

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

MANAGING EDITOR: GEORGE SUMMEY, D. D., LL. D.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS: G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D., R. C. REED, D. D.,
F. R. BEATTIE, PH. D., D. D., SAMUEL A. KING, D. D., LL. D.,
R. A. WEBB, D. D.

VOL. XVII.

JANUARY, 1904.

No. 3.

- I. JONATHAN EDWARDS. R. C. Reed, D. D.
- II. THE DUALISM OF TRUTH. L. G. Barbour, D. D.
- III. ST. ANTHONY THE GREAT. Henry E. Dosker, D. D.
- IV. THE PAPACY UNDER A SEARCHLIGHT: A Reply. P. P. Flourney,
D. D.
- V. THE INSPIRATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Clarence K. Crawford,
D. D.
- VI. THE BAPTISM OF CHRIST. Rev. Jno. W. Caldwell, Jr.
- VII. THE WOMAN QUESTION. James M. Chaney, D. D.
- VIII. PRACTICAL AND HOMILETIC NOTES: The Evils of Vacancies; A
Remedy Suggested. Chas. D. Gilkeson. Presbyterian Polity.
T. M. McConnell, D. D. Mormonism and Citizenship. Homiletic
Synopsis. R. Q. Mallard, D. D., George Summey, D. D., Rev.
R. C. Anderson, Jr.
- IX. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS. R. Q. Mallard, D. D., Jas. A. Quarles,
D. D., George Summey, D. D., Francis R. Beattie, D. D.
- X. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

RICHMOND, VA.:

WHITTET & SHEPPERSON, 11-13 EIGHTH STREET.

\$2.00 A YEAR, IN ADVANCE. - - - - - 60 CENTS A COPY.

The Presbyterian Quarterly:

A Theological, Philosophical and
Literary Review.

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY.

GEORGE SUMMEY, D. D., LL. D., *Editor*.

G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D., R. C. REED, D. D., F. R. BEATTIE, PH. D., D. D.,
Associate Editors.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY will be devoted, as in former years, to the discussion, in somewhat more elaborate form than is practicable in the excellent weekly papers of the church, of the great problems of religious and theological life, and of the work of the church, and to the careful review of current and new literature. It will be the aim of the editorial management to conduct it along conservative lines, while, at the same time, there will be due exposition of the views of those who affect the more advanced ideas. A cordial invitation is given to all who desire to publish their best thoughts upon any of the questions of the day, or who have practical ideas or methods to suggest to their brethren, to make use of its pages. It is believed that the publication of such a periodical as THE QUARTERLY has in the past been a stimulus to many of the best of our writers. Many more are invited to give to others, in this permanent form, the benefit of their thinking and of their experience.

The articles will, as a rule, have the names of their authors attached, and will be published on their responsibility.

To bring THE QUARTERLY within the reach of a larger number of ministers and others, it will be published for two dollars a year, in advance, or two dollars and fifty cents if payment is delayed. Subscriptions will be continued unless the publishers are notified to discontinue.

All remittances are to be made to MESSRS. WHITTET & SHEPPERSON, Richmond, Va.; not to any one of the Editors.

All communications touching editorial matters, manuscripts, books, exchanges, etc., are to be addressed to the Managing Editor, REV. DR. GEORGE SUMMEY, Monteagle, Tenn.

Address all Exchanges, Books, Manuscripts, etc., and all other editorial matter, to GEORGE SUMMEY, D. D., LL. D., Managing Editor, P. O. Drawer, 731 New Orleans, La., and all letters on business matters to WHITTET & SHEPPERSON, Richmond, Va.

P928A
V. 17
No 3-4
1924

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

No. 65.—JANUARY, 1904.

I.

JONATHAN EDWARDS.

THE 5th of October marked the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of this great and good man. In many parts of the country notice has been taken of this fact. Especially in New England, the region of his birth, and to which the labors of his life belonged, have fresh laurels been wreathed for his brow. But it is doubtful if any part of the country, or any section of the church, can pay him as sincere a tribute as the Southern Presbyterian Church. He thought as we still think on the great doctrines of grace, being a zealous Calvinist, and was in accord with the Presbyterian Church in his views of government, though he lived and wrought and died in the Congregational Church. If, therefore, any class of persons should honor the name and cherish the memory of Edwards, those should do so who hold Calvinistic views of doctrine, and Presbyterian principles of polity.

Moreover, while Edwards commands our admiration on many grounds, yet his chief title to our esteem is the almost unparalleled excellence of his Christian character. His life was radiant with the beauty of Christ, sweet and fragrant with all the tender and winsome graces of the Holy Spirit. To pass his life in review, and reflect on those qualities that marked him as the eminent Christian, must be a wholesome spiritual exercise.

The story of his life, quiet and uneventful for the most part, is quickly told. He did not figure as the hero in any great and thrilling conflict; there were few dramatic episodes to give variety to the usually smooth tenor of his career; but his days

were passed for the most part in the seclusion of his humble study, and in the routine of a village pastorate. Whatever of interest belongs to his life is due to the rare quality of the man and his work.

Jonathan Edwards was born 5th of October, 1703, at Windsor, in Connecticut. His parents were Timothy Edwards and Esther Stoddard Edwards. This worthy couple walked together as man and wife for more than sixty years. Eleven children were born to them, ten of whom were daughters, Jonathan being the only son. He entered Yale College in his thirteenth year, and graduated in his seventeenth. He was licensed to preach when only nineteen years of age, and served a congregation in New York with great acceptance for eight months. Shortly before he was twenty years of age he received the Master of Arts degree from Yale, and accepted an appointment in that institution as tutor. He remained in this position above two years; and then being urged by the people of Northampton to become assistant pastor to his aged grandfather, Dr. Solomon Stoddard, he consented, and was ordained to that work on the 15th of February, 1727, being in the twenty-fourth year of his age. At the end of two years his grandfather died, and then the whole work of the pastorate devolved on him. In that day change of pastorates was not by any means an every-day occurrence. The rule was for a pastorate to last a life-time. It was not the fault of Edwards, nor the want of desire on his part that this rule did not hold good in his case. He was constrained by conscience to cross the views of his parishioners touching one or two matters that gave rise to much feeling, and ultimately necessitated his giving up his work among them, after having toiled and prayed for them more than twenty-three years. No other church was available at the time. The commissioners for carrying on work among the Indians asked him to take charge of the mission at Stockbridge, Mass. He was formally inducted into his work there by a council, called for that purpose, on the 8th day of August, 1751. It goes without saying that he was faithful in the discharge of the lowly duties belonging to this sphere, and would cheerfully have spent the remainder of his days there, being fully persuaded that he was where God had

placed him. This would have made any place acceptable to him, so perfectly submissive was he to the divine will. When he had been there a little over six years, he received a call from the trustees of Princeton College to become the President of that young, but hopeful institution. It would seem that he was much more reluctant to accept this position of honor than he had been to accept work among the unlettered Indians of Stockbridge. The place was made vacant by the death of his son-in-law, Rev. Aaron Burr, and Edwards expressed himself as fearing that the contrast between him and his distinguished son-in-law would prove the unwisdom of the trustees in his selection. After mature consideration, however, and under the urgent advice of his friends, he accepted the presidency, and entered upon his duties in January, 1758. The small-pox was then at Princeton, and "as Mr. Edwards had never had it, and inoculation was then practiced with great success in those parts, he proposed to be inoculated, if the physicians should advise to it, and the corporation should give their consent. Accordingly, by the advice of the physicians and the consent of the corporation, he was inoculated February 13th. He had it favorably, and it was thought all danger was over; but a secondary fever set in, and by reason of a number of pustules in his throat, the obstruction was such that the medicines necessary to check the fever could not be administered. It, therefore, raged till it put an end to his life, on the 22nd of March, 1758, in the fifty-fifth year of his life."

Such are the leading facts which lie on the surface, and mark off his earthly span into different stages. There is nothing in the recital of these facts to suggest greatness, or to furnish the prophecy of enduring fame. But there were qualities in the man and elements in the work which he did that will perpetuate his name to the latest posterity.

1. **HIS WORK.** When Edwards began his work at Northampton, religion in New England was at a low ebb. The severe and fervent piety of the hardy pioneers had given place, in large measure, to a cold and feeble formalism; and the lofty morality of Pilgrim and Puritan, born of a profound reverence for the majesty and holiness of God, and supported by a conscience

thoroughly under the dominion of God's law, was yielding to a condition of life where human passions were allowed much freer scope. This decline was due especially to two things. One was the "half-way covenant"—a device by which those who had been baptized in infancy might have their children baptized. The condition which it imposed was not a profession of personal faith in Christ, and obedience to his requirements, but merely assent to the church covenant, and the promise of submission to church discipline. A little later the further step was taken of admitting these persons to the Lord's Supper as a "means of grace." Thus the conception of the church as a society of saints was obscured, and there was introduced into the church an unconverted element, with the inevitable result of lowering the tone of spirituality. The other cause of decline was the rise of Arminianism; not the red-hot, evangelical Arminianism of Wesley and his followers, but an Arminianism which, while confessing the need of the new birth, laid stress on human ability and the efficacy of the means of grace. On this subject, Williston Walker, in his history of the American Congregational Churches, very pertinently says: "It was but following out of the characteristics of human nature that when regeneration was looked upon as a change beyond human power, and at the same time many religious acts within a man's attainment were declared to be adapted to put the soul in a position of hopeful expectation, emphasis should be placed, in men's thinking, on the 'means' which man could employ, even while it was still affirmed that the divinely wrought change was the all-essential matter. Nor is it surprising that as time advanced, some ministers and some congregations began to question the extent of human inability, and query whether God had not so conditioned regeneration on the employment of 'means' that a 'sincere,' though necessarily imperfect, obedience would bring saving grace to him who rendered it." The spread of such doctrine deadened the sense of sin, and made place for a spirit of legalism. Under these blighting influences, already a number of churches in Eastern Massachusetts had ceased to feel the need of the atonement, had practically denied the Lord that bought them, and had formally embraced Unitarianism.

Such was the shadow resting on New England Puritanism when Edwards, a beardless youth, began to lift his voice in God's behalf in the church of Northampton. There was no uncertain sound in that voice. It rang out strong and clear on the doctrine of total depravity, and the sinner's absolute dependence on sovereign and invincible grace. Behind the voice was a heart warm and tender with the fulness of divine love. For a time his preaching had no perceptible effect. But by diligence in pastoral work and catechising of the children, he was getting a grip on all hearts. By days and nights of almost ceaseless prayer he was keeping his grip on the hand of God. At the end of seven years the seed which had been so faithfully sown, and which had been growing in secret, was now ready to put forth the blade, the ear, and the full corn in the ear. In December, 1734, in a series of sermons, Edwards set forth the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and exhorted to immediate repentance. God's Spirit gave effect to the truth. Hearts began to break, tears to overflow the eyes, and soon the whole town was stirred to the deepest spiritual concern. Religion was almost the sole topic of conversation; young and old were alike affected, and in the course of five months more than three hundred persons were believed to have been renewed by the power of God. News of this great awakening spread. Soon revivals occurred elsewhere. By request of friends, Edwards published a *Narrative of the Surprising Work of God*. This was published and circulated on both sides of the Atlantic. The Spirit was poured out on some of the Presbyterian Churches of New Jersey. Dr. Coleman, of Boston, invited Whitefield to visit New England. Soon this flaming evangelist, with his consuming zeal and thrilling oratory, was kindling all New England into religious excitement, and lighting fires here and there along the Atlantic seaboard from Savannah to New York. For years the "great awakening" continued, with more or less of power. It has been estimated that in the ten years between 1734-1744, out of a total population in New England of three hundred thousand, from twenty-five to fifty thousand were converted and added to the churches. Like results followed elsewhere. If we grant that the smaller of the two figures presents an exaggerated statement

of the case, still the fact remains that never has this country witnessed such a manifestation of religious feeling as the "great awakening." While connected with it there was an excess of emotional excitement, and some temporary evils, the main impulse was of incalculable value. It wrought a transformation that has continued to color church life from that day till this. The chiefest human instrumentality in this mighty spiritual upheaval was Jonathan Edwards. Had God used him for no other purpose, the churches of America would still have cause to hold him in grateful remembrance.

God did use him, however, for another purpose. Great as he was as a preacher, and blessed as was his work as evangelist, greater still was Jonathan Edwards as metaphysician and theologian; and more blessed still was his work as profound thinker and writer. Born just one year before John Locke died, he came into the inheritance of that great man's intellectual treasures. At the age of fourteen he read Locke's "Essay on the Human Understanding with the avidity," to use his own comparison, "with which the miser counts his gold." He became, in a sense, the disciple of Locke, but avoided the snare of materialism which Locke unintentionally spread. He carried his logical processes to profounder depths and to safer conclusions than did Locke, and has probably said the last word on one of the most perplexing questions with which the human mind deals—the relation of motive to volition. Since his day, ambitious intellects have broken away from his leading, and have tried to escape from his logic, but Edwards remains the master, and will probably remain so till the light of another life shall remove the limitations which God has imposed on us here. He published quite a number of his writings, among them as especially worthy of mention: *Thoughts on the Revival*, *Religious Affections*, *On Qualifications for Communion*, and *On the Freedom of the Will*. This last is the one most widely read, and which has contributed most to his fame as philosopher. He left in the press when he died a treatise on Original Sin, which bears the impress of all his other works—patient, painstaking and profound thought. If it were read slowly and prayerfully by every young man entering the ministry,

of the American churches, we might confidently predict a mighty reaction toward the best days of Calvinistic orthodoxy and of Puritan morality. Quite a number of his other works were published after his death: *History of Redemption*, *On the Nature of Virtue*, *God's Last End in the Creation*, *Miscellaneous Observations*, *Miscellaneous Remarks*, etc. In his letter to the trustees of Princeton College, he mentions as a reason for hesitating to accept their call, the work which he was doing with his pen. "I have already," he says, "published something on one of the main points in dispute between the Arminians and Calvinists, and have it in view, God willing (as I have already signified to the public), in like manner to consider all the other controverted points, and have done much towards the preparation for it. But besides these, I have had on my mind and heart, which I long ago began (not with any view to publication), a great work, which I call a *History of the Work of Redemption*, a body of divinity in an entirely new method, being thrown into the form of a history: considering the affair of Christian theology, as the whole of it, in each part, stands in reference to the great work of redemption by Jesus Christ, which I suppose, of all others, to be the grand design of God, and the *summum* and *ultimum* of all the divine operations and decrees; particularly considering all parts of the grand scheme in their historical order. The order of their existence, or their being brought forth to view, in the course of divine dispensations, or the wonderful series of successive acts and events; beginning from eternity, and descending from thence to the great work and successive dispensations of the infinitely wise God in time, considering the chief events coming to pass in the church of God, and revolutions in the world of mankind, affecting the state of the church and the affairs of redemption, which we have account of in history and prophecy; till at last we come to the general resurrection, last judgment and consummation of all things, when it shall be said, 'It is done. I am the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end.' Concluding my work with the consideration of that perfect state of things, which shall be finally settled to last for eternity. This history will be carried on with regard to all three worlds, heaven, earth and hell;

considering the connected successive events and alterations in each, so far as the Scriptures give any light; introducing all parts of divinity in that order which is most scriptural and most natural; a method which appears to me the most beautiful and entertaining, wherein every divine doctrine will appear to greatest advantage, in the brightest, in the most striking manner, showing the admirable contexture and harmony of the whole."

It may be worth while to pause and reflect for a moment on what is here brought to our attention. It required a capacious brain to project such a vast and original system of biblical theology as is here proposed. The conception was a bold one, and the attempt to realize it bordered on rashness. But what shall we think of the man who deliberately sets this task before him, not as impelled by any demand of his calling, nor as inspired by any ambition of authorship, but merely as a means of delightful and profitable pastime! Nor was this great undertaking enough to satisfy his craving for such pastime. "I have also," he writes, "for my own profit and entertainment, done much toward another great work, which I call the Harmony of the Old and New Testaments in three parts." It is matter for thankfulness that his great work on the *History of Redemption*, while not intended by the author to see the light, was given to the press by Jonathan Edwards, Jr., sixteen years after his father's death. It was first published in Edinburgh, the manuscript having been secured for that purpose by John Erskine, a predecessor and precursor of Thomas Chalmers. The extent to which Edwards influenced both of these eminent men can never be known; but Chalmers testified that Edwards' *Freedom of the Will* "had given him convictions that had never changed during forty-seven years, since he first read the book, and that it had helped him more than any book, excepting the Bible."

Elegance of style was not cultivated in Edwards' day as it is at present. Hence his writings lack that element of attractiveness. Some one has asserted, and probably with truth, that the more recondite the subject the more profound and abstract the reasoning, the more acute the logic, the more agreeable his style. He never moves so smoothly and gracefully as when boring his

way through regions of thought as dark and apparently impenetrable as the deep forests of Central Africa. But however rugged his style, as in the case of Aristotle, his matter is of such rare value that thoughtful students will not neglect it. Men are willing to dig through rough strata, if assured that gold is to be their reward.

II. HIS CHARACTER. Man is always greater than his greatest achievement. In the case of Edwards, this fact is easily recognized. In the formation of character he had a good start in that he was descended from a line of ancestors noted for piety and intelligence. His father was a minister of the gospel, who had taken the college honors at Cambridge, having received on the same day the degrees of Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts. His mother was the daughter of one of the most influential ministers of his day, the Rev. Solomon Stoddard. She was finely educated for that day, there being no institutions for the higher education of women. She was a woman of much refinement and polish of manner. By the law of heredity, Jonathan Edwards came into possession, as his birthright, of rare gifts of head and heart. Soon these were exalted and transfused by unusual measures of God's grace. He left a manuscript containing an elaborate account of his conversion. He says that from childhood he was much concerned about his soul, but was especially aroused on two occasions. The first was during a revival in his father's congregation when he was a mere boy. At this time his religious exercises were of a very delightful kind. He found pleasure in prayer and religious conversation with other boys. By and by his interest abated, and he finally concluded that it did not originate with the Spirit of God. His second awakening was while at college, and this time the prominent element was a most painful and overwhelming conviction of sin. It was during an illness, and he says, "God brought me nigh to the grave, and shook me over the pit of hell." The season of spiritual agony continued for quite a while, when it gradually gave way to a sweet and settled peace, and a joyous complacency in the character of God. He notes that a remarkable change passed over his feelings in respect to the doctrine of God's sovereignty in choosing

some men to life, and leaving others to perish eternally. From childhood his mind had been full of objections against the doctrine; but after his conversion he not only became reconciled to it, but actually found himself rejoicing in it. "The doctrine has very often appeared exceeding pleasant, bright and sweet. Absolute sovereignty is what I love to ascribe to God. But my first conviction was not so."

Shortly after entering on the work of the ministry, he wrote out a number of resolutions according to which his conduct was to be framed. These resolutions form an impressive testimony to the depth of his earnestness and consecration. The list is too long to be given entire, but a few may be noted as specimens.

"1. Resolved, That I will do whatsoever I think to be most to God's glory and my own good, profit and pleasure, ON THE WHOLE, without any consideration of the time, whether now, or never so many myriad ages hence; to do whatever I think to be my duty, and most for the good and advantage of mankind in general, whatever difficulties I meet with, how many and how great soever."

"2. Resolved, to be continually endeavoring to find some new contrivance to promote the forementioned things."

"4. Resolved, never to BE, DO OR SUFFER anything in soul or body, less or more, but what tends to the glory of God."

"5. Resolved, never to lose one moment of time, but improve it in the most profitable way I possibly can."

These are samples of a list which numbered seventy, and he charged himself to "remember to read over these resolutions once a week." He prefixed to them a short prayer recognizing his dependence on God, "Being sensible that I am unable to do anything without God's help, I do humbly entreat him by his grace to enable me to keep these resolutions, so far as they are agreeable to his will, for Christ's sake."

Endeavoring with unwearied diligence to keep his vows, and constantly seeking help of God, he rose to a height of gracious experience to which few Christians of any age have attained. He combined the mysticism of St. Bernard with the keen dialectic

tical spirit of Abelard. He never tired of reasoning on the mysteries of redemption, but while he reasoned, his soul "floated amid the cherubim." Hear him give an account of himself: "Once, as I rode out into the woods for my health, in 1737, having alighted from my horse in a retired place, as my manner commonly has been, to walk for divine contemplation and prayer, I had a view, that for me was extraordinary, of the glory of the Son of God, as Mediator between God and man, and his wonderful, great, full, pure and sweet grace and love, and meek and gentle condescension. This grace that appeared so calm and sweet appeared also great above the heavens. The person of Christ appeared ineffably excellent, with an excellency great enough to swallow up all thought and conception—which continued, as near as I can judge, about an hour, which kept me the greater part of the time in a flood of tears and weeping aloud. I felt an ardency of soul to be, what I know not otherwise how to express, emptied and annihilated; to lie in the dust, and to be full of Christ alone; to love him with a holy and pure love; to trust in him; to live upon him; to serve and follow him, and to be perfectly sanctified and made pure with a divine and heavenly purity. I have several times had views very much of the same nature, and which have had the same effects. I have many times had a sense of the glory of the third person in the Trinity in his office of sanctifier, in his holy operations, communicating divine light and life to the soul. God, in the communication of his holy Spirit, has appeared as an infinite fountain of divine glory and sweetness, being full and sufficient to fill and satisfy the soul, pouring forth itself in sweet communications; like the sun in its glory, sweetly and pleasantly diffusing light and life."

While his religious experience had its extraordinary raptures, lifting him to summits that touched the borderland of heaven, yet his daily life, his common experience might be described as a dwelling with God on the "delectable mountains." Let no one suppose, however, that these sweet ecstasies were unattended with a sense of unworthiness. He was poles apart from his great cotemporary, John Wesley, touching the matter of Christian perfection. "I have often," he says, "had very affecting views

of my own sinfulness and vileness, very frequently to such a degree as to hold me in a kind of loud weeping, sometimes for a considerable time together, so that I have often been forced to shut myself up. I have a vastly greater sense of my own wickedness and the badness of my heart than ever I had before my conversion. It has often appeared to me that if God should mark iniquity against me, I should appear the very worst of all mankind, of all that have been since the beginning of the world to this time, and that I should have by far the lowest place in hell."

Not only was Jonathan Edwards a marvellous combination of wrapt mystic and acute logician, he was also a combination of the scholarly recluse and the soul-stirring evangelist. He almost lived with pen in hand. "My method of study," he explains, "from my first beginning the work of the ministry has been very much by writing, applying myself in this way to improve every important hint; pursuing the clue to my utmost, when anything in reading, meditation or conversation has been suggested to my mind that seemed to promise light in any weighty point, thus penning what appeared to me my best thoughts on innumerable subjects for my own benefit." Thus it happened that besides publishing thirty-three works, he left more than fourteen hundred manuscripts, most of them comparatively brief, "which he wrote for his own private satisfaction."

About eighteen months ago, it was my privilege to walk through the Hall of Fame, annexed to the University of New York. One of the first names to greet my eyes was the name of Jonathan Edwards. My gratification was not greater than my surprise. The choice of the few immortals, whose names are thus to be perpetuated, has devolved on an age far removed in thought and feeling from the age on which Edwards stamped his impress. His rigid Calvinism is not popular in the highest literary circles, nor does his manner of life commend itself for imitation to the men of a softer and more luxurious civilization. It was, therefore, surprising and all the more significant to find the name of Jonathan Edwards chosen to shine among the stars of the first magnitude. His name led all the rest among the

preachers and theologians voted for, he receiving eighty-two out of the ninety-seven ballots cast, Henry Ward Beecher coming next with sixty-four. What a contrast between these two men during their life-time! Henry Ward Beecher was the very incarnation of the sentiment of the section in which he lived, and voiced that sentiment with a tongue that filled the civilized world with his fame. No man in any profession has stood in a more resplendent blaze of glory than that which enveloped Henry Ward Beecher when at the zenith of his wonderful career. The people of two continents paid homage to his genius, and thrilled under the spell of his matchless oratory. Jonathan Edwards spent most of his years as a village pastor. In the prime of his powers, because he was faithful to conscience and to the Word of God, his people rose up, and drove him from his home in poverty and sorrow, the only field open to him in which to serve his Master and earn his daily bread, an obscure mission among the Indians. This was succeeded by six or eight weeks of presiding over the then doubtful destiny of a young college; then small-pox and death. How strange that these two should be entered as contestants for the laurel wreath! How stranger still that this age—so near to the one, with vivid memories of his magic charm, so far from the other, when called upon to judge—should crown the village pastor as victor! The modest mystic, the humble missionary, comes out from the shadows of the distant past, and in the race for enduring fame outstrips the great metropolitan orator, the mighty apostle of freedom and loyalty, even while the latter's voice is lingering like sweet music in the chambers of the mind. How account for it? The explanation is to be found in the fact that the one was dealing with the transient, the other with the permanent. Beecher was the champion of a cause, which, however absorbing for a time, was short-lived in its issues. He voiced the sentiment of a passing hour. Edwards wrought in a quiet, but masterful way on problems that belong to all time. As long as men continue to be religious animals they must think on the mysteries out of which they came, through which they are passing, and into which they are going. And the man who, in the sphere of these mysteries, can answer their questionings with clearest and truest

voice is the one whom they will declare most worthy to be called a man of God, an ambassador of Christ. The fame of Edwards has been growing since his body turned to dust, and possibly the verdict of Robert Hall may yet become universal: "I consider Jonathan Edwards the greatest of the sons of men, not excluding any country or any age, since the apostolic."

R. C. REED.

II.

THE DUALISM OF TRUTH.

ONE Saturday night we went down to hear the Presiding Elder of the district preach a sermon preparatory to the celebration of the Lord's Supper on the next day. In early life we had been accustomed to heart-searching and warning discourses from the pulpit at such times. On this occasion we heard a carefully written attack on the precious old doctrine of the Perseverance of the Saints. Now, although we might have been in the enjoyment of the witness of the Spirit, himself bearing witness with our spirit that we were a child of God, an heir of God, and a joint heir with Christ, still, as we playfully said to the excellent brother afterward, there was danger of our falling from grace before we reached home that night, provided, of course, his doctrine was true.

The brother's argument was ingenious. He took up, one after another, several texts which might seem to favor the Arminian view; perhaps 1 Cor. x. 12, "Wherefore, let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall," or 1 Cor. ix. 27, "Lest that by any means when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." Then at the end of a paragraph he would say, "If this does not teach that a man may fall from grace, or that there is danger of our falling from grace, I do not understand the meaning of language."

There is one passage, however, which the preacher did not quote—Acts xxvii. 30, 31, "As the shipmen were about to flee out of the ship, when they had let down the boat into the sea, under color as though they would have cast anchor out of the foreship, Paul said to the centurion and to the soldiers, Except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved." After reading and expounding this passage, the worthy Presiding Elder might add, "If this text does not teach that the ship on which Paul and the two hundred

and seventy-five others were buffeted about on that dark and tempestuous night, might be swallowed up by the waves, or was in danger of going down with all on board, then I do not understand the English language." Yet, from Acts xxii. we learn that while Paul was praying in the temple at Jerusalem, a short while before this, his last journey, the Lord said to him, "Depart, for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles." This purpose of the Lord would have been defeated by the loss of Paul's life in the Adriatic Sea. Again, in the night which he passed in the Tower of Antonia, a prisoner, under the guard of the Roman Chiliarch, the Lord stood by him and said, "Be of good cheer, Paul, for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also in Rome." And in chapter xxvii. 22; sqq., Paul says to his terrified fellow-passengers, "Be of good cheer, for there shall be no loss of any man's life among you, but of the ship. For there stood by me this night the angel of God, whose I am, and whom I serve, saying, Fear not, Paul; thou must be brought before Cæsar, and, lo! God hath given thee all them that sail with thee."

Again, in verse 34, Paul assures them, "There shall not an hair fall from the head of any of you."

And so it came to pass, that after all the perils of that fearful night and the succeeding morning, perils from wind and wave, and an unknown passage or channel way into what is still known as St. Paul's Bay, and perils from the ship's crew, and from the would-be murderous soldiers—so it came to pass that some by swimming, and those who could not swim, yet by the direction of the cool-headed centurion, utilizing boards and broken pieces of the ship, they all escaped safe to land. Just as the Lord—is it not Christ?—had promised that they should.

1. Let us now place, in immediate juxtaposition with this account, a few passages referring to the final deliverance of God's children, no matter how sorely bestead on life's stormy sea.

Thus in John vi. 37, "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." How that pronoun of the first person rings forth again and yet again, like some sweet chime of hope and cheer. *πάν ὃ δίδωσί μοι ὁ πατήρ, πρὸς ἐμέ ἔξει· καὶ τὸν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς με.*

Christ might be styled "the God of the First Person," as he truly is from Genesis to Revelation. And then the well-known, and here how precious, double Greek negative, *οὐ μή*, as if he had said, "I will not, I will not cast out."

The Master goes on to say that he had come from heaven to do not his own will, but the will of him who sent him; and what was that divine will, guided by supreme wisdom, and backed by almighty power? "That of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." In consideration of which, and of many other portions of Holy Scriptures, we may boldly say, if they do not teach the safety of God's believing children, I cannot understand the meaning of language. May we advert to one more, and a very striking passage, in Matt. ii. 13, 14? The wise men from the East have taken their leave of the infant Jesus, and now an angel of the Lord appears in a dream to Joseph, saying, "Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and flee into Egypt, for Herod is going (*μέλλει*) to seek the young child to destroy him" (*τοῦ ἀπολέσαι*). Instead of quibbling about the matter, Joseph arose, took the little child and his mother, by night, and departed into Egypt. If we understand the force and intent of human language, that little child (*τὸ παιδίον*) was in peril of his life. Again, if we understand the force and intent of human language, it was as certain that Herod would not slay the infant Christ, as that God lives and reigns. Hence we are fully justified in holding that our excellent brother, the Presiding Elder's argument was only plausible, and the Arminian view narrow, and so far erroneous.

2. We need not dwell upon the long known and eminently sound tenet that some doctrines are what the judicious Turretin calls "impossible," that is, of two given doctrines only one can be true; if that one be true, the other must be false. It seems a pity that the gigantic word "impossibilitas," which Cicero never heard of, should, like some huge saurian, have become extinct and fossilized.

On the other hand, doctrines often seem inconsistent with each other when they are not so in fact. The apparent inconsis-

tency is due to our ignorance and mental weakness. And it is wonderful in how many instances these seemingly conflicting doctrines are of supreme importance. But for them, how meagre would our knowledge of the great God have been. To have kept them locked up in his own bosom, and thus forever withheld from our possession, would have been to "leave us poor indeed," to have kept back from us our richest inheritance in the knowledge of him. Now that so many of them have been revealed, it is dangerous to fly in the face of God. And the type of theology which most fully accepts these transcendent truths will be most fully in accord with God's nature, works, word and ways. And any type of theology which accepts them only in part will be so far inconsistent, illogical and false. Yet, of course, if it can be proven unquestionably and unmistakably of two doctrines, both of which seem to be taught in the Scriptures, that one or the other must be false, all candid men will at once say that either the Scriptures, in whole or in part, are untrue, or else that one or the other or both sets of proof texts have been misunderstood. A remarkable illustration of this is found in the Romish doctrine of the Eucharist, wherein an absurd notion of some early writers of the church, first formulated A. D. 831 by Paschasius Radbert, a monk, and afterward Abbot of Corbery, has, by unsurpassed audacity, been made to attack not only the Scriptures, but even the very foundations of knowledge.

Protestant Calvinists and Protestant Arminians alike hold that the Romish doctrine of the Eucharist, and the consequent doctrine of the Mass, are absolutely inconsistent with some of our Saviour's plainest utterances, and with the intuitions of the human mind, which are a kind of revelation. The rejection of our intuitive beliefs is fraught with untold evil, and this is well shown by the history of those Romish figments. But this wise, sober course of the Protestant world is infinitely removed from the error which we are combatting; for two truths may stand firmly each on its own foundation, and yet it may be difficult, or even impossible, for us, with our present degree of intellect and information, to show their agreement; and in some instances this task may be beyond all created ability, either past, future, or

possible. Yet the knowledge of the separate truths may be of extreme value to angels and to men.

We have ventured to call this quality, "The Dualism of Truth." The clear understanding of this aspect of truth is of inestimable importance. No one who fully grasps the subject need ever suffer a moment's uneasiness from the narrow, popular objections that disturb ill-informed and unstable souls.

We would never have dwelt at such length upon thoughts so familiar to all Presbyterian and Reformed divines, except for the fact that we desire to give an historical view of the subject on a large scale. All of us are acquainted with the beautiful historical argument for the divinity of Christ. Nothing in my theological course of study under Dr. Charles Hodge was more pleasing than this, in which the student of God's Word begins at the first of Genesis and traces down through all the subsequent ages the career of our Redeemer from the earliest and somewhat dim theophanies of Eden until the time when the Christ was powerfully declared to be the Son of God by his resurrection from the dead. Let us take up the vast theme on which we have entered, and learn what we can of it from God's own Word. A part of what we shall say will be the inspired verities of that Word; another part, it may be, will consist of conjectures, to be received as such, and to be held as we hold hypotheses in natural science. An hypothesis is subject to amendment, restatement, even rejection; yet without hypotheses science could hardly have advanced at all.

Let us now go back to the beginning, and in so large a subject, what is worthy of that designation except the "beginning" of John's Gospel, when the Logos was, when the Logos was with God, when the Logos was God? The very deepest of all truths concerning this august Being are expressed with extraordinary brevity and force in his own saying to Moses, "I am he who is. Tell them, I AM hath sent thee." Eternal personal existence and unity of being are here condensed into a statement of unsurpassed grandeur.

Resting on this bed rock of truth, we find next in importance, gradually evolved in the Scriptures, but in fact co-eternal with

God's self-existence, the tri-unity of his nature, the three subsistences, the three hypostases, the three personæ. There is an irresistible fascination in standing thus upon the dividing line of the two eternities, and casting a trembling look back over the dark and shoreless ocean of the Past, over the Past which was God's, and not ours. In order that we might do so, he gave us the exalted, but fearful gift of imagination, so that we might form some conception of what he is. May this be done now and always with reverence and godly fear! Throwing back the search-light of the Bible upon this unlimited and fathomless abyss, we behold, side by side in God, unity of essence and trinity of person. The doctrine of the trinity has been persistently, not to say stupidly, misunderstood by the enemies of our faith. Yet after the removal of all misconceptions and misrepresentations, can any man comprehend the relations of these two fundamental doctrines? So far from it, we believe that the solution of the problem is beyond and above the reach of the loftiest angels, and will be so forever! We find the two doctrines imbedded in the deepest mysteries of the divine nature, and as independent of the divine will as is God's eternal existence itself; for the Jehovah did not will to be; he simply was; and he did not will to be one and trine; he was so, and is so, and shall be so, world without end.

Here, too, we find an antitype—if we might not say the prototype—of the apparent antagonisms of truth, whereby the faith of God's children has been tried in both Old and New Testament times. May we not add, that it is only a paltry treatment of so noble a theme to pick out, here and there in the Bible, certain well-known texts, which set forth one aspect of a comprehensive truth, and, with a roll of drums and a flourish of trumpets, to say, "If this does not mean so and so, we do not understand the meaning of language." But now comes the hour looked forward to from all eternity by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; the hour when the Word shall speak, that Word which shall never be silent again. Step by step the hands on the dial plate creep to the fore-appointed place. The pendulum beats yet once more, and the Logos stretches forth his hand over the waste, and utters the primordial imperative, "Be!" and lo! the shining ranks of

cherubim and seraphim flash out from the abyss of old night. A moment ago, and they were not in existence; now, to adopt the fine phrase of an American poetess—

“Henceforth their life is parallel with God’s.”

More beautiful than the earliest dawn of light upon the chaos was the inpouring of the uncreated splendor of God upon the angelic intelligences. There was a new life, a new joy, a new holiness in the heaven of heavens.

To give unity to our discussion, let us select an angel of supreme intellectual and spiritual powers. Shall it not be Gabriel, who was afterwards sent on so many exalted ministries from heaven to earth—who could say of himself, “I stand in the presence of God”? To that magnificent being, may we say, the greatest of the first-born sons of God, perhaps the suggestion of Dr. Hamilton, of the Scotch Church, London, might apply, viz., that he might look upon the highest efforts of human intelligence much as the scientists of the most cultured nations of earth would regard some curious ingenuity of an Esquimaux. So profound and thoughtful a being must have had an extraordinary experience, a most remarkable life history; for his career has been coeval with all the works of God. If, as we may reasonably suppose, his original endowments were superior to those of the most gifted member of the human race, he has also had enormous advantages in length of time for study, and in intimate acquaintance with principalities and powers.

3. PERPLEXITIES OF AN ARCHANGEL. Let us now glance briefly at some subjects that, in our judgment, might possibly perplex the mind of an angel like Gabriel.

(1) The eternal existence of God through all the limitless past; the horologe beating off the innumerable moments of duration, until the fulness of the time for creation had come. Human philosophers, overpowered by the immensity of this subject and the apparent impossibility of co-ordinating it with our other knowledge, have fled to the unthinkable figment of a *punctum stans*, a duration without succession. Augustine (Confess., I., 10) says, “Since thy years fail not, thy years are one

to-day. All things of to-morrow and all beyond, and all of yesterday, and all behind it, thou hast done to-day. What is it to me though any comprehend not this?" This is the great Latin father's opinion in his own words. Since this is a matter directly involving the infinite, there seems to be no reason for holding that any created intellect whatever could or can comprehend it.

(2) The creation of angels *ex nihilo*. How has our own race wrestled with that problem!

(3) Closely allied to this, the separate, personal existence of the creature; as an entity distinct from God; not a billow on the unconscious ocean of deity; not a mere thought, not a smile or a sigh, not a conation of that which itself neither thinks, nor smiles, nor sighs, nor endeavors. Again, not a spark thrown off from some central sun, and that may be extinguished in endless night.

(4) The fall of Satan and his hosts into irremediable ruin, notwithstanding God's infinite power, wisdom and love.

(5) The entrance of sin and misery, as an eternal element of the coming history of the universe.

(6) The creation of matter, a substance so alien to spirit, and therefore, one would think, so much more difficult to create than spirit. Such a waste of creative power! Made for what possible purpose?

(7) The gradual development of the cosmos out of the chaos, perhaps the formation of worlds from an original vapor, when "the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy"; the birth of heat in the midst of the absolute cold of space; the dawn of light amid the eternal darkness.

(8) In some respects, even more wonderful, a new type of life, with which we children of men are so familiar now—vegetable life, the spring-time of the universe, after the one long winter, and the first appearance, we may perhaps say, of beauty, the shadow of the prime beauty, and author of all loveliness, who, to quote Augustine again (*Confessions*, I., IV.) is "most beautiful, yet most strong," and in Bk. X., 38, "Too late loved I thee, O thou Beauty of Ancient Days, yet ever new!" May we not call this

unification of life and beauty in the vegetable world a hieroglyph of God?

(9) Animal life introduced a new and, *a priori* speaking, an impossible combination of the immaterial with the material. Up to this day we cannot understand it. Intellect, however feeble, yet real, *bona fide* intellect, sensibilities and will, together with the mystery of animal life; how shall we explain these things? Even we in whom they are all found; not only animal life, but animal death as well; a reversion of matter to a more or less chaotic state, and an extinction of mind.

(10) And now Man comes, wondrous being; greater than the beasts of the field, a little lower than the angels, made in the image and the likeness of God, of the same kind of spirit—substance with Jehovah himself; beautified with holiness; capable of indefinite mental and spiritual growth; thus far the most remarkable product of the forces of the universe—with what intense curiosity must he have been regarded by the chiefest of the angels!

(11) Most inscrutable of things appertaining to this new creation was the race-bond. For a period of time, we do not know how long, there had been something analogous to this bond in both the vegetable and the animal kingdoms; but for moral and spiritual creatures nothing resembling it had ever come to light before. What would be the relation of the children to the two parents of mankind? How this question has been discussed by the race! How the relation has been battled over! And who but God understands it? Is Traducianism the true theory? Or is it Creationism? Or is there some third answer? And what difficulties start up, no matter which theory we adopt! Augustine to Jerome: "Tell me what to believe." Is any angelic intellect lofty enough, broad enough, profound enough to solve these enigmas?

The bearing of this on our theme is obvious. Whether we hold the realistic view, or the representative view, or say with Dr. Landis that $\xi\varphi\ \tilde{\omega}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tilde{\eta}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\nu$ is a statement of a fact, not an explanation—a fact perhaps inexplicable to us, yet needful to the justifying of the ways of God to man; in any case we

have something revealed that is beyond our present comprehension, or that is apparently contradictory to, or in some way inconsistent with other truths.

(12) There immediately flows out of this the question concerning the fall of man. How came he to fall? This, as we have shown, was not a wholly new question; yet each sinning angel had sinned and fallen for himself. But in the case of man the destiny of every succeeding member of the race was in some way wrapped up in the first sin of the first man. How are we to understand that brief, relative clause in Rom. v. 12? Shall we translate it "in whom all sinned"? Or, as we prefer, "for that all sinned"? Tremendous moral causation! "For that!" Coupler stronger than steel, indissolubly linking together "Death passed upon all men" with "all sinned."

