had he heeded his favorite text: "He [the Spirit] shall not speak of himself, but shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you." According to our reading, every believer receives the baptism with the Holy Spirit: "He that believeth on *me*, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit which they that believed on him [Jesus] were to receive: for the Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified." (John vii. 38, 39, Revised Version.)

What, now, is this enduement or baptism, which the believer may appropriate if he will? "We have had the enduement of the Spirit presented to us under three aspects: sealing, filling, and anointing; all of which terms, so far as we can understand, signify the same thing, the gift of the Holy Ghost appropriated by faith. Each of these terms is connected with some special divine endowment: the seal, with assurance and consecration; the filling, with power; and the anointing, with knowledge." (P. 92.) The reader will not admit that sealing and anointing are peculiar to some Christians only, who have received the Spirit by an act of special appropriating faith: "In whom [Jesus] having also believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance," etc. (Eph. i. 13, 14, Revised Version.) All Christians are anointed and all are sealed. All, however, are not filled with the Spirit, for Christians are admonished to be filled with the Spirit. (Eph. v. 18.) The enduement-with-power theory is utterly refuted by the fact, to which Dr. Gordon also seems blinded, that saints were endued with power and filled with the Spirit long before Pentecost. A few such are named: John the Baptist was filled with the Spirit; so, too, were his father and mother; so, too, were Bezaleel and Aholiab; and so, too, were all the saints in both dispensations who were efficient in service.

Nor can we admit that "assurance and consecration" can be restricted to the period between Pentecost and Parousia. If this be all that is meant by "sealing," then the Old Testament saints were assuredly sealed. Penitent David cried: "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me. Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free Spirit." (Psalm li. 11, 12.) "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad." (John viii. 56.) Said Simon: "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation." (Luke ii. 29, 30.) Surely there is assurance of hope in David's exclamation (Psalm xvii. 15): "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness." (By the way, this passage is cited by Dr. Gordon (page 125) to prove that holiness

will not be perfected till the second advent.) We fail to see that any endowment Dr Gordon's theory confines strictly to the dispensation of the Spirit as the result of pentecostal baptism was denied to Old Testament saints.

In chapter vi. the author concludes where he should have begun, with "The Communion of the Spirit." He says very truly (page 99):

"The familiar benediction which invokes upon us the 'communion of the Holy Ghost' has, probably, a deeper meaning in it than has generally been recognized." [We do not think that meaning is recognized by the author.] He continues: "The word 'communion'—*κοινωνία*—signifies the having in common. It is used of the fellowship of believers one with another, and also of their mutual fellowship with God. The Holy Spirit dwelling in us is the agent through whom this community of life and love is effected and maintained. 'And truly our fellowship,' says John, 'is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.' (1 John i. 3.) But this having in common with the first two persons of the Godhead were only possible through the communion of the Holy Ghost, the third person."

We contend that the "communion of the Holy Ghost" is not a something in common which the Spirit communicates, but the something in common which *is* the Holy Spirit. That communion is *with* the first two persons only plainly shows that the third person is the *κοινωνία*. In "of the Spirit" we have the subjective genitive, and not the genitive of the "agent." It is the Spirit himself who was promised and was given. Jesus baptizes every believer *with* the Spirit. The author's baptism "of the Spirit" is a baptism which the Spirit administers and of which the Scriptures know absolutely nothing. Jesus is the only baptizer at Pentecost. It is the baptism with the Spirit—the gift of the indwelling Spirit to every believer—which baptizes him into Christ, unites him with the second Adam. The one single sentence in all this volume which suggested that the author entertained the scriptural conception of baptism with the Spirit turns out to bear a meaning utterly foreign to the biblical doctrine. When the author says (p. 62): "As by our natural spirit we are connected with the first Adam, and made partakers of his fallen nature, so by the Holy Spirit we are now united with the second Adam, and made partakers of his glorified nature," he means not, that we are complete in Christ, partakers of his life, made the righteousness of God in him, but that the Spirit by his sanctifying processes works in us a righteousness of our own as a manifestation of the life of Christ: "he reproduces in us the *living* and the dying of our Lord." (P. 62.) This is his own explanation. And the following is his explanation of what he understands by the communion of the Spirit:

"In his promise of the Comforter, Jesus said: 'He shall take of mine and show it unto you.' As the Son while on earth communicated to men the spiritual riches of the invisible Father, so the Spirit now communicates to us the hidden things of the invisible Son; and if we were required to describe in a word the present office work of the Holy Ghost, we should say that it is to make true *in* us that which is already true *for* us in our glorified Lord. All light and life and warmth are stored up for us in the sun; but these can only reach us through the atmosphere, which stands between us and that sun as the medium of communication; even so in Christ are 'hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge,' and by the Holy Spirit these are made over to us." (P. 99.)