And how did the "all" sin? Ah! that one terrific *ἡμαρτον*—what untold guilt and woe, horror and hell are locked up in that Greek word! And with what dismay might a philosophic angel look down upon the deluge, and hear the despairing shrieks of the drowning myriads, and behold earth itself converted into one silent sea of death, on whose surface anon pale and ghastly corpses float; and still later upon the dry land turned into an immense and abiding charnel-house, where saints and sinners alike slumber through the centuries, and the grave, hideous monster, enthroned above all, saith not, "It is enough."

Our subject expands upon our view; but, of course, much can safely be left to our readers. May we advert for a moment to what may be considered, we venture to think, the chief perplexity of an angel, viz.: The incarnation of the Logos, the incomprehensible union of matter, and created mind with uncreated Deity, two natures in one person forever; a scheme of thought so admirably elaborated from the inspired elements in Holy Scripture, by that acute Grecian intellect; the Logos, too, made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death? And words more fearful than all the realistic descriptions of the intense physical agonies of the crucified One, as penned by the evangelists, the Lord of glory was "made Sin for us" (*ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν*, 2 Cor. v. 21), a thought from which Gabriel himself

might shrink back with a shudder, if we may suppose him to have looked over Paul's shoulder while the Apostle was writing; or when this truth was first made known to him, must he not have recoiled with an unutterable dread, as a traveller does from the sheer verge of a precipice, upon which he has suddenly come in the darkness of midnight?

Time would fail us to tell of the angel's bending over from heaven (*παράκλιναι*) to look down eagerly into God's dealings with man (1 Peter i. 12); of the abandonment of the Gentile world to their own devices in Abraham's day; of the casting away of Israel in Christ's day, of the remnant of Abraham's natural seed obtaining mercy, and of the rest being hardened; of the Gentiles obtaining mercy by the disobedience of Israel; of the abundant grace shown to the Gentiles at last inuring to mercy again toward Israel. In view of all which goodness and severity of God, the Apostle is overwhelmed with astonishment, and cries out in exclamations at the depth and the unsearchableness of the wisdom and the knowledge and the judgments of him, of whom and through whom and for whom are all things. And the cry is not wholly one of joy; for it is the beautiful that soothes, gladdens, enraptures, while the sublime thrills, overpowers, or even destroys.

GENERAL REMARKS.

1. Here, as in so many other cases, we must be careful not to generalize beyond what the facts warrant. This vice of generous intellects must be resisted. But surely many of the perplexities that beset every thoughtful man arise from the Dualism of Truth. Some truths are too vast for the comprehension of the finite mind; some relate to facts outside of our consciousness, and some are concerned with apparent conflicts of knowledge, and these are the very ones that perplex the inquirer, and demand of him great solidity of understanding, humility and faith. They require—to borrow an artist phrase—a broad treatment, a largeness of view, such as suits a grand life-size historical painting, and not the microscopic niceties of a miniature. In fact, it is only by such breadth and largeness that we can arrive at the truth.

2. Some mysteries are cleared up after a while, as that of the

humiliated, yet triumphant, Messiah that was to come. And more may be.

3. Why does God reveal to us these double-faced truths? Not, surely, to disturb us needlessly, but to lead us on into a deeper knowledge of himself; to increase our faith, to enlarge our holiness; and God's way of accomplishing these high ends for us must be either the only way possible, or at least the wisest and the best.

4. We suggest the fourth for meditation and question. We all know that the unity of God, as against polytheism, has stamped itself on the universe which he has made, and the Trinity has made its impress upon the plan of redemption. It has been said that without a Trinity redemption would have been impossible. At all events the doctrine of the Trinity is profoundly involved in the actual work of redemption. Hence the question arises whether the combination of unity and trinity in the Godhead is ever, in any way, at the bottom of the Dualism of Truth. Or, does our perception of this Dualism everywhere else prepare us to accept the doctrine of the Trinity?

5. We may expect new and deeper mysteries to emerge hereafter from the unfathomable depths of Deity to challenge our faith and to intensify our adoration.

We read, years ago, in some one of Charles Dickens' works, an account of a stage-coach ride up to London. The night air was cool and refreshing, the English turnpike road was admirably smooth, and the coach bowled along over it in the most exhilarating way, and the driver called to his horses, "Yo ho! yo ho!" And when we recall the scene, we feel like echoing back across the Atlantic the merry shout, "Yo ho! yo ho! yo ho!" And we wish that we were there.

A grander spectacle, however, may be beheld at our own homes. Let us go forth by night and look up at the constellation of Hercules: at that marvellous globular cluster which no man can fathom or understand. Faintly visible to the naked eye as a most delicate brush of white light on the blue of heaven, under a powerful telescope it leaps out into crowds of separate blazing worlds, thus, by the magic of the lenses, accomplishing in a

moment what astronomers say requires ages on ages to effect.

But this is not the most deeply interesting point to us. If it be asked whither is the sun, with our earth and the rest of the solar system, speeding on its course? With one voice the scientists answer, Toward this constellation of Hercules. Day after day, night after night, through the years, and the millenniums, the stars in that neighborhood are opening apart, slowly receding from one another and from λ or ν Herculis; and those in the opposite region of the sky are slowly closing together behind us.

This is one of the most notable discoveries of our modern astronomy. Whither our solar system shall be going ten thousand years hence no man knows. Whither it is flying now has been sufficiently ascertained. In this lofty swing of motion and of thought we may take refuge from the littleness of our petty daily life, and may feel that we are evermore in the hands of the all-wise and almighty One. In the Prologue to *Faust*, Raphael sings—

“Still quiring as in ancient time
With brother spheres in rival song;
The sun with thunder-step (*donner gang*) sublime,
Moves his predestined course along.”

But inconceivably great as the physical universe is, God is still greater, immeasurably greater. He too moves with thunder-step sublime along the course which he himself hath predestinated according to the good pleasure of his will. Before all worlds, he was; and if they should be annihilated, he would still be; for hath he not said, “I Am”?

The brilliant German poet comes so near the scriptural truth here! Speaking of the sun, Raphael says:

“Angels are strengthened by his sight,
Though fathom him no angel may;
Resplendent are the orbs of light,
As on creation's primal day.”

But in the end of the Prologue, Raphael, Gabriel and Michael rise in their chorus up to God:

“Angels are strengthened by thy sight,
Though fathom thee no angel may;
Thy works still shine with splendor bright,
As on creation’s primal day.”

Beautiful as these words are, they give no hint of the ineffably glorious progress in God’s revelation of himself to angels or to men. While the cherubim are singing, the splendor of the Most High’s works is as bright “as on creation’s primal day.” But how about the spiritual glory, which so unspeakably outshines all material brightness, and which not indeed in its unchanging, essential divineness, but in its manifestation, glows and grows through the ages?

At least such has been the case heretofore. Of the future what can be said? How can there be any greater tenderness, compassion, condescension, self-denial, self-abnegation, may I say self-immolation, than the Son of God has already shown to lost men? Or more fearful hatred of sin and more awful punitive justice?

An English philosopher has conjectured that in the coming eternity there may be some exhibitions of the divine vengeance on sin that shall appall the stoutest-hearted cherubim. We may also conjecture that some wholly unexpected display of God’s unfathomable goodness may so utterly overwhelm the Lord’s children that they shall cry to be delivered from the sight, and long for “a quiet oratory of prayer,” as Jean Paul expresses it, where they may weep before God.

Thus may our deepest religious affections sustain the burden which is intolerable to the strongest intellects; and may we understand why Faith and Hope and Love not only may, and shall, but must needs abide forever.

L. G. BARBOUR.

Louisville, Ky.

III.

ST. ANTHONY THE GREAT.

A STRANGE and mysterious man inhabited the ruins of the old castle in the craggy mountains—so the peasants of Middle Egypt said—about the year of our Lord 281. He was mentioned with bated breath, and amazing stories were told concerning him. Tired wayfarers had heard appalling shrieks and moans issuing from his unopening cell. Stories were told of wild scenes around it, and lurid lights; of angry voices, in hot debate; of muffled sounds of stripes and wails of agony; of scanty supplies of food, semi-annually handed to and mutely received from above by the ghostly tomb-dweller.

Who was he, and whence, and why there? Would you know? For the stories of that hermit-life cluster around a true, living personality.

It was Anthony, surnamed the Great. He was born at Coma, near Heracleia, in Middle Egypt, A. D. 251, from an old and quite wealthy Coptic family. Even in his youth, so they say, he had been different from other boys, avoiding company, and loving solitude and musings and seriousness. Dainties and delicacies he cared not for, luxury he hated, learning he detested. The early death of his parents plunged him still deeper into the depths of his own mysterious self, and gave an unrestrained sway to his peculiarities.

And so it came to pass one day, a Sabbath day, as he sat in the house of God, that the gospel of the day was read, the story of the rich young man—"Go, sell all that thou hast, and give it to the poor, and come thou and follow me." It sunk into his heart, and he obeyed it literally. The broad, rich acres were sold, his estate disposed of, and the proceeds divided among the poor. A little remnant he kept for himself and for his only sister, but even that he gave away, as again he heard, "Care not for the

morrow." And so he dwelt in a little hut opposite the old parental estate, and began a life of "training," laboring with his hands for sustenance, and giving to the poor what he needed not. He associated with old, ascetic persons; for even then, although sporadically, Christians had begun to follow the example of the Jewish Essenes and the Egyptian Therapeutae. A burning zeal to excell them all devoured the soul of the young ascete. Torments untold he daily endured, not so much physically, although he was ascetic almost unto self-destruction, but especially mentally and spiritually. The violent perversion of every natural trait was not accomplished in a day, the power of his young life not broken without a dreadful struggle; the past not relinquished without a vigorous protest. The mental horrors of those dreary days assumed an objective form. To his diseased fancy the internal battle was fought externally. Demons appeared to him, and smote him and wrestled with him in his solitude, and so the tale of the peasants, profusely embellished as it was, yet rested on a sure foundation, and had in it a germ of a potent reality.

Says Athanasius, the venerating friend and enthusiastic biographer of Anthony, whose story of this wonderful life reads like a weird romance: "He protected his body with faith, prayers and fastings, setting his thoughts on Christ and on his nobility through Christ, and on the rational faculties of the soul, and again on the terrors of the fire and the torments of the worm, and thus escaped unhurt; . . . therefore he chastised his body more and more and brought it into slavery." Would you know how? He denied himself sleep; often for whole nights in succession. He ate but once a day, after sunset, and then but sparingly. At times but once in two days, and not rarely but once in four. Bread, salt and water were his only food. This dreadful asceticism culminated in a frenzied state of mind, in a sort of wild delirium, in which the hosts of hell appeared incarnate, and he felt himself overwhelmed by agonizing physical suffering.

At one time, as he lay faint and exhausted and prostrate, on the damp floor of his cell, he claims to have heard the voice of God: "Anthony, I was here, but I waited to see thy fight. There-

fore, since thou hast withstood and not been worsted, I will be to thee always a succor, and I will make thee to become famous everywhere."

From that day onward there comes a change over this mysterious life. Like the mighty river of his native land, which, bursting from its sources, in its onward course, is often convulsed by foaming cataracts, which come at greater intervals until finally the broad current flows peacefully and majestically into the wide sea—such was the life of St. Anthony.

His fame had spread meanwhile, and his example was eagerly followed. He was compelled, almost by sheer force, to open the long-locked door of his cell, and to come forth to superintend the life of numerous hermits, who, without his knowledge, had gathered around him during the quiet twenty years of his entire seclusion. His abnormal endeavors to literally enforce misunderstood demands of the gospel had led him, along a cruelly tortuous way, to the peace of God. No doubt but his later years are full of noble sentiments of a truly evangelical spirit, and suggestive of such growth in grace as has been but rarely attained by man on earth.

Meanwhile, the clouds had been gathering on the ecclesiastical horizon. Galerius Valerius Maximinus, the "shepherd emperor," had ascended the throne. A brutal and shockingly profligate tyrant, he was easily induced to renew the stringent edicts against the Christians, and once again the martyr-blood began to stream, and the amphitheatres to resound with their dying wails, and the sun to be darkened by the smoke of devouring flames. In Alexandria a hot persecution raged. And suddenly, on the streets of the luxurious city, a strange apparition was seen, a man with streaming beard and attenuated form, with unkempt hair and blazing eyes, sparingly dressed, in the coarsest possible garments, made of the skins of animals, a girdle around his loins—a veritable picture of the Baptist preacher of repentance, who of yore had caused Judea to tremble at his word. His penetrating voice encouraged the martyrs before the judges, on the scaffolds and piles, on the forum and in the amphitheatre, creating a burning enthusiasm, carrying dismay into the hearts of the judges, and

reversing the rolls, so that the judged became judges, and the judges the judged.

It was Anthony. He had said to his monks, "Let us depart, that we too may wrestle, if we be called, or else see them wrestling." And so the city saw him, which he had not seen for many decades.

Unrestrainedly he witnessed for Christ, and "by pagans and Christians regarded as a sign from God, he succeeded, in a few days, in converting thousands of heathen." He went unscathed. And when the fire of persecution died out he disappeared as suddenly as he had come, and tired of the world and its turmoil, he once more returned to the desert and to greater asceticism.

Even there he soon tired of the company of the monks, and longing for the past, with its entire self-occupation, its unbroken solitude and constant communings with heaven, he desired to go to the upper Thebaid. But a voice, he says, came to him, "If thou wilt have rest, go to the inner desert." Obeying, he bade his monks farewell, forbidding them to follow, and journeyed into the wild wastes for three days. There he found a solitary mountain, at whose foot a tiny spring promised a lasting supply of water. It was Mount Chalzim, between the Nile and the Red Sea, where even now the ancient monastery of Deir Antonius, overlooking the Wady-el-Arabah, preserves the name and fame of the saint. There he lived for many years in entire seclusion, weaving baskets, tending a small plot of arable soil, from which he subsisted; seeing the Lord. But as his retreat was discovered it became once more the Mecca of the miserable and weary and disconsolate. Many are the miracles attributed to him, of power over brute creation, and power over disease, and power over demons. Wonderful are the stories, told by Athanasius, of the powers of his mental vision, strongly reminding us of the mysteries of "clairvoyance," as for instance that memorable desert scene, in which pilgrims, dying from thirst, are stretched out on the burning plain, saved only by the timely intervention of Anthony, who was aware of their distant need; or again, that other instance of the death of Ammon the Nitrian monk, which occurred, at the time indicated by Anthony to his companions, at

a distance of thirteen days' journey from him. Weird were the visions which ever and anon interrupted the monotony of his solitary life.

At the age of ninety years he discovered the retreat of Paul of Thebes, who had spent well-nigh a century in utter solitude, forgotten by the world he had discarded. He came just in time to hear the dying words of the old recluse, whom he considered "far better than himself," and to lay him at rest in the warm sand of the desert, in the shade of the ancient palm-tree, which had fed and clothed him.

Once more in 351, in the height of the Arian troubles, he was seen in the streets of Alexandria, testifying against the doctrines of the heresiarch Arius. The wide-reaching fame of the great anachoret, the halo of piety which surrounded his venerable head, the almost superstitious veneration in which he was held by the mass of the people—all these gave special weight to his visit, and to his testimony in favor of Athanasius and the orthodox faith.

Returning to his mountain home, he lived on for five more years, and finally fell asleep in Christ at the patriarchal age of one hundred and five years, lamented by all the East, sorely wept by the monks of the desert, and buried, at his own request, in an unknown spot, by two faithful attendants, who had ministered to the needs of his declining years.

How touchingly does Athanasius write of him: "He was altogether as a physician given by God to Egypt. Who met him grieving and did not go away rejoicing? Who came troubled and did not obtain peace of mind? And now he has fallen asleep, all are as orphans who have lost a parent, consoling themselves with his memory alone, and keeping his instructions and exhortations." Truly Antony had been great, great through his simple and unadulterated piety, and that alone. Worldly wisdom he had none, and yet he was wise.

The ready power of repartee, and the keen sarcasm which show themselves in some of his preserved utterances, the eminent weight of some of his sayings, almost seem to justify the saying of Synesius, the philosopher, that "the natural genius of Anthony did not require the aid of learning." The great of the earth

strove to do him honor, and even Constantine the Great, the first Christian emperor, wrote him a letter, begging for some reply, which request Anthony hesitatingly granted, saying to his monks, "Wonder not if kings write to us, but wonder rather that God has written his law to man and spoken to us by his Son." And in his reply he gave to the emperor such counsel as kings but rarely receive from their subjects.

"His countenance," according to Athanasius, "had great and wonderful grace; his temper was inexhaustibly tolerant, except towards schismatics and heretics." The daily bath, so highly prized in the East, was entirely discarded by him, "he never washed himself, never even wetting his feet by passing through water, unless it was absolutely necessary." So great, says Athanasius, was his asceticism that "even if he was going to eat or sleep he was ashamed, when he considered the rational element of his soul, and often, when about to eat in the company of monks, he remembered the spiritual food, and declined and went away, thinking that he should blush if he was seen eating by others."

This strange, and yet great man made a deep impression on his own and subsequent times; or, rather, the great principles he embodied impressed themselves so deeply on the Christian Church that an irresistible force carried them along through thirteen of the most eventful centuries of her history, and that even to-day they cannot be said to have completely wasted their energy. True, Anthony was not the first Christian ascetic. Long before him Paul of Thebes had sought in the desert what the busy world did not afford; many others had done the same, and separating from the world, had sought after a closer communion with God in the silence of nature's wastes; but many of these had been driven into the wilderness and solitude. More than eight hundred years before, Buddha, the young Hindoo rajah, had voluntarily left palace and wives and glory, that he might find rest unto his soul.

The Jewish Essenes had separated themselves from the nation, that, unrestrained by family ties or the taint of luxury, amid self-inflicted misery, they might see the pitying face of Jehovah. The Greek Cynics had taught that the truer man is he who has lesser wants, and that the truest man has the least; and

so they had studied to become insensible to all the affections and all the changes of life, amid self-imposed privation. The Therapeutae in Egypt, the connecting link between the Jewish Essenes and the Christian Anachorets, had done the same, and so fertile a soil their tenets had found in the "Morning Land" that Eusebius, on the authority of Philo, says "that they abounded in every district, and teemed around Alexandria." But it was reserved for Antony to call the attention of the church to these principles, to clothe them in the garb of holiness, to open a vent for that zealous spirit, which you may call, if you desire, "religious sensationalism"; which, whetted by centuries of bloody persecution, had gloried in martyrdoms and exulted in suffering, and which now, pent up in the bosom of the church, threatened serious harm. The world persecuting could be endured, but the world pacified appeared a *monstrum horribile*.

And so Antony's fame had no sooner spread through the church than thousands of men followed his example, and in lonely spots, amid want and self-denial, which not rarely degenerated into self-torture, these anachorets "sought after that sanctification which they deemed it impossible to attain in the midst of a corrupt world."

The church applauded and goaded these hermits on to redoubled efforts. It became a struggle for the mastery, a rivalry of reputation; for they were, after all, but men—even if then life was called *α βίος αγγελικός*—an "angelic estate."

Not rarely they were driven to despair, and in some instances the excessive privations they endured, together with a mere spiritual pride, engendered by the veneration of the masses, totally unbalanced their minds.

If wonderful stories are told by these old anachorets of impossible horrors they passed through, and miraculous occurrences they experienced in the dead silence of their solitary lives, remember that they were not wilfully deceiving, but that many of these things appeared real to their diseased fancies, which were but apparent. And tradition never lessens, but always enhances the mystery surrounding these sacred dwellers of the desert. "Distance lends enchantment to the view." They were held in pious

veneration, and nothing appeared incredible which was told of this "knighthood of asceticism."

Some of these anachorets were subject to curious fancies. The life of Anthony fairly teems with them. Hilarion, the great recluse of Palestine, maintained, with the greatest earnestness, that his body was an ass, which he must feed straw and hay, lest he should become too lively and frolicksome. Pior, an Egyptian monk, being allowed to see a loved and long lost sister, deliberately shut his eyes during the entire visit. Says Gibbon: "Some aspired to reduce themselves to the rude and miserable state, in which the human brute is scarcely distinguishable above his kindred animals, and the numerous sects of anachorets derived their name from their humble practice of grazing in the fields of Mesopotamia with the common herd."

A simple asceticism, such as was practiced by Antony, soon was found inadequate to quench the fiery flames, which would burst from these souls, warring, as they thought, Christ's warfare; and so the element of deliberate torture soon was added to the ascetic life. They loaded themselves with chains and crosses, they endeavored to make life one continuous misery, and happy was he who invented a seat or detected a dwelling place whereby comfort in any sense became absolutely impossible. Pleasure and sin had become synonyms.

Women were considered with contempt, almost with abhorrence. Marriage was decried. The woman was a "noxious animal," a "fragile vessel," "the cause of all man's misery," and yet the spirit of Anthony entered into them as well, and the hermits lived to see the day when they were compelled to acknowledge that women could suffer and endure and adore, as well and as persistently as men.

The progress of the new movement was not less rapid than that of Christianity itself. The cells of the anachorets soon completely covered Lybia. The Nitrian desert is said to have been peopled by no fewer than five thousand anachorets, and still abounds with ruins of monasteries; and it was a fond thought of the Egyptian of those days that they numbered as many monks, in his country, as other inhabitants. Indeed, "Antony had be-

come the father of a numerous spiritual progeny." It must have been a curious phenomenon to the thinker of those days to see this constant exodus, from the world into solitude, of men—some of whom were noble and learned, ay leaders of men—joining a people "which subsisted without money, which was propagated without women, and which derived from the disgust and repentance of mankind a perpetual supply of voluntary associates," and not unjustly does Gibbon sneeringly remark that "posterity might well repeat the saying, which had formerly been applied to the sacred animals of the same country, that in Egypt it was less difficult to find a god than a man."

But the movement swept on, in its divinely appointed historic channel. These followers of Anthony had the consciousness of walking in the steps of the prophets of old. They divided their time between prayer and meditation and labor for themselves and the poor, and in the frivolous times in which they arose, they were a living proof of the vanity and unreality of the pleasures of life, and of the dreadful reality of eternal things, which should have a foremost place in the thoughts of man. And this very thing, the reality of their religious beliefs, and the intensely practical application of these principles to life it is which attracts to them the very leaders of the church; which causes Basil the Great to leave his wealthy bishopric and to assume the leadership of the monks scattered along the dreary coasts of the Black Sea; which makes of Athanasius and almost all the church fathers such earnest defenders of the new movement.

Jerome does not hesitate to say "that if all the members of his body were changed into tongues, and if all his limbs resounded with a human voice, he would yet be incapable of sufficiently praising the monastic life."

There can be no question but, originally at least, these men were actuated by noble impulses, in the great majority of cases. They sought after God, and went out after him; and everything around them reminded of and drew towards God.

The lazy, changeless days, the deep blue sky overhead, the profound quiet of that rainless climate, the impressions of nature, which Antony called his "great book of study"; an atmosphere

of which it was said that "man needs there hardly to eat, drink or sleep, for the act of breathing will give life enough"—all these must have reminded of the eternity and immeasurability and love of God.

And so, if for the above reasons many of the followers of Anthony went hopelessly astray, even if such extravagances as those of the pillar saints must be acknowledged to be shoots from the selfsame tree, it is equally true that some of these hermit lives contain an inspiration, of which Mons. de Montalembert truly says, "Who is so ignorant or so unfortunate as not to have devoured these tales of the heroic age of monachism; who has not contemplated . . . with the admiration inspired by an uncontrollable greatness of soul, the struggles of these 'athletes of penitence.'"

Through all the ages of the world solitude has been esteemed a sovereign remedy against frivolity. It has in it an element of compulsion. It has certain irresistible demands of its own. It has a rare power of revelation. Brundley, the engineer, is said to have remained in bed with a great problem till he had worked it out. Turner, the great painter of nature, spent whole days in solitude, observing but one thing, and when he had once spent an entire day in fixedly looking at the water, into which he threw pebbles, and was mocked by his friends, his wise reply was, "Now I know at least how water looks when stones are thrown into it." The great poets and thinkers of all times have experienced the soothing and elevating power of solitude. And for this revealing, elucidating, elevating power of solitude the anachorets loved it. Anthony, in his mountain home, enjoyed a vision of calm, stern beauty, such as but rarely is seen by man, and its daily unchanged recurrence drew him aloft to God; and hundreds of his followers with him found in the desert what they had sought there—communion with God.

It is not difficult to assign the causes from which this movement sprung. A glance at the church and the world of that day will suffice.

When Anthony and his immediate followers had already given to monachism an impulse which swept everything before it, the

church had not yet authoritatively spoken on doctrinal points. Religious teaching was marked by a strange, almost inconsistent, individuality. Chameleon-like, it changed hues according to its surroundings. Dreadful heresies arose from this source, and convulsed the life of the church, for longer or shorter periods, and some of these storms had swept the church before Anthony left for the wilderness. The great monarchian heresies had had their sway, and left the church with a tolerably clear idea of the Trinity. Montanus had preached his wild doctrines in Phrygia a hundred years before the birth of Anthony, and one of these had been a rigid asceticism. Tertullian, the great church father, had preached these doctrines, in a refined form, in Carthage, and some of the cotemporaries of Antony must have remembered the teacher whose doctrines had become the salt of Africa. And, in a sense, Anthony was but a child of his time. Had he not taken the lead, some one else would have done it, for men waited but for one who would boldly dare to embody in life what lived in many a heart. Manichæism had arisen, and was working in the East, and, whether we believe it or not, more of the condemned heresy of Mani was embodied in the life of the church than she was ever aware of. Again and again in the history of the church, it cropped out in many a way, and lives on till this day, leaving old forms and assuming new as the times vary. And the fundamental idea of asceticism is the dualistic tendency of Manichæism. All matter is inherently evil; and so sanctification degenerated into something physical. The crushing of every carnal thing was, therefore, a gradual rising in the scale of perfection, till one reached the sphere of the divine, where all temptation was forever dead. Arianism was just then ruining every prospect of peace and growth. Do you wonder that men became tired of all this confusion, that they longed for solitude, where perhaps beatific visions of God might be vouchsafed to such as fled the trials and temptations and wranglings of life?

A complete withdrawal from the world seemed a necessary consequence of the rupture between Christianity and the world. True, that world had ceased to persecute, but that by itself but added to the horrors of the time; for the martyr-agonies had

hitherto been the bond of union between diverging spirits. They were one at the stake, on the scaffold, in the arena, wherever else they might differ. The serious minds in the church had considered the last persecutions as divine judgments to arouse the apathies of the church. And now peace prevailed, and the church had come to honor, the ballast seemed removed, and the ship rolled dreadfully amid the tempestuous waves. Martyrdoms ceasing, the world appeared to afford no longer a fit opportunity for the full exercise of Christian virtue. And so the desert naturally took the place of the amphitheatre, among a people and in a country over which, like a dreary pall, hung a heavy, mystic, gloomy past, leading, and fitly leading, to just such developments as these; for it is in Egypt that monachism principally arose and earliest developed. These men fled from the world, I said, and what a world it was! Look at it! Hardly a ray of light in it. The emperors on the throne, call them pagans or Christians, as you please, for if Christians, they were but Christianized pagans, reducing the empire to the low level of pure oriental despotisms. The morals of the people, high and low, beyond the power of description. Marriage fidelity almost unknown. Blood streaming without provocation. The slaves in a condition, compared to which the worst-treated serf of modern times appears like a soul in paradise. The ignorance of the masses proverbial. The people crying to heaven under a load of taxation, which crushed, without killing. Bloody internecine wars, devastating the provinces and ruining the resources of the empire. And, above all, the horizon black with approaching horrors. The wildest rumors afloat of barbarians, of prodigious strength and dreadful appearance, who dressed in the skins of wild animals and wielded swords six feet long, who drank the blood of their victims and knew no pity. Nations rolling like irresistible tide floods over nations, till their place was found no more.

Such were the things which terrified the world, and caused the church to look upward for the coming of the Lord. Do you wonder that many left that world and longed for solitude, that there they might prepare to meet God? Do not hastily condemn Anthony or his anachoret disciples. They had a divine mission.

Developing into brotherhoods, when the reaction of the social principle in them set in, they served a grand historic purpose. Humanly speaking, the church of Christ in the earth could not have been what she is to-day, if it had not been for monachism, of which Anthony is rightly termed the father. It is a tree of life and of death in mysterious union. It was the main divine agent for the preservation of the Holy Scriptures, and the many monuments of Grecian and Roman literature, multiplied by their indefatigable pens, for soon they added study to meditation.

Let Gibbon sneeringly say, "that monastic studies have tended for the most part to darken, rather than to dispel, the clouds of superstition." He is obliged to add, "that the curiosity or zeal of some learned solitaries have cultivated the ecclesiastical and even the profane sciences, and posterity must gratefully acknowledge that." That sentence we will adopt, as our own, and gratefully subscribe. The chaff has been blown away, the heavy golden corn remains. If our reader has obtained a glimpse of St. Anthony, in his solitary life, with its underlying principles, let him remember that he has seen, on history's wall, the chrysalis from which, at God's own good time, in the sixteenth century, burst the strong-winged, glorious Reformation, which brought to us, in these later days, that purer vision of the Lord, which the hermits of the desert, amid their ascetic training, have often longed for in vain.

HENRY E. DOSKER.

Louisville, Ky.

IV.

THE PAPACY UNDER A SEARCHLIGHT:

A REPLY.

THE object of the following pages is to arouse interest in a subject of great practical importance to American Protestants, and to give accurate and reliable information about it. The discussion of it in the present form has been suggested by an extremely discourteous review of *The Searchlight of St. Hippolytus*¹ in the July number (1903) of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*. The writer begins by speaking of it as "a worthless little book," and remarks that "It is the mission of this *Review* to concern itself about higher game than Mr. Flournoy and his *Searchlight*. The duty of catching 'the little foxes that destroy the vines' we may safely leave to others." He, however, does condescend to concern himself about it, and undertakes the duty which he would otherwise assign to humbler hands "because requested to do so by persons whose friendship we value." It is surprising, too, that of the book reviews—to which this quarterly gives much attention and large space—the review of this book is the longest but one. We are immediately impelled to ask, "Why such large shot if the game is so small?" It would be strange to see a lion-hunter hunting sparrows at all, and certainly much stranger to see such a mighty hunter go forth to kill sparrows equipped with ammunition suitable for the destruction of the king of beasts. There is a good deal in the same strain which can hardly be worthy of notice. Some remarks on the unwisdom of belittling a task set before one might be *a propos* here, and, especially, of boasting while girding on the harness; but it is not my intention to undertake to teach the editor of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* either wisdom or good manners. My purpose in writing is not to defend "the

¹ See note at the end of this article.

worthless little book" either. It has gone forth, and having received the approval of many scholars whose judgment may well be relied on, can safely be left to take care of itself. My aim, as has been intimated, is far higher. It is a further vindication of the principle back of, and pervading, the book.

For years the impression has been bearing with ever-increasing weight upon many minds that Romanism is one of the very darkest clouds on the horizon of our country's future.

Those who see the emigrant ships discharging their cargoes on our shores can have no doubt of the fact that a large amount of the scum of Europe is flowing our way; and this scum is generally Romanist. America has shown a wonderful power of assimilation in the past, and has made real Americans out of much foreign material, and material of excellent quality much of it has been. But all must recognize the fact that there is a limit to this process, especially when the material to be assimilated declines in quality. Dr. Strong, in his suggestive book, *Our Country*, tells us: "Mr. Beecher once said, 'When the lion eats an ox, the ox becomes lion, not the lion ox.' The illustration would be very neat if it only illustrated. The lion, happily, has an instinct controlled by an unfailing law which determines what, and when, and how much he shall eat. If that instinct should fail, and he should some day eat a badly diseased ox, or should very much overeat, we might have on our hands a very sick lion. I can conceive that, under such conditions, the ignoble ox might slay the king of beasts."

A very important thing to be considered in this connection is that the great and rapidly increasing Romanist foreign element of our population is in the hands of the most powerful and astute organization that exists in the world, an organization, too, which has always claimed, and when able has maintained, an authority superior to all human governments. It is an organization which, in spite of minor internal differences, has a marvellous unity of action, and, since the Vatican Council, that whole power may be directed by one supposedly infallible hand. It is an old saying that the papal power is "a sword whose handle is in Rome and its blade everywhere." It is certainly here—apparently

harmless it may be now; but the time may come when the edge will cut as cruelly as ever in the past. Although so quiet and apparently harmless now, it hangs by a hair over the head of the press of our country—and a free press is the chief guardian of our liberties.

It is impossible to tell what will be the political power and influence of the lately formed "Federation of Catholic Societies." Does it mean the unification of the Catholic vote of this country, so that the pope, in some crisis of our political affairs, can place that vote in either scale, and thus decide the question at issue? I do not assert it; but all must acknowledge the possibility.¹

But Rome may do something worse for the American people, even, than this. Religion is the chief concern; and if the light of the gospel should be replaced by the errors of Romanism and a spiritual darkness like that of the middle ages, the hope of our country would surely be blasted. All history shows that God's blessing has been upon those who have kept his Word. Protestantism is the religion of the Bible; Romanism, whatever may be its professions, is not. There is a danger here of which many are strangely oblivious, and about which many are indifferent. A very observant friend lately remarked, that never since the Reformation has Romanism received from a Protestant nation the favor shown it in the United States at this time; and

¹ It may be well for those who think lightly of the peril which Romanism brings to our country and its free institutions to consider such facts as these:

"Rome, with characteristic foresight, is concentrating her strength in the Western Territories. As the West is to dominate the nation, she intends to dominate the West. . . . Not including Arizona and New Mexico, which have a large Roman Catholic population, the six remaining Territories in 1880 had four times as many Romanists as there were members in all Protestant denominations collectively. . . .

"When the Jesuits were driven out of Berlin, they declared that they would plant themselves in the Western Territories of America; and they are there to-day with empires in their brains." . . .

Lafayette's warning was: "If the liberties of the American people are ever destroyed, they will fall by the hands of the Romish clergy."—*Our Country*, pp. 89–91. Rev. Josiah Strong, D. D.

In our two largest cities, New York and Chicago, and in New England, the Romanists probably equal in number the members of all Protestant churches, while in California they out-number them four to one.

another, who has laid down his life in Christ's service in Brazil, said to me some years ago, that his impression in coming from a Romanist country, and seeing the rapid progress the Church of Rome is making here, and the utter apathy of Christian people about it, was such that, if he could give up his work in Brazil, he would devote the rest of his life to the task of trying to awaken our people to their peril.

Now, the editor of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* is naturally displeased with any attempt to show the falsity of the claims of Romanism, and vents his spleen on this little book. The book shows that during the life of Hippolytus, a man born little over a half century from the death of the Apostle John, and dying about 235, there was no pope in Rome, and that no such personage had ever been heard of there. It asserts (p. 77) that "Hippolytus has evidently never heard of Peter as primate and of popes as his infallible successors." This is shown by quotations from *The Refutation of all Heresies*, the work of Hippolytus, discovered at Mount Athos, and the remark is made that "thus, *The Refutation of all Heresies*, while intended for the refutation of the heresies of those early times, refutes also, by the facts which it lays bare, that which has been the arch-heresy of the Christian era, the infallibility and supremacy of the popes."

The reviewer does not seem to think that it is at all necessary to bring any evidence to show that there were popes in those days. Like other Romanists, he takes it as an axiom that there is an unbroken line of popes beginning with Peter. A celebrated philosopher thought it necessary to prove logically even that he himself was in existence. "I think, therefore I am," was his argument. Most of us feel that we exist, and so have no need of logic to prove it. Our existence is the basis of all our thinking, instead of thinking being with us a logical proof of our existence. The reviewer seems to take the existence of the papacy from the first as a thing so necessarily true, as the basis of all his thinking, that proofs of it are entirely unnecessary. One would naturally suppose, however, that Hippolytus, the contemporary of Zephyrinus and Callistus, and knowing them well, was better

qualified to decide whether or not they were infallible popes than the editor of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, in the third year of the twentieth century.

He asserts, indeed, that Victor, the immediate predecessor of Zephyrinus was "every inch a pope," and that Pope Callistus (the ex-slave, who became a defaulting bank officer and fugitive from justice, and then an encourager of immorality among church members, and a promoter of the Noëtian heresy) was a "glorious proof of papal infallibility."

He seems to forget that we have part of a letter written by Irenæus, the teacher of Hippolytus, blaming Victor for his uncharitable treatment of the Christians in Asia Minor, and another from Polycrates of Ephesus, claiming for these very people, of whom he himself was one, that they had a better right to their view as to the Quartodeciman practice than Victor had for his. Irenæus and Polycrates, his contemporaries, evidently did not consider him infallible, whatever may be the view of this twentieth century writer.

It is undoubtedly true that the bishop of Rome exercised wide influence even in the latter part of the second century, and that this influence, from the prestige of the city, increased as time went on, especially after Constantine made Christianity the state religion. This was due to the fact that Rome was the capital of the Roman Empire; that it was a gathering-place for many nations; that it was the only apostolic church of the West; and that eventually the tradition that Peter founded the church there, and was its first bishop, and that Peter had been made the primate of the church by our Saviour, gained increasing credence. This last reason, however, was an afterthought, and did not have its influence for a considerable period. The decree of Valentinian (445) places the then claimed supremacy of Rome on (1) "the merits of Peter; (2) the majesty of the city of Rome; (3) the authority of a council."

Irenæus and our Hippolytus both thought that Peter had something to do with founding the church in Rome; but neither ever dreamed of his primacy and a transmission of the same authority to a line of successors who should be popes. Irenæus

gives a list of Bishops of Rome, but names Peter and Paul together without a hint that Peter had more authority than Paul.¹ The Liberian Catalogue (352 A. D.) is the earliest Latin list of the Bishops of Rome, and names Clement as one of them. Yet we have the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, and it is not in Clement's name at all, but in that of "the church at Rome."

Ignatius, in his epistle (105-115), in writing a letter to the Romans, addresses it to no pope, but to the church. When Jerusalem was destroyed, the city of the mother church of Christianity, the church at Rome, being an apostolic church, and the church of the city which was the capital of the empire, naturally rose to prominence and extensive influence among the metropolitan churches; but there was in it no more official authority than in the other metropolitan churches of Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth and Thessalonica.

Indeed, it seems not to have gained such authority, even over the churches of the suburbicarian provinces, until after Constantine had erected these provinces under the political control of the city of Rome.²

¹ As to "the Roman Episcopate of Peter" Kurtz has this to say:

"The tradition that Peter, after having for some years held the episcopate at Antioch, became first Bishop of Rome, holding the office for twenty-five years (A. D. 42-67), and suffered martyrdom at the same time with Paul, had its origin in the series of apocryphal writings out of which sprang both the romance of the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions, and the Ebionite Acts of Peter; but it attained its complete form only in the fourth century, after it had been transplanted into the soil of the church tradition through the *Acta Petri et Pauli*. . . . According to the Acts, Peter, in A. D. 44, lay in prison at Jerusalem, and according to Gal. ii., he was still there in A. D. 51. Besides, according to the unanimous verdict of tradition, as expressed by Irenæus, Eusebius, Rufinus and the Apostolic Constitutions, not Peter, but Linus was the first Bishop of Rome."—Kurtz's *Church History*, Sec. 161, Macpherson's Translation.

² The Council, therefore, as Rufinus also, and the oldest Latin collection of canons, the so-called *Prisca*, understood this canon, maintains that the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Roman chair extended, not over all the West, but only over the ten *suburbicarian* provinces belonging to the diocese of Rome, according to Constantine's division, *i. e.*, over Middle and Southern Italy, with the islands of Sardinia, Corsica and Sicily.—Kurtz's *Church History*, Sec. 46, 3, Macpherson's Trans.

The first "decretals" from the Church of Rome (and these were addressed to the churches of the West only) were issued by Siricius, who was bishop from 384 to 398.

Several influences helped to the extension of this authority, such as the removal of the seat of the emperor to Constantinople, the Arian controversy, the invasion of the Goths, and the division of the empire. It was not till the time of Innocent I. (402-417) that the idea of universal authority arose. It was not till 445 A. D. that Rome became a court of appeal.

The Refutation of all Heresies plainly shows that in the time of Hippolytus (who died about 235 A. D.) there was no pope in Rome, and that such an office was undreamed of. The turning on of the searchlight which reveals this naturally shocks and enrages this reviewer, for it does indeed tend to destroy this imaginary "vine" of the papacy by showing that it is not rooted in the first or second century, but springs up in a later age.

The universal authority of the Bishops of Rome is disclaimed explicitly as late as the seventh century by one of them who did most to extend the influence and increase the power of that see, Gregory the Great.

Just before Phocas waded through blood to usurp the imperial dignity, and gave the title of universal bishop to the occupant of the Roman see, Gregory, writing to the Emperor Maurice (whom Phocas murdered), says: "I say it without the least hesitation, whoever calls himself the universal bishop, or desires this title, is, by his pride, the precursor of Antichrist, because he thus attempts to raise himself above the others. The error into which he falls springs from pride equal to that of Antichrist," etc.

Writing to John the Faster, after telling him that even "Peter, the first of the apostles," did not claim this title and dignity, he says of the Bishops of Rome, after the Council of Chalcedon had conferred the title, "And yet none of us hath permitted this title to be given him; none hath assumed this bold title, lest by assuming a special distinction in the dignity of the episcopate we should seem to refuse it to all the brethren."¹

¹ See *The Papacy*, by the Abbé Guetteé, pp. 210 and 211-236.