The Spirit under the old dispensation took of the things of Christ to show them unto the saints. Remember that Dr. Gordon restricts all this ministry of the Spirit to the "church extending from Pentecost to Parousia."

The communication of the life of Christ to us is not the reproduction in us

of his living. "God hath given unto us eternal life, and this life is *in* his Son." "He that hath the Son hath life." "He that believeth on *me* hath everlasting life," not he who subsequently by a definite act of faith appropriates the Spirit. Dr. Gordon's enduement theory is confronted with this dilemma. If by "life" he means life in Christ, *i. e.*, salvation by a definite act of faith appropriating the post-pentecostal Spirit of life, then, of course, all who died prior to Pentecost were lost, and so, too, those Christians who do not receive the baptism. This, of course, he does not mean. If, however, he mean, as we have shown he does, the power of holy living through the post-pentecostal communion of the Spirit appropriated by a definite act of faith, then he contradicts the records of Old Testament saints, who through faith wrought righteousness. This he has not considered. This enduement theory does not articulate with Old Testament Scriptures. Its *proton pseudos* is its repudiation of baptism *with* the Spirit.

The vivifying, sanctifying, energizing operations of the Spirit are by the author's theory logically denied to Old Testament saints. On the other hand, the theory that the gift of the Spirit by the risen, justified, and glorified Saviour was first communicated at Pentecost to effect organic union with the justified captain of our salvation, and guaranteed every believer, no more denies the operations of the Spirit who was with the Old Testament saints than it does the benefits of Christ's sacrifice for them, though he, the incarnate Christ, himself "was not yet."

Dr. Gordon advocates a theory which utterly fails in that which it attempts, to define the Pentecostal baptism and to draw a legible line of demarcation between the two dispensations as to the operations of the Spirit.

Greenville, Miss.

JOHN W. PRIMROSE.

GORDON'S "IMMORTALITY AND THE NEW THEODICY."

IMMORTALITY AND THE NEW THEODICY. *By George A. Gordon, Minister of the Old South Church, Boston.* Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1897. Pp. x., 130.

This is the first Ingersoll lecture upon "The Immortality of Man," in Harvard University. This lectureship was established by Miss Caroline Haskell Ingersoll in deference to the wish of her father. The endowment is \$5,000. One lecture must be delivered each year. The choice of the lecturer is not limited to any one denomination. Our Southern institutions of learning suffer for the want of such establishments. Here is an open door for service and fame, for the entry of some liberal spirit. But this is digression.

The essay before us is brilliant until it dazzles. Its conceptions are startling; its language glows with rare beauty; its press-work is luxurious. But, in the biting words of Dr. S. M. Smith, it teaches that "the chief end of God is to glorify man, and to develop him for ever." It is a "new theodicy." It is not a development of the thought of the past, the clarifying and advancement of the old argument for immortality; it is repudiation, destruction, reconstruction. Until the rise of modern evolution, and perhaps before the issuance of this book, the world never had any sound basis for its belief in immortality! It has believed, but its belief has not been rational and intelligent. The author has "sincere sorrow" in departing "from able and honored men," but when the truth is at stake and the life of humanity involved, "the sorrow must be borne."

"One must surrender at the start all hope of demonstration"—this is the primary condition of the discussion. It is not on this account to be excluded from a legitimate place in human thought; still it must be treated as an event which "cannot be proved." This seems to surrender to the agnostic before the battle begins; but our author reassures us by saying "the discipline of doubt is indispensable to the growing insight of mankind." "Those who doubt nobly, for the most part, doubt in hope." Doubt is the "sign of hope," the ray of "a prophetic hour."