That this is the true view of the development of the papacy, undistorted by Protestant prejudice, will be clear to any one who will candidly examine the facts as given by such historians as Milman¹ or Kurtz,² men whose honesty and thoroughness as investigators do not need to be commended to any who are well informed. If mere monkish legends and traditions, without the slightest evidence to substantiate them, are accepted as historical, of course almost any extravagant and baseless claim, such as the universal authority and infallibility of the papacy from the first, can be proven. The conclusion, of course, always depends on the premises; and if one takes a free rein, and makes his premises just as he wishes them to be, then, of course, he will have no trouble in arriving at the desired conclusion. This has evidently been the method of this reviewer, who announces that the course of Callistus "is a glorious proof of papal infallibility." Take the theory that the decision of a universal council of the Roman Catholic Church is absolutely correct, then the fact that the Vatican Council in 1870 declared the Pope of Rome infallible, then disregard the facts stated by Hippolytus about Callistus, and it is easy to bring in the decision of this reviewer—indeed, it comes in of itself. Pursue the same course, and discredit all that Tertullian says about the immediate predecessor of Callistus, Zephyrinus, and his course becomes another "glorious proof of papal infallibility." We may say, "But what is to be done about the facts stated by these contemporaries of these two notorious men, which show that they were both at the opposite pole from infallibility?" Our reviewer's answer can only be that of all reasoners like him, that "If the facts, in any measure, fail to agree with this conclusion, it is just so much the worse for the facts. The decision of infallibility has been made, and the facts must conform or get out." Accordingly, he does try to put the facts out of court.

It is refreshing to see that at least one Catholic historian does not follow the method of the reversed syllogism employed by this reviewer and Romanists in general, in this matter. The Rev. William Barry, D. D., "formerly scholar of the English

¹ *Latin Christianity*, Vol. I.

² *Church History*, Sec. 46, Macpherson's Tr.

College, Rome; Professor of St. Mary's College, Oscott," has written a book on *The Papal Monarchy*,¹ and a few extracts will convince the reader that the view just given of the development of the papacy is not due to Protestant prejudice and misrepresentation, but that which accords with the facts of the case, even as viewed by a Roman Catholic scholar.

Dr. Barry tells us that the title of the pope, "Pontiff," is derived from that of the Roman rulers, Pontifex Maximus. From the half legendary Numa down, they exercised the functions of chief priest of religion. Dr. Barry points out the fact that the determination of times and seasons, especially as connected with religious functions, came in the line of their duties, and that Julius Cæsar, in 46 B. C., and Pope Gregory, in 1582 A. D., are found making, the one the Julian, and the other the Gregorian calendar. On page 13, he says of the Roman Emperor: "He was Pope as well as Consul and Imperator. He continued to hold it (*i. e.*, the title Pontifex) for some time afterwards; and not only Constantine, but his more Christian successors, Valentinian I. and Gratian, are mentioned under this name on inscriptions now extant. Theodosius, however, gave up all pretence to be the high priest of a heathen worship; and the title passed to the bishops of Rome, for whose office it must long have seemed a fitting designation."

Mentioning the designation of the Church of Rome in the time of Soter, "the church presiding in charity in the country of the Romans," Dr. Barry remarks, "and Pope Soter speaks as representing a community so late as 170 A. D."

As to the way in which Rome began to have a preëminent place of influence among the churches, he says, "The Christian system moulded itself on the imperial, and bishops fell into their places according to the importance of the cities over which they ruled."

Cyprian very stoutly opposed the Bishop of Rome, and certainly considered him very far from infallible; yet his sacerdotal ideas did more than anything else to elevate the Roman see into the region of those supernatural powers which were to hold sway

¹ A recently published volume of *The Story of the Nations* series.

over the superstitious for all succeeding time. Cyprian spoke of it as "the chair of Peter, whence the unity of the priesthood took its rise." Dr. Barry remarks, "These words and this conception were to furnish the Magna Charta of the Papacy."

The influence of the central city of the world's power naturally helped on the developing aggrandizement of this bishopric. "An endemic 'custom of the city,' acting on a creed not fully developed, and on the strength of what was allowed to be apostolic tradition, enabled this church at the centre to gain in preëminence."

The legend of the so-called "donation of Constantine" has been used very extensively for establishing and extending the temporal power of the Pope.

The story is that Constantine had leprosy, and was told that he could be cured only by a bath in the blood of a child, and that Bishop Silvester saved him from taking the horrible measure of murdering the child by miraculously healing him by baptizing him; and that thereupon, Constantine, in gratitude, gave the aforesaid "donation." "Hereupon, Constantine made over to the Pontiff, Rome and Italy, with the islands of the West." Of this legend, on which so much has been built, Dr. Barry remarks that it was "told in the eighth century, and believed down to the end of the fifteenth."

As to the temporal authority of Silvester, or any Bishop of Rome near his time, he says, "Neither Pope Silvester, nor any pope for centuries, dreamt of disowning the imperial rule."

He adds, "The powers of its government, used in the disputes of local churches or contending sects, was afterwards applied to provinces and kingdoms."

It may seem strange that the removal of the seat of the imperial government, and then the fall of the Roman Empire of the West, under the incursion of the Goths, Visigoths and Vandals, should have tended to increase the power of the Roman see, instead of absolutely destroying it. But, when we remember that the Bishop of Rome at that crisis was none other than Leo the Great—one of the greatest, in ability, of the sons of men, indeed he was—and that the Goths had received the gospel, Ulphilas, the apostle to the Goths, having translated the Bible

into their language three-quarters of a century before this time, it does not seem so strange. The great Leo had more power over them than any emperor could have had. Their reverence for this able and earnest head of the Roman Church enabled him to conquer, in great measure, the conquerors of Rome.

Siricius had nearly a century before this issued the first genuine "decretals" [decisions on questions in dispute], and now Leo could threaten Hilary of Arles when he exercised powers to which he was not entitled.

Ambrose of Milan, near the same time, had uttered the telling sentence, "Where is Peter? there is the church;" and on this Dr. Barry remarks, "On this classic sentence the policy of excommunication, interdict, and even deposition—which is the story of the middle ages—may be made all to depend."

As he says, and we may plainly see, "The church was steadily mounting toward preëminence."

"The primitive church," he says, again, "was the empire, taken a second time, but for spiritual and heavenly purposes." We can hardly agree with him that all the purposes were "heavenly," but his explanation of the aggrandizement of the Roman see is certainly in accord with the facts of history. For he goes on to say, "It is the old Roman vision of a world-empire, expanding and realizing itself as a Catholic Church, which, if not yet governed by a supreme head, was by all its institutions calling for one."

As a further explanation of the widening supremacy of Rome, Dr. Barry tells us: "By the time of Gregory the Great (542–604), the two patriarchal churches associated with the name of Peter [Antioch and Alexandria] had almost run their course. Rome was left as the sole apostolic see founded on the rock."

The principles of the false decretals were already acted on to a great extent by Leo the Great (390–461), though these writings were not forged till some four centuries after his times. He did, however, for his purposes, cite as Nicæan canons those of Sardica. Says Dr. Barry: "The canons (real or interpolated) were those of a later assembly at Sardica, now Sophia, in Bulgaria. But they took their place in the *Corpus Juris*, and helped,

like the ever-growing pile of decretals, to furnish precedents on which the mediæval popes were really to act in every part of Christendom."

Mohammed helped later by destroying the competing power of the East; but before that took place, Phocas, the murderer of the good Emperor Maurice, and then of his widow and children, had issued the decree that Boniface III. should be obeyed as the universal bishop. Thus, in 607, the papal chair became, by the decree of the emperor, the seat of universal authority in the church.

The account of the steps by which the Roman see came to be the "Papal Monarchy," given by the Catholic scholar, Dr. Barry, is substantially the same as that of Kurtz and Milman, and makes the assertion of our reviewer, to the effect that the conduct of Callistus is a "glorious proof of papal infallibility," sound rather absurd.

Though the holders of the Roman bishopric in the first three centuries are generally called popes, now, the designation as applied to them is a misnomer. They were not popes in any true sense, but only bishops of what became the most prominent see in the Christian church.

It has already been mentioned that in the Vatican Council (1870) which made the pope infallible, there was a very large minority very much opposed to the perpetration of the blasphemous absurdity. Among the many Catholic scholars who earnestly protested was the learned historian, Dr. Döllinger—a man who, in spite of his great devotion to his church, could not conscientiously acquiesce in what, as an accurate investigator of the facts of history, he knew to be utterly false. He was excommunicated, and headed the "Old Catholic" movement. In his book, *The Pope and the Council*, he has given a great mass of irrefragable testimony to the two facts: (1) that the popes have not been infallible, and (2) that the early Roman bishops were not popes at all—two things which Hippolytus makes very clear from the facts of his own time.¹

¹ The heresy of Noëtus, though favored by Callistus, was condemned by "the blessed presbyters"—the Presbytery of Rome. See *Searchlight of St. Hippolytus*, Ch. VI.

Dr. Döllinger, in speaking of "the errors and contradictions of the popes," mentions, among other cases, that of Innocent I. (402-417) and his successor, Zosimus, and shows us that, in the Pelagian controversy, the latter reversed the decision of the former. The African bishops sternly rebuked Zosimus for declaring Pelagius and Celestius orthodox, "telling him that they adhered to their decision, and that he was mistaken. And, after they had again anathematized the teaching of Pelagius and Celestius at a council held at Carthage, . . . the pope assented to their judgment."

As to the case of the masterful Leo I. in the matter of Hilary, Bishop of Arles, where it has been held by some, perhaps, that the infallibility of the Roman chair is asserted, Dr. Döllinger gives "the verdict of history" to this effect, "Leo himself acknowledged that his treatise could not become a rule of faith till it was confirmed by the bishops." He proves this by a reference, not to any second-hand authority, but to the letter of Leo himself. (Leonis, Ep. ad Gall. See Mansi, Concil. VI., 181.)

Another remarkable instance of papal fallibility is that of Vigilius, in his decision about the letters of Theodore, Theodoret and Ibas, which were held to be Nestorian in doctrine, "which he first pronounced orthodox in 546, then condemned the next year, and then again reversed this sentence in deference to the Western bishops, and thus came in conflict with the Fifth General Council, which excommunicated him. Finally, he submitted to the judgment of the Council, declaring that he had unfortunately been a tool in the hands of Satan, who labors for the destruction of the church, and had thus been divided from his colleagues; but God had now enlightened him. Thus, he thrice contradicted himself."

Perhaps our reviewer would grow enthusiastic over this case, as he does over that of Callistus, telling us that his course is "a glorious proof of papal infallibility." Indeed, there is a decided likeness between Vigilius and Callistus, of whom Hippolytus tells us that "Callistus at one time branches off to the opinion of Noëtus, and at another into that of Theodotus, and holds no sure

doctrine" (*Refutation of all Heresies*, Book X., Chap. 23). "Glorious proof of papal infallibility," indeed!

The reviewer must think of the readers of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* as infants, ready to swallow whatever he may prepare for them. It is milk for babes indeed, and, alas! with swarms of hurtful bacteria in it.

It has been claimed that the early fathers looked upon the Bishops of Rome as popes, gifted with infallibility. What is the evidence?

Dr. Döllinger asserts that, "In the first three centuries, St. Irenæus is the only writer who connects the superiority of the Roman Church with doctrine; but he places this superiority, rightly understood, only in its antiquity, its double apostolic origin, and the circumstance of the pure tradition being guarded and maintained there by the constant concourse of the faithful from all countries. Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, know nothing of special papal prerogative or of any higher or supreme right of deciding in matters of doctrine."

He remarks on the interpretation, now universal among Romanists, of the words of our blessed Lord to Peter (Matt. xvi. 18; John xxi. 17), "Of all the fathers who interpret these words in the gospels, *not one single one applies them to the Roman bishops as Peter's successors.*" (Italics his.)

Thus, it seems clear that not only is it true, as seen from the testimony of Hippolytus, that there was no pope in Rome in his day, but, also, that from the light thrown on the first three centuries by the writings of these fathers, it is made clear that there was no pope in all that period. The real papacy was the result of the many influences that have been alluded to, and was the development of a later age.

The celebrated Egyptologist, Flinders Petrie, whose recent discoveries have wonderfully extended our knowledge of early civilization so far back into the hitherto unknown period called prehistoric, and shown the remarkable development of art, even before the building of the pyramid of Cheops, in making the annual address before the Victoria Institute this year, began with this sentence: "The essential difference between mediæval

thought and modern thought is that the mediæval scholar dealt with what ought to be, according to the premises and convictions with which he started; the modern student deals with what is, having learnt by bitter experience the fallacies and hopelessness of trusting to systems of theory however beautiful."

It must be evident to all that this reviewer's method is the mediæval. He liveries his facts in his own colors, and bids them wait on his theories. Or, to express it a little differently, he makes his facts the flunkies of his theories. This is the mediæval, not the Baconian, method.

Perhaps nothing revealed by the *Searchlight of St. Hippolytus* was more disagreeable to this reviewer than the view given of the regard in which he held the authority of the Scriptures.

It is well known that though the Church of Rome professes to receive the Bible as inspired, practically, the teaching of the church is the only all-sufficient rule of faith and practice for the individual. In the very number of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* in which this criticism of the *Searchlight of St. Hippolytus* appears, there is a sketch of "Very Rev. Augustine F. Hewitt, C. S. P.," who, some years ago, went from the Congregationalist Church into the Episcopal, remained for a time under the guidance of Bishop Whittingham, of Maryland, and then, unable to occupy the half-way position of Bishop Whittingham and so many others, went into the Roman Catholic Church, and became a co-worker with Father Hecker. It is said of him that at a certain stage of his transition "he began to grasp the idea of tradition, and the utter lack of value in Scripture as a basis of faith unless there be a norm of external authority by which to interpret both Scripture and tradition."

The words of Cardinal Gibbons, in his book, *The Faith of our Fathers* (44th ed., Chap. VIII.), are to the same effect, as to this "lack of value in Scripture as a basis of faith," without an infallible church or pope to interpret it: "Indeed, when you accept the Bible as the Word of God, you are obliged to receive it on the authority of the Catholic Church," etc. He asserts, as the ground of this, that the Third Council of Carthage (397

A. D.) "declared what books were canonical and what were apocryphal."

The Searchlight of St. Hippolytus shows that Hippolytus had practically all of the New Testament canon which we have now, and that he viewed it as having the same authority which the most orthodox Protestant ascribes to it. Bunsen (*Hippolytus and His Age*, Vol. II., p. 144) says, "The expressions of Hippolytus on the paramount authority of Scripture in all matters of faith and doctrine are as strong as those of the Reformers." *The Searchlight*, to show that this is true, gives such expressions of Hippolytus as these: "There is one God, my brother, and him we know only by the holy Scriptures. . . . Let us, therefore, see what the holy Scriptures pronounce; let us understand what they teach, etc. . . . Not according to our own will, nor according to our own reason, nor forcing what God has given; but let us see all this as he has willed to show it by the holy Scriptures." Thus, it is shown that Hippolytus, who was born nearly two centuries and a half before this Council of Carthage met, viewed the "Holy Scriptures" as the sufficient and perfect rule of faith and practice as Protestants do now. It is made plain, then, that the Romanist's is the new view of the Scriptures, and that the Protestant's is the old and original.

A writer in this same number of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* draws the line between Protestantism and Romanism in the first sentences of an elaborate article on "The Passing of Mary," as follows: "Among men who call themselves Christians there exist two theories in regard to the nature of the church. The first holds that a full and sufficient revelation has been made once and for all, and entirely contained within the Holy Scriptures." This, of course, is his account of the position of Protestantism. He gives that of Romanism as follows: "The second theory holds not only that a divine revelation has been given, but also that a divine interpreter has been given." This "divine interpreter" is, of course, the Romish Church.

Which is the position of Hippolytus? No one who reads his words can entertain a moment's doubt.

It is the fashion to speak of the Roman Catholic Church as

the old and the Protestant as the new. From the standpoint of the dark ages, this may seem true; but when one rises from this valley of the shadow of spiritual death, and takes his stand on the earlier age just after the time of the apostles, he finds that the position of the earliest fathers with regard to the Holy Scriptures is that of Protestantism.

Take Polycarp, for instance, the disciple of John, the beloved disciple, and we find it true, as Harnack says of him, that he "lived wholly in the ideas of the older generation and of the apostles, and would admit no addition to their teaching."

The reviewer professed to deal only with the first eighty-seven pages of *The Searchlight of St. Hippolytus*; but there can be little doubt that he saw these things too; but thought it the part of wisdom not to mention them. To let it be known that an honored saint of the Catholic Church actually taught the fundamental principle of Protestantism would have been too much to expect even of so eminent a Catholic scholar. This is, indeed, the fundamental principle of Protestantism, and when it is established in any intelligent human mind, Romanism becomes an impossibility.

Once establish firmly in the minds of intelligent people this fundamental principle, that the Holy Scriptures are the only divinely ordained source of authoritative teaching, they cannot be Roman Catholics. It is true that the church is appointed to teach, through its ministry, all nations; yet it is commanded to teach them "all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Just as soon as mere human tradition is added, and any man, or order of men, is invested with original and infallible authority, then comes in the anti-Christian principle of Romanism. On the other hand, when we follow the divine injunction spoken on the Mount of Transfiguration, "Hear ye him," and Christ's Word alone is regarded as infallible, away goes mariolatry, away goes the mass with its altar, away go the horrors of purgatory, with priests and popes.

Hinc illæ iræ. When *The Searchlight of St. Hippolytus* shows plainly that so eminent a man among early Christians as Hippolytus held the Protestant view of the Holy Scriptures,

it is not strange that this Romish reviewer lets his angry passions rise.

In writing these pages, the aim has been to avoid the example of the reviewer, who, instead of refuting the statements of the book, has performed the much easier task of hurling epithets at the author. The endeavor has been to return for his hard words some very hard facts, which, though they may not mollify the ire of the reviewer, it is hoped may draw the attention of some readers to the burning question of the papacy and its menace to America.

PARKE P. FLOURNOY.

NOTE.

At the suggestion of a valued friend, the following note, written by him, with change of a few words, is appended for the information of any who may not have read *The Searchlight of St. Hippolytus*:

"In the year 1551, some excavations were made at Rome on the Via Tiburtina, or road to Tivoli. A marble statue was unearthed sitting in a chair. The figure represented a person of venerable aspect, bald, with a flowing beard, and wearing the Greek pallium. On the back of the chair is carved a catalogue of works composed, doubtless, by the person who occupies the chair. Within about fifty years several of these long-lost works have been discovered, and it is now known that the author is St. Hippolytus, a disciple of Irenæus, who was himself a disciple of Polycarp, a disciple of the Apostle John.

"This monument was placed in the Vatican, where it is now, and August 22d is marked in the Breviary as his *feſta*. The little book referred to (*The Searchlight of St. Hippolytus*) gathers from his writings evidence regarding the church in the city of Rome in his day, and that evidence is fatal to the pretensions of the papacy touching the pope and shows the recognized authority of the Scriptures independent of the church."

V.

THE INSPIRATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THIS is a subject upon which so much has been written that it might seem to be almost useless to attempt to add anything to the already voluminous literature. And yet, because so much has been written of late, which, in my judgment, is positively harmful, I feel that those of us who still walk in the old paths should not be silent; so this brief study is presented in the hope that it may prove helpful to some, who may be wrestling with the difficulties raised by recent investigations.

Perhaps there is no question which the intelligent Christian of to-day is called upon to answer, either to himself or others, more often than this one: After all, is the Bible the Infallible Word of God?

The question is a momentous one; for if the Bible is the infallible Word of God, then man is a sinner, and as such is under the wrath of God; if it is, then there is such a being as a personal devil, and there is such a place as hell; if it is, then Christ died as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice; and if it is, then there is no other way of salvation, except through this atoning sacrifice of Christ. But suppose that the Bible is not the infallible Word of God, and that these doctrines just alluded to belong, as is so frequently claimed, to a bygone age, and represent an immature religious development; suppose that the Bible is merely the collection of the writings of pious Israelites, inspired indeed by God in a certain sense, but not in such a way as to render their opinions authoritative or infallible. Are such suppositions as these tenable?

This is the point under discussion, the question that must somehow and at some time be decided. Many of us do not believe that such positions are tenable, but many others are just as firmly

convinced that they are. It is possible, of course, that they are right and that we are wrong, and it is equally a matter of course that I believe that we are right; and my reasons for so believing I will state, in part at least, as briefly as possible consistent with clearness.

I. THE NATURE OF INSPIRATION.

To do this, it is necessary, first, to answer the question, What is inspiration? And this is no easy task, as it is a question that has caused differences of opinion in all ages of the church. Still it is a question that every thinking Christian must meet and must answer. And in attempting to do this, it is necessary to draw some distinctions, which, while they have been frequently made, and are in no sense new, are perhaps still more generally overlooked.

DISTINCTIONS.

1. *Between Inspiration and Spiritual Illumination.* The first of these is the distinction between inspiration and spiritual illumination, by which latter term I understand the ordinary operations of the Holy Spirit upon the hearts of men, subsequent to regeneration, as a result of which believers are enabled to commune with God and to make progress in the spiritual life.

The question is, Does inspiration do more than this? Can the two be distinguished, the one from the other? Are we to believe that Milton was as truly inspired as Isaiah, and John Bunyan as Paul? Is the only difference between the operations of the Spirit upon the minds of Isaiah and Paul, as distinguished from Milton and Bunyan one of degree and not of kind? A great number of scholars, whose learning and honesty we cannot question, answer these latter questions in the affirmative as conscientiously, I do not doubt, as I must answer them in the negative. And when you ask me for my reasons, I can only point to the result. To many this does not seem to be satisfactory, but to me, the unique character of the Bible, its wonderful unity, the universal adaptability of its teachings to the needs of humanity, and the wonderful results that it has accomplished in the history of the world, present an array of facts for which I can only

account on the theory that a special cause, influence, agency, or whatever you may please to call it, operated in a way that has never been repeated.

I do not believe that any man, or any body of men, with the religious literature of the world at their command, with the most painstaking care, could possibly compile a book that would for an instant compare with the Bible. But why not? These men, we will suppose, are all sincere followers of Christ, and have the guidance of the Spirit in the apprehension of truth. They have the advantage over the biblical writers of nineteen centuries or more of Christian experience. It would certainly be a very easy matter to get together a body of men with more natural ability than the biblical writers, to say nothing of their superior educational advantages. Why, then, could not such a body of men compose or compile a book that would not only equal, but even be an improvement upon the Bible? The thing certainly ought to be easily possible if the biblical writers possessed nothing that our modern scholars do not have. But such a feat as this, so far as I know, has never been attempted, because all would recognize it as foredoomed to failure, which proves to me, and I hope to you, that there is an essential difference, for which I find inspiration a most satisfactory term.

2. *Inspiration and Revelation.* Another distinction that should always be kept in mind is that between inspiration and revelation. By revelation I understand an act of the Holy Spirit whereby he imparted to his chosen agents knowledge of which otherwise they must have remained deprived.

Usually revelation was accompanied by the gift of inspiration, but not necessarily so. As a single illustration, take the theophanies of Abraham. In these, God made known to Abraham, as fully as he was prepared to receive them, his purposes regarding the chosen people and the plan of salvation. He was unquestionably the recipient of truth, through the medium of revelation; but, so far as the Bible record goes, I know of no reason to suppose that he also received the gift of inspiration.

Definition of Inspiration. What, then, is inspiration? In answering this question I shall not attempt to present even the

most prominent of the many theories that have been, or now are, held, nor to give any one's definition except my own.

Inspiration, as I understand it, was the supernatural coöperation of the Spirit of God with the biblical writers, producing in them such subjective states of mind as to enable them infallibly to apprehend divine truth, whether presented to them through the medium of revelation, or otherwise, and infallibly to communicate it to others. This is what I conceive inspiration to be, and am now ready to consider the facts upon which my opinion rests.

II. THE EXTENT OF INSPIRATION.

To do this it will be necessary to note certain preliminary facts with regard to (1) the writers themselves, as individuals, and (2) their writings, as finished productions, before coming to the two principal questions of (1) the way in which their thoughts were expressed, or verbal inspiration, and (2) the principal result of that expression, so far as this discussion is concerned, or inerrancy.

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS.

1. *The Extent of Inspiration in the Biblical Writers, as Individuals.* With regard, then, to the modifications or limitations of the gift of inspiration caused by the individual peculiarities or circumstances of the biblical writers, three facts are worthy of notice:

(1) It was partial. The first of these is that inspiration was not a constant quality or characteristic rendering, authoritative or infallible, the opinions of its possessor at all times or upon all subjects. On the contrary, it was temporary and recurrent. Even in the cases of such prominent writers as Isaiah and Paul, they themselves distinguish between their opinions as private individuals and as the official representatives of God. "Thus saith the Lord" is the constantly recurring prophetic phrase to indicate that what follows is spoken under the divine guidance, and Paul, at least once in his writings, says, "But I speak this by permission and not of commandment" (1 Cor. vii. 6), to warn his readers that what he has just uttered is merely his individual opinion, and not the authoritative and infallible mind of the Spirit.

David, as the "sweet singer of Israel," wrote some of the most beautiful and precious portions of the Bible; but the letter that he wrote to Joab and sent by Uriah certainly was not inspired by the Spirit.

Again, inspiration might be limited in time to a single moment, or in matter to a single thought. There is no reason to suppose that Noah was inspired, except upon the occasion of the unfilial conduct of his son Ham; or Jacob, except when uttering his prophecy concerning the future of his sons.

(2) It was limited by the personal capacities of its recipients. The second fact is, that inspiration was limited by the intellectual and spiritual capacity of its recipients. Consequently the writings of the uneducated and uncultured Amos, "the herdsman of Tekoa," cannot for a moment be compared, so far as beauty of form and expression is concerned, with those of the trained and highly intellectual Isaiah. But this does not mean that there are "degrees" in inspiration. The conceptions of divine truth in the mind of Amos, as far as they went, were just as infallible as those of Isaiah, and just as truly the Word of God; but both the spiritual and the intellectual capacities of Amos fell far below those of Isaiah, and consequently his conceptions of divine truth were far less sublime and beautiful, as well as less complete.

(3) It was limited by their historic environment. The third fact is, that inspiration in the biblical writers was necessarily accommodated to the age in which they lived. We must not forget that the self-revelation of God was progressive. Consequently inspiration could not cause Noah to grasp ideas that were familiar to Moses, or Moses to apprehend truths that were axiomatic to Paul. Yet we must not conclude that the inspiration of Moses was defective or fallible, as compared with that of Paul; for it was perfect as far as it went, and was simply less complete.

Inspiration did not make the Old Testament prophet a cosmopolitan; he was still a Jew, and his apprehensions of divine truth, even when inspired, were necessarily colored by his environment. Take a single illustration—the conversion of the Gentiles. Guided by the Spirit, many of the Old Testament

prophets looked forward to a time when the nations of the world would be brought to acknowledge Jehovah as their God. Yet they never for a moment imagined that this would or could be brought about, independently of themselves. Their idea was that Jerusalem was to be the capital of the world, and the Israelites its rulers. It is true that the nations of the world were to be made the recipients of the blessings bestowed by Jehovah upon his people, but only as they gave up their national existence and became identified with Israel.

How could it have been otherwise? Their whole training and environment conspired to make this the only logical, nay, the only possible conception for them to have entertained. Yet when the fuller light came, and we look back upon these primitive ideas, we find in them nothing at variance with the "great commission"—"Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." The knowledge of the Old Testament prophets was simply incomplete; their light was comparatively dim, but it was light, not darkness; it was truth, not error.

2. *The Extent of Inspiration in the Biblical Writings as Finished Productions.* With these principles before us we are ready to pass to the second preliminary question, viz., the different divisions, or kinds of composition making up the Bible, and to note the relation of inspiration to each.

(1) The very words of God. In the first place, scattered here and there throughout the Old Testament, are certain statements that purport to be the very words of God. Of this class the ten commandments are notable examples, as they are said to have been written by the finger of God himself. Again, we have recorded the conversations of God with Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses and others of the patriarchs and prophets. Now from a study of these passages I conclude that many of the Old Testament characters, while not looking with their physical eyes upon the glory of God, did actually hear, whether with physical or spiritual ears, I do not pretend to decide—though I think the latter far more probable—the very words of God. In this class of passages there is no room for inspiration, except in the infallible record of what God had uttered.

(2) Thoughts revealed by God. Another class of Old Testament writings is that in which the thought or the concept has been revealed to the mind of the writer, which he has expressed in his own language. Here belongs the great body of prophecies prefaced, as a rule, by some such formula as, "The word of the Lord came unto me, saying." That what follows is the language of the prophet is shown by the diversity of style that marks the various writings, and by all of those idiosyncrasies by which the personality of a writer is so plainly manifested.

In this class of passages, the thoughts or the concepts were the result of revelation, as they were subjectively presented to the minds of the sacred writers by the Holy Spirit, while by the gift of inspiration they were enabled to formulate these thoughts in words, and to commit them to writing so as to express the very mind of the Spirit. I am well aware that this is debatable ground, and assumes the possibility of thought without language, in which, as a metaphysical position, I am a firm believer.

(3) The thoughts of the writer. A third class is composed of those writings in which revelation clearly had no part. Here belong the greater part of the historical books, the Hagiographa, and portions of the prophets. The question with which we have to deal here is, What is the relation of inspiration to pious meditations, which compose the greater part of the Psalter, or to plain historical statements wherever found?

Are those correct who claim that in this class of writings only the ordinary operations of the Spirit in spiritual illumination are to be found? I, of course, do not so believe, for if so, then the Psalter would logically be on the same level with *The Imitation of Christ*, and the Book of Kings with any Church History. On the contrary, I believe that, by the gift of inspiration, the writers of the Psalms, for example, were preserved absolutely from uttering anything at variance with the will of God, so far as then revealed, and that the compiler of the historical books was likewise preserved from incorporating into them anything not historically true.

(4) The sayings of wicked or uninspired men and of Satan. The only other class of passages to be found in the Old Testament

is that which contains the record of the doings and the sayings of wicked, or at least uninspired persons and of Satan. Examples of this class may be found in all of the recorded sayings of Satan; in the advice of Balaam to Barak; in the sentiments expressed by the wife and the so-called friends of Job, and, not to multiply examples, in the greater part of the Book of Ecclesiastes. Now, because these cannot be the words of God, in any sense that would make him responsible for the sentiments expressed, is it necessary to give up the position that the Bible is the Word of God, and accept the one now so very popular, that it merely contains the Word of God? I think not; for God's part in such records is to be found in their bearing on the plan of salvation, and in the great spiritual lessons which they teach.

How could man have ever been brought to understand the justice of God, in his dealings with the race, had not the conversation of Satan with our first parents been recorded in Genesis? How else could the sophistries of the times have been so thoroughly exposed, and the great mystery of human suffering so fully explained, as by recording the lies of the devil and the false arguments of Job's friends, which were subsequently placed in their true light? How could the false ideas of life have been more effectually attacked than by following the author of Ecclesiastes, in his philosophic wanderings and errors, to arrive at last at the sublime result, "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man."

This class of passages, then, has as definite a purpose in the revelation of the plan of salvation as any other, and the inspiration is to be found, not alone in securing an infallible record, as so often stated, but also in the lessons that the record teaches.

As a result, then, of this analysis, I come to the conclusion, that while the relation of inspiration to the record may vary according to the character of the passage, still there is no portion of the Old Testament that is not due to its influence. So I most unhesitatingly accept the theory of plenary inspiration, as thus explained.

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONS.

1. *Verbal Inspiration.* I have endeavored to show that inspiration was limited by the individual peculiarities of its recipients, as well as by their environment; and also that all parts of the Old Testament cannot be said to be inspired in the same sense, though all are under its influence; and am now ready to consider the question as to whether the coöperation of the Spirit with the mind of the writer was confined to the suggestion of right thoughts, or whether it extended to the expression of those thoughts in words; in brief, verbal inspiration.

Do I believe in it? I certainly do not believe in the mechanical theory, according to which the writers were mere passive instruments, who used the words they did because they must, and because the use of any others was impossible. I believe that they were perfectly free to use any words that seemed to them the best suited for the expression of their thoughts, and have no doubt but that they frequently changed the form of expression when they came to write that which they had previously spoken; yet, in it all, the guidance of the Spirit was such as, while not interfering, as a rule, with the freedom of their wills, or their human peculiarities, preserved them from all error. This you may call verbal inspiration or not, just as you please; the name matters little; the important fact is, it gives us an infallible Bible, which is the Word of God.

My reasons for this position I will briefly state:

(1) This has been practically the position of the church universal for centuries; and while this is by no means conclusive, on *a priori* grounds it is much more likely to be correct than otherwise.

(2) I believe that this is the biblical position, and for me this is decisive. Of course, it is just here that differences of opinion arise, and as no intelligible argument can be presented without a detailed examination of the facts, I must content myself with the mere statement.

(3) But the argument that has always appealed to me personally, far more powerfully than any other, is based upon the

indisputable fact that the prophets themselves often did not fully understand the meaning of their own prophecies. In support of this position I merely quote the well-known passage from 1 Peter i. 10, 11, "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you; searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that would follow."

The full force of this argument can only be appreciated after a careful study of the Old Testament prophecies.. Take the Messianic conceptions of the Psalter as an illustration. After all of these have been collected, analyzed and classified, it will be found that while unquestionably the Holy Spirit had revealed much truth which man could never have discovered for himself, still, when compared with that fulness of light that came with the incarnation, the writers of the Psalter were forced to grope their way, so far as the Messianic ideals were concerned, in comparative darkness.

Now the argument is just this: Understanding the true nature of the subject as little as they did, and writing about it and referring to it as often as they did, it would have been absolutely impossible for them always to have avoided using language that would not have run counter to the future development of the person and work of the Messiah, had they not been guided by the Holy Spirit in the choice of the words in which they expressed their ideas.

Continuous study of these prophecies for a number of years has convinced me thoroughly of the absolute impregnability of this argument. So I again affirm that if the influence of the Spirit had been confined to the suggestion of the thoughts, and had not also extended to the expression of those thoughts in words, it would have been simply impossible for the prophets, of themselves, so to have expressed ideas that were so imperfectly comprehended in many cases, as that they should most minutely agree with the facts of future history.

2. *Inerrancy.* And now a few moments' consideration of the question: Was this influence of the Spirit, even though it ex-

tended to the words in which the ideas were expressed, of such a nature as to have preserved the writings, as originally made, from all error, and this discussion must close.

(1) The doctrine of the church. And here I wish again to refer to the fact that it has been the belief of by far the greater part of the church for nineteen centuries that the text of the Bible, as originally committed to writing, contained in it nothing whatever of error. I understand, of course, that this is a position that cannot be demonstrated, as the original text of the Bible has been lost for centuries, and in all human probability no part of it will ever be recovered. I understand also that no deliverance of any council or any assembly of the church of this age, or any other, can be accepted as final or decisive, for our fathers were mistaken about many things, and it is possible that they may be mistaken here also. But I do feel that the almost universal consciousness of the church for so many centuries is not lightly to be set aside, for the following reason:

A careful study of the doctrines of the church in both dispensations will establish the fact, I think, that the limitations of the one or the other were due in the main to their lack of knowledge; that, as a rule, they failed to grasp the whole truth, because of the lack of full light, but that, so far as they went, they were correct. Their light may have been dim, and so their knowledge may have been incomplete; but it was light, not darkness; it was knowledge, not ignorance.

This position I am prepared to defend absolutely, so far as the biblical writers are concerned. The only question is, Does the Spirit's influence, which is possessed by the church, and known as spiritual illumination, produce a result identical or similar to that produced in the biblical writers, by that influence that we know as inspiration? In answering this question, while I am not ready to place the authority, either of the church or of human reason, upon the same plane as revelation, still I am ready, not alone to admit, but even to insist upon the force of the argument derived from the witness of the Spirit with the spiritually quickened mind of the church. The biblical writers, guided by inspiration, gave us, I believe, an infallible Bible; the church,

guided by spiritual illumination, while not infallible in its conclusions or doctrines, is far more likely to be correct than otherwise.

(2) The teaching of the Bible. The second line of argument that determines me in holding to the theory of inerrancy is what I conceive to be the teachings of the Bible on this subject. Here again, of course, opinions differ, and each must decide for himself. But so far as I am concerned there is no room for debating the proposition that Jesus himself, and all of the New Testament writers, appeal to the Old Testament writings as the court of final resort, and that they regard them as the infallible, inerrant Word of God.

A modification of this position, now held by many, regards the element of inerrancy as being confined to the spiritual teachings of the Bible. The argument is made that it was the purpose of the Spirit merely to reveal the plan of redemption; that, therefore, inerrancy might be expected in doctrine, and in all spiritual matters; but that in non-essentials, such as science, geography or history, the writers were left to their own unaided human powers.

The reply to this argument, in a word, is that it is impossible, as I believe, to draw the line of demarcation between these subjects without impairing the integrity of the whole. Doctrine rests upon what was evidently intended as history in such a way as to render their separation impossible; and in addition to this, there is a wide difference of opinion as to the historicity of certain parts of the biblical record.

For example, we are told that the early chapters of Genesis are, in whole or in part, beautiful myths, having for their aim the impartation of religious truth. There could not have been, in the very nature of the case, we are assured, any such historical fact as that described in the record of the fall. This is merely a beautiful fiction invented by some pious mind for the purpose of explaining the entrance of sin into the world.

From this position it must follow that Paul was mistaken when he wrote, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. xv. 22), and we can no longer assert Paul's

inerrancy in those spiritual matters contained in what is known as the "Federal Theology."

Once more, if what we have always supposed to be the great facts of Old Testament history, such as the confusion of tongues, the deluge, the Abrahamic covenant, the Egyptian bondage, and the exodus, not to mention others, are unreliable, and to a certain extent unhistorical, then, to my mind, the element of unreliability must necessarily extend to the doctrines founded upon these facts.

I therefore regard this compromise as untenable, and maintain that the element of inerrancy must be a characteristic of all parts of the Bible, or of none.

(3) The analogy between the written and the Incarnate Word. The last line of argument to which I will refer as causing me to decide in favor of the theory of inerrancy is the striking analogy which I think must be conceded to exist between the written Word, or the Bible, and the Incarnate Word, or Jesus the Christ. A brief examination of a few biblical passages will make my meaning plain. "In the beginning was the Word, the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (John i. 1); "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us" (John i. 14); "And he is arrayed in a garment sprinkled with blood; and his name is called the Word of God." All will admit that these passages can refer to Christ alone.

Again, "Now the parable is this: The seed is the Word of God" (Luke viii. 11); "And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God." Here all must admit that the phrase "the Word of God" in these passages must refer to the sum total of God's revelation of himself to humanity; but the record of this revelation is contained in the Bible; therefore, the Word of God here means the Bible. Having thus placed the point before you, I cannot, perhaps, do better than to quote the remarks of Dr. Schaff in the introduction to his commentary on Matthew, one of the volumes in the Lange series, in which he says:

"The Bible, like the person and work of our Saviour, is theanthropic in its character and aim. The eternal personal Word

of God was made flesh, and the whole fulness of the Godhead and of sinless humanity was united in one person forever. So the spoken Word of God may be said to have become flesh in the Bible. It is, therefore, all divine, and yet all human, from beginning to end. Through the veil of the letter we behold the glory of the eternal truth of God. The divine and the human in the Bible sustain a similar relation to each other as in the person of Christ; they are unmixed, yet inseparably united, and constitute but one life, which kindles life in the heart of the believer."

With this position of Dr. Schaff I most heartily agree, and if it be correct, then it seems to me it must follow, that if we admit that the union of the divine and the human in the persons of the sacred writers did not preserve them from error, we must also admit that the advocates of the Kenotic theory are right in their claim that the union of the divine and human in the person of Christ did not render his humanity perfect, and did not preserve him from error.

"To err is human" is one of our most common proverbs, and unfortunately it is just as human to err spiritually as intellectually. If, then, Christ's divinity did not prevent his humanity from making intellectual mistakes, can we be quite sure that it prevented him from making spiritual mistakes? The position is perilous, and one which, if carried to its logical conclusions, will undermine the whole system of theology, which I regard as the true exponent of the biblical teachings.

I well know that the views I hold and have here advocated are regarded by many as being out of date; but this does not unduly trouble me, as I believe they are founded upon "the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture." If not, then the church, as a whole, will finally "come out in the light," for "truth is great and will prevail." But until such a time, let us hold to a theory of inspiration that gives us an infallible Bible and an infallible Saviour.

Louisville, Ky.

CLARENCE K. CRAWFORD.

VI.

THE BAPTISM OF CHRIST.¹

THERE is probably an interval of time between the events of the first and the concluding verses of the third chapter of the gospel by Matthew. The banks of the Jordan had for months echoed to the voice of the wilderness-prophet, as he preached repentance to the crowds who came to hear. Jerusalem and Judea and Samaria had sent hundreds who had confessed their sins, and received baptism at the hands of John the Baptist. This zealous worker had probably been laboring for about six months, when an event happened, the like of which he had never seen. From "Nazareth of Galilee" comes Jesus unto John at Jordan to be baptized of him. He wished to link himself with John's work, so he comes to him. What a meeting that was!