Dr. Gordon then draws the issue. Of course, the question respects "the permanence of the human personality, the continuance of the soul after death." But this is superficial; to-day the problem states itself as never before. "It is a duel between two contrasted philosophies of man's existence, between universal reason and its opposite, between a noble optimism and an absolute pessimism." "And this means simply the ultimate reasonableness or unreasonableness, the intelligence or brutality of the Power that is responsible for our existence." This is the "deeper issue of the debate."

The essay then passes on to state "the evidence of the denial" of immortality. "The growth of the physical organization is accompanied, in all normal cases, with corresponding mental development." For every change in the bodily organism there is a corresponding change in the soul. Together they come into existence; together they grow; why not together they die? "Organization, then, is essential to the expression of mind; to the unbeliever it seems essential to the existence of mind." As the two—body and soul—rise together, so they seem to fall together.

The next section of the essay labors to discount this argument. "A further and perhaps larger deduction is necessary." "What is the nature of the organization upon which the mind is said to be completely dependent?" The conclusion reached is "that the body is a section of the total human consciousness, that it is a section which fluctuates greatly during the present life, and that as an inconstant part of the personality it may pass utterly away, and still leave the personality itself in full vigor and open to new and superior opportunities." "Human life is a chariot drawn by two horses, and when one drops, it does not follow that the other ceases to exist."

The sixth section of the essay states the "postulates of immortality." They are three: (1), The moral perfection of the Creator; (2), The reasonableness of the universe; and (3), The worth of human life.

This leads to the pointing out of two "illogical limitations" upon the interest of God in mankind: (1), The Hebrew idea of the remnant advanced into the Calvinistic idea of election. Isaiah was not blameworthy. "It was the best he could do, even under special inspiration." To such as Augustine, "who believed that one text of Scripture carried as much authority as another, a restricted theory of salvation was a necessity." (2), The second illogical limitation restricts "the opportunity of salvation for this life only."

The eighth section opens: "The advent of the doctrine of evolution has done much to discredit old notions of the relation of God to mankind." "A new humanity has arisen." "It is too vast and noble to be consigned to perdition." No man in his senses can survey the case and "admit that the saving interest of God in mankind ceases at death, and still believe that God is a moral being."

"The Creator's redeeming interest in mankind must continue for ever." Man is worth too much to perish; God cannot afford it. This is the core of the argument.

If to carry out this universal purpose of a "redemptive universe" it be objected that the scheme involves determinism, the author answers: (1), All great systems of theology are deterministic; and (2), "Determinism and freedom come near being but different sides of the same truth."

But there is a deep wish in the serious mind for "an outside, an unbiased, a higher and wholly competent judgment upon the question"; that is, for "the verdict of the Infinite." There are four paths to this verdict: (1), Through the higher instincts, not of one man, but of all men; (2), Through the kinship to the Infinite, not of single lives, but of all lives; (3), Through the ideals that dawn, not upon a few favored individuals, but upon mankind; (4), Through the great note of permanence in the soul. Through these channels the universe delivers the verdict of the Infinite upon the immortal dignity and destiny of mankind.

Reduced to a sentence, the argument is: God is responsible for the existence of man; his vested interests in the human race are immeasurably great; if any part of the race perishes, God will be a serious loser; if the entire race were to perish the Deity would be bankrupted.

R. A. WEBB.

STIFLER'S ROMANS.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS: A Commentary, Logical and Historical. *By James M. Stifler, D. D.*, Professor of New Testament Exegesis in Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. Pp. xvii., 275. \$1.25.

This is a valuable contribution to biblical literature. The style is clear, concise, cogent, simple, untechnical. The analyses of thought are abundant and original, their development firm, fresh, evangelical.

The author's aim "is to make the somewhat difficult Epistle to the Romans better understood—to report to the reader what the apostle has written. It is not put forth in the interest of any theological system; it has no theory of any kind to advocate, and no point to make, except by dispassionate study to ascertain the meaning of Paul's language." It is the product of twenty years' study with classes in the seminary.

As the best way to give the reader some idea of this commentary on the great book of the Romans, we make up from its pages the author's analysis of its contents, and present it in tabulated form.

I. GRAND DIVISIONS.

1. Salutation ((i. 1-7).
2. Introduction (i. 8-15).
3. Theme (i. 16, 17).
4. Sin (i. 18-iii. 20).
5. Righteousness (iii. 21-viii.).
6. Theodicy (ix.-xi.).
7. Christian Walk (xii.-xvi.).

II. SUB-DIVISIONS.

- 1 *The Outlook* (i.).
 - (1), The Salutation (i. 1-7).

- (2), Fraternal Introduction (i. 8-17).
- (3), Sin Begun: Guilt of Gentile World (i. 19-23).
2. *Jews Equally Guilty with Gentiles* (ii.).
 - (1), Principles of this judgment (ii. 1-16).
 - (a), According to "Truth" (vs. 2).
 - (b), According to "Deeds" (vs. 6).
 - (c), Without "Respect of Persons" (vs. 11).
 - (d), "According to my Gospel" (vs. 16).
 - (2), Upon These Principles Jews Guilty (ii. 17-24).
 - (a), Because They Knew the Truth.
 - (b), Because They Refused It.
 - (c), Because They Yielded to Idolatry, etc.
 - (3), Religious Rites Unable to Change Their State (ii. 25-27).
 - (4), This Judgment as to Their Guilt Founded upon Character (ii. 28, 29).
3. *Sin Concluded; Righteousness Begun* (iii.).
 - (1), Sin Concluded (iii. 1-20).
 - (a), An Objection Answered (vs. 1-8).
 - (b), Universality of Sin Proved (vs. 9-20).
 - (2), Discussion of Righteousness Begun (vs. 21-31).
 - (a), Righteousness Described (vs. 21-26).
 - (b), Boasting Excluded (vs. 27-31).
4. *Righteousness, as Described, in Harmony with Old Testament Scriptures* (iv.).
 - (1), Abraham was so Justified (vs. 1-5).
 - (2), This Method Celebrated by David (vs. 6, 7).
 - (3), Abraham was Justified Before His Circumcision (vs. 9-12).
 - (4), Promise of His World-heirship Made to Faith (vs. 13-17).
 - (5), Gospel-faith the Same as Abraham's (vs. 18-25).
5. *Justification by Faith a Safe Method* (v.).
 - (1), Tribulations Strengthen Faith (vs. 2-4).
 - (2), Love of God Stronger (vs. 5-11).
 - (3), Parallelism Between the Two Adams (vs. 12-21).
6. *Justification by Faith not Favorable to a Sinful Life* (vi.).
 - (1), Because Such a Life is Impossible (vs. 1-14).
 - (2), Because it is Inconsistent (vs. 15-23).
7. *Law Cannot Sanctify* (vii.).
 - (1), How and Why it Cannot (vs. 1-6).
 - (2), It Makes Sin Abound (vs. 7-13).
 - (3), It Delivers no Man (vs. 14-25).
8. *Holy Spirit Insures a Godly Life* (viii.).
 - (1), By Delivering from the Flesh (vs. 1-11).
 - (2), By Realizing our Sonship (vs. 12-17).
 - (3), By Preserving us in Suffering (vs. 18-30).
 - (4), By Putting into our Lips the Pæan of Victory (vs. 31-39).
9. *Theodicy* (ix.).
 - (1), Paul's Personal Sorrow for Israel (vs. 1-5).
 - (2), Their Rejection Consistent with the Word of God (vs. 6-13.)
 - (3), Also with His Justice (vs. 14-29).
 - (4), Their Present Status Before God (vs. 30-33).