The forerunner and the Christ himself. "Behold the Lamb of God"; behold the prophet coming in the spirit and power of Elijah. The one the Master; the other the servant. John, therefore, "forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus, answering, said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and lo! the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting upon him; and lo! a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

Here, then, is the record of a fact. But is it a little thing? Is it unimportant?

Let us recall that John was preaching the baptism of repentance; that those he baptized confessed their sins. His words

¹ Read before the New Orleans Presbyterian Ministers' Association, Nov. 24, 1903.

were strong, for the people were wicked; they were cutting, for they told men their sins; they were effective, for men repented at that preaching. In view of this, what is the significance and meaning of the baptism of Jesus by John? Let us address ourselves first to this inquiry.

I. THE MEANING OF CHRIST'S BAPTISM.

Negatively: 1. It was not for repentance. We are absolutely confident on this point. Jesus was stainless and pure, sinless and holy. To those who believe in his divinity no argument here is needed. The Son of God, as John testified, was here. God's holy, chosen one, in whom he delighted, was different from those all around him. They came as sinners, defiled and polluted. They came as those whose hearts were stained and wicked. They came as those who did evil before God and their fellow-men, and they confessed it. But here is Jesus; no word of confession falls from his lips; no sigh of a sinful heart heaves his breast; no syllable of repentance is in his mouth; the Holy One of Israel has no sin. His baptism, therefore, was not for repentance.

2. Nor was it a mere form. Jesus was incapable of anything like that. He abhorred formalism in his nation; he detested sham; outward formality without anything behind it he could not abide. Hypocrisy was loudly denounced. He could not have begun his active ministry with anything that savored of this, even in the most minute particular.

3. Nor was it simply for an example for others. Such an act would have been "simply a theatrical performance, unworthy of him, not to be countenanced by the serious Baptist." The results of it show that it had to do with the person and the work of Christ.

But, positively, what did it mean for him?

1. Baptism looks to the future as well as to the past, forward as well as backward. As a rite, in regard to the future, it is a dedication, an act of self-consecration. Jesus had no sins, but a grand future; no guilt, but a great work. Here is a rite in which he would give himself to that work, dedicating his powers to its accomplishment. By this rite he would be set apart to his work; by this rite he would consecrate himself to it.

As the subject of baptism covenants to live for God, even so could Jesus, in an especial manner, as he comes to the commencement of his active ministry.

2. A second reason is suggested. Let me quote the following:

“Had the main purpose of John’s preaching and baptism of repentance lain in the confession of sins and penitence, the coming of Jesus to be baptized would appear strange, and might be regarded as an argument against the stainless purity of his religious consciousness, or as the expression of a false humility. We must consider, however, that the main element in the idea of repentance lies in the positive bent of the spirit towards conformity with the divine will; and that turning from sin, so far as it has existed, forms only the preparation for, or the reverse side of, that process. We must remember, also, that the final and essential purpose of the Baptist’s preaching was to create the positive endeavor after a righteousness conformable to God’s will, and to the establishment of the Messianic kingdom. Hence it appears intelligible and truly fitting that Jesus should, not merely in spite of, but just on account of his consciousness of integrity and filial obedience to God, feel impelled to submit to John’s Baptism. He thereby sealed his resolve to yield his will wholly to the will of God, abjuring all sin, and thereby he gave that resolve a definite reference to the kingdom of God, whose nearness the Baptist proclaimed, and of which he desired to be a member.”
(*Dr. H. H. Wendt.*)

3. As a reason for his baptism, notice the answer that Jesus himself gives to John. “I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? Jesus said, Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.” John was related to Jesus. He doubtless knew him “after the flesh,” though he did not always know him as the Lord. In some way, he knew and was conscious of the superior holiness of Jesus; so he is astonished that the Lord should seek baptism at his hands, along with the sinful crowds. Hence his protest. But Christ’s word is, “It becometh us—you and me—to fulfil every part of righteousness; every requirement that has the divine sanction; every ordinance of God.” He had received circumcision as an infant; he had

been presented in the temple as a son of the law at the age of twelve; he had been subject to his mother and Joseph in the home; "he would now go through the transitional dispensation, being baptized by John in preparation for the kingdom."

He was a man, under the law, and he was humbling himself to everything that should be required of a man in such a position. This was an act of lowly obedience in "connection with the deepest religious movement of the time." Suffer it now; at this season, in contrast to the more permanent and rightful relation which shall be recognized later. Observe here the consciousness of his Messiahship, even before his baptism, at which time many have thought that this consciousness began. By this act, which shows the spirit of submission in us both, it becometh us—that is, it is morally fitting—to fulfil every part of righteousness. Not the whole circle of righteousness, but every part, as each is presented to us. Thy duty is to baptize, mine to be baptized. It is the plan of God for us both. I come to thee for this. And he suffered him.

4. "But beyond all this, his baptism was his formal setting apart for his ministry, and was a most important portion of his consecration to be the High Priest of God. He was just entering on the age of thirty, the age at which the Levites began their ministry, and the rabbis their teaching." The consecration of Aaron to the high priesthood was by baptism, unction and sacrifice. (Lev. viii. 1, 2, 6, 10, 14.) "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Take Aaron and his sons with him, and the garments, and the anointing oil, and a bullock for a sin offering." "And Moses brought Aaron and his sons, and washed them with water, . . . And Moses took the anointing oil, and he poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head to sanctify him, and he brought the bullock for the sin offering."

"All these were undergone by Jesus. First, he was baptized by John; then, just as the high priest was anointed immediately after his baptism, so when Jesus had gone up out of the water, the heavens were opened unto him, and the Spirit of God descended upon him; and thus, as Peter tells us, 'God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power.' The

sacrifice, indeed, was not till the end of his earthly ministry, when he offered up the sacrifice of himself; and then at his resurrection and ascension, he fully took upon him the office of priesthood, entering into the presence of God for us, pleading the efficacy of his sacrifice, and blessing those for whom that sacrifice was offered. Baptism, therefore, was the beginning of consecration; unction was the immediate consequent upon the baptism, and sacrifice was the completion of the initiation, so that he was thenceforth perfected, or fully consecrated as a priest for evermore."

5. Another reason also may be brought forward. It is that Jesus was putatively a sinner, in the same sense that one has called him the greatest sinner that ever lived. Jesus was in our place under the law. Our sins were laid upon him. He "was made sin for us." The world's guilt was rolled as an unspeakable burden upon his heart. The sin-bearer must bear the sin; not his own actually, for he had none; but ours putatively, for he is the substitute. Thus, as the bearer of the sin of the world, he comes to John, and goes through the rite in Jordan, which he henceforth requires of his followers. The baptism is the symbol of the cleansing away of the guilt and pollution; and there stands our Lord, with our sins upon him, to be baptized, as others, for the remission of sins. So when his work is completed and the sins taken away forever, he commands his apostles to preach his Word, and teach men, and baptize them in his name.

Jesus was one of our race; the holy and pure. And "he was so truly one of us that he felt ashamed of our sins, grieved because of them, felt as if they were his. The father hangs his head, sickens and dies, when the son is disgraced. The wife cannot persuade herself she need not be ashamed when the husband commits a fraud. Our Lord could not claim separation from those whom he more intensely loved than human heart has ever loved; nor could he help feeling a truer sorrow and a deeper shame for sin than the holiest of sinners or the most despairing has ever felt."

His baptism, then, is symbolic of the washing away of sins, not his by water, but ours by his blood as we have faith in him.

II. In a few words, consider now the divine manifestations which immediately followed this baptism.

Having thus received this rite, Jesus comes up from the water, and the heavens are opened, and the Spirit, like a dove, comes upon him. This vision was probably seen only by Jesus and John. The appearance is as if the heavens literally were opened, and they were enabled to look through the veil between. The gates of paradise closed for Adam are opened for Christ. The vision comes to hearts prepared. There had been given a special revelation to John that this sign would be the means of his determination of the Messiah: "He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God." The Spirit comes to Jesus and abides with him. He comes without measure, and fills him, taking full possession of his powers and being. The relation between the Spirit and the Son, the *Pneuma* and the *Logos*, has been the subject of much speculation. Such psychological and metaphysical questions I leave for other minds.

The narrative does not preclude the possibility of the statement that perhaps at this time Jesus had a fuller conception of his mission, and a clearer view of what was before him. Being filled with the Spirit, he is now ready for his great battles, and temptations immediately assailed him; but he stands, he does not fall—he has begun his active work of human redemption.

The Spirit could not ordinarily be seen in his coming. Some visible form is therefore needed, that the sign may be of value. The Word says, "As a dove," or "Like a dove." "Not that the Holy Spirit was thus at all incarnate, but that either the appearance of a dove was seen by John's eyes only, or, as is not unlikely (says one writer), a dove really flew down and lighted on the Lord, and that this, "to outsiders merely a curious incident, was to our Lord and the Baptist a sign of spiritual blessing."

The dove. The Spirit takes many forms. He came upon the apostles in tongues, or flames, of fire. There was something to be purged in them. Christ had nothing that needed cleansing.

On Jesus he appears in gentleness and love; purity, harmlessness and sincerity, innocence and meekness.

But there was another divine attestation, the voice from heaven. "This is my beloved Son, in whom is my delight." Practically the same words were uttered on the mount of transfiguration. It was the voice of God speaking to men in a day of grace. Jesus saw the Spirit of God, as though the people did not. John also probably saw the vision. But the voice is not restricted. The revelation of the Son of God is for all who have ears to hear.

The Christ goes to his ministry, his active work; and after the initiatory rite, the word from heaven attests his divine nature, for God delights in his beloved Son. Here is the beginning of redemption, and the heavenly voice tells of the Father's delight in him who comes to take away the world's sin and guilt.

The blessed Saviour is now actively engaged in the salvation of lost men. As he goes to the work, he is not alone. The entire Godhead is interested in the work. The Son in human form goes henceforth the way of the cross. The Spirit comes, to do his part, and the Father breaks the silence of the skies, and speaks his word, which calls men to hear. This is our hope, well-founded and secure; this is our salvation, divinely conceived and divinely wrought out; for the blessed Trinity is manifested for its consummation; Father, Son, and Spirit, all are come; surely men ought to hear and heed.

JOHN W. CALDWELL, JR.

New Orleans, La.

VII.

THE WOMAN QUESTION.¹

AFTER a hearty supper I was sitting in the hammock enjoying a good smoke, and the parson was sitting by me reading a magazine. Hearing the front gate close, I looked up and saw a handsome young lady, perhaps eighteen, walking toward the house. After a short stay she departed, accompanied to the gate by the parson's wife. The latter approached the hammock, and told the object of the young lady's visit. It was to ask advice as to the propriety and expediency of her going to the city to attend a business college to study shorthand and typewriting. She did not like entering on such a work, but necessity was laid on her to do something for a living, and nothing else seemed open to her.

"And what advice did you give her?" said I.

"I told her I had always been opposed to girls engaging in that kind of work, but under the circumstances I could not advise her." She then asked what advice I would give.

I suggested that perhaps she might find a small-pox patient, go and nurse her, and if possible take the disease and die.

The parson raised his head from the magazine he was reading, and looking over his spectacles, said, "Did any one ever hear such nonsense?" Then, turning to his wife, said, "Advise her by all means to take a business course. Many girls are earning a good living in that way. I never knew a girl that was qualified to fail to secure a good position. Advise her to go at once. She can make arrangements with the college to pay for her tuition after she has secured a position. Tell her I will go on her bond."

To this the wife replied with some emphasis, "I shall do no such thing. I shall advise her to wait and see if she cannot escape such dangers."

¹ A chapter from *Truth Pushed Beyond the Perpendicular*. By James M. Chaney.

Then, turning to me, she said, "Please explain what you meant by that strange suggestion you made."

"I meant simply that it is a choice between two evils," said I. "It is not a question of moral right or wrong, but purely a question of expediency. To be closeted all day with a man as his employee is not a position suitable to any self-respecting young lady. Sometimes it seems to be necessary, but it is a necessity attended with great danger. The girl, who occupies such a position, takes her life in her hand. Before doing so she should carefully meditate on the sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer."

"Now," said the parson, "I shall do some shooting at you with your own weapon, which you have placed in my hand. What you say is the abuse, not the use of an opportunity of making a good living. The work is light, remunerative, and specially suited for a young lady. I believe in giving a woman a chance in every department of work for which she has the necessary qualification."

"I knew you would say that," said the wife, "therefore, I did not ask your opinion. Mr. C—— seems to have settled views on all subjects, and I thought I should like to hear an expression on this subject."

To this I replied, "This is a subject on which I have meditated a great deal. It has come, and I suspect has come to stay, that girls shall fill such positions. It is difficult to form an opinion in any given case. I have very decided views on the question of the proper sphere of woman, but prevailing customs are all against me. Paul's advice is that the younger women marry. Such is my advice. Woman's sphere is in the family. But it takes two to make a bargain. It is not suitable that she marry one of her girl companions, but a young man will not think of marrying unless he has means for supporting a wife. But young ladies have monopolized many of the positions in which it is possible for him to make a living. If my theory of woman's sphere is correct, and I think both nature and Scripture teach it, then it does not belong to the sphere of girls to be found in telegraph offices, department stores, nor officiating as stenographers and typewriters for business men. My objections are,

(1) Such a position is not a woman's sphere. (2) The position is one of great hazard, too great for any Christian girl. (3) It tends greatly to lessen the possibility of girls marrying, because it robs young men of the opportunity of securing means of supporting a wife."

To all this Mrs. R—— heartily assented, and said, "Mr. R—— and myself have never been able to agree on this whole woman question. Not long ago, a young lady friend, soon to be married, came to see him to request that he leave off 'obey' in the marriage ceremony. Before Mr. R—— could answer, I tried to persuade her not to insist on such a request. But she persisted, and Mr. R—— promised that he would comply with her wishes. Don't you think that both were wrong?"

"I certainly do," said I, "and it is difficult to determine which committed the greater sin, she in asking such an omission, or he in granting it."

"It amuses me," said the parson, "to hear you call such an omission a sin when you refuse to admit that it is a sin to drink wine or use tobacco. Perhaps you can enlighten me as to the sin of such an omission?"

"No, not if your infatuation is as great on this subject as on those you mention; I think your case is hopeless. But I will say this: Marriage is a divine institution. It is one of our inheritances from paradise. As a minister of the gospel, in officiating at a marriage, you act in a representative character. You are an ambassador, representing the Great Head of the church. It is to be taken for granted that you will seek to unite the parties according to the revealed will of God. Unquestionably, the Bible enjoins obedience on the part of the wife. It is, then, very clear that it is your duty to include this promise of obedience. To agree not to do so is to prove false to your trust, and to repudiate the authority of your church, and of your Lord and Master. You committed a grievous sin in making such a promise. As to the young lady, she ought to tremble at the thought of making such a request. It can admit of no other interpretation than this, a deliberate repudiation of the authority of God. God says wives must obey their husbands, and she defies God in saying she will

not make any promise to obey. Think of entering wedlock with such a protest against God! A repudiation of his authority! Defying him to his face! It is horrible to contemplate."

"But," said the parson, "obedience is included in the promise to be faithful. She is willing to promise that she will be faithful."

"That is the merest subterfuge. The husband promises that, and you know very well that the Bible requires something more of the wife than is enjoined upon the husband. Besides, if you and she admit that obedience is included in the promise to be faithful, you thus admit that you have no objection to the promise to obey. Then why insist on its omission?"

"I wish I had not made the promise," said the parson.

Mrs. R——, looking down the street, said, "Yonder is Miss Mattie standing at Mrs. Wilson's gate, talking to Agnes." She proposed to go and bring her up, but seeing her turn her face in our direction, she motioned to her and she came. I was introduced to her, and at the earnest request of the parson's wife, I repeated my ideas on the omission of that word "obey" in the marriage ceremony. I explained the matter to her at great length, showing her how it was defying God, and repudiating his authority. She was a sensible girl, and a Christian. She said her attention had never been called to the matter before, and heartily thanked me for preventing her from the commission of a sin so great. Then turning to Mr. R——, she said, "I wish you to put in that word 'obey,' and I shall lay special emphasis on my answer."

"Now," said the wife, "I wish you would get Mr. R—— straight on the whole woman question. A short time ago, the paper announced that a Presbyterian preacher in K. C. was absent, or sick, and his wife preached in his stead. I was shocked to think that a woman, and a Presbyterian, would get so far outside her sphere. I do not believe that a woman has any business talking in public, where a man is present, even though she be a returned missionary. But Mr. R—— said he thought she did right to preach under such circumstances if she was qualified to perform that duty."

"I could not call it a duty," said I.

"I did not mean that; I meant a work."

"Well, I see I am in a strait betwixt two. Both of you, I think, have become imitators of the stupid Irishman, in wishing to push the pole a little further to make sure that it was perpendicular. Mr. R—— is pushing the pole beyond the perpendicular towards the east, and you are doing the same thing towards the south. The Bible has placed this pole, the woman question, perpendicular. Why not leave it just where the Bible has put it?"

"Do you not think that Mrs. C—— did a very naughty thing in going into the pulpit, and officiating as her husband was wont to do?" said Mrs. R——.

"In so doing, she ignored the law of her church, and defied the authority of God. On this there is no room for a difference of opinion among those who receive the plain teaching of the Word of God."

"I confess," said the parson, "this woman question has given me no little trouble. I have endeavored to examine it in all its bearings. I am sure the Bible cannot contradict itself. The four daughters of Philip prophesied. Paul speaks of women praying and prophesying with their heads covered. But prophesying means what we mean by preaching. Therefore, I conclude that in particular cases a woman is justified in performing that work. I confess that in some measure I am influenced by what you may call common sense. If a woman has the piety, knowledge and ability to preach, I see no reason why she should not thus glorify God."

"As a preacher in the Presbyterian Church, your reasoning would be amusing if the subject were not so serious," said I. "But to say nothing of the plain prohibition of Paul, in your church it is understood that no one has a right to officiate in that capacity, be it man or woman, unless specially set apart to that work. But your church has decided that a woman cannot, under any circumstances, be ordained to the work of preaching the gospel."

"When Paul says that a woman must not pray or prophesy

with her head uncovered, does not that imply that she may do so if she does it with her head covered?"

"Such is a legitimate inference, and such, I am sure, is his meaning. With her head covered, in the sense in which the Apostle uses that expression, she may both pray and preach. A little attention to what the Apostle says about the woman's head being "covered" would make his language understood. The difficulty of understanding Paul's discussion of this woman question in the eleventh chapter of First Corinthians arises because of his reference to customs which then prevailed, but which have changed. There is no change in the truth taught, but in the manner of illustrating the truth. If we could completely dismiss all that Paul said to illustrate the truth, by customs then prevailing, and confine ourselves exclusively to the truth he was illustrating, then all difficulty would disappear. But since the illustrations are on record, it is well to explain them. The important truth to be illustrated is the official subordination of woman. Her position, according to the revealed will of God, is one of subjection, of subordination. Because of this, she must do nothing that implies headship, or leadership, over man. What tends to confuse us now is the method by which Paul illustrates this truth, as the illustrations used are no longer in vogue. At that time, long hair was regarded as the symbol or token of her subjection, or subordinated position. The 'covering' spoken of was her hair, as appears from the fifteenth verse, 'For her hair is given her for a covering.' He refers to this in all the preceding part of the chapter. While long hair was regarded as a symbol of woman's position, it was not only a shame, but a sin—a defiance of God's authority—for a woman to wear short hair in public. In the tenth verse Paul says she should wear the symbol of her position on her head out of regard or respect to the regularly ordained ministers or bishops of the church. In this verse they are called 'angels,' just as they are denominated in the first and second chapters of Revelation. Thus (i. 20), 'The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches.' In ii. 1, 'Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus.' The same in verses 8, 12, etc. We should not be confused or led astray when a sacred writer

speaks of a sign, declaring of it something which is true only of the thing signified, as when he speaks of baptism washing away sin. In 1 Cor. xi. 3, he introduces his statements about 'head covering' in this manner, 'I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man.' Then he proceeds to discuss the impropriety of the woman acting in a manner to deny or repudiate this relation she sustains to man. But instead of speaking of the thing signified, he confines his speech to the sign, or the symbol, the head covering. In chapter xiv. 34, he drops the sign or symbol, and speaks of the thing itself. Thus he says, 'Let your women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak: but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.' In the same manner he drops the symbol in his letter to Timothy; 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12, 'Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.'

"So far as the meaning is concerned, these two forms of expression are identical—

"(1) Let not a woman pray or preach with her head uncovered.

"(2) Let not a woman pray or preach under circumstances that implies that she is usurping authority over man.

"When one prays in public, he 'leads' in prayer—he assumes 'leadership' or headship. When one teaches, in a didactic manner, he does the same thing. He assumes headship, superiority. If a woman does either of these things in a miscellaneous congregation, she does the same thing, and thus usurps headship—leadership over the men present."

"It is difficult to understand the limitations here placed on woman. It is difficult to understand why she should be debarred from anything man may do, provided she has the necessary qualification," said the parson.

"Whether you can see it or not, yet every restriction of her sphere is a token of the kindness of her Creator. She was created

expressly to be a wife and mother, a helpmeet. When God instituted marriage, he instituted the family. In the family there could not be two official heads. It would be a greater monstrosity than a double-headed animal. Nature teaches that the headship belongs to the man, because of his superior physical power. One would be in a ridiculous predicament to have or claim the right to exercise authority, yet be destitute of the power to enforce the claim. Thus nature teaches that authority to rule was not committed to woman, but to man, because to him was given superior physical power. The Bible, in the most unmistakable manner, teaches the same fact. The 'head of the woman is the man,' is the Bible truth. To the same import is the statement that women are 'commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law.' The church is patterned after the family. For the same reason that 'headship' is given to man in the family it is given to him in the church. The fact that headship, and duties growing out of it, are denied to woman, does not indicate any real inferiority on her part, but simply official inferiority. In all civil governments we find many things that would serve to illustrate this. It is a fact that there are hundreds and thousands of men more worthy and better qualified to perform the duties of judges, governors, and kings, and emperors than many of those who hold these honorable positions. But that does not give them the right to assume the authority, or to perform the duties of those who hold such official positions. In the matter of praying and teaching and preaching she is not debarred except when her doing so implies headship over man. All children, in their minority, occupy the same position of official inferiority, and are thus on a level with her, and she may teach them without violating the divine injunction, even though they be males."

To all this the wife assented and expressed her gratification at the explanations given. Then she added, "I am in great doubt as to the propriety of women talking in public when all those present are of her own sex. Also, I question the propriety of her leading in prayer in prayer meetings when all present are ladies."

"Now," said I, "you are pushing the pole as much beyond the perpendicular in one way as your husband is the other. The duty

to pray in secret and in public is as binding on women as on men. The only limitation is that she shall do so within the sphere laid down for her in the Bible."

Then she said, "In your opinion may a returned missionary, a woman, I mean, address a mixed congregation?"

"Most undoubtedly," I replied, "so long as she confines herself to a recital of her missionary work among the heathen, in her mission field, and abstains from all attempts to teach men what they ought to do in the cause of missions."

"Here is a case," she said. "Rev. Mr. T—— and his wife were missionaries in China. On their return to this country they were invited by many churches to visit them and give a talk on their missionary work. They visited the Presbyterian Church, in C——, and on Sabbath morning Mrs. T—— went into the pulpit, read a chapter, then said, 'Let us pray,' and led in prayer. Then she took a text referring to mission work, and preached an excellent missionary sermon, by which the missionary spirit was aroused in all present. It was a mixed congregation, and many preachers were in the audience, and some in the pulpit. Was it proper for her to do so?"

To this I replied: "The fact that she preached an excellent sermon, and that she did much good by so doing has a blinding effect in reaching a conclusion as to the propriety of her thus officiating. The good accomplished is not a factor in determining the right or wrong of her acts. The cart might have upset, and the ark might thus have been injured or destroyed, if Uzzah had not, in his zeal, put forth his hand to steady it. But God smote Uzzah for his error. Paul says the damnation of those is just who say that we may do evil that good may come. Anything is evil if it is done in violation of divine law. So far as we can see, a vast amount of good might be accomplished by ordaining many women to the full work of the gospel ministry. But what saith the Word of God, our only guide?"

"In two particulars Mrs. T—— got outside her sphere, and transgressed the divine law—

"(1) In leading the prayers of that mixed congregation. In that she showed her short hair, or uncovered head, or usurped

authority over the men, in that she assumed headship, leadership, the very thing from which she is debarred.

“(2) In publicly expounding the Word of God she did the same thing in an aggravated form.

“In both these things she defied the authority of God, and repudiated that subjection and subordination of which the Apostle speaks.”

“But,” said Mrs. R——, “if she had confined herself to a recital of the work in which she had been engaged, would not that, in such a congregation, have been in violation of the rule laid down by Paul?”

“Not at all,” said I. “In that case it could not be said that she assumed any superiority, or, as Paul puts it, she would not have been speaking with her head uncovered, that is, usurping authority over the men present. Her recital of her missionary work would not have been inappropriate if the whole congregation had been preachers, or if the address had been in the presence of the General Assembly of our church.”

Here the parson had a word to say. It was this, “Would she not, under such circumstances, have been communicating information, thus giving them knowledge, and is not that a form of teaching, and does not Paul say, ‘I suffer not a woman to teach’?”

“Teaching,” said I, “as used by the Apostle, has a well understood, technical meaning. It relates to abstract truth, or truth imparted in a scientific or didactic manner. It is quibbling. By such a perversion of truth as you suggest, a woman would be forbidden to answer a civil question propounded by a man, or even her husband, because such answer would communicate information or knowledge. By that kind of perversion, as she is commanded to keep silence in the church, she would not be permitted to sing. Thus, too, you can prove that it is a sin to kill a beast or fowl, for the law says, ‘Thou shalt not kill.’”

Mrs. R—— then asked, “Is the law as laid down by Paul an iron rule, like the laws of the Medes and Persians? How can we locate the line up to which women may go, and beyond which is forbidden ground?”

To this I replied: “The law we are now considering belongs

to that class of laws known as positive, because based on the will of God, and not on his nature. Such were the ceremonial laws of the Jews, and such is the law of the Sabbath. Two peculiarities of such laws are—

“(1) They may be, and sometimes are, changed by the proper authority. Thus, the Jewish ceremonial law ceased, and thus the Sabbath was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week.

“(2) Another peculiarity of such laws is that we are required to keep them, not so much in their letter as in their spirit. From this it follows that if one is honestly desirous of keeping such a law, yet, through ignorance or inability, does not keep it in its letter, his desire meets the spirit of the requirement. The fourth commandment serves perfectly to illustrate the law relating to women. Works of necessity and mercy are not a violation of the fourth commandment. A stickler or a quibbler might ask how are we to draw the line between those works which are, and those which are not works of necessity or mercy? Such a difficulty is purely imaginary. Any one, in any case, can solve the problem. What is required is that we have an honest desire to keep the commandment. Then our decision, as to the work being one of necessity or mercy, will be acceptable to God. Of course, it is assumed that one has an enlightened conscience, and has carefully and prayerfully informed himself as to what the Bible requires. Such an interpretation of the fourth commandment would not open the way for a man to go on with his usual avocation Sabbath after Sabbath on the plea of its being a work of necessity. That would show wilful ignorance or utter disregard of the commandment. This serves to illustrate the case of Mrs. T——, of which you spoke. There was no necessity for her to lead in prayer, or thus publicly to expound the Word of God. Either she was wilfully ignorant of the divine injunction, or she contemptuously disregarded it. Her honesty of purpose in such a case could be no palliation of her offence. Her leading the congregation in prayer and preaching a sermon on missions constituted a flagrant violation of the divine injunction. If a woman of ordinary intelligence will carefully study what Paul says on this subject,

and if she is conscientiously desirous of complying with the injunction, there is no possible danger of her getting outside her sphere. The chief danger is that she will fall short of her duty, and fail to do those things which she ought to do, especially because of the widespread perversions of the law relating to the sphere of her activities. A most excellent means of testing any case that may arise is to apply the principles governing the observance of the Sabbath. The law relating to the sphere of woman is no more and no less binding than the law relating to the Sabbath."

"I cannot imagine any case of necessity arising when it would be proper for a woman to violate the letter of the law as laid down by the Apostle," said Mrs. R——.

"Yes," said I, "such a case might arise. Here is a case that actually occurred. A minister and his wife went as missionaries to Alaska. They were far removed from other workers. After some years of faithful service, they were rejoiced in the conversion of some of the heathen to whom they had gone. A church was organized consisting of a few members. Many who had not confessed Christ were deeply interested. At that juncture the minister was stricken with a fatal malady and died. It was the purpose of the wife to return to her distant home. Those in the little church, and others interested, implored her to remain with them and carry on the good work begun. She felt that it was her duty to comply with their request. After a while some who accepted Jesus desired to be baptized. After prayerfully considering the matter, she baptized them. Again, they desired to celebrate the Lord's Supper. She administered it to them as her husband would have done. This is analogous to the case I mentioned of the preacher leaving his pulpit on a Sabbath morning, and travelling all that day to reach the bedside of his dying boy, in answer to a telegram from his wife who was with her boy. No one but a hypocritical Pharisee could say that he did wrong. In doing what she did in administering the sacraments of the church, while violating the letter of Paul's injunction, yet she kept it in its spirit. It is very certain that it met the approval of her Lord."

"And yet you condemn Mrs. T—— for preaching an excellent missionary sermon?" said Mr. R——.

To this I replied: "The cases are in no measure parallel. In the case of Mrs. T—— there was no necessity. The matter might be illustrated by what is known as Lynch Law. In mining districts, hundreds of miles from any court of justice, it might be proper to execute even the death penalty on a criminal after being well satisfied of his guilt, and giving him, as best they could, a fair trial. But in a civilized community, where the courts are in session, it matters not how great is the man's crime, nor how well established his guilt, Lynch Law is itself a crime. Your apology for Mrs. T—— and an apology for Lynch Law in a civilized community would be parallel."

"How would it be in a case like this," said Mr. R——; "At a prayer-meeting in a small church it often happens that all present are women. Do you think it would be a violation of Paul's injunction if the minister should call on some lady to lead in prayer?"

"To my mind, that is precisely analogous to Christ's supposition of an ox fallen into a ditch on the Sabbath day. Most assuredly, any woman would be justified in complying with such a request, under such circumstances. The act of the preacher in making the request relieves her from doing that which otherwise could be interpreted as usurping authority over the man.

"In all such matters we are to remember that the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. It was sticking to the letter of the law, while ignoring its spirit, that led God to say to the Jews that their compliance with the letter of the law was an abomination to him. Scylla is as dangerous as Charybdis. The pole is as far from the perpendicular when pushed too far as when not pushed far enough. "

JAMES M. CHANEY.

VIII.

PRACTICAL AND HOMILETIC NOTES.

THE EVIL OF VACANCIES: A REMEDY SUGGESTED.

IN an article in the October-November, 1902, number of the *Union Seminary Magazine*, Dr. M. L. Lacy, of West Virginia, discusses "Vacancies in the Presbyterian Church." In the December-January number of the same volume of the same magazine, under the caption of "Our Call System," signed "Layman," Mr. M. M. Caldwell directs attention to a serious evil growing out of our system as at present administered. In the *New York Observer* of May 14, 1903, Dr. Lewis W. Mudge, of New Jersey, discusses "Pulpit Vacancy and Supply." These three articles bear on the same subject, but treat different phases of it. Each one seems to be ignorant of the articles of the others, yet each one, while dealing with a different evil growing out of the system as administered, points out the defect in the administration of the system and the abuses of the great historical and unquestionably scriptural principle upon which the system is based, and emphasizes, as the remedy, the need of the exercise of more presbyterial authority. One says that this principle, "as now used, is working great damage." Another declares that "there is something radically wrong in the administration of the system," while the other speaks of our "happy-go-lucky methods," and says, "As to the common methods of seeking churches and obtaining pastors, they are as unsatisfactory and uncertain as they well could be."

Dr. Lacy concludes his article with this suggestion: "Let the next General Assembly appoint a committee that shall take this whole matter into consideration, formulate a plan, and put an end to this enormous evil that is wasting the best strength of our church, and shaking the faith of some in the divine wisdom of its system."

On the initiation of another than Dr. Lacy, Greenbrier Presbytery overtured the Lexington Assembly to appoint such a committee. This overture was granted. (See p. 494, Minutes 1903.)

It is not the writer's purpose to discuss an evil which is so painfully patent, but to suggest a remedy, with the hope of stirring up other minds to work, that some plan may be devised to end this evil.

To the writer, it seems that any plan adequate to meet the evil should cover the following points: (1) It should provide a definite plan to aid, by presbyterial oversight, vacant churches in finding suitable men for their pulpits without long delay. (2) It should eliminate the "W. C.," and thereby remove from our church the reproach of carrying upon its rolls the names of unemployed ministers when, at the same time, almost one-fourth of our churches are vacant. (3) It should introduce more flexibility into our system. When a pastor feels that he ought to make a change, the only way now open to him is to write to churches or brother ministers, which is sometimes unpleasant and embarrassing, and often fruitless, or to resign, which at once prejudices him in the eyes of the church, not knowing when he may obtain work or how support his family. No minister ought to be subjected to the alternative of either holding on to a work which he feels that he ought to give up, or resigning with no work in view and no means of supporting his family. Such a state of things ought not to exist, and Presbyteries, Synods and Assembly owe it to churches and ministers under their care that they should not exist.

Any relief that may be attained through any action of church courts must come in the exercise of the episcopal authority vested in Presbytery and the ready consent of congregations thereto. No change in the constitution of the church is necessary. Ample authority is given to the Presbytery in Book of Church Order, paragraph 77. But the Presbytery is too small a body, the field over which its jurisdiction extends covers too small an area, to work successfully any scheme of interchange. There must be the coöperation of Synod and Assembly, and, therefore, in the plan suggested below, while Presbytery retains all the authority given it in our constitution, the Synod is suggested as the unit.

The Plan.—There shall be in each Synod a Committee on "Vacancies and Supplies," composed of one member from each Presbytery, elected annually by the Presbytery (or this work may be assigned to Synod's Committee on Evangelization or Home Missions, if formed as suggested above). This committee shall elect its own chairman and clerk, and minutes of all its proceedings shall be subject to the review of the Synod. It shall hold at least two

stated meetings annually, one before the meetings of the Presbyteries in the spring, and one before the fall meetings of Presbyteries. It shall be the duty of this committee: (1) To keep a list of ministers and licentiates available for appointment as special evangelists. (2) Also, a list of vacant churches. (3) From the "available list" it shall nominate, for appointment by the Presbyteries, supplies for the vacant churches, to be known as special evangelist. The nomination of the committee shall be considered equivalent to an appointment, unless rejected by the vote of the Presbytery in which the vacancy exists. The Presbyteries, acting on nominations for churches in their bounds, shall make all appointments to expire either on March 31st or September 30th. Appointments shall be made, ordinarily, for one year, and never for more than eighteen months. In cases where the special evangelist is continued for the same church, the appointment shall be for six months at a time only.

List of Availables.—(1) All ministers without charge, able for work, shall be placed on this "list," those unable for work to be designated in Minutes of Assembly "Inf." or "H. R." (honorably retired).

(2) All students for the ministry, who have received aid from the church in their preparation, upon their licensure, shall be placed on this "list," and serve under the appointment of this committee for a term of years, say three. This is the suggestion of M. M. Caldwell, in the article referred to above, where many good and sufficient reasons are given, for the good of the young ministers as well as that of the church, why this may be wisely adopted as the policy of our church.

(3) Any minister or licentiate may, at his own request, be placed on this "list"; but in doing so it is to be understood that he agrees to be subject to the appointment of the committee and Presbytery.

Ministers engaged in this work shall be known as special evangelists.

Vacant Church List.—(1) Any church, when it becomes vacant, may, by a vote of the congregation, go at once on this list.

(2) When a church has been vacant six months, Presbytery may advise or direct that it be placed on this list.

(3) A church, or group of churches, dependent upon the Home Missions Fund of Presbytery, Synod or Assembly, may, by order of Presbytery, be placed on this list.

(4) Any church in which there is dissension that makes it im-

probable that it can agree with any unanimity upon a pastor, may, by order of the Presbytery, be placed on this list.

When the committee has appointed a special evangelist for a church, and the Presbytery has confirmed the same, that church shall receive the appointee for the time specified by the Presbytery, and, as true Presbyterians and loyal members of the body of Christ, uphold him in his work and provide for his support as though a regularly elected and installed pastor.

It shall be competent for a church supplied by a special evangelist to call a pastor at any time, and it shall be encouraged and expected to do so within the time of the service of the special evangelist, it being understood, however, that under ordinary circumstances the pastoral relation cannot be formed until the expiration of the services of the special evangelist. Likewise, a special evangelist may accept a call at any time, it being understood, however, that under ordinary circumstances he can enter on a pastorate in another field only upon the expiration of his time as supply.

Any church desiring to continue the services of the special evangelist for another six months, shall make application to the Presbytery in the usual way, and notify the Synod's committee of its purpose to take this action at least thirty days before a stated meeting of that committee.

Stated clerks of Presbyteries shall promptly notify the chairman of their Synod's committee of all calls, vacancies, etc., in their Presbyteries.

Chairmen of Synod's committees should keep in close touch with each other, so that transfers may be readily made from one Synod to another.

Vacant Churches Not on the Vacant Church List.—When a church, upon becoming vacant, does not go (or is not placed) on the vacant list, Presbytery, at the same time it dissolves the pastoral relation, shall appoint a committee of one or more (it may be the representative of the Presbytery on the Synod's committee, or, better, another member of the Presbytery, who shall act with the member of the Synod's committee), to advise with the church and assist it in securing a pastor. (Very helpful suggestions for this committee may be found in Dr. Mudge's article, referred to above.)

If, at the end of six months, it be shown that the church has not exercised due diligence to secure a pastor, it shall be competent for Presbytery to place the church on the "vacant list."

Some Advantages of Such a Plan.—(1) It will provide work for all that are able and willing to work, and, if paragraph 77 be enforced, will remove all “dead wood” from our rolls.

(2) Give churches time to look up the man suited to their pulpit, while at the same time the pulpit is filled and the church work goes steadily on.

(3) It will help to answer the question, “What shall be done with the old ministers?” Many of our ministers, incapacitated by ill health or the infirmities of age from full pastoral work, are nevertheless able to fill most acceptably any of our pulpits for a year at a time and do the more urgent pastoral work. By some such plan the church could use them to bridge over the gaps between pastorates, and at the same time give to them the opportunity, which I know some of them crave, of preaching the blessed gospel.

(4) It will help many an anxious pastor to decide the question as to whether he will hold on to his work because nothing else offers, or place himself at the command of the church, to be used where she deems best.

(5) It will enable Home Mission committees to man the picket lines with young men, and at the same time give our young men excellent training and the opportunity for making “a loving sacrifice for the Master.”

(6) Sometimes it is necessary, for reasons of health, for a man to move from a higher to a lower, from a warmer to a colder climate. Some such plan would make the transfer easy, and possibly thereby prolong the life and usefulness of many a minister.

There are no doubt objections to this plan. Ministers may be slow to place themselves at the disposal of such a committee. Churches may be wary of accepting, even for one year, a man sent to them. But a wise committee could do much to allay such fears, while what may seem a hard and fast rule may be much modified by the committee taking heed, as far as consistent with an adherence to the spirit of the law, to the suggestions and preferences of ministers and churches. If a plan be seen to conserve the best interests of the whole church, in time ministers and churches will willingly submit. There are no doubt objections to this plan, but there are also existing evils. A study of the Minutes of 1903 reveals the fact that twenty-one per cent. of our churches are vacant, and that six per cent. of our ministers are marked “W. C.” (without

charge), that thirty-five per cent. of the churches that are supplied are supplied by stated supplies, and six per cent. by domestic missionaries or evangelists, leaving only fifty-nine per cent. of the churches that are supplied, supplied by duly elected and installed pastors. These figures call loudly for some relief, some reform. But there are other evils, and more serious ones, which this paper aims to alleviate, which cannot be stated in figures. There are objections to this plan, but a malady which has taken such hold requires heroic treatment, and time and patience will be necessary before a cure can be effected. Shall we sit with folded hands and see this "wasting" and "loss" go on, and not even make the effort to correct the evil?

As stated above, this article is not written to defend this plan against the field, but to elicit discussion. Let it be discussed. Let the committee, charged by the Assembly to devise some plan to meet the evil, have all the light it can get from all over the church. Amend it, criticise it, suggest a substitute for it, through the press or by private correspondence with the committee. By all means, let us keep agitating, discussing, until some feasible plan is found to meet this evil.

CHAS. D. GILKESON.

Richlands, W. Va.

PRESBYTERIAN POLITY.

THAT which distinguishes the Presbyterian Church from other churches is not so much its system of doctrine, as its polity, or form of government. Several other churches hold the Calvinistic system of theology in all its main features. This is true especially of Episcopalians and Baptists; but while agreeing in all essential doctrines, there is a radical difference between them and Presbyterians in the matter of church government. The three churches represent three different types of polity, known, respectively, as the prelatical, congregational and presbyterial. In the first, the power is lodged in, and exercised by, an individual, and the government is similar to a monarchy in civil affairs. In the second, the power is lodged in, and exercised by, a company of individuals, or directly by the people themselves, and the government corresponds to Democracy in the management of State affairs. In the third type the power is still lodged in the people, but is delegated to, and exercised by, men whom they have chosen to represent them. The government,

as thus executed, is strikingly similar to the republican government of the United States. In fact, the similarity is so great that it has frequently been noted by statesmen familiar with both; but it causes no surprise to those acquainted with the well-known historic facts, that "in framing the Constitution of the United States its authors took for their model the constitution of the Church of Scotland," and that one of the most influential members of the Continental Congress was the celebrated Dr. John Witherspoon, a Presbyterian preacher, and a lineal descendant of John Knox. To the three types of polity already mentioned some writers add a fourth, which is called the pontifical, or government by the pope.

As we have seen, a Calvinistic church may exist without elders, but it will not be Presbyterian; and, on the other hand, there may be an Arminian church with elders, and it will be Presbyterian. Such is the case with the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, which is largely Arminian in its theology, but acknowledged as a member of the great Presbyterian family, and so admitted into the "Alliance," representing all the churches of the world whose polity is administered by representatives chosen by the people. The eldership, then, is the real badge, or distinguishing mark, of the Presbyterian Church, and from that office it derives its name. It is the church of the elders, or presbyters. The election of these representatives is a matter of the greatest importance, inasmuch as the office is one of grave responsibility and far-reaching influence; and just here, in the opinion of the writer, may be found one of the most serious defects in our admirable form of government, and one of the most fruitful sources of trouble in its practical workings. Our church requires, and rightly so, a great deal of its ministers. Before they are permitted to preach they are carefully examined, both as to their personal piety and knowledge of the doctrines taught by the church; and yet, in the election of an elder, prominence and social standing frequently outweigh piety and spirituality, while men are often chosen who have had no theological training whatever, or perchance have come from other denominations, where they learned doctrines and imbibed sentiments widely differing from ours. No wonder, then, that differences sometimes arise in our courts which result in great harm to the church, for, as is well known, we believe in the parity of the eldership as well as of the ministry, and in the government of the church the most ignorant, unsound and worldly-minded elder has as much authority as any of his colleagues. Our ministers

differ widely in gifts and graces, but in rights and privileges they are all equal; and so with the elder in matters of government. The pastor, by virtue of his superadded functions as teacher, has certain official duties to perform which are not required of the other elders; but as a ruler, or member of any of our church courts, he is simply an elder, with no more authority and no more responsibility than any other member. The unity of the church under Presbyterian polity is realized in a series of graded courts, where the elders rule jointly. The first, or lowest of these courts, is called the Session, and is composed of all the elders of a particular church. It has charge of the spiritual interests of the church, and so, self-evidently, should be made up of spiritually-minded men. It has oversight of the Sabbath-school, choir, societies, and other local agencies, and has the authority to receive, dismiss and discipline members. The next court is the Presbytery, which consists of all the ministers, and one ruling elder from each church within a certain district. In it is vested the right to ordain ministers, organize churches, and constitute or dissolve pastorates. The Synod is only a larger Presbytery, but deals with the churches rather by reviewing the proceedings of the lower courts than by direct oversight of the churches themselves; while the General Assembly is our supreme court, to which all mooted questions are referred for final adjudication. It is composed of an equal number of ministers and elders, chosen annually, not from the churches, but from the Presbyteries, one from each, as a rule. Each of these courts has jurisdiction over the courts below it, to review their proceedings, and act upon appeals from their decisions, thus affording ample protection from the irresponsibility of congregationalism on the one hand, and the one-man-power of ecclesiastical monarchy on the other, so that each and every member of the Presbyterian Church has all his rights and privileges securely guarded. If he fails to get justice in the Session, he can appeal to Presbytery, and if still dissatisfied, he can appeal to Synod, and finally to the General Assembly, so that the polity of our church is clearly sanctioned by reason, and supported by the principles of justice. But it is fortified and commended by a higher consideration still, and that is, it is clearly revealed in the Bible as the form of government which God himself instituted. Christ is the only King and law-maker in Zion, but he does not govern the church directly. On the other hand, he delegates authority to chosen men, not to make laws, but to interpret, expound and enforce the laws he has already

revealed in his Word. The power delegated is not legislative, only judicial and executive; but in the exercise of it the guidance of the Holy Spirit is promised; and so when the deliberations of these courts are thus carried on, their decisions are ratified in heaven as the decisions of Christ himself (Acts xv. 28). The Bible, then, is the great statute book of the church, in which we find revealed not only all the laws necessary for its government, but the agencies by which that government is to be administered. Now, it is worthy of note that while "in the world we find three forms of church government, in the Word we find but one." From the first trace of the church in Genesis to the last mention of it in Revelation, its government has uniformly and always been administered by elders. Dr. Stuart Robinson says that even under the patriarchal dispensation, when the church was embosomed in the family, it seems to have been governed by elders, of which the father, as head of the clan, was doubtless the chief. The very first glimpse we have of the church is in the family of Abraham, and there we read of Eliezer, "the elder of his house" (Gen. xxiv. 2). He was doubtless a member of the household session, of which Abraham was the moderator, or "chief ruler"; and, by way of confirming this interpretation, we have only to turn to Gen. l. 7, and there we find unmistakable reference to these "household elders" in the family of Joseph. When he went up to bury his father, "the elders of his house, and all the elders of the land of Egypt," went with him. The church in Egypt, then, was clearly governed by elders; and so when Moses was sent to deliver the Israelites from bondage, he was commanded to go to the "elders of Israel," and tell them what God intended to do (Exodus iii. 16). He was neither sent to a bishop, nor to the congregation, but to the elders; and for forty years, during all their wanderings in the wilderness, God never dealt with them except through their elders. These exercised government through what seems to have been a series of graded courts, rising one above another in point of responsibility and authority, similar to those of our church to-day. Their General Assembly, or supreme court, was composed of "seventy elders," chosen for the purpose of assisting Moses in the government of the whole church (Num. xi. 16, 17). Below this there seems to have been a Synod, or tribal court, with authority over each tribe (Deut. xxxi. 28), while the affairs of each community were entrusted to a Presbytery, or city court (Deut. xix. 12, and xxi. 3-6), and those of a still more local nature were, perhaps,

committed to a Session, or local court, as we know was the case at a later day in the government of the synagogue.

The elders are frequently mentioned after the establishment of Israel in Canaan during the administration of both the judges and the kings (Judges ii. 7 and viii. 14; 1 Sam. xvi. 4; 2 Kings vi. 32), while both during and after the captivity they continue as the representatives of the people (Ezek. viii. 1, and xiv. 1; Ezra x. 8-14). In the time of Christ they exercised authority both in the synagogue and Sanhedrin, as his tragic death attests with melancholy emphasis, for it is a noteworthy fact that his crucifixion was accomplished through the efforts of the General Assembly of the Jewish Church (Matt. xxvi. 57, and xxvii. 1, 2, 20).

Christ found the Presbyterian polity in existence when he came to earth, and sanctioned it by direct command (Matt. xxiii. 2, 3), and when the apostles began to organize churches, by his authority and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, they took for their model the Jewish synagogue, and ordained a plurality of elders in every church (Acts xiv. 23, and xx. 17). It is very clear that the number was not restricted to one pastor for each church, or to the pastors of several churches in the same city, for, according to the inspired record, they "ordained elders in every church." One of these was doubtless the pastor, or "teaching elder," who added to his responsibilities as ruler the solemn duty of preaching the gospel (1 Tim. v. 17). These elders were no doubt elected by vote of the congregation, and ordained by "the laying on of hands," very much as ours are to-day (Acts vi. 5, 6), and they administered the government of the church, not severally, but jointly; not as individuals, but as a court, as we learn from the minutes of one of their Presbyteries, which were recorded on the pages of inspiration for the guidance, most probably, of all subsequent church courts (Acts xv. 6-29).

More than one hundred and fifty texts, running through the entire Bible, show that the government of the church, in all ages and dispensations, has been by elders, or representatives of the people. The very first glimpse we have of the church it was governed by elders, and the very last we see of it, as it appears in heaven, it is still so governed. As John saw it there, in his vision on Patmos, the elders were still conspicuous. There were "four and twenty" of them, representing the church under both the Old and New Testament dispensations, and they "sat upon thrones and wore crowns,"

as symbols of their authority to govern. As another has said, "Change has characterized almost everything else in ecclesiastical matters—ceremonies, symbols, sacraments—but no change whatever is anywhere intimated, either by precept or example, in the polity of the church." Among the patriarchs, in Egypt, in the wilderness, in Canaan, both during the captivity and after it, while Christ was upon earth, during the days of the apostles, and down to the last page of Revelation, the one emphatic and invariable feature of the church is government by elders. It has always and everywhere been Presbyterian! Upon such an impregnable basis rests the polity of our church. It has always existed, and will continue to do so as long as the church shall last!

From secular sources we learn that its polity has been in force from apostolic times down to the present. Bishop Lightfoot, as quoted by Dean Stanley, says that "the constitution of the church of the first century was not that of a single bishop, but of a body of pastors, . . . that Presbytery was not a later growth out of episcopacy, but the reverse, . . . and that there were, from the commencement of the middle ages down to the Reformation, large exceptions from the principle of episcopal government, which can be called by no other name than Presbyterian." This testimony of "the most learned of all the bishops of the Church of England," thus endorsed by an authority so eminent and competent as Dean Stanley, is worthy of special notice, and is important in establishing our claim to the uninterrupted perpetuity of Presbyterianism. Through several of the "exceptions" noted by the scholarly Bishop, we are able to trace our ecclesiastical pedigree down to the present. This is especially true of the Culdees of Scotland, and the Waldenses, aptly termed "the Israel of the Alps." Among snow-capped mountains and in deep, dark gorges, God preserved, through ages of relentless persecution, a little flock of faithful servants, who maintained in its integrity the model of government he had given to his church at its organization. History establishes the fact that these remarkable people observed essentially the polity and preached the doctrines so dear to the Presbyterian Church to-day. "Popery was never able wholly to exterminate the truths they taught, nor to eradicate the principles they inculcated." The star of their heroic testimony has continued to shine through long centuries, and to-day still guides and gladdens the hearts of ever-increasing multitudes. Through these living links we connect our history with that of the

apostolic church, and by means of this clasp complete the chain of perpetual Presbyterianism. Grand old martyr church, that has stood while hoary centuries and multiplying millenniums have passed away! May she continue her God-given mission with the same unflinching firmness and fidelity to truth that has ever been her distinguishing characteristic, and may her future be as resplendently glorious as her heroic past!

“There’s a home for the bee in his waxen cell,
Where he ceases from labor and loves to dwell;
There’s a home for the bird in her downy nest,
And the tree where it hangs she loves the best;
There’s home by the hearthstone, and bright are its fires,
But the home of my heart is the church of my sires.

“Who chides the bird that she loves her nest?
Or the bee that he thinks his own cell the best?
Who chides the sons and daughters away,
That their hearts seek the homestead by night and by day?
And who will chide me, as my heart thus aspires,
To speak a good word for the church of my sires?

“There the water of baptism fell on my brow,
There first did I know and my Saviour avow.
And there were the holy hands laid on my head,
As the oath of my covenant on record was spread.
There formed the resolve that whatever transpires,
I will always be true to the church of my sires.

“There’s a work for her still ’mong the Israel of God,
And still there’s a place for her ancient abode;
All Israel I love, but it must be confessed
I have loved and will love my own tribe the best!
For it beats my heart, till in death it expires.
Dearly loved, truly loved church of my sires.”

Gainesville, Ga.

T. M. McCONNELL.

MORMONISM AND CITIZENSHIP.

THE United States Senate has never, in its eventful history, had so great a volume of petitions as that which has poured in asking that it refuse Senator-elect Reed Smoot, of Utah, a seat in that august body. As the matter now stands, there appear to be three lines upon which the discussion goes, and upon which it is asked that the Senate act: First, to eject the man because he is a polyga-

mist, or because he belongs to a polygamic faith; second, to refuse him a seat because he holds to the religion of the Mormons; third, to decline to receive a man whose oath in the Mormon religion and hierarchy is inconsistent with the oath which, as an American citizen and as a senator, he must take, his allegiance by his Mormon, or Endowment House, oath having been pledged to Mormonism as a rule, as well as a religion, above any allegiance that he may pledge to the United States Government. The matter sharply put, as to the last point, is simply this: Does the Endowment House oath of a Mormon disqualify him for American citizenship, and therefore, so much the more, for American legislative power?

As to the first ground upon which to deal with the Smoot case, it is stated that there is no proof that he is a polygamist in practice, whatever he may be in his belief, and that missionaries of the true faith in Utah testify that the charge cannot be sustained. As to the second ground, the position is rightly taken that for mere religion's sake, no discrimination should be made against any man; that if the "practice" of a man's faith does not bring him into conflict with the laws of the land, there can be no dealing with that man because of his religion or non-religion, however much his faith may be regarded as unreasonable or religiously dangerous. All the effort, therefore, seems to have crystallized of late around the third point, viz., Is a Mormon apostle disqualified by his Endowment House oath from properly taking the oath of an officer of the United States Government?

This question has been carefully looked into and passed upon judicially. The United States District Court for the Third District of Utah has examined it, with a view to determining whether membership in the Mormon Church is consistent with citizenship in the United States. The result of this examination is embodied in a monograph, entitled, "The Inside of Mormonism," which should be in the hands of every student of this problem, whether as presented in the Smoot case or as a problem affecting our general national life. This pamphlet, published by the Utah Americans, contains, first, an abstract of the testimony of witnesses examined before the court above named; secondly, a few quotations from the voluminous documentary evidence, ample quotations from which are found in the accompanying decision of the court; thirdly, the opinion and decision of the court. All this is taken from the stenographic report, as certified to by the court itself.

The conclusion of the court, amply justified by the evidence which is cited and recorded, was "that the teachings, practices and aims of the Mormon Church are antagonistic to the Government of the United States, utterly subversive of good morals and the well-being of society, and that its members are animated by a feeling of hostility towards the government and its laws, and, therefore, an alien who is a member of said church is not a fit person to be a citizen of the United States," and the applications of certain parties to become citizens were denied.

The compiler of the pamphlet rightly concludes, "If the decision of Judge Anderson is valid, and if the denial of citizenship to foreigners who are under Endowment House oaths is warranted by the evidence, surely an inspired and a preëminently authoritative official in the Mormon kingdom, whose first obligation is to aid in maintaining and administering that alien and hostile government, ought not to be allowed to participate as a legislator in the affairs of the nation which he is sworn, if so counselled by the oligarchy to which he belongs, to help destroy."

The logic of these facts is patent. There is no need, as indeed there would be no propriety in such a course, in going into the purely religious aspects of the question. The disposition of the Smoot case should turn upon the question, clearly decided by a regular and competent court of the country, whether the Mormon organization is one which, as such and by its requirements and obligations upon its members, is "an oath-bound, disloyal and despotic organization, which exists for other purposes than worship or charity, and which obscures its political nature and character behind the exterior of religion."

The book above referred to is worthy of commendation as a valuable contribution to the study of the practical question now before one body of our national legislature.

HOMILETIC NOTES.

"IF HE FOUND ANY OF THIS WAY."

"And desired of him letters to Damascus to the synagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether men or women, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem."—ACTS ix. 2.

SAUL the zealot: Paul the apostle! If we had separate biographies of the two, would we dream they were the same? Saul, cursing the Nazarene and his followers with every breath, not content with the murder of Stephen and harassment of home disciples, but "persecuting them to strange cities," going an hundred miles to drag the fugitives to punishment, and Paul, "in journeyings often" facing every peril and privation from love to Jesus and his people, present an amazing contradiction. This chapter furnishes the key to the enigma, in the story of the supernatural transformation, by which Saul the persecutor became Paul the preacher, he was never weary of telling it, as it filled the early church with adoring wonder.

The text, "If he should find any of this way, whether men or women, he should bring them bound unto Jerusalem," belongs to his former life.

How was he to find them? By inquiring of the heads of the synagogues, to whom he had letters, what Jewish families had ceased to attend the Saturday service; of informers, who of the Hebrew colony were known to be holding separate meetings; and as the leaders and most of the members were bold and zealous propagandists, he would have no difficulty in locating them. If his plans had not happily miscarried, and he had chosen to go deeper, he would have found them marked by what were not Jewish characteristics: faith in Jesus of Nazareth as the promised Messiah, submission to him, and patient waiting for his return.

Some of this way, men and women, have existed ever since. How shall we go about to find them in our day, not with deadly, but friendly intent?

Diogenes the Cynic, walking in broad daylight the streets of Athens with lighted lantern, when questioned, replied, "I am hunting for a man," a caustic criticism upon Athenian citizenship! Let us equip ourselves with the searchlight of Holy Scripture, and go seeking among our race "men and women of this way."

1. Shall we turn its broad sheen of light through the transiently opened door of the gambling den? Of all vices, gambling is perhaps the most mastering; the passion becomes uncontrollable. Ordinarily it hides behind shut doors; but sometimes, under the protection of society, it flaunts itself brazenly in drawing-rooms and marts of trade. Happily, in our city legal lottery gambling no longer, as it did formerly, spreads its net for the young and unwary at every street corner; its nefarious traffic has been driven into corners. Now, as the chief inducement of gambling, whatever its protean form may be, is gain—money, and what money will bring—it surely cannot be the pursuit of such as have laid up their treasures in heaven; and that which loves darkness cannot be the practice of “children of light.”

2. Shall we, some balmy summer’s Sabbath morning, turn our searchlight upon the multitude filling the many coaches of the excursion train? Here and there will sometimes be found a church member, strangely out of place in the crowd composed of godless people and nominal Christians, who feel no impropriety, for they have been taught that, after mass, Sunday is a holiday. Such, on the contrary, feel the need of excuse, such as scantiness of purse, lack of time, need of recreation. A dollar or two has been saved, a few hours for business, at the cost of a wounded conscience and offended Lord. Suppose there is a wreck, and many are wounded, some laid by the side of the track dying, and our professor saved. Imagine him kneeling and whispering in the dulling ear, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved!”

3. Shall we turn our searchlight into the drinking saloon? Time was when, in this city, the lunch table and the liquor bar were inseparable, and the habit of treating customers or closing a bargain with a dram was universal. Happily, times have changed, and the Christian has now no excuse for visiting such places. If consistent, he will avoid the appearance of evil; if temperate himself, he will not lure the weak into danger by his example. A man is shot fatally on the street; will any one send to the nearest saloon for a Christian to instruct and comfort him?

4. Will we be more successful if we turn our light next upon the race-track—upon the excited betters, or hardly less excited spectators? Possibly we might find some cold professor or young Christian caught in the meshes of fashionable society, but ill at ease in her surroundings, and glad when it is all over. As this is but another

form of gambling, we shall not expect to find believers in such a crowd. We will not find there many men and women of this way.

5. Shall we turn our searchlight in the direction of the theatre, some Sunday night, or any week night? Let us be fair and just, which some of its opponents are not. To some the very name, play-house, is a red rag. To enter it once, under any circumstances, is as truly a sin as to lie once, to steal once! Such unreasonableness, put down to ignorant fanaticism, only harms the cause. Now, I admit that I have never attended a play proper; but this does not bar criticism, for there are other reliable sources of information, reports of those who go, bill posters, press dramatic column, and admissions of actors themselves. Further, I am a lover and student of Shakespeare's plays; have in my desk a critique of *Hamlet*, written two vacations since, and would like, did other things not forbid, to see *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *Lear*, *Macbeth*, interpreted by some master of the histrionic art. I do not hesitate to quote the poet in this pulpit. Why, our children in the nursery are actors and actresses, rehearsing, in the wide land of make-believe, the comedies and the tragedies of coming life; and Jesus, who saw the street children of Jerusalem at it, illustrates, by their experience, the contradictory attitudes of his generation toward him and his forerunner. I admit, further, that there are worthy actors and pure actresses, clean plays and chaste acting.

But, now, on the other hand: The average character of followers of the stage as a profession is not high, and there are stars, swinging openly, defiantly, away from the orbit of virtue, to whom, if their course is not changed, is reserved the blackness of darkness forever; and while the majority of theatre-goers are what they now are, and managers have an eye to profits, the average play will not be wholesome. I once heard the late Dr. Palmer remark, "Virtue is too humdrum an affair to interest the public, so vice is used to spice the entertainment." We have just seen a similar statement from one who should know, herself an actress in unwholesome plays, Clara Morris. She is reported in the *Literary Digest* as observing, "The drama deals in aberrations; all interesting occurrences are aberrations, many of them aberrations from the straight rule of rectitude."

Some noted actresses have confessed the corrupting influence of the stage on professionals, for example, Charlotte Cushman, and more than one has on this ground dissuaded ambitious young girls from seeking this avocation.

It is idle, while the church is in the minority, to attempt, as has been suggested, by attendance, the elevation of the stage. As for occasional attendance, when a great tragedian or comedian is announced, or only when the play is known to be clean, what of the example? Does the public keep note and observe absence at other times? And the presence of a Christian once will encourage others to attend constantly and indiscriminately. And what of Paul's rule of putting a restraint upon personal liberty where its exercise will cause a brother to offend? As for the average play, we submit a test: tell the whole thing next morning, in the cold light of the breakfast table, to the assembled family, and not blush for shame! Shall we flash our searchlight upon parquette, dress circle or pit, to find "men and women of this way"?

6. Reverse, now, the lens a half-circle, and we turn it, in hope of successful search, toward the house of God, or rather to Sabbath assembly, for God's people have been constrained, for various reasons, to assemble in strange places, in upper room and school of Tyrannus, by river brink, in catacombs of the dead, in snowy mountain tops, and dark caves and hidden glens, as well as in buildings dedicated to him. But in all ages and circumstances they have loved to meet together for worship, and the "How amiable are thy tabernacles" of David finds modern expression in—

"I love thy kingdom, Lord,
The house of thine abode."

Pliny describes the early Christians as meeting before light on the first day of the week, and singing hymns to one Christ. Happily for them, many attend who are not yet Christians, but in a fair way to be; but when one is never willingly absent, and takes manifest interest in every part of the service, you may know you have found what you have been looking for.

7. Again, turn the light on the Lord's Supper, and we shall be more successful. All communicants are not participants; but where there are correct views of the Supper, and discriminating preaching, the majority are "men and women of this way."

8. Turn, now, the light upon the home. Should you find every sleeping chamber temporarily a closet, the fire alight on the family altar, children being reared in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, you may safely believe parents, sons and daughters are of this way.

9. And, finally, could we make our light an x-ray, but with greater clearness, penetrating the walls where dwells the inner self, and should find repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, and communion with the invisible, we could afford to close our lantern slide and cease our search, for we have found "men and women" such as Saul, in the days of his ignorance, was seeking to find, that he might destroy, but in after years loved with all the might of his big heart.

Application.—Three distinct impressions have possibly been made upon as many classes:

1. Some of my unconverted hearers, having hitherto only hazy ideas of the second birth, have been thinking that the difference between themselves and the new-born is so slight as easily to be overcome, whenever it is willed. Now, you realize what a tremendous change is involved. May it startle you into immediate attention to the business of your personal salvation.

2. Possibly some unhappy professor has awakened to the fact that this change has never by him been felt. Thank God for the discovery of your mistake while it is correctible. Leave your name on the church roll, stay away from the communion for the present, if you cannot come conscientiously, and give no sleep to your eyes nor slumber to your eyelids until a better foundation is found. The path is still open to the cross.

3. Many of you have discovered a pleasing resemblance to the experience described. Rejoice and give thanks; press on; climb higher; for it is of you, and such like, that the Master was speaking when he said, "Therefore, whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock."

R. Q. MALLARD.

New Orleans, December, 1903.

THANKSGIVING FOR REVERSES.

"We glory in tribulations also."—ROMANS v. 3.

It is to be deplored that in the thanksgiving proclamations the Christian faith is so scrupulously ignored. The religion of Christ lies at the very foundation of our national and state prosperity,

material no less than religious. It is also to be deplored that in our thanksgiving there is too great an ignoring of the adversities and reverses of life. The blessings of prosperity are by no means the greatest blessings we have. Those that come under a more sombre garb are perhaps not so quickly recognized, but are oftentimes richer, greater, stronger, more productive. We may glory in tribulation also.

Adversities, no less than prosperity, come from the hand of our Maker, Ruler, Guide and Father. His wisdom is in them no less than in his goodness. He knows what is best. We should be glad ever to be in his hand, and to take whatever comes with such companionship.

Adversities bring out beauties of life and character which, without them, would never be known. The graces of patience, gentleness, sympathy, endurance and submission are unknown except under the darker light of trouble and difficulty, and who would be without these? How greatly they beautify life! How much richer they make it! How much more closely they bind us one to another in the sweet compacts of earth, the companionship of home, the love of friends, the opportunity for relief, and the ministering of what we have to those who have not. The school is a hard one, perhaps, but its tuition is ever happy and productive of the sweetest results.

Adversity develops positive graces also, as well as those of endurance. They are the *camera obscura* in which the light of God's favor paints the film and makes the negative; or dark room in which are developed, even though it be under a ruby light, symbolic of pain and sacrifices, the blood pictures of beauty that will attract the eye, strengthen life, and win the admiration of God and men.

The world says nothing succeeds like success. This is not a true statement, or not wholly true. Failure often produces ultimate success more surely than any other cause. It develops the robust qualities, it strengthens the soul, it makes the man able to bear and strong to do; it is a great discipline. Antæus gathered strength to wrestle with Hercules every time he was cast to the ground, and Hercules could win his feat only by keeping him off the ground. We will never be defeated as long as we are permitted to be schooled in adversity, and thereby become stronger for the combat. Ben Hur's great victory in the chariot race was won by his years in a galley ship.

This accords with God's Word, as well as with reason and experience. We glory in tribulation also, because tribulation worketh

patience, and patience experience, and experience hope, and hope maketh not ashamed, because of the love of God shed abroad in our hearts. It proves sonship to God. "Whom he loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." It is God's evidence to his children of his love and purpose to take them home. That which makes the difference between disaster and blessing is our relation to Christ. If we are his, the tribulation is a discipline; if we are not, it is his judicial dealing of punishment for our sin. Faith in Christ is a chain of golden links, one of which is this link of tribulation. Faith, access to God, tribulation, patience, experience, hope—these form the golden chain. Let even this one of tribulation be dropped out, and the chain is broken.

Well, then, may we thank him when we are rejoicing for blessings which make us better, stronger, more disciplined, truer in life and thought and heart to him whom we serve.

What shall we render unto God for all his benefits toward us? We will take of the cup of salvation; we will call upon the name of the Lord; we will pay our vows unto God; we will confess him now in the presence of all his people; we will accept the afflictions he sends as stones over which we fall, and find we are in the wrong path because of them; or, rather, we will take them as stepping stones to rise more quickly and directly to higher, better, nobler, sweeter, stronger life.

CALMING LIFE'S STORMS.

"Take me up and cast me forth into the sea; so shall the sea be calm unto you."—JONAH i. 12.

THE soul, and not simply the fact, of history is that which is profitable in the solution of the problems of life. Not the incident, but what the incident means, and the principle which it illustrates, is the essence of history. Especially is this true of the Old Testament history, which is the inspired record of divine, living illustrations of both gospel and law. In the narrative of Jonah's life and experience we have a divinely-painted picture in miniature form of some of the most precious truths of the gospel and Christian life. The facts of Jonah's experiences in themselves are of but passing interest to us to-day, but what they mean is of priceless value for all time. Jonah was called of God to be a missionary to the great

city of Nineveh; but, because of the distastefulness, difficulty and danger of the work, he sought to lay aside his prophetic office and, in disobedience, to flee to the distant city, Tarshish, where he hoped to live according to the dictates of his own heart. The facilities of disobedience were abundant and the way appeared easy; but soon he finds himself upon the bosom of a boisterous sea in the teeth of a storm, and his own life, and those with whom he is associated, are in imminent peril. How deceitful is the way of sin! In the critical moment, when all are about to be lost, Jonah rises to the zenith of his greatness, and the glory of his life appears in our text. He gives himself to the raging billows of the sea that his companions might enjoy the salvation and peace of calm waters. "Cast me forth into the sea; so shall the sea be calm unto you." We have illustrated here—

I. Salvation through redemption. Christ refers to this sacrifice of Jonah to illustrate the nobler sacrifice of himself to save his people. It is true, in the case of Jonah, it was the sacrifice of the guilty to save the innocent; but in the case of Christ it was the sacrifice of the innocent to save the guilty. Christ saw none but man could bear the penalty of man's sins, and that none but God, above the law and infinite in his dignity, power and holiness, was able successfully to accomplish the work. In his infinite grace and boundless love, of his own volition he gave himself to sink to the bottom of the sea of death to meet its terrors, conquer its powers, and to give the calm of salvation to his guilty people. He said, in effect, Cast me into the sea; so shall the sea be calm unto you (Matt. xii. 40). Thus, the prince of this world was cast out, the penalty of sin was borne, death was conquered, and the blessed peace of his salvation was given to me. "My peace give I unto you." The threatening storms of sin abated, the sea of death was calmed, and in its calm the world enjoys its sweetest peace, its most perfect rest, and the sublime blessedness of its glorious salvation.

II. The true secret of the way of life. The text marks the hour when Jonah repented of his sin and made a complete surrender to the will of God for the salvation of others. It was the hour when he died to himself, and to every visible appearance gave himself, life and all, absolutely into the hands of the mercy of God. In his heart at least he died to this world. But did he die? Yes, to self, to the world, to disobedience, to the flesh; but he lived to God, to righteousness, to the spirit, and to divinely glorious ideals and

purposes. The greatness of Jonah and the beauty of his life makes its first appearance in the words of the text. The glory, beauty and greatness of every life begins when we repent of sin, surrender ourselves to God, die to sin, self and the world, and devote ourselves completely to some great and noble service. When we can say, with the good Samaritan, to the needy, "I will get down, you get up; your needs be met, though my pocket be empty," we may justly claim to be ranked among the heroes or heroines of the world.

III. We have here an illustration of how the storms of this earth are calmed. Not by sin, nor strife, nor selfishness, but by the more powerful and peaceful influence of loving sacrifice. The world's cruel storms are calmed by the noble spirits that are great enough to say, "Cast me into the sea, but let the sea of this life be calm." Mothers who say, "Let us be cast into the sea, but let our homes be a haven of rest and holy peace;" fathers and husbands who say, "Let us be cast into the sea, but let our homes be blessed with comfort and peace;" friends who lose sight of themselves in loving service to their community; churches, filled with the Spirit of the Master, forgetting self and living for the salvation of men—these are they that are calming the troubled waters of life. Our missionaries, who die to home and the comforts of the homeland, and go in self-sacrificing devotion to all parts of the heathen world, are they who are stilling the storms of sin, death and destruction. "Cast me forth into the sea; so shall the sea be calm unto you."

R. C. ANDERSON, JR.

Shelbyville, Tenn.

IX.

CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

JOHNSON'S "LIFE AND LETTERS OF ROBERT LEWIS DABNEY."

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF ROBERT LEWIS DABNEY. *By Thomas Cary Johnson.* 8vo, pp. xvi, 585. Cloth, gilt top, \$2.50. Richmond: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1903.

A book that in binding, paper, print and picture pleases the most fastidious eye; containing the life history of one of the greatest men the Southern Presbyterian Church has produced, told by one of kindred avocations, convictions and strength of character and acknowledged ability, all pointing him out as a fitting historiographer.

In brief, the contents of the book are a beautiful dedication to Dr. Dabney's wife and old students, a short, modest and chaste preface, remarkably satisfactory index by chapters, family tree, showing honorable ancestry, two striking portraits, pictures of Hampden-Sidney College building, of his homes at Tinkling Spring and at Hampden-Sidney, and of the College Church. He who takes up this book will be led in fascinating excursion through more than five hundred pages, mostly autobiographical, written with no such intent, but instinct with life, until he ends at a copious index, covering the whole journey. The two guiding principles foreannounced, viz., to portray the subject exactly as he was, and to let him largely tell the story of his own life, are well observed. But let it not be supposed that the sole merit, as well as work, of the biographer, is to be seen in the skilful arrangement of the abundant accessible material. The links of the story are much more than mere connections. They constitute distinct and valuable contributions, and near the close the author, in elaborate portraiture, gives his personal estimate of the man in his manifold relations and pursuits. It is a deeply interesting fact that the splendid triumvirate of consecrated ability, Dabney, Hoge, Palmer, all now among the immortals, is brought together in the eloquent and masterly tributes by the last two to the first, who preceded them only by a few short years.

We have space only for the record of a few impressions. First, of the beautiful, reverential and tender relation to mother, knightly and loving devotion to wife and children, three of whom were taken from him in their early years, and strong affection for the whole wide circle of his kindred. His thoughtfulness for his mother, leading to temporary interruption of the education of an eager student, is proof of the former; his constant demand for minutest tidings of home folks and home doings shows a heart that held to family with grip of steel. In him "the child was the fatler of the

man." The same sterling qualities of absolute intellectual as well as moral honesty, sturdy independence and intense passion for truth, marked even his young student days, and one can see in his caustic criticism of the textbook on morals which he studied at the University the shadowy portrait of the coming author of one of the most luminous books ever published on the subject, "The Practical Philosophy." An intense Southerner and politician as a boy, these sentiments deepened and became more rational with years.

The social surroundings in which he was reared, and which contributed to his making, had a strangely familiar aspect to us; for in truth it was not so much a Virginian as a Southern atmosphere which he breathed in his youthful days. The matron so vividly described has had many an original besides those Johnson and Page picture, and the affectionate relations between master, mistress and black slave might stand for a description of almost the entire South.

The manifoldness of the man and his avocations fills one with wonder: pastor, professor in college, university and seminary, author, staff officer, statesman, philosopher—successful in all; not only Virginia, but the South might well be proud of him; let it rather be said, the Southern Church should be thankful for him. In fine, our gratitude is due to the family in allowing his life to be perpetuated by the press, and in furnishing such abundant and rich material, and to the Union professor for contributing to our splendid and augmenting Southern Presbyterian literature a book that will live and help to shape our rising ministry on sturdy and strong lines. It is worthy of a prominent place in our church, seminary, manse and family libraries.

New Orleans.

R. Q. MALLARD.

BRUCE'S "APOLOGETICS."

International Theological Library. APOLOGETICS; OR CHRISTIANITY DEFENSIVELY STATFD. By Alexander Balmain Bruce, D. D., Professor of Apologetics and New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow; author of "The Training of the Twelve," "The Humiliation of Christ," "The Kingdom of God," etc. Sixth edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901.

This is one of twenty-four volumes, constituting the International Theological Library, and prepared by British and American divines of the school of Higher Criticism, under the editorship of Drs. Charles A. Briggs and S. D. F. Salmond. The Library is designed to cover the whole field of Christian Theology, to form a series of text-books, and to give full and impartial statements both of the results of theological science and of the questions which are still at issue in the different departments.

The volume before us is an "apologetic presentation of the Christian faith with reference to whatever in our intellectual environment makes faith difficult at the present time to men whose sympathies are with Christianity, but whose faith is weakened by anti-Christian prejudices." It has an introduction, containing a historical sketch and a statement of the functions and method of Apologetics. The discussion is divided into three books: treating,

consecutively, the Theories of the Universe, Christian and Anti-Christian; the Historical Preparation for Christianity; and the Christian Origins. The first book discusses questions of Natural Theology under the topics, "The Christian Facts," "The Christian Theory of the Universe," "The Pantheistic Theory," "The Materialistic Theory," "The Deistic Theory," "Modern Speculative Theism," and "Agnosticism." The second deals with Old Testament issues, as preparatory to Christianity, discussing "The Sources," "The Religion of the Prophets," "The Prophetic Idea of Israel's Vocation and History," "Mosaism," "Prophetism," "Prophetic Optimism," "Judaism," "The Night of Legalism," "The Old Testament Literature," and "The Defects of the Old Testament Religion and Literature." The third book treats directly of Christianity, especially as set forth in the New Testament, under the headings: "Jesus," "Jesus as the Christ," "Jesus as Founder of the Kingdom of God," "Jesus Risen," "Jesus Lord," "Paul," "Primitive Christianity," "The Synoptical Gospels," "The Fourth Gospel," and "The Light of the World."

In the first book, as evidence of the advanced position of the writer, we note some points of interest. He holds that the "Synoptical Gospels" may at least plausibly be regarded as history, colored more or less by the faith of the narrators; that sin could not have come into the world with God's consent, but must be conceived as the result of a wrong choice on the part of primitive man; that the Genesis account of the origin of sin is not irreconcilable with the doctrine of evolution; that death and other physical evils existed before sin, and so, objectively, are not to be viewed as caused by sin, but, subjectively, to be considered as the penalty of sin; that the world might have had a beginning, and that, if eternal, it was so by God's will; that universal salvation is not an article of faith any more than it is a heresy; that the Christian evolutionary view may eliminate miracle, or the purely supernatural, but does not the divine activity which underlies the whole; that the belief in God is antecedent to evidence, and that in our theistic reasonings we formulate proof of a foregone conclusion, innate and inevitable.

The second book discusses the Old Testament from the standpoint of the higher criticism. Dr. Bruce holds that the proper attitude of the apologist towards criticism is essentially the same as that towards evolution: with the spirit of fearless trust, "to recognize the legitimacy of the inquiry, while not dogmatizing as to the truth of the results, to acquire such an acquaintance with the main lines of thought as shall enable him to grasp their drift, and to show, if he can, that the old faith can live with the new science or hypothesis." Accordingly, he retains the old faith and accepts, as a working basis, the conclusions of the more conservative wing of the school of modern criticism. The more important of these conclusions are: that Genesis is a composite construction, of which Moses is not the author; that in the Pentateuch there are "at least three distinct strata of legislation, of different dates, but all subsequent to the time of Moses, as written compilations; the short code in Exodus xx. 22-xxiii. 19, designated in Exodus xxiv. 7, The Book of the Covenant; the more extended body of laws contained in Deuteronomy, especially in chapters xii.-xxvi., distinguished as The Deuteronomic Code; and the large collection of laws relating to religious ritual, uncleanness and

kindred topics, scattered throughout the middle books of the Pentateuch—Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers—appropriately called *The Priestly Code*.” Dr. Bruce thinks that we must recognize three great periods in the religious development of Israel: I. Mosaism, to which the Decalogue belongs, and of which Moses is probably the author, 1400–800 B. C. II. Prophetism, true to Mosaism, and carrying it to a higher issue, to which the prophetic books belong, 800–600 B. C. III. Judaism, 600–0, during which most of the Old Testament was written, an era in which the prophetic motto, “To obey is better than sacrifice,” might be said to have been transformed into “sacrifice, the sum of obedience,” the twilight of Judaism deepening into the night of pharisaic legalism. Only a few of the Psalms are of Davidic origin, and the Psalter, as a whole, is to be regarded as the “Song-book of the second temple.” The prophets precede the law. The Deuteronomic Code belongs to the period of prophetism, and reflects its spirit; while the Priestly Code is the outcome of the degenerate days of Judaism, subsequent to the exile.

Besides this general survey of his discussion of the Old Testament, there are some special points that are interesting. The ignorance of the heathen, however deep, it is a hasty judgment to pronounce incompatible with salvation. The name for Israel’s God, Jehovah, or more correctly, Jahveh, is in all probability not an absolutely new name, but an old tribal name revived and pronounced with new emphasis, and charged with deeper significance. Granted that Elijah tolerated the presence of the ox in the provincial sanctuaries devoted to the worship of Jehovah, the ox might be simply a symbol like the cherubim, and symbolism in religion, whatever its dangers, is not incompatible with the spirituality of the object of worship. It is not improbable that the nomadic ancestors of Israel in prehistoric times were, like the Aryan races, nature-worshippers, and that the spiritual conceptions of the Godhead were a later acquisition. The prophets claimed unrestricted liberty of prophesying, did not hold themselves bound by each other’s opinions, those of one generation might modify or cancel the oracles of those of a preceding generation, and they recognized no standard of orthodoxy. We cannot claim for the prophets, or psalmists, or for the unknown author of the Book of Job, that they give us a perfect solution of the problem of the suffering of the righteous, though here and there hints of the true solution are traceable. The prophets did not predict in order to supply apologists with arguments in support of a supernatural revelation. It is not legitimate exegesis to extract from “the Lord our righteousness,” as Jeremiah used it, the Pauline system of theology. The second part of Isaiah was written by “the great prophet of the exile,” and sets forth the ideal as power reached through weakness, honor through shame, healing through pain, righteousness through wrong. All prophecies have not been fulfilled, and, in the precise form in which they are given, never will or can be fulfilled. It is natural that an earnestly ethical religion, which sees in the whole history of the world a struggle between good and evil, should in the course of its historical development evolve a doctrine of resurrection and eternal judgment. Later Judaism tended to a transcendent conception of God; the God of the Levitical cultus is a far-off God, incapable of having anything to do with the world except through mediators, human or angelic.