10. *Israel's Failure Their Own Fault* (x.).
 - (1), Christ was Set Before their Eyes as the End of the Law (vs. 1-4).
 - (2), Salvation by Him was Free (vs. 5-11).
 - (3), It was even Universal in Scope (vs. 12-18).
 - (4), Their own Scriptures had Forewarned Them (vs. 19-21).
11. *Israel's Failure Not Complete and Final* (xi.).
 - (1), Their Present Rejection not Total (vs. 1-10).
 - (2), Nor is it Final (vs. 11-36).
12. *Religious Duties* (xii.).
 - (1), Special (vs. 1-8).
 - (2), General (vs. 9-21).
13. *Civil Duties of Believers* (xiii.).
 - (1), Duties to the State (vs. 1-7).
 - (2), To the Citizen (vs. 8-10).
 - (3), Enforcement of these Duties (vs. 11-14).
14. *Fraternal Duties in Matters of Conscience* (xiv.).
 - (1), With Respect to the Weak (vs. 1-12).
 - (2), With Respect to the Strong (vs. 13-23).
15. *Fraternal Duties Concluded* (xv.).
 - (3), Christian Forbearance (vs. 1-13).
 - (4), Personal Matters (vs. 14-33).
16. *Love Within the Church* (xvi.).
 - (1), Commendations (vs. 1, 2).
 - (2), Greetings (vs. 3-16).
 - (3), Solicitude (vs. 17-20).
 - (4), Further Greetings (vs. 21-24).
 - (5), Doxology (vs. 25-27).

Such is the author's plot of the thought of Paul in the Romans. Let the reader study it by the side of his own scheme, or that of other expositors, and we are sure his knowledge of this great treatise will grow.

We are particularly impressed by Dr. Stifler's treatment of that great central chapter, the fifth. He thinks this chapter does not treat of "the fruits of justification by faith," but of this question, "Is this method safe?" By faith, says the apostle (verse 2), we have access into the grace of justification, a justification which is upon the ground of the righteousness of God, wrought out by Christ, imputed by grace, and received by faith. Upon that scheme we "hope for the glory of God." Is a hope, so based, assured?

If it meets disappointment, it must be for one of three reasons: (1), Because faith—man's hold on God—fails; or (2), Because love—God's hold on man—fails; or (3), Because this whole scheme is inconsistent with God's moral government. Hope will not be disappointed on account of (1), Because "tribulations" and all that tends to break man's hold on God, strengthen faith; not on account of (2), Because if God loved us while we were enemies, how much more when we are friends, and if his death reconciled us, how much more shall his life preserve us; not on account of (3), Because the principle underlying this scheme of justification is precisely the principle which underlay the scheme of condemnation—"as in Adam, so in Christ."

Dr. Stifler is a Baptist, but there is the barest hint of his denominationalism in his comments on chapter vi. 3, 4. We must praise him for his self-restraint here; in his exposition, however, he verges perilously near to the heresy of salvation by "baptism." "The Romans," he says, "died to sin, the hour of that death being the time when they entered the waters of baptism." Again: "By the ordinance, or in the ordinance, they . . . came 'into' him." Again: "The union with Christ brought about in the ordinance." Again: "We are buried with him by means of into-death baptism." But Dr. Stifler distinctly repudiates the doctrine seemingly taught in these quotations. He expressly says, "It is not effected by the baptism, but in it."

But how can the doctrine of salvation by baptism be avoided by any of us? Christ said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Paul says: "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death." Peter says: "Baptism doth also now save us." Paul again refers to it as the "laver of regeneration." Ananias said: "Be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Why do not these passages teach dogmatically salvation by baptism?

Dr. Stifler answers: "The sign stands for the thing, and is constantly used for the thing." Be it so; then does the "sign" become essential to salvation? It would look so, for the "baptism" mentioned in the texts quoted seems to carry salvation with it: "baptism doth also now save us."

We suggest another solution. The word "baptism" is used in two senses in the Scriptures: (1), Literally, for an ordinance; (2), Figuratively, for suffusion of power. In the list of texts above quoted, the word has its second and figurative meaning. It has no reference to the rite of baptism in these places. Here the word imports the endowment of the subject with the power of the Holy Ghost. If that is its meaning, then it is exactly true that "baptism [not the ritual, but the spiritual] doth also now save us." Without such a baptism there is no salvation. The word has this spiritual signification in Romans vi. 3, 4. So interpreted, it leaves the Baptist no proof-text for his interpretation of the significance of baptism, and so despoils him of one of his strongest arguments for immersion as the mode.

This is a good book, free from the controversial spirit and phrases.

R. A. WEBB.

STERRETT'S "POWER OF THOUGHT."

THE POWER OF THOUGHT: WHAT IT IS, AND WHAT IT DOES. *By John W. Sterrett, Esq., of Rockbridge, Va.* With an Introduction by J. Mark Baldwin, Professor of Psychology in Princeton University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1896. 12mo, pp. xiv, 320.

This is a remarkable book. It is such for its authorship being the work of a country gentleman, who was moved by his love for thought to employ the leisure and retirement of a rural life in the profound and long-continued study of philosophy. He was a large farmer, a Presbyterian elder, who had carried his musket in the war between the States, and an alumnus of old Washington College, in the days of Dr. Henry Ruffner. His next studies were in the law, but the cares of a great inherited estate soon allured, or, perhaps, constrained him to relinquish his chosen profession. Those who are familiar with the reflective character and native

vigor of the Scotch intellect will not think it so strange that a retired country gentlemen should have produced a work on an abstruse science second in learning and power to none issued in our century.

Mr. Sterrett does not profess to have given a continuous and complete text-book upon mental science. For instance, he gives no complete classification of the mind's powers and faculties. He does not treat of the great faculties of suggestion, memory, and imagination. He gives no theory of the logical inference or syllogism. He does not profess to give any complete scheme of the feelings. The singular title of his book foreshadows its real design and contents with great precision. His system of psychology is obviously the Scotch in its main traits. He is a dualist, rejecting both the current modern materialism and idealism, and dealing at both these philosophic heresies deadly strokes of refutation as he passes along upon his chosen road. His one dominant purpose is to explain and establish his theory of volition, free agency, and moral responsibility. His central idea is, that rational thought is the active forth-putting of spontaneous mind, provoked, indeed, by sensation, but not created or directed by it. Sensations furnish the occasions, indeed, which incite the opening intellect to thought, but it is conscious mind which gives the form and power to its own thoughts. The author's main doctrine is, that cognition is by no means to be viewed as a passive function of mind, non-active in its quality; but that every thought, every concept, every rational idea is active, involving spiritual energy, engaging the soul's most intimate interests, and thus carrying in itself "ardor," "emotive energy," "desire," "rational impulse." With him thought is not only a light, but a power; and it is this power, and this alone, which culminates in choice. The power of thought, thus conceived, is the power which acts in a rational disposition, appetency and desire, and consummates itself in volitions. Thus the mind is only free, as it is a freely thinking power; thus the human agent is a rational one, and thus he is a morally responsible agent. In a word, with Mr. Sterrett thought is not only a light, but a power; and this is the power which constitutes man a free, rational, and responsible agent.

In defending this theory through twenty-four chapters, the author delivers some gigantic blows against the current philosophic heresies of our age, with a directness and crushing weight delightful to the friends of sound philosophy. Here is one specimen. He adverts to that piece of mischievous ingenuity, propounded by Kant, and since taken up by Darwin, Spencer, and the whole evolutionary school, viz., that the teleological concept cannot be validly drawn from the observed order and laws of the created universe, so as to be ascribed to God (if there is any). And hence, the teleological argument for the being and attributes of a personal and rational God, the very corner-stone of our natural theology, must be given up. "But," says our author, "suppose it be found upon correct inquiry that all human thought is teleological; that the whole interest and tendency of every thought in every rational human are towards some practical end and action; that were it not so, no thought would subsist in the human spirit? And this is just the truth. Now human thought is the only kind of thought of which man has any conscious experience. But if all known thought is found to be teleological, then for the human reason it is an inevitable induction that the thought seen in nature must also be teleological. In short, without teleology there can be no mind, no thought. But the universe is full of the products of thought, in its

order and adaptations. Therefore teleology is true; and it leads us up by one grand step to belief in the infinite creative mind.

Take another instance. Do Alexander Bain, Spencer, and their company try to persuade us that thought and volition may be accounted for as reflex sensations? Mr. Sterrett asks, Where is the physical seat of sensation? In the sensorium. How is the molecular tremor translated into a rational cognition, *and who translates it?* Only the conscious ego! And is not this the absolute condition of every such translation of physical sensation into thought, that I shall first cognize the me, the self, as a thinking agent over against the objective thing, which stimulated the sensorium as independent of it and antithetic to it? Yes. I must first know the ego, consciously and intuitively, in order to know the non-ego; and the absolute condition for cognizing the objective is that I must first distinguish and separate myself from it. Yet this wretched materialism would juggle us into the admission that the objective thing can generate the subjective as its own mere reflex! Which is precisely as absurd as to teach that the child generates its own father.