The Book of Daniel was probably written in the time of the Maccabees, and presents what is really history under the form of prophecy. One might say that the best days of Israel were over before the sacred Book appeared; that Jehovah was more manifestly present among the chosen people when she was the people of the living Word, than when she became the people of the written Word; the people of the Book were a degenerate people, the emergence of the Book was coincident with the night of legalism, and the use of it was to a large extent idolatrous; nevertheless, a record of some sort might be pronounced, in a broad sense, indispensable. Baxter was right in denying, against Owen, that a knowledge of the Bible was necessary to salvation. The errorless autograph of the Hebrew Bible, for which some so zealously contend, is a theological figment; there may conceivably have been such a document for each part in succession, but there never was an errorless autograph of the collection as a whole. The Masoretic Hebrew text is only an approximately accurate translation by Jewish scholars of the vowelless original. The Hebrew editors of the Old Testament, in mixing up things, showed crude morality, but not immorality; the case of Balaam raises the question whether even a good conscience be an indispensable condition of inspiration. Can we, children of the new era, read the Chronicles without feeling that more is made of the Levitical system than it was all worth, and that the Philo-Levitical spirit of the writer is a religious defect, if not a moral fault? We should find Christ in the Old Testament, but we should also see that the Old Testament is defective in so far as it comes short of Christ.

These statements have been given almost *verbatim* from the book.

Coming, finally, to the direct study of Christianity, Dr. Bruce devotes five chapters of the third book to Christ, as the centre and substance of his religion. Paul is then presented as the expositor of Christian theology, whose importance, though great, has been exaggerated. The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Acts give us the primitive Christianity of the apostolic church; but the religion of Jesus in its purest form is to be found in the Gospels, especially the Synoptists. The final chapter returns to Christ, "The Light of the World."

There are some striking statements in these last pages. Revelation is hardly responsible for the apocalyptic writings of the Old Testament; for the most part they sink below the level of inspiration, and belong to the night of legalism. The histories of the Infancy in Matthew and Luke do not belong to the original synoptical tradition; they are a later addition, prefixed to the evangelic story of the public ministry and the final sufferings of Jesus. The words of Jesus are "words of eternal life," and no truth not spoken by him can be essential to salvation, however helpful for upbuilding in faith. The section in Matthew's Gospel which most wears the aspect of an ideal, not real, history is that containing the great commission of the risen Christ to his disciples. The Fourth Gospel presents the hardest apologetic problem connected with the origin of Christianity. The stress of the problem does not lie on the question as to Johannine authorship; a question of this kind can in no case be vital to the Christian faith. While the doctrinal significance of the book is great, its claim to have been written

by the Apostle John does not rise above a high degree of probability; nevertheless, one who feels himself incompetent to play the difficult part of a historical critic may reasonably take up the position of deferring to the patristic tradition, and the opinion of such modern inquirers as think that the evidence for Johannine authorship amounts to little short of demonstration, though unable quite to rid himself of the uncomfortable haunting doubt that it is by no means so strong as sanguine reasoners assert. The heart of the man Jesus, in its rich fulness of grace and spiritual truth, is more adequately shown in the first three Gospels than in the fourth. The function of revelation is not, as has been supposed, to reveal truths which the human mind is unable to conceive; it is rather to convert conceivable possibilities into indubitable realities; to turn, *e. g.*, the fancy or dream of God as a Father into a sober fact. What is the ideal church? It is a body of men believing Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, with a faith not received by tradition, but communicated directly by the Father in heaven to each believer. If the true church mean the church of the ideal, then there is no true church in this world. The important question is not the abstract one as to the nature and limits of church authority, but what church has the moral right to exercise authority. Speaking generally, with reference to the actual situation, it may be said that a believing man does well to be jealous of church power for Christ's sake. We must recognize Christ setting himself as an authority above the Scriptures. It is possible, by a wrong use of the Bible to-day, to miss Christ; to miss him, not in the sense of forfeiting all share in his salvation, but in the sense of utterly failing to do justice to his claims as the supreme Master in religion. It comes about through not realizing that the Gospels are the core of the Bible. In such cases the Bible as a whole, instead of Christ in particular, has been regarded as the authority in religion. Without cherishing superstitious ideas of church authority, we may rationally pay great deference to the final verdict of fathers and councils as to the canon; still every Christian has a right to examine into the matter for himself, and to hold himself in suspense in regard to the canonicity of particular books, as tested by the principle of essential agreement with the mind of Christ in moral and religious teaching. The sphere of Christ's authority is religion and morals, not science, whether sacred or secular.

These numerous statements have been given from the volume before us in order that we may see the range and extent of Dr. Bruce's departure from traditional views, and may understand the position of the school of moderate criticism to which he belongs. To many it will doubtless seem that such views are incompatible with evangelical Christianity. That Dr. Bruce nevertheless holds the fundamentals of the old faith, will appear from the quotations now to be given.

Christianity is the religion of redemption. Jesus brought into the world supremely valuable and imperishable boons: a God who is a Father; a regenerated human brotherhood; a love that had in it purpose and power to redeem from sin; a love that could die, and that expected to die, a ransom for the million. If, to satisfy the demands of our religious nature, we insist on retaining the moral miracle, then we must provide ourselves with a theory

of the universe wide enough to make room for as much of the miraculous element as may appear to the wisdom of God necessary for realizing his great end in creating and sustaining the universe; the bias of faith in the present time is to make itself entirely independent of the miraculous, but the thing cannot be done. All subscribe to this creed at least, that Jesus was an extraordinary man, a religious genius; the church believes him to be God. The specific lesson of the fourth Gospel is: God, in the glory of his majesty and might, revealed, as it were, behind a lowly humanity, the glory of the only begotten Son shining through the fleshly veil; what more legitimate and wholesome than to think of Jesus, the uniquely good, as the very Son of God, absolutely one with God in mind, will and spirit? God is both immanent and transcendent in all spheres; nor does any reason appear why prayer should be confined to the spiritual sphere. It is a violation of all historical probability to minimize the significance of Mosaism in deference to a naturalistic theory of evolution, which demands that the early stage in a religious development shall be sufficiently rudimentary to allow the whole subsequent course of things to present the appearance of steady onward progress. On the principles of Protestantism, which forbid us to accept the decisions of church councils, whether ancient or modern, as final, the canon is an open question; but practically the question is closed. All naturalistic attempts to explain away the resurrection of Christ, up to this date, have turned out failures; the physical resurrection remains—remains, it need not be added, a great mystery. The whole apostolic church call Jesus, Lord, *Κύριος*, the equivalent for Jehovah in the Septuagint. For the writers of the Gospels the religious interest is supreme; their temper is that of the prophet rather than of the scribe; they are truly inspired men. The Trinitarian formula simply sums up in a single phrase the theology of Jesus; he ever spake of God as Father, he called himself God's Son, and in the few utterances concerning the Holy Ghost recorded in the Synoptical Gospels he represents him as God communicating himself in his grace to receptive souls.

The purpose of this notice is purely expository: no attempt has been or will be made to criticise the views presented. The writer is not competent to discuss intelligently the merits of the higher criticism. He believes that its methods are legitimate, and that the results reached by its conservative wing, though not accepted by him, are not inconsistent with evangelical orthodoxy. The essence of Christianity he believes to be: the Lord Jesus Christ, the infinite Son of God, the embodiment and expression of supreme love for man, a vicarious sacrifice for the sins of every penitent believer.

Washington and Lee University.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

HILPRECHT'S "EXPLORATIONS IN BIBLE LANDS."

EXPLORATIONS IN BIBLE LANDS DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. *By H. V. Hilprecht, Clark Professor of Assyriology and Scientific Director of the Babylonian Expedition, University of Pennsylvania, with the co-operation of Licentiate Dr. Benzinger, Formerly University of Berlin,*

Professor Dr. Hommel, University of Munich, Professor Dr. Jensen, University of Marburg, and Professor Dr. Steindorff, University of Leipzig. With nearly two hundred illustrations and four maps. 4to, pp. xxiv., \$10. Buckram cloth, gilt top, \$3.00 net. Philadelphia: A. J. Holman & Company. 1903.

In character, contents, completeness, as well as in its mechanical execution and interesting literary style, this is perhaps the book of the year. Certainly in its department of study and investigation it is the book of the decade. It is decidedly the best compendium of biblical archæology dealing with the countries and people surrounding the Jews that has ever appeared, for both scholarly and popular use.

The work is divided into five parts: The Resurrection of Assyria and Babylonia, written by Prof. Hilprecht: Researches in Palestine, by Licentiate Dr. Benzinger; Excavations in Egypt, by Prof. Steindorff; Explorations in Arabia, by Prof. Hommel, and The So-called Hittites and Their Inscriptions, by Prof. Jensen. Nearly three-fourths of the splendid volume is devoted to the first subject, happily entitled The Resurrection of Assyria and Babylonia.

In pursuing his subject, Dr. Hilprecht gives a full account of the rediscovery of Nineveh, by Benjamin of Tudela, in the twelfth century, followed by Leonhart Rauwolff and Sir Anthony Shirley in the sixteenth, followed still more rapidly in the next century or two by large numbers of business men, scholars and priests; and of the rediscovery of Babylon, vaguely in the latter part of the sixteenth century by Rauwolff, Balbi and Eldred, and more definitely in the next century by Pietro della Valle and Vincenzo di Sienna, followed by the more scientific and precise explorations and statement in the eighteenth century by Niehbuhr, Beauchamp and Olivier. The next chapter is devoted to the explorations and surveys of the nineteenth century, heralded by Grotefend, a young German scholar, whose most deserving work was not recognized until long after his death, by numerous men of science, prominent among them being Rich, Buckingham, Porter, Mignan, Fraser, the Euphrates Expedition under Colonel Chesney, James Felix Jones, Lynch and others. Then came the more widely known and productive work of the great masters in Assyriology. Layard, Rassam, Loftus, Fresnel, Thomas, Sir Henry Rawlinson and others, whose detailed work in the excavations of walls, palaces, libraries and tombs has revealed a world of information to the scholarship of men, and has reopened the pages of history and re-read the records of a hoary past. The various excavations under French, English, German, American and Turkish auspices are described minutely, the larger proportion of this part of the book being given, naturally, to the American work at Nuffar, under Peters, Haynes, and the author himself. The account of the latter is as interesting as any romance, while at the same time it shows more clearly than ever the value of Eastern exploration in its bearing upon the interpretation of the Old Testament, and upon the history of art and human civilization in general.

The four remaining parts of the volume are very brief as compared with the first, and deal only generally with the subjects considered, in an outline

of the history and results of exploration in each country brought under review. That on Palestine contains only very familiar matter. The interpretation by Wright and Sayce of the Hamath inscriptions and the tracing of an identity in all the numerous rock inscriptions found in the Taurus region is questioned by Prof. Jensen, so far as it warrants the use of the name Hittites in describing the people whose only monumental record yet found these inscriptions form, and a much later date is also given them. Prof. Jensen devotes his chief attention, so far as the narrow limits of his paper will allow, to the discussion of the linguistic aspects of the matter, tracing an Armenian lineage in the people "so-called Hittites."

A general index, an index of Scripture quotations, hundreds of the finest illustrations, numbers of them full page, abundance of foot-notes, giving altogether a very full bibliography, and four great maps, contained in "pockets" attached to the binding, make this volume a most complete and useful work, as well as a monumental one. As a comprehensive statement of the whole subject, and as a summary of its history and results, it is the best book we have ever had in our hands. It is thorough, learned, practical and withal to the student thrilling. No pains nor expense have been spared in making it, in its form, of the highest character; and the learning, devotion and assiduity of the several writers deserve the splendid setting given their work.

GEORGE SUMMEY.

New Orleans.

PROUDFOOT'S "SYSTEMATIC HOMILETICS."

SYSTEMATIC HOMILETICS. *By John J. A. Proudfoot, D. D., late Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology in Knox College, Toronto, Canada; Edited by Rev. J. A. Turnbull, B. A., LL. B., and Rev. A. J. McGillivray, M. A.* Chicago, New York and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1903. Pp. 320.

The author of this excellent book on the structure of sermons, taught this subject for thirty-four years in the Presbyterian Theological Institution in Toronto, Canada; and about two years ago, after an honored career in the church he served on earth, he entered upon his eternal reward in the church above. This book contains the system he taught, and it is published almost as he was in the habit of delivering the lectures to his classes from year to year. The editors have done their work very well, and have made but few changes in the form of these lectures, as the author left them quite complete and almost ready for publication.

When a student in Toronto, the writer of this notice was in the classes under Dr. Proudfoot. This book, therefore, has special interest for him, and it revives, in a somewhat romantic way, pleasant memories of student experiences in the class-room of the author. Not only are these lectures recalled with tender memories of the hours spent in hearing them, but the memory of the fear and trembling with which we awaited his criticisms of the sermons we had to prepare for his analytical genius, for he was a merciless critic, is recalled. He prescribed the text for each member of the class

months before, the student wrestled with it for these months, seeking to discover a subject and to invent a plan that might pass muster on the fatal day. These sermons were handed in to the Professor a week or so before the day for their criticism. On that day the student read his sermon, usually about twenty-five minutes. Then the rest of the hour was devoted to an analysis of the sermon. This was done with great critical keenness and sermonic ability. The result did not foster conceit in the student.

The treatment is in twelve chapters of quite unequal length. Their titles run as follows: "Introduction," "The Plan of the Work and the Definition of Homiletics," "Objections to the Utility of Homiletical Culture," "Subject and Text," "The Unity and Invention of the Subject," "Methods of Sermons," "Figurative Texts and Expository Sermons," "Rhetorical Development Movement," "Rhetorical Movement—Adaptation," Appendix—"The Exordium."

The author defines Homiletics as "the application of rhetorical principles to religious discourse" (p. 43), and rhetoric he defines as "the science of persuasive discourse." This is to be taken to include both language and gesture. He also distinguishes sacred rhetoric from philosophy and poetry mainly by the fact that it always has a practical end in view. This end is the persuasion of the hearer in order to bring him over to the opinions and feelings of the speaker (p. 45).

In dealing with the subject and text, he insists that the text should always be a fitting passage of the Word of God. Then the subject should naturally and logically rise out of the text, and should clearly express the truth contained in the text. He takes the important position here that the subject need not exhaust the text, but the discussion should logically exhaust the subject. To this end he points out the importance of the logical division and the rhetorical development of the subject.

Much stress is laid upon having unity in the subject, and movement in its unfolding. Some very suggestive things are said about the invention or discovery of the subject from the text, and he constantly insists on the radical distinction between the purely didactic or expository treatment of a theme and its proper rhetorical presentation. Many of the best things in the book are said in this connection.

The discussion of "Method" in regard to sermons is very complete, and here the logical insight of our author is also very evident. Some of the distinctions here made are of vital importance, as, for example, the difference between a subject which denotes a class of things and a subject which embraces a group of qualities. Here again our author is at his very best.

But we cannot expand. This book will be welcomed by scores of those who were the students of its author, and many others will greatly profit by its careful study. It takes rank easily beside Dabney and Broadus upon this subject. For strict, logical and rhetorical exposition, it may, in certain respects, surpass either of these capital books.

It is likely to have a large circulation, for many earnest preachers desire help in the lines which this book follows. If another edition be needed, as is most likely, we would suggest one or two simple things which the editors can very easily supply. First, a good analysis of each chapter, set either at the head of the chapter or in the Table of Contents, would be useful. See-

only, a list of all the Scripture texts which are treated in the book might be of interest. Thirdly, a good, full Index should be drawn up, for no book in our busy day should ever be without an Index. It is too good a treatise not to be made as serviceable as possible. May it find a host of earnest readers!

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Louisville, Ky.

COLEMAN'S "SOCIAL ETHICS."

SOCIAL ETHICS: An Introduction to the Nature and Ethics of the State. *By James Melville Coleman, Sterrett Professor of Political Philosophy and History, Geneva College.* New York: Baker & Taylor Co. 1893. Small 8vo, pp. 357.

The author of this little book on a large theme is a teacher of Political Science in the College of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, at Beaver Falls, Pa. Taken all in all, it is a compact and common-sense treatise on a subject about which many things wise and unwise have been written in recent years. It is really a discussion of the principles of civil government, and on the whole, its general positions are safe and sound.

There are fourteen chapters of about twenty pages each. Their titles are, "The Nature of the State," "Social Institutions," "Church and State," "State and the Individual," "Factors of Social Union," "Social Mind," "Social Conscience," "Social Forces," "Sovereignty of the State," "Law," "Authority," "General Principles of Authority," "The Social Confession of Christ," "What Constitutes a Christian State." This list of topics reveals the scope of the discussion.

The author professes to treat of social facts, and the social fabric among men from "a distinctively Christian point of view." At the same time he seeks to give "an adequate place to the conclusions of science and philosophy." He says that we "need a cosmic philosophy," but "a philosophy must be Christian in order to be cosmic." Here it is that he thinks that both Herbert Spencer and John Fiske are quite defective. In this judgment we are inclined to agree with our author.

He does not hesitate to assert that "Jesus Christ must be taken as the point of departure and approach" in any adequate philosophy of the cosmos and of the social fabric. His will is to be taken "as the governing agency in matter," and his teaching must be accepted "as the ultimate rule of human life." This theory really runs all through this little treatise. While we concede the soundness of the latter position for the social order among men, we hesitate to commit ourselves without qualification to his cosmic view of Jesus Christ set forth in the former statement. Jesus Christ is incarnate among men primarily in order to redemption, rather than to solve cosmic problems of any kind.

The views of the author on the relations of the church and the state are substantially sound. In general he teaches that each has its own proper sphere, so that we may have a free church in a free state. His discussion of law and authority is forceful and good. In his views of the socialism of Jesus Christ he perhaps goes a little further in the socialistic interpretation

than most of his readers will care to go; still his chapter on this topic is written in fine spirit.

In the last chapter we have an excellent discussion of what constitutes a Christian State. This is perhaps the best chapter in the whole book. He holds, in general, that a state is Christian when its people are more or less completely under the control of the teachings of Christ and the principles of Christianity. Hence a state may be distinctively Christian without a state church. He passes the Constitution of the United States under review, and makes some interesting strictures upon it. On the whole, we like the book not a little.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Louisville, Ky.

"THE TWENTIETH CENTURY NEW TESTAMENT."

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY NEW TESTAMENT. A Translation into Modern English, made from the Original Greek (Westcott & Hort's Text); in Three Parts. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company, Publishers of Evangelical Literature.

This is not a stage in the development of the original translation into English made by Tyndale, of which there have been so many revisions. These revisions have culminated in the American of 1901, without doubt the best in text and translation of the long and excellent series to which it belongs. All of these revisions of Tyndale have in common, that they use the English of Queen Elizabeth, a golden period of our literature. The latest differ from the earliest chiefly in the accuracy of the text and rendering. The English of these revisions may be characterized as Elizabethan and sacred. The work under review is a new translation, independent of its predecessors, and specially differentiated from them in that the English used is Victorian and secular, the English of to-day and of every-day life.

This radical departure from the tradition of three centuries is interesting, indeed striking. It has been condemned in the July number of 1903, and will be by those of conservative tendencies. There are many who believe that the line between the sacred and the secular should be broad and distinct. It seems manifest that under the old economy it was so; the priesthood, the holy of holies, clean and unclean meats, the Sabbath, the unutterable name, all point that way. So now it is thought that preachers should wear clerical garments, keep themselves aloof from familiar contact with men, and use a pulpit tone in their official ministrations. In keeping with this, it is held that the Bible should have a language, and even type and binding of its own.

There are other minds not indisposed to change, and that hail it when it appears to be progressive. Many of these believe that the broad separation between the sacred and the secular is Jewish, as distinct from Christian; that it served a useful purpose under the old dispensation; but that it is one of those things which have been done away by Christ, who broke down this middle wall of partition, and secularized the sacred in sanctifying the secular. "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it

be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified through the Word of God and prayer." The writer sympathizes with this general view.

People differ both in taste and culture; some are more impressed by the homely utterances of the backwoods preacher than by the classic eloquence of the most scholarly divine. Moreover, every one can understand the familiar forms of speech, while the language of literature is an unknown tongue to the masses. Still further, the cultured prefer that which is simple. The Bible is God's revelation to all men, and not to the learned theologian alone, nor even chiefly. The Greek of the New Testament is not classic, but popular. The Master used such speech that the common people heard him gladly. The scholarly ministry of the Presbyterian Church has, probably, to a degree failed to reach the masses, because their language has been above the comprehension of the unlettered. These considerations seem to show there was need that the Word of God should be put into the English of the every-day people of this generation. Its sixteenth century phraseology has become a form, which we are liable to venerate with superstitious reverence. We may, therefore, hail this new translation as meeting the wishes and the needs of many readers of the Book.

The translation is the work of some twenty scholars, extended over many years. That it is a scholarly production is manifest to every intelligent reader, from the translation itself, the paragraphing, the headings, and the whole make-up of the work. Indeed, it may be criticised as using classical rather than popular Saxon words; the language has not been fully brought down to every-day life. It is also to be noticed that the English used is English English, as distinct from American English.

Next to the forms of speech, the most noticeable change is in the order of the books. It might seem that the order which the Holy Spirit used in the composition of the histories and letters would surely be the best; this would place the Epistle of James probably first, and the Gospel of John last. The objection made to this arrangement is that it would mix up the histories and epistles in a curious way. It was, therefore, determined not to disturb the old order, so far as the classes of books are concerned, but to arrange the books of each class according to the date of its writing. The histories accordingly come thus: Mark, Matthew, Luke, John, Acts. The Pauline Epistles are placed first, and in the following order: First and Second Thessalonians, Romans, First and Second Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, First and Second Timothy, Titus and Philemon. The other epistles follow: Second and Third John, Hebrews, James, First John, First and Second Peter, and Jude. The Revelation is placed last.

This translation suggests, what the writer has long thought, that there was need of popularizing the form in which the Bible is published. As it is, the blessed Book is presented to the people in the least attractive form. The type is small, the lines unleaded, the margins narrow, and the illustrations few, or altogether wanting. There is not another popular book to be found in our homes so uninviting to the eye. This is true, not only of the cheap editions, but of the more expensive as well. We bind them in costly leather and gild the edges on the outside, but within there is the same crowded, unrelieved page. It is a solid proof of the intrinsic attractiveness of the

Bible, that, notwithstanding this hindrance, it is the most universally read book in the world. If it were printed as other books that are meant to be sold and read, its popularity and usefulness would be increased. A series of interesting Sunday-school books could be prepared by taking the numerous stories of the Bible, and publishing them separately, in the attractive form in which our popular volumes are given to the world. Would that some one would do it!

JAS. A. QUARLES.

Washington and Lee University.

X.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Apologetics: OR, THE RATIONAL VINDICATION OF CHRISTIANITY. *By Francis R. Beattie, D. D., LL. D., with an Introduction by Benjamin B. Warfield, D. D., LL. D.* In Three Volumes: Vol. I., Fundamental Apologetics. Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1903. Pp. 605. Price, \$2.50.

The first volume of Dr. Beattie's treatise on Apologetics is just out in a very handsome dress from our Committee at Richmond. An adequate review of it will be made in our next issue by a competent hand, so that we now merely make a simple notice of it in this number of the QUARTERLY.

The scope of the whole treatise is comprehensive, and it will be completed in three volumes. The first deals with fundamental or philosophical apologetics; the second with Christian or historical apologetics, and the third with applied or practical apologetics.

The present volume of 605 pages is the first, and it deals with those philosophical questions which lie at the very foundation of the Christian system. In general, after the nature and aim of Apologetics have been properly defined, the theistic philosophy of God, man and the universe is vindicated. The nature and origin of theistic belief are explained at some length. Then the theistic proofs are opened up in detail, after which the antitheistic theories are refuted in order. The result is the establishment of a natural theology and a theistic cosmology, which presents the Christian "world-view" as the secure basis for Christianity, as the only religion which has an adequate redemptive revelation.

THE ATONEMENT AND THE MODERN MIND. *By James Denney, D. D., Professor of New Testament Language, Literature and Theology, United Free Church College, Glasgow.* Cr. 8vo, pp. 159, cloth, \$1.00. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1903.

The author's recent work, *The Death of Christ*, so familiar to all, and making such a happy impression as to the scholarship, ability and soundness of Dr. Denney, prepares the way for this volume in a hearty welcome by all his previous readers. The readiness thus to welcome it will be intensified when, on opening it, one finds the purpose and nature of it. It embraces but three short chapters, entitled Preliminary Definition of the Subject, Sin and Divine Reaction Against It, and Christ and Man in the Atonement; but these are written as a supplement to the author's work on *The Death of Christ*:

Its Place and Interpretation in the New Testament. They are discussions based upon the same principles, and have for their end the commending of the atonement to the human mind as that mind has been determined by the influences and experiences of modern times. The book is thus both satisfactory as a supplement to the former work, and timely as to its application of the principles taught to the conditions in which modern thought manifests itself.

HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. *By Henry C. Graves, D. D., President of the Boston Evangelical Institute.* 12 mo, pp. 176. Philadelphia-American Baptist Publication Society. 1903.

A handbook based upon Dr. Alvah Hovey's *Manual of Christian Theology*, and presenting the elements of Christian doctrine in a form adapted to the class-room and for the use of beginners in the synthetic study of biblical truth. Besides Dr. Hovey's work, that of Dr. A. H. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, is also freely used. After a becoming introduction, dealing with definitions and suggestions, the author presents his subject under the usual six heads of Theology, Anthropology, Christology, Soteriology, Service and Ordinances, and Eschatology. The paragraphs dealing with baptism are written from the immersionist standpoint. He holds to plenary inspiration, and the authority and infallibility of the Word, but stumbles at any doctrine of imputation of sin, holding that "every child of Adam is accountable for the sympathy he has with the evil in the world, and with the primal act of disobedience." He states a true doctrine of election, but gives small attention to the subject of the extent of the atonement. The purpose and method of the work are such as to prevent very full treatment of any topic.

THE EMPHASIZED BIBLE. A New Translation. *By Joseph Rothcrham, Translator of "The New Testament Critically Emphasized."* Vol. I., Genesis-Ruth; Vol. II., 1 Samuel-Psalms; Vol. III., Proverbs-Malachi. The three volumes, 920 pages, 4to, \$2.00 per volume. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

A new translation, so arranged as to structural printing and marks of emphasis, together with close adherence to the idioms of the original tongues, as to give, in the translator's judgment, accurately and quickly, the exact meaning, proper terminology, and graphic style of the sacred originals, and to show, by a mechanical analysis and at a glance of the eye, narrative, speech, parallelism, and logical analysis, and also the divine names. The text is also accompanied with many critical notes, while an introduction directs attention to the conditions occasioning the work and explains the author's purpose and method. The introduction also discusses several interesting themes, such as the original texts, the incommunicable name, etc. The work displays an immense amount of labor and painstaking care. It will not be popular, however, for to the ordinary reader it is entirely too heavy, and to the critical student too mechanical. Its attempts to make the Scriptures clearer by a close adhering to the idioms of the original tongues are entirely abortive. The discussions in the prolegomena are somewhat deficient

in clearness. A peculiarly involved literary style characterizes the author. We fear that the work will soon find its way to the back shelves of the libraries.

THE KESWICK MOVEMENT, IN PRECEPT AND PRACTICE." *By Arthur T. Pierson, with Introduction by Rev. Evan H. Hopkins.* 12mo, pp. 124; cloth; 50 cents net. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company.

Any one desiring to know something concerning this movement from the standpoint of its advocates will find in this small volume not only its history, but an exposition of its principles. The author endeavors to steer clear of the shoals of that perfectionism towards which these principles seem to front. The underlying principles and practical development of the doctrine are given as follows: 1. The prompt renunciation of what is known, or even suspected, to be contrary to the will of God. 2. The acceptance of the Lord Jesus Christ, not only as Saviour, but as Lord. 3. Obedience now becomes the watchword of the soul. 4. This prepares for close and constant fellowship with God. 5. The sense of divine possession of one's entire being—spirit, soul and body—is the natural outcome of such conditions. 6. There is now a new joy and peace which passeth understanding, a new revelation of Christ as an indwelling presence, and a true infilling of the Holy Ghost. 7. All this fits for the largest possible service to God and man.

A BIBLE STUDY OF THE TWO OBSTACLES BETWEEN MAN AND HEAVEN; CHRISTIANITY, ITS TRUE NATURE. *Both by Samuel Spohr Laws, D. D., LL. D.*

The first, with its alternative and explanatory title in pencil marks, "The Legal Factor in the Gospel Problem," is a paper read before the Presbyterian Ministers' Association, Washington, D. C., 1902, and the other a sermon preached the same year at Warm Sulphur Springs, Virginia, and of which a copy was asked by Senator Morgan, who chanced to have been a charmed listener. The author is bringing forth fruit in his old age of the lustiest strength and value. The sermon, cast in popular form, expounds three cardinal features of Christianity, the unique character of its knowledge, the peculiarity of its love, its outward life as revelative of this unique knowledge and peculiar affection. The other is an elaborate treatise on the moral and legal obstacles to man's salvation, and God's two-fold remedy. It need not be said that it is sound to the core, and marked, not only by the author's profundity of thought, clearness of analysis and accuracy and perspicacity of definition, but by unusual freshness and originality of treatment. It is a distinct and valuable contribution to theological literature.

GETTING AND GIVING; OR, THE STEWARDSHIP OF WEALTH. *By W. M. Weekly, Secretary of Church Erection Society of the United Brethren Church.* 12mo, pp. 134. 75 cents. Dayton, Ohio: United Brethren Publishing House. 1903.

The author believes in a campaign of education for the elevation of the standard of beneficence in the church, and of the quickening of its spiritual

life. This book is his contribution to that campaign. He holds to the fundamental principle of the divine proprietorship, and to the doctrine of man's stewardship. He accepts Paul's system of giving as embracing the four principles of (1) the time, the first day of the week, (2) the givers, everybody, (3) the extent, as God hath prospered, and (4) the spirit, willingly and cheerfully. In dealing with the subject of the extent of the giving, as a rule, and in interpreting Paul's words, the author does not think that the Apostle lays down a "rabbinical maxim of a tenth," but that he leaves the measure of every man's charity to his own conscience. The questions of the results of faithful stewardship, of wrong methods of raising money, of covetousness, ministerial support, the duty of the ministry, and the divine method of church building, are fully considered.

A YOUNG MAN'S DIFFICULTIES WITH THE BIBLE. *By D. W. Faunce, D. D.* 18mo, pp. 196. 25 cents net. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1902.

A new edition, after four years' successful circulation, of a little work admirably adapted to remove some of the difficulties seemingly connected with the Bible. The chapters are *The Young Man's Book; Is the Bible True? Is the Bible Inspired? Difficulties as to Miracles and Teachings; Difficulties as to Geology; Difficulties from Astronomy; Difficulties About Historic Facts.*

WHY WE BELIEVE THE BIBLE. *By Henry Melville King, author of "Our Gospels," and "The Messiah in the Psalms."* 12mo, pp. 231. New York: American Tract Society. 1902.

The author presents as ground of our acceptance of the Bible the light from the monuments, the voice of history, the witness of the Bible itself, the proof from miracles, the testimony from Christian experience, and the evidence from the triumphs of Christianity. These subjects are discussed in a popular rather than technical way, adapting the volume to the use of average readers, as well as the more scientific or cultured. The argument is not new, but is presented with vigor and clearness.

A SHORT HISTORY OF AMERICAN PRESBYTERIANISM, FROM ITS FOUNDATION TO THE REUNION OF 1869. 12mo, pp. 207, paper. 25 cents net. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1903.

This is really not a history, but a grouping together of three discourses or dissertations, one by Dr. A. T. McGill, another by Dr. Samuel M. Hopkins, and the third by Dr. Samuel J. Wilson covering as many periods of American Presbyterian Church history. It is neither exhaustive nor characterized by unity. The latter part of the third discourse, for it is a rhetorical rather than a historical treatise, is especially unsatisfying. The earlier parts of the book are more interesting.

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST. *By Rev. R. H. Crozier, D. D., Palestine, Texas.* (A copy to any address on receipt of two-cent stamp to cover postage.)

A very practical and able discourse on the resurrection of Christ, giving an argument apart from the Bible. Dr. Crozier shows the unreasonableness, the inconceivability and the impracticability of imposture here. The argument is strong, sound and convincing.

THE HISTORY OF PRESBYTERIANISM IN ARKANSAS. 1828-1902. 8vo, pp. 190. Published by a Committee of the Synod, Rev. S. G. Miller, Chairman, Little Rock. 1903.

This interesting volume embraces the addresses delivered at the semi-centennial celebration of the Synod of Arkansas, October 21-24, 1902, together with sketches of many of the churches and eminent men connected with the development of Presbyterianism in the State. The first chapter is a sketch of "Presbyterianism in Arkansas," by Col. C. B. Moore, of Little Rock, followed by short histories of the several Presbyteries of the Synod. The biographical sketches embrace the lives of Revs. James Wilson Moore, Joshua Fry Green, Thomas R. Welch, D. D., Isaac J. Long, D. D., and Cephas Washburn, and of several of the well-known ruling elders of Arkansas. The book is embellished with many illustrations of churches, ministers and elders and institutions. It is a valuable contribution to local church history, and it shows how the hand of the Lord has been leading his people.

WHAT A PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH SHOULD STAND FOR IN A COMMUNITY. *By Rev. H. M. Perkins.*

This admirable address, first published in *The Southwestern Presbyterian*, has been issued in pamphlet form by the Publication Committee, Richmond, Va. It has been pronounced most useful wherever read, and the Committee has printed a large edition for general circulation.

THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN PREACHING. *By T. Harwood Pattison, Professor of Homiletic and Pastoral Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary, author of "The Making of the Sermon," "Public Worship," "History of the English Bible," etc.* 12mo, pp. xvi., 412. \$1.50 net. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1903.

The author's purpose in this most interesting work is not so much to delineate the great preachers of the successive ages as to show that the voice of the Christian preacher has never ceased to be a power in the world, from the days of the apostles until now. So he studies the controversies of Christendom, the ecclesiastical movements of the ages, the reformations by which religion has been purified and renewed, and the great missionary advance of the church, to trace in them all the relation to them and the results of a personal ministry of preaching. The result is a book of very rare interest and information. Modern preaching and especially that of America, is

given large space and studied fully, in some of its great exemplars, as Wesley, Watson, Punshon, Candlish, Dale, Spurgeon, MacLaren, Eliot, Cotton Mather, Edwards, Hopkins, Fuller, Broadus, John Hall, Phillips Brooks, and others. The author has been broad and evangelical in both his selections for study and his analysis of his subjects, and in his conclusions from his investigations.

OLD TIME STUDENT VOLUNTEERS. *By H. Clay Trumbull, D. D.* 12mo, pp. 250. \$1.00 net. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

The volunteers in the army of mission workers of to-day are not the pioneers in this great cause. The author reminds us, in these pages, most delightfully and in a way to stimulate and inspire, of a host of noble men of earlier days, some of them little known outside their own circle of Christian work, and many of them great leaders in the work, such as Judson, Scudder, Moffatt, and others. The lives of nearly fifty men are traced, all of them living more than fifty years ago. Their work was not confined to the ministry, either, but, as the author shows, contributed largely to the advancement of mankind in science, art and research.

PIONEERING IN CENTRAL AFRICA. *By Samuel P. Verner, author of "The Cape to Cairo Railway," "The Development of Africa," "Among the African Pygmies," etc.* 8vo, pp. 512. Cloth. \$2.00 net. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1903.

Our Committee in Richmond is evidently "trying itself." Three sumptuous volumes, unequalled in mechanical execution, profound thought, and interesting details of life, travel and work, have been sent out within a month. Mr. Verner was for six years a missionary on the Congo. He is thoroughly qualified, by gifts and experience, to write of the situation, needs and work in Central Africa. His book is of intense interest from beginning to end.

CHINA'S BOOK OF MARTYRS. A Record of Heroic Martyrdoms and Marvellous Deliverances of Chinese Christians During the Summer of 1900. *By Luella Miner, author of "Two Heroes of Cathay."* Cr. 8vo, pp. 512. \$1.50. Philadelphia. The Westminster Press. 1903.

The larger part of this thrilling story of the Christians' sufferings in the Boxer uprising is made up of narratives to which the author listened during the siege of Peking and the ensuing year of residence in that city. Aside from its account of the facts connected with that horrible time, in its different phases and incidents in different localities, the book is of special value as showing the steadfastness of the faith of the native Christians. It is a complete overthrowing, by the record of actual facts, of the slander of religious enemies, as old as Job's day, and expressed in the words, "Doth Job fear God for naught? Put forth thy hand now, and touch all that he hath, and he will renounce thee to thy face."

THE LAOS OF NORTH SIAM. *By Lilian Johnson Curtis, with introduction by Robert E. Speer.* Illustrated from photographs taken by the author. 8vo, pp. xx., 338. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 1903. \$1.25 net.

This work should evoke special interest in the South. It describes the people, customs, needs and mission work in a region where our own beloved McGilvary opened the field, and continues in it, after thirty-six years of abundant and successful labor. The author also went from North Carolina, and was for four years a laborer, with her husband, among the Laos of Siam. The book is most interesting, and is beautifully printed and illustrated.

SOCIAL REGENERATION THE WORK OF CHRISTIANITY. *By the Rev. W. N. Sloan,* Ph. D. 12mo, pp. xiv., 142. Cloth, 60 cents. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 1902.

A brief and vigorous treatise on the problems of socialism, not cast in scholastic mould, but popular and direct and readable. After a few chapters describing the chief problems and showing the inadequacy of the solutions from the standpoint of human nature and external relations, and setting forth what requirements must be met, the author reaches his thesis, which is that Christianity alone, in what it has done in the various relations of life, and in what it is, and especially in its dealings with sin, the source of all friction in social relations, is the remedy for all social ills. The hopes of human progress, he argues, depend upon the increase and extension of the religion of Christ.

THE BOY AND HIS BIBLE is an admirable little treatise, for which we are indebted to the author, Dr. A. L. Phillips. It deals both philosophically and practically with the matter of the study of the Bible by the young. It tells exactly how one may provide oneself with the material needful for a practical course of reading and study. Richmond, Va.: Committee of Publication. Price, 5 cents.

THAT DEAR OLD SWORD. *By Nettie Gray Daingerfield.* 12mo, pp. 99. 75 cents net.

THE KING'S GIFT. *By Annie M. Barnes, author of "Tatong, the Little Slave," "The Outstretched Hand," etc.* 12mo, pp. 100. 50 cents net.

AN IVY VINE and HOW IT GREW. *By Annie E. Wilson, author of "A Jewish Maiden," "Love's Leading," etc.* 12mo, pp. 333. \$1.00 net.

DORRIS AND HER MOUNTAIN HOME. *Translated from the German of J. Spyri,* by Mary E. Ireland. 12mo, pp. 166. 75 cents net.

All the above published by the Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va. 1903. These well-printed and well-bound volumes indicate that our Committee in Richmond proposes to do good work. They also indicate its intention to contribute something, in the church's name, to the literature of the day. The first story, *That Dear Old Sword*, is rather an impossible tale, its chief feature being a child abduction case, in which the child

stealing is made almost romantic by the circumstances wrought about it. The "dear old sword" was an heirloom, and a symbol and reminder of nobility and chivalry. *The King's Gift* is a story laid in Palestine, in the days of one of the Herods and of the Saviour. The "king's gift" was not, as was at first expected, a gift from Herod, but the gift of the healing of a withered arm from Christ. *An Ivy Vine* and *Dorris and Her Mountain Home* are pretty, wholesome stories, which will interest the young reader, and leave a pleasant and helpful flavor behind.

GLENGARRY SCHOOL DAYS, A STORY OF EARLY DAYS IN GLENGARRY. *By Ralph Connor, author of "The Man from Glengarry," "The Sky Pilot," "Black Rock," etc.* 12mo, pp. 340. \$1.50. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

With characteristic vividness, mingled with philosophic and profound analysis of character and experience, as well as here and there with the tender pathos that surrounds many of the scenes he describes, Mr. Connor gives us in this most charming book pictures of old-fashioned backwoods school life, in its teacher and its growing lads. He touches many a familiar chord, and makes it vibrate with music again, and the reader's fountain of tears will sometimes be touched unless he be too hardened to feel the tenderness of the scene. The author here, as in all his delightful books, gives us something that is true not only to nature, but to religion, and the best religious thought.

GEOGRAPHIC INFLUENCE IN AMERICAN HISTORY. *By Albert Perry Bingham, A. M., F. G. S. A., Professor of Geology in Colgate University.* 12mo, pp. x., 285. \$1.25. New York, Chautauqua, Springfield: The Chautauqua Press. 1903.

A very interesting study, combining the materials of American history and geography. The book deals with the several regions which are more or less distinct in their physical development, but ends in showing much of historical unity. "The Eastern Gateway of the United States," "The Shore-line and Hilltop in New England," "The Appalachian Barrier," "The Great Lakes and American Commerce," "Prairie Country," "Cotton, Rice and Cane," "The Civil War," "Where Little Rain Falls," "Mountain, Mine and Forest," form the several chapters. The chapter on the civil war is largely devoted to a study of the relation of the great rivers to that conflict, quoting a remark of a Southern man to Horatio Seymour, "The North would never have beaten us if it had not been for our rivers."

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE DELUSION. *By Rev. A. C. Dixon, D. D.*

This is not as comprehensive a treatise as that by McCorkle, published by the Assembly's Committee, but it is vigorous and thorough as far as it goes. It has an added value that it is by a Boston pastor, not many miles from Concord, where in seclusion resides the high priestess of the absurdest cult ever imposed upon a long-suffering public.

AGRICULTURE FOR BEGINNERS. By Charles William Burkett, Professor of Agriculture, and Frank Lincoln Stevens, Professor of Biology, and Daniel Harvey Hill, Professor of English, in the North Carolina College of Agricultural and Mechanic Arts. 12mo, pp. xii., 267. Boston and London: Ginn & Company, The Athenæum Press. 1903.

In nine chapters, finely illustrated, followed by an appendix, a glossary, and a full topical index, the collaborators on this little book have brought together and presented in popular form many most useful and valuable facts and suggestions for beginners. It is interesting reading to every one. The chapters are on The Soil, The Soil and the Plant, The Plant, How to Raise a Fruit Tree, The Diseases of Plants, Orchard, Garden and Field Insects, Farm Crops, Domestic Animals, Farm Dairying. It is not a book on farming, but a book for those whose life may be spent on a farm, and a preparation for fuller study. It contains fundamental and interesting facts, with which everybody should be familiar, and indispensable to the student of agriculture, clearly told, well illustrated, and happily enforced. It is a work well calculated to lend attraction to the life of one following agriculture as a pursuit. The work is prepared as a text-book for the public schools, and deserves a place there.

SIMPLICITY OF LIFE. By James I. Vance, D. D., author of "*Rise of a Soul*," "*Royal Manhood*," "*Young Man Four Square*," etc. 16mo, pp. 38. Cloth, 25 cents. Chicago: The Winona Publishing Company, 195 State St. 1903.

A characteristically clear, striking, and epigrammatic discourse by Dr. Vance, pleading for less complexity, more simplicity. The road to the latter are, first, Be natural; second, Value the dignity of life as against the importance of things; third, Faith, or believing in something above and beyond the race, the visible, the finite.

THE ONE WOMAN. By Thomas Dixon, Jr. 12mo, pp. 353. New York. Doubleday, Page & Co. 1903.

An evil book, and with hardly anything else but evil in it. There's strength in it, unquestionably, but it is chiefly the strength of passion and intensity. The type of socialism which it is the book's aim to depict and destroy is not possible and cannot be. There's not enough inherent strength in the evil to hold it together long enough to become or to produce such results as the author portrays. As we read the book there comes the impression that the author has in mind some characters whom he has encountered in his work, and who set themselves against him, and whom he would excoriate in his writing.

The Winona Review is a new candidate for public favor. It is published in February, May, August, and September, by the Winona Publishing Company, Winona Lake, Ind., and Chicago, at one dollar per year. Its editorial management is not named, but is doubtless in the hands of the Winona As-

sembly officers headed by Dr. S. C. Dickey. The number before us, the second of the *Review*, contains many valuable articles, by Drs. James Orr, J. Wilbur Chapman, James M. Gray, John Balcom Shaw, W. G. Moorehead, A. C. Dixon, and others.

The *Bible Student* for December is as full as usual of good things, scholarly, sound studies of the prophecies being in the editorial department, and following this papers on The Literary Setting of the International Lessons, The Religious Value of the Book of Acts, Self-Control in the Book of Proverbs, The Twenty-Third Psalm, Analysis of First John, The Canon in the Time of Samuel, etc. Announcement is made that with this number the *Bible Student* passes into the hands and under the control of the American Bible League. It will continue to bear its old name, and to stand for the principles for which it has always stood, and hopes to enter upon a broader field of usefulness.

Dixon's Sermons is the title of a monthly publication, from William H. Smith, Publisher, Boston (10 cents a copy, \$1.00 a year), of some of the sermons of Rev. A. C. Dixon, D. D., now of Boston. The current issue, for November, contains two discourses, one on Soul-winning, the other on The Vision of God and Man. In the first he discusses the meaning, the means, the methods and the motives for soul-winning. Ezekiel's vision is used to show how we have a vision of the human and divine, of the winged intelligence, of a winged courage, of a winged patience, of a winged aspiration, of a winged fellowship, of a winged directness, of a winged stability, and of a winged progress. Both the discourses are suggestive and spiritual.

Missionary Circles, No. XI., 1904. This pamphlet, handsomely printed and covered, contains programmes for missionary circles, for the year 1904, one for each month, prepared by the Ladies' Foreign Missionary Society of the First Presbyterian Church, Augusta, Ga. It is full of good suggestions for the organization and conduct of similar societies in other churches. Copies may be had at twenty-five cents each, or ten copies or more at the rate of ten cents each, by writing to Mrs. B. F. Brown, 122 Goodrich Street, Augusta, Ga.

THE ENVELOPE SYSTEM

of Raising Church Moneys.

The envelope system has been so uniformly successful in our churches whenever it has been fairly and faithfully tried, that its general use is recommended as a solution of the difficult problem of raising the necessary funds for the various branches of church work. It has some variations, and is adaptable to the circumstances of any church.

To its success, as of every other method, perseverance, system and proper management are essential; but with these the result will be most gratifying.

The prices given for the envelopes include the subscription card, which we place on the top of each package, numbered to correspond to the package which it accompanies, and also free delivery to any part of the United States.

For packages of 65 envelopes each (52 envelopes for the Weekly Offering, and 13 for the General Assembly's Causes), printed with the name of church, dated for each Sabbath in the year, with subscription card, and package numbered throughout, and enclosed in a neat case, and delivered, the prices are as follows:

1 to 25 Packages, . . .	17c. per package	75 to 100 " . . .	10½c. per package
25 to 50 " . . .	14c. " "	100 to 300 " . . .	9½c. " "
50 to 75 " . . .	11c. " "	Over 200 " . . .	9c. " "

For a Treasurer's Book, Clarke's Record Book will be found to fill all requirements, and is supplied in the following sizes, at the prices named, postage prepaid:

No. 2, Four hundred names,	\$1.00
No. 4, Eight hundred names,	1.50
No. 5, Fifteen hundred names,	2.50

The system is being successfully used in a great number of churches, and the increased orders we receive each year attest its usefulness and popularity. Make a trial of the system. Order of

Whittet & Shepperson, Richmond, Va.

50 YEARS' EXPERIENCE

PATENTS

TRADE MARKS
DESIGNS
COPYRIGHTS &C.

Anyone sending a sketch and description may quickly ascertain our opinion free whether an invention is probably patentable. Communications strictly confidential. **HANDBOOK** on Patents sent free. Oldest agency for securing patents. Patents taken through Munn & Co. receive special notice, without charge, in the

Scientific American.

A handsomely illustrated weekly. Largest circulation of any scientific journal. Terms, \$3 a year; four months, \$1. Sold by all newsdealers.

MUNN & Co. 361 Broadway, New York
Branch Office, 625 F St., Washington, D. C.

PRINTING!

BOOKS belong to the "high art" of Printing. There are first-rate carpenters, but the cabinet-maker can turn out work the carpenter cannot do; and there are good house-painters, but the artist is away above him in handling the brush. So, in Printing, Bookwork stands in the same relation.

WHITTET & SHEPPERSON love to put into elegant garb the work of the Theologian, the Literary Genius, and the Poet. Their Bookwork is of the best.

The following works are some of the more recent issues from their presses, and they would respectfully refer authors and publishers to them as the class of work which, with the aid of skillful workmen and the most efficient machinery, they are enabled to present:

- Life and Letters of Rev. Moses D. Hoge, D. D.
- Life and Times of Rev. Dr. Adger.
- Discussions of Philosophical Questions, by Dr. Girardeau.
- Sermons, Apologetic and Doctrinal, by Dr. C. R. Vaughan.
- The Threefold Fellowship, by Dr. B. M. Palmer.
- The Universal Salvation of Infants, by Dr. Stagg.
- Apologetics, by Rev. Francis R. Beattie, D. D., LL. D.
- Life and Letters of Robert Lewis Dabney, D. D., LL. D., by Rev. Thos. C. Johnson, D. D., LL. D.

Also numerous volumes for Sunday-school Libraries, published by the Presbyterian Committee of Publication.

As examples of Magazine Printing, they would refer to those numbers of THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY which have been issued since July, 1902, and also to THE UNION SEMINARY MAGAZINE.

They make a specialty of printing MINUTES OF PRESBYTERIES AND SYNODS, undertaking to relieve the Stated Clerks of the distribution of the printed copies. The arrangement has been very satisfactory, and they are desirous of extending this line of work, and invite correspondence.

WHITTET & SHEPPERSON,
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

MANAGING EDITOR: GEORGE SUMMEY, D. D., LL. D.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS: G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D., R. C. REED, D. D.,

• F. R. BEATTIE, PH. D., D. D., SAMUEL A. KING, D. D., LL. D.,

R. A. WEBB, D. D.

VOL. XVII.

APRIL, 1904.

No. 4.

- I. THE REVISED CONFESSION. R. A. Webb, D. D.
 - II. ATHANASIUS. R. C. Reed, D. D.
 - III. THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST. Rev. J. A. McMurray.
 - IV. THE PROOF OF INSPIRATION. Rev. E. E. Smith.
 - V. THE PLACE AND USE OF THE BIBLE IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE UNITED STATES. Francis R. Beattie, Ph. D., D. D.
 - VI. LAY CO-OPERATION IN CHURCH WORK. Edward Payson Davis, D. D.
 - VII. THE IDEA OF BEAUTY INHERENT IN THE WESTMINSTER STANDARDS. Rev. Chas P. Foreman.
 - VIII. SENTIMENTAL REASONS FOR PRESBYTERIANISM. Rev. John W. Moseley, Jr.
 - IX. PRACTICAL AND HOMILETIC NOTES: The University Consolidation Movement. The Proposed Union of Churches. The Attitude of Southern Presbyterians. Civil Government. J. H. McNeilly, D. D., A. B. Curry, D. D.
 - X. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS. Samuel H. Smith, D. D., Francis R. Beattie, Ph. D., D. D.
 - XI. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.
-

RICHMOND, VA.:

WHITTET & SHEPPERSON, 11-13 EIGHTH STREET.

The Presbyterian Quarterly:

A Theological, Philosophical and
Literary Review.

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY.

GEORGE SUMMEY, D. D., LL. D., *Editor.*

G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D., R. C. REED, D. D., F. R. BEATTIE, PH. D., D. D.,
Associate Editors.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY will be devoted, as in former years, to the discussion, in somewhat more elaborate form than is practicable in the excellent weekly papers of the church, of the great problems of religious and theological life, and of the work of the church, and to the careful review of current and new literature. It will be the aim of the editorial management to conduct it along conservative lines, while, at the same time, there will be due exposition of the views of those who affect the more advanced ideas. A cordial invitation is given to all who desire to publish their best thoughts upon any of the questions of the day, or who have practical ideas or methods to suggest to their brethren, to make use of its pages. It is believed that the publication of such a periodical as THE QUARTERLY has in the past been a stimulus to many of the best of our writers. Many more are invited to give to others, in this permanent form, the benefit of their thinking and of their experience.

The articles will, as a rule, have the names of their authors attached, and will be published on their responsibility.

To bring THE QUARTERLY within the reach of a larger number of ministers and others, it will be published for two dollars a year, in advance, or two dollars and fifty cents if payment is delayed. Subscriptions will be continued unless the publishers are notified to discontinue.

All remittances are to be made to MESSRS. WHITTET & SHEPPERSON, Richmond, Va.; not to any one of the Editors.

All communications touching editorial matters, manuscripts, books, exchanges, etc., are to be addressed to the Managing Editor, REV. DR. GEORGE SUMMEY, Box 731, New Orleans, La.

Address all Exchanges, Books, Manuscripts, etc., and all other editorial matter, to GEORGE SUMMEY, D. D., LL. D., Managing Editor, P. O. Drawer, 731 New Orleans, La., and all letters on business matters to WHITTET & SHEPPERSON, Richmond, Va.

Printed by WHITTET & SHEPPERSON,
Richmond, Va.

Entered August 11, 1902, as second-class matter,
Post-Office at Richmond, Va., Act of Congress of
March 3, 1897.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

No. 66.—APRIL, 1904.

I.

THE REVISED CONFESSION.

THE Northern Presbyterians have published their Revised Confession of Faith, and it is proper for other Presbyterians, not of that communion, to review the changes which have been made, with a view to ascertaining whether they are alterations in the mere superficies or in the substantive body of the Calvinistic system. The hilarity with which the revision has been received by such diluted Calvinists as the Cumberland Presbyterians, together with the promptness and enthusiasm with which they offered organic union on the basis of these changes, awakens apprehension, and calls for cautious examination.

An inventory of the changes which have been made will show that the Northern Presbyterians have, (1) explained their former doctrine of Predestination, (2) interpreted their doctrine of the salvation of Dead Infants, (3) restated their doctrine of works done by unregenerate persons, (4) amended their doctrine of Oaths, (5) withdrawn their charge that the Pope of Rome was Antichrist, (6) added a new chapter on the Holy Spirit, (7) and added a new chapter on the Love of God, and Missions.

We are not going to take up these points in detail, but elect, for animadversion, the changes which seem to affect the integrity of the Calvinistic system.

We quote now the new language which is the basis of our fault-finding:

CHAP. XXXV. 11.—“In the gospel God declares his love for the world, and his desire that all men should be saved.”

DECLARATORY STATEMENT.—1. “The doctrine of God’s eternal decree is held in harmony with the doctrine of his love to all mankind, his gift of his Son to be the propitiation for the sins of the whole world. . . . Concerning those who perish, the doctrine of God’s eternal decree is held in harmony with the doctrine that God desires not the death of any sinner.”

Here we have three universal propositions, which have been incorporated in the creed of Northern Presbyterians: (1) The universality of God’s love; (2) the universality of God’s desire; (3) the universality of Christ’s atonement. God loves all men, God desires the salvation of all men, God has made propitiation for the sins of all men—these are the new doctrines which the revisers have added to Calvinism. We claim that they are substantive additions; that they are new doctrines; that they are out of harmony with the Calvinistic system; that they are radical and reconstructive; that they logically issue in universalism—universalism pure and absolute, or universalism conditional and hypothetical; that they are premises which cannot be made to yield that particularism which is the historic mark of Calvinistic soteriology.

The controversies and age-long debates over these topics must be the context in whose light they are to be interpreted and criticised. The Northern Presbyterians have adopted and put into their creed the fundamental premises of their historic opponents. It is hard to see how the enemy can keep from rejoicing—can restrain himself from claiming a surrender of organic doctrine. The Universalist pure and unmodified has ever reasoned thus: God loves all men; God desires the salvation of all men; God has made provision for the salvation of all men; therefore, all men must eventually be saved, or the divine love be shocked and the divine heart disappointed. The Arminian has reasoned from the same premises in this way: God loves all men; God desires the salvation of all men; God has made atonement for all men; therefore, all men will be saved, unless they check the divine love by their wills. The Calvinist, on the contrary, has ever argued: God loves some men; God desires the salvation of some men; God has made atonement for some men; therefore,

only some men will be saved, and they certainly, because nothing can defeat God's desire or disappoint his heart. History is the context, and these new doctrines shoulder towards ancient opponents. Logic will not allow a stop.

The satisfaction, and even the elation, of Cumberland Presbyterians, and all semi-Calvinists, with the new doctrines of the Confession are rational and consistent. Universal love, a universal desire, a universal atonement, implicate a universal vocation. The operation of the Holy Spirit would logically be as extensive as the love of God, as the desire of God, as the death of Christ. Given the premise, God loves all men, the non-elect as well as the elect; add to that the premise, God desires the salvation of all men, of the non-elect as well as of the elect; then add to these the premise, Christ has made a propitiation for the sins of all men, of the non-elect as well as the elect, and the logic has not been invented which can stay this conclusion: the non-elect are as salvable as the elect. These universal propositions would yield the salvation of the universal race, unless the universality of the result is checked by the interposition of the sinful will. This is the very essence of Arminianism. In Calvinism the will of God is the causal efficient of salvation; in Arminianism the will of the sinner is the determining cause.

But let us examine these three new doctrines separately.

I. The Northern Presbyterians have formally set up in their creed the doctrine that *God loves all men*.

Is this correct? Have they said that God loves all men? The new creed declares, "In the gospel God declares his love for the world and his desire that all men should be saved." The words "all men," in the second clause interpret and explain the word "world," in the first clause. Besides, it is inconceivable that God's "love" should be narrower than his "desires." But in another place the new Confession says, "God's eternal decree is held in harmony with the doctrine of his love to all mankind." This language is explicit. Define the human family, and you will define the objects of God's love, according to this document. It can mean nothing else, and was intended to mean nothing else, but that God loves all mankind without exception.

1. This dogma of the universality of God's love is un-Calvinistic. It cannot be made to homologate with this system of particularism; and Calvinism is, if anything, a scheme of limitationism—a plan of salvation in which God has at no point contemplated the whole race, but at every point the salvation of only a part of our race. For this conception, it has been criticised for centuries. Election is, in Calvinism, not universal, but partial; atonement is not for all men, but for some men only; the operation of the Spirit is not upon all, but only upon some; regeneration, justification, adoption, sanctification, glorification—all the benefits of the redemption of Christ are not for all, but only for some; *particularism* is the very genius of the system, the genetic principle of all its soteriology. It is so interpreted by its Confession and its standard expositions. It is the elect who are the objects of God's "free grace and love"; it is believers who are the objects of "the unchangeable love of God"; effectual calling is of his "free and special love to the elect"; the wicked he "doth blind and harden"; they "deserve his wrath and curse." These are statements scattered throughout the Confession, and quoted here to show that the Confession teaches that God's love is "special" and not general, "particular" and not indiscriminate. It is inconsistent to plant in such a Confession the doctrine that God "loves all men," and "desires the salvation of all men." The whole Calvinistic soteriology is but the result of the conception of God's love as electing, particular, discriminating.

2. The doctrine that God loves all men will not harmonize with the divine character, and is therefore untheological.

There are two fundamental forms of feeling in God—love and wrath, ἀγάπη and ὀργή.¹ These emotions are real and essential. The existence of the one necessitates the existence of the other, so that, if there be in him the love of righteousness, there must be in him the hatred of unrighteousness; if he loves the elect, he must be angry with the non-elect. If there be in him no power to be angry at sin, there would be no power to be pleased with obedience. "He who loves the good by this very fact hates

¹ Some attempt has been made to find a substantive difference between ἀγάπη and φιλία, but the words are too nearly synonymous to justify any serious doctrinal distinctions.

the evil, and he who does not hate the evil does not love the good, because the love of goodness issues directly out of the hatred of evil, and the hatred of evil issues directly out of the love of goodness. No one can love life without abhorring death, and no one can have an appetency for light without an antipathy to darkness." This conception is affirmed in the Scriptures. "All they that hate me love death." "Ye that love the Lord hate evil."

Dr. Shedd beautifully says, "Complacency towards righteousness and displacency towards sin are not contraries, but opposites, or antitheses. . . . The relation of opposites or antitheses is that of polarity. Moral love and moral wrath are like two poles, north and south, of the same magnet, or the two manifestations, positive and negative, of the same electricity. Boreal magnetism is as really magnetism as austral, and positive electricity is as really electricity as negative. So, also, moral wrath is as truly holiness as moral love. . . . Accordingly, the two feelings of love of holiness and hatred of evil coexist in the character of God, the most perfect of beings, and in that of angels and redeemed men. Human character is worthless, in proportion as abhorrence of sin is lacking in it." Inability to feel moral indignation is a defect and a weakness in character. Its absence signifies the maudlin. Moral love and moral wrath are but the two sides of the same attribute, the obverse and the reverse sides; but the two hemispheres of the same spherical perfection. The one is awakened by righteousness, the other by sin. They are essential aspects of the divine character; they are not optional properties of his heart. Whatever is holy must give him pleasure, and whatever is wicked must awaken his moral disgust, just because God always sees truly and feels accurately. A sinner must be viewed as elect in Jesus Christ in order to be an object of the divine love; out of Christ he is an object of the divine wrath. It is a deception to tell him that he is an object of God's love.

The Scriptures support this interpretation of the divine character. An examination of any large concordance will show that the "anger" and "wrath" of God, and their cognates, occur as often and as emphatically as do "love" and "mercy," and the whole group of his amiable perfections.

Time was when God's love was universal; it was when he foresaw all men as creatures in his image and likeness, holy as he was holy: then he loved all without distinction because all were good and lovely as they lay in his thought. Time was again when his wrath was universal; it was when all sinned in Adam and fell with him in his first transgression: then his anger was against every man because all were foreseen as guilty and polluted as they lay under his vision. Time was again when he foresees the entire human family divided into two classes—the elect and the non-elect. The two classes, while their constituent members remain the same, are variously designated in the Scriptures: friends and enemies, sheep and goats, children of God and children of the devil, servants of Christ and servants of sin, believers and unbelievers, Israelites and Gentiles, God's people and aliens. Many are the appellations, but the personnel of the two classes is always the same. One of these classes is the unchanging object of God's love, and the other is the unchanging object of his indignation and wrath. It must be so, because he sees correctly and feels truly. When the race had a common estate in holiness, as in Eden, his love was universal; when the same race had a common state in sin, as in the fall antecedently to election, the divine wrath was universal; and when the same race was divided into two classes (in eternity, the elect and non-elect; in time, believers and unbelievers; in the consummation, the glorified and the lost), his love and his wrath became particular and sectional: he loves one section of this divided race, and hates with moral righteousness the other section. One section is seen in Christ, and so is lovely; the other section is seen out of Christ as sinful, and so is hateful.

God's pity is universal, because all men are miserable; but his love is sectional, because only those who are foreseen to be in Christ are lovely. But pity does not help: pity only sheds tears, it does not rescue. Love, on the other hand, saves all its objects that it can. God does not save every man whom he pities, but he saves every man, without exception, whom he loves. He destroys all he hates. There are no trophies of his affection in hell; nothing which he desires is in that waste-heap.

Universal love logically leads to universal atonement, and through it to universal salvation. But to escape these legitimate consequences it is a favorite dodge of many to affirm that God loves the sinner, but hates his sin: love terminates upon the person, and hatred upon the sin. Sin and holiness, however, separated from persons are mere abstractions, and as such are the objects of neither hate nor love. Persons are the only objects of moral affections; the attributes of those persons make them the objects of love or hate. The elect are loved: their persons are the objects of the divine affection, and their relations to Jesus are the ground of that affection. The sinner is hated on account of his sin: his person is the object of divine wrath, and his sin is the reason for the divine displeasure. Penal suffering falls upon the object of God's wrath, and it is the person who experiences the suffering and not his abstract sin.

It is sometimes said that God must be just, but that he may be affectionate; that, while the exercise of righteousness is a necessity of his moral nature, the exercise of love is an option of his will. This general proposition must be received, if at all, with caution and discrimination. We must assume that God always sees truly and feels accurately: that things always appear to him as they really are. If, therefore, the qualities of any character are inherently lovely, the divine heart would energize towards them complacently, and if those qualities were truly ugly, the divine heart would energize towards them repulsively. To assume the contrary, would be to assume that God can disregard facts. Sin is, if anything, moral ugliness, and sinners are rendered thereby inherently repulsive. The problem, How can God be just, and yet justify the ungodly? has as its parallel this problem, How can God love himself, and yet love the sinner, which is the opposite of himself? The love of the one precludes the love of the other. But some sinners are loved by God, genuinely and gloriously loved by him—how can it be? The answer is, Election; they are foreseen in Christ Jesus, and as clothed with the beauty of his holiness.

Love and its counterpart, wrath, are not optional attributes of the divine nature, subject to the beck and call of his will;

else could God command himself to love what is hateful, and hate what is lovely. Whatever is lovely, God must spontaneously love, and whatever is hateful God must spontaneously hate. He is immutable. He cannot be quiescent and inactive when the good and holy are before his face. Nor can he contemplate sin and wickedness with mere passivity of heart; he must feel indignant and wrathful towards wickedness. He cannot make himself morally colorless by a decree of his will: he is a necessary being. All men are sinners; all are, therefore, ugly and unlovely. How, then, can he love any, if he feels truly? Only on the supposition that they are in Christ Jesus, and prophetically changed into the image of his moral beauty and loveliness. None but the elect in Christ can be the objects of the love of God. All the remainder of the race must be the objects of his moral wrath and righteous disgust.

3. The doctrine that God loves all men is not only un-Calvinistic and untheological, but unbiblical.

"God is angry with the wicked every day" (Psa. vii. 11). Then how can it be true that he loves the wicked every day?

"Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated" (Rom. ix. 13). Soften the word "hated" in any way imaginable, it still cannot be transmuted into "love," so as to put Jacob and Esau on the same footing before the divine heart.

"All their wickedness is in Gilgal: for there I hated them: for the wickedness of their doings I will drive them out of mine house, I will love them no more" (Hosea ix. 15). God hated these Ephraimites for their wickedness, withdrew his love from them, and drove them out of his house. It is a strange alchemy which can turn these expressions and actions into manifestations of "love."

There are some whom God has "given up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves" (Rom. i. 24). Does he love those Sodomites whom he has "given up"? Then what can men be, what can men do, to forfeit the love of God?

"The foolish shall not stand in thy sight: thou hatest all workers of iniquity. Thou shalt destroy them that speak leasing:

the Lord will abhor the bloody and deceitful man" (Psa. v. 5, 6). God loves all men: "the foolish" are men, "workers of iniquity" are men, "murderers" are "bloody" men, liars are "deceitful" men. Does God love them? Does he love those whom he "hates"? Does he desire those whom he "abhors"?

"Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them" (Gal. iii. 10). Shall we represent God as a being who "curses" any object of his love? Given the proposition that all men are the objects of his love, and it would seem to be morally impossible that he should "curse" a single one of them.

There are some men who have committed "the unpardonable sin," for whom we are not at liberty to pray. Does God love this class, and desire their salvation? We must answer in the affirmative if "all men," without exception, are the objects of his love and desire.

But the text, "God is love," is in the reader's mind. This passage can mean nothing more than that God possesses the attribute of "love"; it does not give a hint as to the "objects" of that love. To interpret it as the sentimentalists do, so as to represent "love" as the essence of God, is to portray the divine character as nerveless, and the divine being as an easy-going God, too sentimental and maudlin to maintain his own dignity and self-respect; incapable of anger and wrath and moral indignation. His very affections would render him incapable of smiting the ungodly and casting from him the unholy with loathing and disgust.

Then there are the famous words, "God so loved the world," which is the chief reliance for the doctrine that God loves all men. But what does the word "world" mean in this place? By it the Northern revisers mean "all mankind." But does it have this equivalency in the Scriptures?

The word "world" is employed in two senses in the Scriptures, (1) the "world" which is saved, (2) the "world" which is lost. "The Son of man came not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." Here the "world" is that which is not condemned, but saved. "Now is the judgment of this world; now is the prince of this world judged." Here the

“world” stands for that which is condemned, whose prince is cast out. There is a “world” for which Christ prays, and a “world” for which he does not pray; a “world” for which he died, and a “world” for which he did not die; a “world” which God loves, and a “world” which God does not love.

The old world and the new world: the one is the object of God’s wrath, and the other is the object of his love and redemption. The old world is the one that now is; the new world is the one which comes out of the renovation of all things. The inhabitants of the old world are sinners; the inhabitants of the new world are the glorified saints only. Those who perish are the citizens of the old world; those who live are the citizens of the new world. It was this new world, as foreseen by God, to which he gave his love and his Son. This the “world he so loved.” Perhaps there is not an instance in the Scripture where “world” is used exclusively for the “inhabitants of the earth.”

II. The Northern Presbyterians have announced as an article of their revised and corrected faith the doctrine that God desires the salvation of all men.

The objects of this desire are all men: elect and non-elect, believers and unbelievers, sheep and goats. We are not told that he desires the salvation of one class more than he desires the salvation of the other class. We are left to infer that his desire is equal and indiscriminate. In one place the new language is, “His desire that all men should be saved,” and in another place it runs, “The doctrine of God’s eternal decree is held in harmony with the doctrine that God desires not the death of any sinner.” He desires the salvation of “all men”; he desires not the death of “any sinner.”

It is a truism of our theology that God does all he wants to do. “My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure” (Isa. xlv. 10). “The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands” (Isa. liii. 10). “He doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?” (Dan. iv. 35). The actions of God are measured by his desires. He does all he wants to do; he does nothing which is out of harmony

with his desires. Then if God desires the salvation of "all men," all men will be saved.

We are all familiar with the old dilemma: "Either God could save all men, but will not; or he would save all men, but cannot. If he could save all men, but will not, then he is not all-loving. If he would save all men, but cannot, then he is not almighty." Take one horn of the dilemma, and you limit his love; take the other horn of the dilemma, and you limit his power. Universalists have ever stood upon the proposition: God can save all men and God will save all men; Calvinists have ever stood upon the premise: God can save all men, but he does not desire to save all men; Arminians have ever stood upon the platform: God would save all men, but cannot. One system limits his power; another system limits his desire; the first system limits neither his power nor his desire.

This new Calvinism of the Northern Presbyterians represents God as desiring the salvation of all men; it also denies that all men are actually saved. God's desires are larger than the results of his scheme of redemption. In the consummation he will have, therefore, an overplus of unsatisfied desire.

Is not unsatisfied desire the essence of unhappiness? To want what you cannot get is the secret of all misery. Deny love its object, deny desire its gratification, and you break the heart. The divine love is immutable, and the divine desire is unchangeable. If he loves a man once, he loves him forever; if he desires him once, he longs for him always. If all men are the objects of his love and desire, they are always the objects of his love and his desire. He is a pretemporal being. He changes not, therefore the sons of Jacob are not consumed. The doctrine of the new Confession would make God forever a mourner at the gates of hell!

If he desires the salvation of all men, what is to prevent him from gratifying himself? The Arminian has an answer: the human will. By it the universal desire of God is checked and denied its gratification. But the Northern Presbyterian can make no such reply. He has not revised his doctrine of the will. On the contrary, in his new chapter on the Holy Spirit, he says

the Holy Spirit "is the only efficient agent in the application of redemption." We have it then in this way: God wants to save all men; he can save all men; he saves all who are saved; no man can prevent him from gratifying his universal desire. Unrevised Calvinism had an answer for this perplexity: All men are not saved because God does not elect to save all men; does not desire to save all men; on the contrary, he desires the damnation of all those whom he passes by and leaves in their sin and guilt.

God does, as a matter of fact, consign some men to hell; the Northern Presbyterians admit it. But they now tell us that God "desires not the death of any sinner." We ask, How can God do anything which he does not desire to do? How can he act against himself and disappoint himself? It is not harsh to say that God abhors the wicked, has a moral aversion from them, and, considered apart from Christ, has a moral complacency in their punishment.

The high pressure exhortation, which runs in this way: God has done everything he can to save every sinner; God sincerely desires the salvation of every man, woman and child; it would break his great heart of love if any man is lost; you sinners have the mental peace and happiness of God in your hands—such preaching renders the divine being ridiculous, cheapens the gospel and composes the ungodly. It will be a day of apostasy when Presbyterians cease to preach that the sinner is in the hands of an angry God, and consoles him with the delusion that he is in the embrace of love.

III. The Northern Presbyterians have added to their Confession the doctrine of the universality of the atonement.

All that is necessary here is to prove the charge; every half-way Presbyterian knows that the doctrine of universal atonement will not coalesce with historic Calvinism.

In the Declaratory Statement, made as a foot-note to the chapter on the Decree of God, we have this language, "The doctrine of God's eternal decree is held in harmony with the doctrine of his love to all mankind, his gift of his Son to be the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, and his readiness to bestow his saving grace on all who seek it."

That the word "world" is here used as a synonym for "all mankind" is proved by the fact that in one of the clauses added we have the expression, "His love to the world," and in another clause we have the expression, "His love to all mankind." With the revisers, then, "world" means "all mankind." Then we have the doctrine that God gave his Son to be the propitiation for the sins of all mankind. It is true that the Apostle John uses this form of words, but the use which the Northern Presbyterians make of them is an interpretation. In the light of controversies over the extent of the atonement, and in the light of the context of the additions made to the Confession, the language of John has not been merely quoted; it has been interpreted, and interpreted to mean that Christ has made a propitiation for the sins of all mankind. There would have been no gain, no clarifying of doctrine, for the Northern Presbyterians to have quoted this debated text, without giving an explanation of it. The very purpose of its addition was to assert belief in the unlimited nature of the atonement. Whatever, therefore, this form of words may have meant as used by John, as used by Northern Presbyterians it means that Christ has propitiated God for all mankind. So explained it is a distinct surrender of old doctrine, and the addition of a new doctrine borrowed from the historic opponents of Calvinism.

In the chapter to which this explanatory foot-note has been added, we read, "Wherefore, they who are elected being fallen in Adam are redeemed by Christ. . . . Neither are any others redeemed by Christ." Now we are asked to hold, as harmonizing with this language, the following, "His gift of his Son to be the propitiation for the sins of the whole world." In another place in the unrevised text of the Confession we read, "The Lord Jesus . . . hath fully satisfied the justice of his Father, and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto him." This language defines the confessional doctrine as to the nature of the atonement; "it fully satisfied the justice of his Father." It also defines the objects of that atonement: "all those whom the Father hath given unto him."

If then the new doctrine is consistent with the old, as to the nature of the atonement, we are now taught that Christ has fully satisfied the justice of his Father for the whole world. Atonement is "satisfaction," and the beneficiaries of that satisfaction are all mankind. If God is thus propitiated, placated, fully satisfied with respect to all mankind, there remains no more ground of complaint against any. It would seem that all are salvable.

The new theory of the atonement harmonizes neither with the old doctrine as to the extent of the atonement or as to the nature of the atonement.

The atonement is as wide as God's election, as wide as God's love, as wide as God's desire, as wide as the prayers of Christ, as wide as heaven, but no wider. Christ died for those who were given to him; he laid down his life for the "sheep"; he did not lay down that life for the "goats."

Let us not become frantic. The God of Calvinism is not some detestable monster. He is not some Jupiter Tonans fulminating out of Olympian darkness, for judgment and justice are the habitation of his throne. He is not some pitiless Shylock demanding his pound of flesh, for mercy and truth are met together, and righteousness and peace have kissed each other in his character. He is not some Moloch casting his children into the fire, for he saves every child he has, and will gather every son of his love into a blessed and fadeless heaven.

Neither is he a namby-pamby God, a character of easy-going good nature, in love with all sorts of men and women, desiring the companionship of all sorts of moral reprobates; too sentimental to feel moral indignation, too nerveless to smite what opposes his lofty purpose, too pulseless to defend his honor, too colorless to have a respectable moral character. Let us not sacrifice his reputation in order to commend him to sinners. Let us not reduce him to a mere goody-goody, in love with everybody, and longing for the salvation of every sinner, when he is conscious that he is the only being who can save any sinner. There are some people whom he loves and desires to have with him in glory, and he will bring the last one of these to his blissful courts above, and

there are some other people whom he detests, and he will sweep every one of them out of his presence in "the fierceness of his wrath."

The new premises of the Northern Presbyterians must work like leaven in the dough. The development must issue in the Hypothetical Universalism of the New Schoolman, or in the Contingent Universalism of the Arminian, or in the Absolute Universalism of the Universalist. God loves all men, God desires the salvation of all men, God has been propitiated towards all men; then, (1) all men must be saved, or (2) God must be checked in his love and desire by himself, or (3) he must be limited in his love and desire by the will of sinners. If he hinders himself by withholding his Spirit, then we shall have God prevailing against God. If he is hindered by the will of the sinner, then we have man prevailing against God. Neither can be: God does all his holy pleasure, and actually saves every man he loves, every human being whom he desires to save, every individual for whom Christ died.

The problem for the Northern Presbyterians is to show how a universal love, a universal desire and a universal atonement actually issue in a contracted and limited salvation. Who, but they, make heaven smaller than the heart of God, smaller than God desires it to be, smaller than the atonement of Christ?

The premises of unrevised Calvinism are, (1) God loves some men, (2) God desires the salvation of some men, (3) Christ made atonement for some men, (4) the Spirit effectually calls some men, (5) only some men are finally saved in heaven.

The Northern Presbyterians have wandered. Let the Southern Presbyterian Church preserve its identity. It may yet be "the color guard" around which the Calvinistic hosts may rally when weary of devious ways and confessional experiments.

R. A. WEBB.

Clarksville, Tenn.

II.

ATHANASIUS.

EARLY LIFE.

IN the long ago, a number of children were playing on the smooth, sandy beach that separates between the city of Alexandria and the sea. One suggested that they play church; all heartily agreed, and elected one of the number bishop. The newly made bishop went through the service with becoming gravity, catechising the other children, and then baptizing them in the sea.

In a house overlooking this part of the beach, the Bishop of Alexandria had that day assembled a number of his clergy for conference. Happening to look out of the window, he saw the children engaged in their innocent mockery. Sending one of the clergy for them, he soon had the children before him. At first the children were frightened, but the good bishop soon quieted their apprehensions, and they freely confessed that they had been imitating the rites of the church. The strange part of the story is that the bishop and his clergy, after considering the matter, concluded that the baptisms, performed in sport, were nevertheless valid, and so anointed and confirmed the children as communicants of the church. The name of the boy-bishop was Athanasius.

This is the first mention that either history or tradition makes of a name destined to become illustrious beyond almost all other names of early church history. We do not know the names of this boy's parents, nor the date of his birth, nor even the race to which he belonged, whether Greek or Coptic. The name indicates that his parents were Greek, and the fact that at an early period he was familiar with the rites of the church would indicate that he was reared in a Christian home. It was fortunate for him that he was born in Alexandria, for that city was especially celebrated for its schools, and the culture of its people. It was

here that the first great Christian school came into being, developing naturally out of the catechetical instruction which was given to those who came out of heathenism into the Christian Church. Before the days of Athanasius, this school had attained to such a position as to give a good training in philosophy and theology, and had numbered among its teachers such names as Pantenus, Clemens and Origen. We know nothing of the school days of Athanasius, but his writings reveal the fact that in addition to theological instruction, he had enjoyed the benefit of a liberal course in the Greek classics. He quotes from the poets and philosophers. It is said that his education was presided over by the same bishop who had taken an interest in his boyish sports. At any rate this bishop had the pleasure of ordaining him as deacon, and of having him after that in constant attendance on his person. No doubt this association had much to do in shaping the career of the younger man.

THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY.

We cannot understand the life of Athanasius without understanding the Arian controversy, for his whole public life was given to the championship of one side of this controversy. Chiefly what he did and what he suffered grew out of this. The controversy was precipitated by Arius, a presbyter of the church of Alexandria. He was a man of vigorous and restless mind, strong will and ascetic piety. He propounded the view that Christ, being begotten of the Father, could not be coeternal with the Father; that he must have had a beginning, and that he must be placed in the category of creatures. Arius exalted Jesus above all other creatures, and taught that through him God made all other creatures. He taught that Christ was not of the same substance with the Father, but was created by the will of the Father out of that which before did not exist. While the church at this time had no carefully defined views of Christ's relation to the Father, yet it was the general doctrine of the church that Christ had existed eternally, and that he was consubstantial with the Father. These views of Arius were, therefore, very offensive to the Bishop of Alexandria, and to a large part of his clergy. He

tried to get Arius to modify or recant them, and failing in this, he called a council of Egyptian bishops in 321, and deposed and excommunicated Arius as a heretic. But Arius was not without a following. He had commended his views to many persons of influence, and by his winning address had attached to himself quite a circle of devoted friends, including many noble ladies. Excommunication did not end, but only embittered and enlarged the controversy. When Arius was driven from Alexandria, he travelled through Syria and Asia Minor disseminating his views. Some bishops of eminence gave him sympathy. Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, wrote circular letters, announcing his deposition, and warning against him. Soon a perfect conflagration of theological strife was sweeping over all the Eastern provinces of the church. "Bishop rose against bishop, and province against province." It is impossible for us to conceive the eager, and even fierce, avidity with which the acute Greeks entered into the controversy. "Sailors, millers and travellers sang the disputed doctrines at their occupations, or on their journeys; every corner, every alley of the city (this is said afterwards of Constantinople, but must have been still more true of Alexandria) was full of these discussions—the streets, the market places, the drapers, the money changers, the victuallers. Ask a man, how many oboli; he answers by dogmatizing on generated and ungenerated being. Inquire the price of bread, and you are told, the Son is subordinate to the Father. Ask if the bath is ready, and you are told, the Son arose out of nothing." It so happened that just at this time Constantine, the first Christian emperor, had put down all political rivals, and had extended his sceptre over the undivided empire. He was disturbed by this great church quarrel, and tried to stop it by negotiations with the principal parties. This method failing, he called a council.

THE COUNCIL OF NICEA.