It is with similar power and directness that our author, in his twentieth chapter, annihilates the opposing heresies of a will fatally necessitated, and of a will *in equilibrio*, and endued with the power of contrary choice in the very instant of a determinate choice. He there establishes and accounts for the freedom *of the mind*, not of a distinct faculty of will, as consciously known to every man, and also asserts the doctrine of determinism or the certain directive power of the mind's own strongest subjective reason or motive. If any one has been embarrassed by that groundless antinomy, advanced by Sir William Hamilton and Paul Janet: "Since motives cause volitions, and efficient causes act necessarily, the will must be necessitated; but *per contra*, consciousness tells us immediately that we are free, and consciousness is an authority as high and original as the intuitive law of causation," let him read Mr. Sterrett's masterly exposure of the sophism.

The reader will notice two singular traits of this book. One is its highly figurative, not to say metaphorical style. This, indeed, is the natural expression of the thorough independence of the author's mind, *in verbis nullius inquit magistri addictus jurare*. He has read numerous authorities; he bows to none. Having done his own thinking for himself, he creates his own vocabulary, and, indeed, his own nomenclature. His propositions are, in their dress, frequently metaphorical; and the metaphors are as bold and original as they are expressive. The reader who is familiar with nineteenth-century philosophy easily translates our author into the more exact terms of the science. But we may say of him who attempts to read Mr. Sterrett without previous knowledge of philosophy, what Socrates is reported to have said concerning the writings of Heraclitus, "that the reading will require strong swimming."

The other trait which we note with some regret is the absence of a distinct explication of the great fact of native active disposition in man as one of the ultimate subjective determinants of his will. Aristotle, the most thorough of ancient annalists, arrives at this and stops at it as a simple fact of humanity, incapable of further analysis by us, that every spirit has its own native *hexis*. This is what the Latins called *habitus*, not *consuetudo* in our modern sense of habit or wont, but the "holding" or attitude of the spirit, as to the preferableness of an objective

reported in thought. We inevitably conceive of every active spirit as naturally *disposed some way*, this way or that, rightly or wrongly. And its native disposition cannot be the mere product of cognition, seeing that it is one of the determinants of whatever cognition the mind may take up concerning objects of preference or aversion. Our author seems to us in error, when he asserts that *every idea* we have carries with it essentially the vigor of a personal interest, a potential desire and a potential choice. It appears to us that plainly there are ideas which carry no such interest whatever, because they appeal to no native *habitus*, regulative of our preferences or aversions. For instance, let one say to his fellowmen: Let us hasten to Cripple Creek in Colorado, and dig there, because we shall find there abundance of waste earth and stones. This idea will certainly lead to neither desire nor action in any sane man. Why not? Because there is no disposition in any human spirit attaching any value or preference to waste earth and stone. But let one say: Let us hasten to Cripple Creek, Colorado, because they dig much gold there. If his proposition is believed, men will recognize a motive for going, because their native disposition prefers wealth. Once more, let this be the appeal: Let us hasten to dig in Cripple Creek, Colorado, in order that we may thereby contract a malignant fever while we get no gold. This reason, if believed, will certainly repel all hearers, and prompt a negative volition, because their native disposition is averse to suffering. In a word, this is the simple account universally true of all man's rational free choices, that the reason or motive of choice presents in thought a something which stands in the double category of the true and of the desirable. Multitudes of objects in thought, which are believed true, are not desirable, and multitudes of objects which are desirable are not believed true. As it is evidence which determines the true, it is native disposition which determines the desirable. And here are the two co-ordinate and ultimate determinants of rational action. Our analysis should omit neither. Our author stands in curious contrast with Victor Cousin. He makes thought impersonal and finds our only personality in the function of will. Mr. Sterrett asserts that it is thought, and thought alone, which constitutes our personality. The theory of the Virginian may give us a useful counterpoise to that of the great Frenchman. The faculty of cognition and the energy of disposition are the two inseparable factors which together constitute the rational, free, responsible person.

R. L. DABNEY.