This was the first œcumenical council. Not till this time was such a council practicable, for two reasons: the pagan emperors would not have permitted it; had they done so, the bishops could not have borne the expense. But when Constantine summoned the

bishops from all over the church to meet at Nicea, he ordered the public conveyances to be put at their disposal, and their expenses, both while travelling and while in attendance on the council, to be paid from the public treasury. The number of bishops attending has been variously stated, the later historians generally agreeing on the number 318. Each bishop was instructed to bring a presbyter, and might be attended by three servants. Many things conspired to make this council memorable. It was the first council called by an emperor, the first to represent the whole church, the first to frame a creed for the whole church, and the first to use the civil power for enforcing its decrees. Nicea was only twenty miles distant from Nicomedia, one of the royal residences. Constantine himself attended the council, and we are told that the "moment his approach was announced by a given signal, the bishops all rose from their seats, and the emperor appeared like a heavenly messenger of God, covered with gold and gems, a glorious presence, very tall and slender, full of beauty, strength and majesty. With this external adornment he united the spiritual ornament of the fear of God, modesty and humility, which could be seen in his downcast eyes, his blushing face, the motion of his body and his walk. When he reached the golden throne prepared for him, he stopped and sat not down till the bishops gave him the sign. And after him they all resumed their seats." Constantine professed to have nothing to do with settling the doctrines of the church. He was there to show his interest, and to urge them to bring their contentions to a speedy end, and thus restore peace to the distracted church. He found it easier to set their tongues to wagging than to get them to wag in harmony. Charles the Fifth spent his last days in trying to regulate a number of clocks so as to make them run exactly together. The task was too much for him. But it was child's play compared to the task of Constantine in trying to make three hundred and eighteen theological tongues keep perfect time and tune. They wrangled on and on for weary weeks, and finally framed a statement which, under pressure of imperial influence, all but two of the bishops were induced to sign. It expressed the doctrine concerning the Son's relation to the Father which is still

counted orthodox. Along with this was the condemnation of Arius and his friends who stood by him. Athanasius, though a very young man, and holding only the rank of a deacon, had a greater influence probably in shaping the conclusions of the council than any other one man in it. He ascribed the chief influence to Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, Spain, who was an intimate friend and confidential adviser of Constantine. But from this council dates the beginning of Athanasius' career as leader of the orthodox party, and his ascendancy may be gathered from the fact that against him were directed the fiercest assaults of the enemies of the Nicene faith.

RELATION OF THE EMPEROR TO THE CHURCH.

We must pause to note the relation of the emperor to the church. As already intimated, Constantine's professed relation was one thing, his real relation another. He called himself "Bishop in Externals," and said he would make it his business merely to execute the decrees promulgated by the bishops. Of course, even such a relation is abhorrent to our ideas. In accordance with this notion, he banished Arius and his friends, and also sent the two bishops who refused to sign the Nicene Creed into exile. It was a most regrettable precedent for the first Christian emperor to set. Others will follow his example, and it means the crushing out of religious liberty, liberty of dissent by the minority. All must think with the majority, or suffer civil pains and penalties for venturing to differ. This policy was inconsistent with the noble edict which he and Licinius had jointly issued before Christianity became the dominant power. That edict declared for "the sacred rights of conscience." Alas! neither the emperor nor the church whose interests he sought to guide knew the meaning of the sacred rights of conscience. The majority in the Nicene Council were perfectly willing to have their decrees executed by the emperor. They thought it a happy omen for the church that one sat on the throne of the Cæsars who felt a sufficient zeal for the truth to suppress with a strong hand those who dared to oppose it. They seem not to have considered that

the emperor might not always be on the side of the truth, and that in such case he might turn his hand against its friends.

Moreover, Constantine and his successors went very much further than he claimed the right to go. Instead of waiting for the bishops to settle doctrinal questions, they took a hand and used their power unsparingly to have their views of doctrine prevail in the councils. It is not too much to say that councils usually went their way, and their way was often determined by political considerations. It seemed, indeed, a sure method to secure unity in the church, to call a council, let the majority decide and then have the emperor constrain the minority either to accept the decision, or to go into exile. But unfortunately for the method, emperors sometimes changed their minds; and they always died sooner or later, generally sooner; and their successors were liable to take the other side. Thus it came to pass that heresy had the support of imperial power about as frequently as orthodoxy, and it was just as effectual on the one side as the other. To-day heretics were paying the penalty of their errors; to-morrow the champions of orthodoxy were suffering martyrdom for the truth. It was a sad day for the church when Constantine took it upon himself to help regulate the affairs of the kingdom of Christ; a sad day when the servants of Christ availed themselves of his help. It was the beginning of an unholy and unhappy mixing of the things of Cæsar and the things of God, which through long, long centuries converted the church into a battlefield on which fierce and fiendish passions displayed themselves, and wrought havoc with human life by means of tumults, tortures and flame. How the Saviour's wisdom has been justified, "Render, therefore, unto Cæsar," etc.

PERSECUTIONS OF ATHANASIUS.

The Council of Nicea determined the ultimate doctrine of the church, but it by no means put an end to the controversy. Those who signed the creed under compulsion began at once a warfare of intrigue. They began to devise all manner of accusations against Athanasius, who had become Bishop of Alexandria in 328. Among other less atrocious crimes, they accused him of

murder. Some of his enemies exhibited a hand which they said had belonged to an Egyptian bishop, by name Arsenius, whom Athanasius had slain, and whose dissevered hand he had used in the practice of magical arts. They finally prevailed on Constantine to appoint a council, and to summon Athanasius before it. This council was held at Tyre by the bishops who were on their way to dedicate a splendid church which the emperor had built in Jerusalem. Athanasius had got on track of Arsenius, whom he was accused of murdering, and who had been kept in a place of concealment. He was able to lay his hands on him, and to have him present at Tyre when his trial was called before the council. When the accusation of murder was undergoing investigation and the hand was exhibited in proof, Athanasius had Arsenius brought in, muffled in a cloak. Throwing back the cloak from his face, he asked the judges if they recognized the man. Receiving an affirmative answer, he then threw back one corner of the cloak, revealing his right hand, then the other corner, revealing his left hand, and then asked, "Will you please tell me from what part of his body this severed hand could have been cut?" This question was a poser. Of course, the charge of murder had to be dropped; but they had other charges, and it became evident that by fair or foul means they were bent on destroying the object of their malice. Athanasius watched his chances, and stole away from the council. He boarded a vessel, and went to Constantinople to appeal to the emperor for justice. The council proceeded to depose and condemn him. Then they sent deputies to Constantinople to have the emperor execute their sentence. Greatly were they surprised to be confronted with their intended victim. But they were ready with other accusations. One of these touched Constantine in a tender place. They said that Athanasius had interfered to prevent the shipment of the usual corn supplies from Egypt to Constantinople. It is hardly conceivable that the emperor should have believed this, but he had by this time modified his theological views, and so he made this accusation a pretext for confirming the sentence passed at Tyre, and banished Athanasius to Trier, in Gaul. It is just ten years since the Council of Nicea, where the first Christian emperor used for the

first time the imperial power to secure the victory of orthodoxy; and here is the first Christian emperor using the same imperial power to silence the great champion of orthodoxy. Surely, "it is better to trust the Lord than to put confidence in princes." Constantine had already recalled Arius, and had ordered that he be restored to the communion of the church. The day was set for this ceremony, and it was not carried out, solely because of the sudden death of the noted heretic. What a commentary on the policy of royal interference in the affairs of the church!

I shall not follow in detail the fortunes of Athanasius, but hastily sketch the principal incidents of his remarkable career. When he reached the city to which he had been banished, he found there the eldest son and namesake of Constantine. It is much to the credit of this young prince that he conceived a strong liking and a great admiration for the persecuted bishop. When the emperor died in 337, the empire was divided between his three sons. To Constantine II. were allotted Gaul and part of Africa. He at once restored Athanasius to his see, amid the rejoicings of the people, the clergy especially "esteeming that the happiest day of their lives." His stay, however, was short, lasting only one year, four months and twenty-four days. Constantius, the second son of Constantine the Great, to whom the government of the East had fallen, exercised jurisdiction over Egypt. He was an Arian, and all the piety he had was concentrated in his zeal for this party. The enemies of Athanasius, now enjoying imperial favor, soon devised a way to oust him from his position. Finding his life endangered, he escaped from Alexandria, and went to Rome. There Julius, Bishop of Rome, received him kindly, gathered a council of Italian bishops, investigated the charges against him, and pronounced him innocent. But the time had not yet come when the Bishop of Rome could speak with a voice which all Christendom must obey. Athanasius spent three years in Rome, during which time he enjoyed the friendship of Constans, the youngest son of Constantine the Great, who ruled in the West. This young emperor, like his eldest brother, heartily espoused the cause of Athanasius. He called a council at Sardica, which acquitted him of all the charges

preferred against him, and lifted the sentence which had rested on him since the Council of Tyre. Then Constans wrote to his brother in the East requesting the recall of Athanasius, and intimating that a refusal would be construed as a *casus belli*. Constantius yielded, recalled Athanasius, and sent him back to Alexandria with letters of commendation from his own hand. As the returning bishop approached Alexandria, the citizens of all ranks and classes poured out for miles along the road to meet him, and escorted him back through the gates with the wildest demonstrations of joy. Never did conqueror returning from victorious battle receive a more generous ovation. He was now forty-eight years old, and for nearly ten years he remained peacefully pursuing the labors of his high office. This has been called the "golden decade" of his life, and was the longest season of quiet he ever enjoyed. But Constans was assassinated, his eldest brother Constantine had long since been killed in battle, and Constantius, the zealous Arian, was now left sole emperor. He hated Athanasius with a peculiarly bitter hatred; and it was not long until the prefect, whom he had appointed over Egypt, with a strong band of soldiers, broke into the church where Athanasius and a large congregation were worshipping. In the tumult that ensued, Athanasius was carried out through a back door by his friends, more dead than alive, and concealed from his enemies. For six years he was hidden away, no one knows where, but presumably among the monks in the Nitrian desert, or far up the Nile, in the neighborhood of Thebes. In 361, Constantius was succeeded in the throne by Julian the Apostate. He was the avowed enemy of all the bishops; but one of his first acts was to recall all the bishops whom Constantius had banished, thinking thereby to throw the churches into utmost confusion. But when Athanasius returned, he found the see vacant, and was gladly welcomed once again by his people. Julian looked upon his growing influence with an evil eye, and soon wrote to the church of Alexandria that in inviting Athanasius to return, he did not mean to restore him to his bishopric, and he ordered Athanasius into exile again. The people gathered about him, bemoaning their loss. Athanasius said, as he prepared to take his leave, "Be

of good heart; it is a little cloud, and will soon pass away." These words were prophetic. Julian's reign lasted less than two years. He was succeeded by Jovian, who wrote a letter to Athanasius, which is a beautiful tribute to his character, and in which the emperor invites him back to his church. Only eight months passed by, and Jovian was dead. Then the empire was divided between Valentinian and Valens, the latter having the East, and therefore swaying his scepter over Egypt. Indifferent at first to theological controversies, he soon fell under the influence of the Arians. This meant further trouble for Athanasius. Valens issued an edict commanding him to vacate his see, and to take himself beyond the borders of Egypt. This was his fifth exile; it was very brief, and proved to be his last. Valens found that it was bad policy to continue the persecution against the man whom all Egypt venerated, so he recalled him. Athanasius had yet seven years to live. He filled these years with noble efforts to heal the long and disastrous contentions, and to bring the whole church to acquiesce in the creed of Nicea. He showed a conciliatory spirit, and by judicious concessions, which involved no sacrifice of fundamental truth, he did much to win for the doctrines, in behalf of which he had suffered so much, a substantial and permanent victory. This was the crowning achievement of his life, and by it, in the language of Jerome, "he snatched the whole world from the jaws of Satan." He was busy to the last, and died in the seventy-fifth year of his age, having been Bishop of Alexandria forty-five years, twenty of which he spent in exile.

Many things indicate the rare greatness of the man. He was but twenty-seven years of age at the Nicene Council, where he mounted at once to a position of leadership, and carried the day against the most eminent men of that age, such as the learned Eusebius of Cæsarea, and the able statesman and bishop, Eusebius of Nicomedia. He was barely of canonical age when he was elected Bishop of Alexandria, the most commanding bishopric at that period in the whole church, not excepting Rome. From the first his influence was dominant over all Egypt, its people, its clergy, and the monks that occupied its distant solitudes. He

lived through the reigns of five emperors, and was persecuted by all these except Jovian, whose reign lasted but eight months. While the intrigues of his theological adversaries had much to do with bringing upon him these persecutions, yet there is reason to believe that jealousy of his political power also had much to do with it. Certain it is that Magnentius, the murderer of Constans, who attempted to seize the throne which his crime made vacant, sent a deputation to Athanasius to secure through him the help of Egypt. Constantius, in alarm, pleaded piteously with him to remain loyal to him, and promised in return a continuance of his royal favor. But when the danger was over Constantius, moved evidently by jealousy of Athanasius' commanding influence, played into the hands of his enemies and drove him with violence from his church. The very fact that the Arians, all over the empire, made him the center of their assaults, attests his supremacy. They felt that while Athanasius could lift his voice in opposition their victory would be neither complete nor secure, and consequently they left no stone unturned to silence that voice forever. Gibbon says he was better fitted to rule an empire than any of the degenerate sons of Constantine.

AN ESTIMATE OF HIS CHARACTER.

What were the elements of his greatness? Vigor of intellect and elevation of character. He is not to be classed among the great scholars, or the great theologians of the church. What he might have achieved in these directions, had the circumstances of his life been different, we cannot say. But as a matter of fact, the greatness of his intellect is to be seen in his ability to discern the proportion of things, the relative importance of truths, to grasp that which is fundamental, disentangle it from metaphysical perplexities, and give it its proper dominating position. He saw more clearly, he felt more profoundly than any of his contemporaries the absolute necessity of vindicating to the last jot and tittle the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. He was not obstinate from arrogance, for he gave conclusive evidence of rare humility; he was not contentious because he loved strife, but

for a half century he lived in the midst of violent controversy, and frequently put life in peril, simply and solely because he saw in the doctrine of Christ's unqualified divinity the very hinge on which the whole scheme of redemption hung. He wrote to the bishops of Egypt, "We are contending for our all." No arguments could mislead him, no sophistries could veil the truth from his eyes. His gaze was steady and penetrating, his grasp of principle firm and unwavering.

Of course, this clearness of vision would not have made him great had it not been associated with a courage which nothing could daunt, and a steadfast loyalty to conviction which nothing could shake. If ever courage and firmness were put to the test, his were. Councils, embodying the highest learning of the age, met and condemned his views, and invoked upon him the curse of God. Emperors banished him time and again, chased him from place to place, and set a reward on his head. At one time all the bishops, in all parts of the empire, were persuaded or coerced into pronouncing against him. Thus the phrase originated, "*Athanasius contra mundum*"—Athanasius against the world. But with all this pressure bearing on him he yielded not an inch. We admire Luther, and justly admire his sublime obstinacy, as he stands before the brilliant and august Diet at Worms, refusing to recant, "Here I stand. I can do no other. May God help me. Amen." Athanasius furnishes an example of heroism equally sublime. They were kindred spirits, inspired from the same source. Each was called to bear, like fabled Atlas, the weight of a world. Each, sustained by a courageous faith, than which nothing could be grander, bore it without staggering. What would have become of the Reformation had Luther given way? Apparently it would have died in its birth throes. What would have become of the early church had Athanasius given way? Apparently it would have slipped from its moorings, and drifted out on the sea of error, without a chart, a star, or a pilot. He alone held it anchored to the throne of a divine Mediator, the only safe anchorage.

Having mentioned these two names in connection, we may

note one other point of similarity; Athanasius, like Luther, sometimes gave way to righteous indignation, and sought relief by hurling thunderbolts of coarse invective against his adversaries. Such choice epithets as "devils," "antichrists," "maniacs," "Jews," "polytheists," "atheists," "dogs," "wolves," "lions," "hydras," etc., chase each other through his polemical writings. If not excusable, the sin of both him and Luther is greatly palliated by the fact that they were contending with adversaries who were thirsting for their blood, and who, to accomplish their purpose of destroying them, would scruple at no iniquity. In fighting with such furious beasts, the sweet amenities of life are out of place.

In one respect, Athanasius more resembled Calvin than Luther. It is a common remark that Calvin never changed his theological belief. He sprang into the arena of public debate, like Minerva from the head of Jupiter, full-grown, full-armed. From the twenty-seventh year of his age till his death, at fifty-five years of age, he published several successive editions of his famous *Institutes*, enlarging each time, but never correcting or modifying, only expanding. From the first his system was complete. Apparently he did not emerge from darkness through shadows into clear shining, but stepped at once from night into day. The like reflections apply to Athanasius. He wrote his first theological treatise at the early age of twenty, and at that time laid down lines from which he did not swerve through all the years of after life. He did not commit himself to positions hastily; but once having thought over the ground, he took positions for all time. He was a stranger to motives of policy; he knew no self-interest, except that highest self-interest which results from eternal loyalty to God. It was this supreme devotion to truth, this unswerving adherence to the right as he saw it, that placed him on such a conspicuous pedestal in the eyes of his cotemporaries, and at length drew to his side all the choicest spirits of the church.

Such men as Athanasius are the chronic need of the church. Our age needs them: men of clear vision to discern the truth,

of devout spirit to feel its value, and of courageous faith to declare it and fight for it in the face of a gainsaying world. A false liberalism that ignores the boundaries set by the Bible; a weak charity that condones recognized error; an easy-going indifference that treats all creeds alike—these and kindred tendencies call for men of the Athanasian mould to smite them hip and thigh, and to “contend earnestly for the faith once delivered unto the saints.”

R. C. REED.

Columbia, S. C.

III.

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST :

ITS EVIDENCE AND ITS ETHICAL VALUE.

It is possible to hold the fact, and yet not know the power, of Christ's resurrection. This being one of the things which we have believed from childhood, faith, in many cases, is undisturbed only because it has been sheltered. Yet there is no point at which the approach of unbelief is more subtle, or its thrust more fatal, and it must always be a cause of grateful wonder that this strange and distant event upon which so much depends is evidenced to us with a certainty that is not possible in the case of any other fact of history.

By reason of its varied and vital relations, the resurrection of Christ is capable of proof by all three of the ordinary processes of reasoning. It is deducible from admitted principles; it may be established by competent testimony; it may be arrived at inductively from well-known facts. Rather we should say it has been thus proved, and the case cannot be put more forcibly and concisely than in the first argument that ever was made on the subject. Indeed all argument now must needs be a restatement of that which the Apostle Peter made on the day of Pentecost, which, for completeness, is amazing—a manifest inspiration. His argument is threefold (Acts.ii. 24 ff):

First. "God raised him up, having loosed the pangs of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it."

Second. "This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses."

Third. "Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this which ye see and hear."

Of these three lines of evidence we may say that the first is prophetic, meaning that it belongs especially to the era of Old

Testament prophecy, the method of a prophet's foresight being largely this of inspired deduction; the second is contemporary—the special privilege of the people of Christ's own day; the third is historical, pertaining to the history of Christianity, and coming with special force to us. The first demands faith in God; the second requires confidence in men; the third appeals to our own observation and experience.

It should be said here that any words whatever on this subject are intended for those who believe in the living God. No amount of evidence would convince a man of the resurrection who is determined to reject every supernatural event, and such men are not few, who yet claim to be teachers of the Christian religion.

On the other hand, an honest faith in God not only enables, but compels us to believe that Jesus rose from the dead.

I. The first ground of our belief, then, is this: "It was not possible that he should be holden of it."

Every part of this verse throbs with a feeling of that impossibility. The expression "pains (or pangs) of death," instead of the Old Testament "cords of death," is one of those flashes of inspiration which the New Testament writers often show in their use of Old Testament Scripture. They were not dependent upon the Septuagint version, as some would have us think, nor did they use it carelessly out of mere habit, but with sharp discrimination, and if Luke, in his account of Peter's sermon, has adopted the word "pangs" (*ᾠδῖνας*), we may look carefully for his reason, assured that he has reported faithfully the Apostle's meaning. The truths of Christianity were often too large for the Old Testament words which had previously contained them, and by a slight change of words the enlarged, but otherwise unaltered, truth was expressed, and it is one of the best marks of the writers' inspiration that they were able to pack meaning into words until they were very miracles of condensation.

In this instance, it is one word with two meanings (the plural construct of *הָבֵל* and of *הָבֵל* being identical in form). One meaning is "cords," the other is "the pangs of child-birth."

The first sense is enough in the Old Testament passages. When death lays hold of a man, he is ensnared in toils against

which there is no struggling. He is hopelessly a captive. But the idea, applied to Christ, receives sudden expansion. When the cords of death encompass the "Prince of life," they become, by their very effort to hold him, the pangs of parturition. It is not in the nature of things that he should be holden of it.

The same feeling is shown by the use of the word translated "holden." It is the word that carries with it the idea of conquest, used of one who has been overpowered, and is held captive by his conqueror. It was simply unthinkable to Peter that Jehovah's servant, whom he had promised to uphold, should suffer defeat at the hands of this last great foe.

This was evidently Peter's earnest conviction. On what grounds did it rest? Why was it not possible for Christ to be held captive by the power of death?

Peter goes on to explain. Read his words carefully, for they contain not only explanation, but proof of his assertion. "For David saith concerning him, I beheld the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand that I should not be moved; therefore, my heart was glad, and my tongue rejoiced; moreover my flesh also shall dwell in hope; because thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, neither wilt thou give thy Holy One to see corruption. Thou madest known unto me the ways of life; thou shalt make me full of gladness with thy countenance. Brethren, I may say unto you freely of the patriarch David, that he both died and was buried, and his tomb is with us unto this day. Being therefore a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins he would set one upon his throne; he foreseeing this, spake of the resurrection of the Christ, that neither was he left in Hades, nor did his flesh see corruption."

Whereupon some have said the reason is that the resurrection of Christ had been divinely foretold, and therefore must come to pass; which is no reason at all, seeing that God does not play at making predictions and fulfilling them. The reason underlies David's prediction as well as Peter's assurance.

Another reason suggested is, that because he was divine he could not be held by death—a statement that is true enough in itself and in its place, but here it is God that raised him up, and

the connection shows that this act was a sign of God's acceptance of him and love for him. God's treatment of him is contrasted with the treatment he received from men. "Ye crucified and slew him: God raised him up"—showing that while they hated him, God loved him.

This brings us to the true explanation, plainly shown by Peter's use of David's words: Jesus was, in the full sense, God's Holy One, God's Beloved, in whom his soul delighted, and it was not possible that God should abandon him to the power of death, and suffer his Beloved to see corruption.

Here are two propositions, which, if they are true, lead directly and with great power to the conclusion that Jesus must have risen:

First, the general statement that God will never abandon one who is entirely devoted to him, and in whom his soul delights, especially with that final abandonment to the power of death.

Second, the particular statement that Jesus is such a one, that he is God's Holy One, God's Beloved.

The strength of the reasoning is felt at once when we notice that neither the general nor the particular proposition is open to dispute. They only need to be fairly stated to be accepted.

One is a universal and necessary belief, in so far as men believe in God at all, and the other is proving itself with increasing power. Peter said to the Jews that Jesus was a man approved of God unto them by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of them all, and looking back at those things they were not able or disposed to question the assertion. Much less are the men of our day able, and much less are they disposed, to question it. Men of all classes, of all creeds, and of no creed, are saying that Jesus of Nazareth was the one man of our race that lived not for himself, who came not to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him, the one man, therefore, who could expect the fulness of divine favor.

So we need not spend time in proving either of these propositions, but simply try to understand them, and here, as is often the case, the truth is gathered up into a single word—the Hebrew

word translated Holy One, and containing also the idea of Beloved.

Once grasp that word and the character for which it stands, and no proof will be needed to show that he who can claim the title in its fulness has the utmost power of God pledged for his help and protection; and as the Old Testament picture is drawn, every added mark will be recognized as a lineament of the face of Jesus. It is the word which in the Old Testament stands for God's people, as distinguished from the rest of mankind, those who are in special, or covenant relations with God. According to Gesenius, "the primary idea [of the root **הָסַר**] seems to be that of eager and earnest desire, ardor, zeal by which one is actuated" towards another. As expressing the relation between God and his own, it has, of course, a double meaning, according as it is regarded from the human or the divine side—God's zeal for his people, or their zeal for him—and so it appears in English in various forms, as "the godly," "the saints," "God's holy ones," his "Beloved."

The Scriptures are so full of these ideas that it is not possible or necessary to cite the particular passages. What is the Bible, in fact, but a history of that special relation between God and his people, with all that it involves on God's part and on theirs? And what is more prominent in it all than the thought that God is the champion of his own, that no good thing will he withhold from them, no evil thing shall befall them? What is more awful in all the Scriptures than the fury of God against the foreign or domestic, public or private, enemy who dares to lay the finger of oppression on his chosen? "Touch not my beloved," says he, "and do my prophets no harm." And this conception of God is not peculiar to the Scriptures. It is present in the heathen religions, from the lowest to the highest. Whatever else men have believed about their god, they have believed this, that he will do the utmost for those who are, for any reason, peculiarly his.

And the idea is universal evidently because it is necessary. Men cannot believe in God at all without believing this about

him, and they believe it in spite of all appearances to the contrary. In the ordinary course of life there is little evidence that the righteous are the special objects of God's care. All seem to fare alike, and if there is any difference, it is often in favor of the ungodly. This fact has troubled the saints no little, but it has not altered their conviction. Multitudes of them, like Abraham, have died without the proof of their belief, yet they have died believing. In many cases the very circumstances of their death seemed positive proof that God had forsaken them, yet they were sure that he had not. It is not a matter for proof, or disproof. It is an intuition. God cannot forsake his own.

But in the Old Testament history of God's people it is evident that, while they knew they were his chosen, and had many signs of his special care, they were conscious also of limiting, by their sins, the exercise of his love. They were not, in the full sense, his beloved, because they were not wholly devoted to him. They were full of the love of other things and vexed him sorely, so that he could not delight in them, and could not do for them what he would.

Yet he was seeking a people for himself, to be his own peculiar treasure, in whom he could delight, and upon whom he could bestow the fulness of his love, and the time must come when the idea would be realized. The prophets saw more and more clearly that the realization would come in and through an individual man—Abraham's "Seed," David's "Son," Isaiah's "Servant of the Lord."

Every one of these titles, which we now apply to Christ, belonged originally to the nation, and every one of them stood for this fact of God's peculiar favor: The seed was promised to be the inheritor of the blessing; the significant thing about David's Son was that God said, "I will be his Father and he shall be my Son, and my loving-kindness shall not depart from him," and Isaiah's word is, "Behold my servant whom I uphold, my chosen in whom my soul delighteth."

Thus the people's hopes were transferred and centered in him who would come, him upon whom God could lay his hand and say, "This is my Son, my beloved, in whom I am well pleased."

Hence called the Anointed One, Messiah, Christ. To him would be fulfilled every promise that had been made to God's own; in him would be realized every hope which they had but partially attained to; in short, "the favor which God bears unto his people" would be fully exhibited in his case. No good thing could God withhold from him. No evil thing could befall him.

In the title, "Son of God," this assurance is complete, for the fundamental idea of his Sonship, the feature from which all others seem to be derived, is this, that he is the supreme object of the Father's love. To this Jesus attributed his power (John v. 20), and the glory which he had with the Father before the world was (John xvii. 24). This may be touching upon things not intended for us to know, but the fact is certain that the infinite wealth of God's affection was all his.

This the prophets foresaw, and it was in connection with the Messianic hope that some of them were enabled to reach the assurance that the fulness of God's favor involved a resurrection from the dead. The Christ, at least, must rise.

It was a long and difficult reach of faith, because so absolutely without evidence, but, having once entertained the thought, it was the most reasonable conclusion of all. Death is the sum of all calamities, the king of all terrors, the last of foes, and if God's favor means anything at all, he must save his Beloved from that. Struggling up towards the light, from age to age, appearing in the words of David, of Isaiah and of others, this truth reached at last a clear, confident, matter-of-fact statement in these words of Peter at the supreme moment of inspiration, "It was not possible that he should be holden of it."

Now we can see how truly the Apostle could say that David was speaking of the resurrection of the Christ, although the Psalm seems to be purely personal, with no apparent reference to the Messiah; and we must be impressed with the fact that New Testament inspiration did not confer upon these men a license to make unreasonable application of Old Testament words, but, on the contrary, secured the most scrupulous honesty, and the utmost reverence in the handling of the word of God, and gave

the writers a mental vigor and a spiritual discernment beyond the experience of other men.

In the sixteenth Psalm David expresses his complete devotion to God: "I have no good beyond thee." As for the heathen and their gods, "I will not take their names upon my lips. The Lord is the portion of my inheritance and of my cup." He was borne up by an unusual feeling of entire consecration. He remembered at the same time the peculiar assurances of God's favor which he had received above other men. He was in truth God's anointed one, his beloved.

In this exalted state of mind, under the impulse of the Spirit, his faith began to reach out after the fulness of God's favor, "Because he is at my right hand I shall not be moved, my flesh also shall dwell in safety." Carried out of himself and forgetful of his limitations, he was laying hold of things that belonged indeed to God's Holy One, God's Beloved, but not yet to David, "Thou wilt not leave my soul to sheol, neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption." While he was yet speaking, he realized that he had overreached himself, but he remembered that promise of a son who would be, what he himself longed to be, in the full sense, God's Holy One, God's Beloved, and he thought, "These assurances belong to him."

Luke, with remarkable accuracy, indicates this as David's state of mind by the use of an unusual preposition in the statement, "David speaketh concerning him." It is not the ordinary word for "concerning," but the word that means "to" or "towards," and the idea seems to be that while David was saying these things his mind was stretching forward towards the Christ.

And David's state of mind was but a picture of the Old Testament religion as a whole. Springing out of a deep conviction of God's unchanging love for his own, it leads up to, and demands, the resurrection of Christ as the only possible conclusion.

There is one difficulty with this argument. Why should there be any occasion for a resurrection of the Christ? If he is God's Beloved, why should he be allowed to suffer the agony of death? So thought his disciples, in despair.

Here comes again the sad fact of human sin checking the

action of infinite love. This, too, the prophets foresaw, when they spoke of the sufferings of the Christ and the glory that should follow. He was indeed God's Holy One, God's Beloved, in whom his soul delighted. In him was no sin, but upon him was the sin of the world, and once more God could not do what he would for his Beloved.

Not that there was ever a moment when the Father's love was one whit less by reason of Christ's connection with human sin. We have reason to believe that it was gathering intensity and volume with every hour of his Son's suffering. "Therefore doth my Father love me," said Jesus, "because I lay down my life that I may take it again." Remember when Israel was his beloved how the lightest touch of the oppressor's rod stirred his wrath, and how he flew to their relief, and then think of him as he looks upon his beloved Son, bearing in silence the mocking, the spitting, the scourging, the crucifying at the hands of his enemies, and be assured that the Father yearned over him with infinite love.

Why did he not rend the heavens and come down, and scatter them with the blast of his nostrils, and deliver his Beloved, if he delighted in him? So said the Jews, in mockery. "He saved others; himself he cannot save." It was true. He could not. But they knew not why. In their ignorance and folly, they were playing with the very springs of infinite wrath. They were like ignorant savages dancing above a mine of dynamite, and jeering at the harmless burning of the fuse. "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do."

It was the world's sin that held him to that suffering, and kept back the gathering flood of God's favor; but the time of his release was drawing near. "In that he died he died unto sin once for all." Let that connection be broken, and they shall see what God's love can do. Pent up, impetuous, it rushes to the rescue of the Beloved. It is no wonder that the earth shook, and the rocks were rent asunder, and death gave back its prey. "It was not possible that he should be holden of it."

II. Leaving this part of the Apostle's argument, we are conscious that it is not sufficient of itself to establish the fact of Christ's resurrection. It has created an overwhelming presump-

tion that he must have risen, but in the absence of direct evidence it would be a mere presumption, sufficient for a future event, but not for one that is said to be past. The question remains, "Did he rise?"

On the other hand, it must not be supposed that this first part of the argument is unnecessary or unimportant for us. Some one may say, "Why spend time proving that he must have risen, when we have evidence that he did rise?"

But it takes precisely this conviction to make the testimony credible. If we asked why three thousand Jews so readily accepted the fact of the resurrection upon that one statement of the evidence, while Christ's own disciples were convinced with great difficulty, we should probably get the answer that the Holy Spirit was then first given, and it was his office to convince men. That is true, but may we not see, in this first sermon of Peter, so plainly inspired, the method which the Spirit used in working that conviction? And is not this the explanation, that before the testimony was pressed in regard to "this Jesus" the people were convinced, out of their previous knowledge and belief, that the resurrection of the Christ was both reasonable and necessary, while the disciples, without that preparation, stumbled abruptly upon the alleged fact that Jesus had risen?

As we shall see presently, there was an important reason why the disciples should be convinced without that aid, but it is almost certain that without it we could not be convinced at all. The resurrection of Jesus is to us a far away event. We cannot put our fingers into the print of the nails, and before we can accept the testimony of others, we must be fully persuaded that the event is not unreasonable. A resurrection is, in any ordinary case, incredible. It is a matter about which we could hardly trust our own senses. If a dozen of us should testify that a well-known citizen, recently dead and buried, had risen from the dead, and that we had seen him and talked with him at various times, and finally had watched him ascend into heaven, a cloud receiving him out of our sight, who would believe our report? Our best friends would doubt it, and try every possible explanation, as that we were not in earnest, or were deluded. If

we persisted, they would say we were crazy, and even if they could find no satisfactory explanation, they would settle down to the conclusion that there must have been some mistake. "It is altogether unreasonable to suppose that this man has risen from the dead and ascended to heaven, while the rest of mankind remains under the power of death."

And it would be impossible for us to show any reason why that man should be an exception, but in regard to Christ this has been done, and his peculiar relations to God and men lead us to believe that he must have risen, so that we should be disappointed if the testimony were not forthcoming.

We must approach the disciples' testimony with this conviction strong upon us, and, having this preparation of heart, we need not linger long over their glad story. It is so simple, so straightforward, so earnest, and evidently means so much to them, he must be a cynical man indeed who questions the truth of it.

The substance of it is, that Jesus, whom they knew intimately before, and up to the time of, his death, had showed himself alive to them after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them by the space of forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.

We need not rehearse the details of those ten recorded instances of his appearing, but simply notice that they were in such a variety of times, places and circumstances, that it is impossible to suppose the disciples were mistaken, or had merely seen a vision. He appeared to one, two, seven, eleven, five hundred, of them at a time; sometimes to the men, sometimes to the women; in the house, on the road, at their places of business, in the city, in the country; sometimes unexpectedly, sometimes by appointment; at dawn, in the evening, and again in broad daylight; speaking to them by name, talking with them, walking with them, eating with them; now recognized by a familiar word or gesture, again showing them his pierced hands to convince them that it was he himself.

Notice, too, that it was an event for which they were totally unprepared. They had not taken in the words of Jesus on the subject, and they had entirely missed the Old Testament teaching,

for John, indicating that they were convinced only by what they saw and heard, said, "For as yet they knew not the Scripture, that he must rise again from the dead," referring to some particular passage (*γραφήν*), doubtless the sixteenth Psalm. It was towards the end of the forty days that their unbelief was conquered, so that, when he appeared to them, none dared to ask who it was, knowing that it was the Lord. As Edersheim remarks, it was not that the knowledge of the Scripture led them to expect the resurrection, but the evidence of the resurrection led them to understand the Scripture.

It may be well to remember who these men were—not their names, but their character, their mental and moral competency for such testimony, and the undoubted earnestness of it.

1. Their enemies spoke of them contemptuously as "unlearned and ignorant men," but it is interesting to notice that this description is the best guarantee of their intellectual health and vigor. These two words are thus explained by Dr. Joseph Addison Alexander. Speaking of the word translated *unlearned*, he says, "This adjective is virtually the negative or opposite of the noun translated *scribe*, and means without scholastic or rabbinical training. *Ignorant* seems simply an equivalent expression, but the Greek word has a different derivation, and a marked significancy of its own. Its primary sense is that of private persons, as opposed to kings, rulers, military officers, etc. A secondary sense is that of one without official or professional knowledge, in which sense Thucydides opposes it to the physician, and Plato to the poet and musician. This approaches very nearly to the wider use of our word *layman*. Accordingly Tyndale has 'unlearned men and lay people.'"

What, then, was this technical, professional, rabbinical education that the apostles lacked? Its chief characteristic was its puerility. Nominally engaged with the profoundest truths of religion and morals, the scribes were really spending their strength upon matters that were not worthy of a child's consideration. The man who could determine the exact number of furlongs in a Sabbath day's journey was surpassed in learning only by one who was able to devise a way of passing the limit without break-

ing the law. To such minds the width of a phylactery might have seemed a more important question than the resurrection of Christ. They were babes, and they were such on account of their special training. This was the education the apostles lacked, and the lack was their best equipment for dealing with these great truths. Mentally strong and healthy, they were not given to following delusions. Their writing is sufficient proof, for it is theirs, though inspired.

2. Morally, the apostles were in yet sharper contrast to the scribes and Pharisees, and they cannot be seen in truer light than by means of that contrast.

Pharisaism was a lie. The Pharisees, being constantly engaged in the effort to deceive God and men, had become false through and through. They were of their father, the devil, who was a liar from the beginning. The reason they did not understand Jesus, or believe him, was that he told them the truth.

On the other hand, the disciples of Jesus were those who, when the true light came into the world, were honest enough to come to the light. They represented the response to the purest and most searching moral teaching that was ever heard. Whatever else their discipleship meant, it certainly meant that they desired to know and do the truth. It is safe to say that there never were more thoroughly truthful men.

3. As to their earnestness, remember that to these pure-hearted, strong-minded men, life was serious and real. They had the ordinary ties of the tenderest and strongest kind. They were not reckless adventurers. Yet they left their occupations that they might spend their time testifying that Jesus had risen, and they were ready at any time to be imprisoned, scourged, stoned, or killed in any way, rather than stop speaking that which they had seen and heard.

Surely, if testimony is capable of establishing anything, the resurrection of Jesus was proved.

III. Yet the evidence is not complete. That was nineteen hundred years ago. The disciples' testimony has indeed been preserved for us in a most wonderful way, but, coming across the centuries, it could not possibly make the resurrection of Jesus a

present and influential fact. As with any other historical incident, we might be convinced of its truth, but that would be the end of the matter so far as we are concerned. But we cannot say even this much. The defect is more serious.

If Jesus Christ rose from the dead and ascended to heaven, that event cannot be hid away in books to be searched for. He himself intimated that his departure from the world did not mean that he would cease to be active in the world's life. If he now lives, there must be present and continuous signs of the fact, and the absence of such evidence would cast grave doubt upon the testimony that he rose.

So we come to the third class of evidence, which we may call the Holy Spirit's testimony.

In giving to his disciples the promise of the Holy Spirit, Jesus said, "He shall testify of me: and ye also shall bear witness." His testimony and theirs was to be concurrent, but separate. Not that they were independent of the Holy Spirit, for it was by his power alone that they must testify; but that he was independent of them, and his own peculiar testimony was not through their word, but in addition to it. This is plainly indicated by Peter in Acts v. 32, "We are witnesses of these things, and so is the Holy Ghost." Of course the testimony concerning Jesus included all the facts of his life, but in the Spirit's testimony, as in that of the disciples, the first and foremost fact is the resurrection from the dead. It was of the resurrection that Peter spoke when he said that they and the Holy Ghost were witnesses of these things.

In this third point, "It is Jesus who hath poured forth this which ye see and hear," Peter reaches the culmination of his argument. All that he had said was preparatory to this, as any one may see by looking back over his words from verse 14.

I have called this the testimony of the Spirit, not meaning that the Holy Spirit was heard to say that Jesus rose from the dead. The Spirit, like the wind, is perceived only by his work, and here were effects that proved his presence; and his presence in such fulness was impossible until Christ had risen and ascended to the right hand of God.

But those startling effects at Pentecost were just the beginning of the Spirit's presence and work, and when we speak of the Holy Spirit's work in the world, what is this but another name for the history of Christianity? Shall we say, then, that Christianity proves the resurrection of Jesus? Exactly so, and probably the case cannot be stated in a better way: Christianity, or the church, if that is taken as coextensive with Christianity, the church, in its origin, its organization, its continued life, is our best evidence that Jesus lives. Each of these three—the origin, the organization, the life of the church—is declared in Scripture to be the work of the Spirit, and distinctly connected with the resurrection of Jesus.

1. What was the origin of the Christian Church? The day of Pentecost, we say at once. That sudden descent of the Spirit, in overflowing abundance. The most obvious fact of that day, and all those early days in Jerusalem, was the presence of a power that was all-pervading and irresistible, a power that could sweep into the little company of the apostles thousands of people in a day without surfeit, and assimilate this mass into one body animated by one spirit, a power that could not be confined in any bounds, whether of Jewish law, or social custom, but created for itself a new, separate, independent body of people which knew no law or custom except the natural outgoing of its own life, for the Christians, without any apparent design, simply lived their jubilant life, and proclaimed constantly, as by an inward compulsion, the one great fact that made that life possible.

Whence came this flood of spiritual power that gave Christianity its separate existence? "Jesus having been raised from the dead and exalted at God's right hand, poured this forth according to promise," said Peter. "Wait for the promise of the Father," Jesus had said. "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you."

2. But at first all was confusion. Whence then came order in the church? Was its organization left to human wisdom? No, the organization, as well as the origin, of the church tells that the Spirit is here, and that Jesus is at the right hand of power. It was the Spirit of God that was in the church, and he is not a God

of confusion, but of order. Notice that the confusion was not that of inanimate objects, waiting for some outside force to arrange them. It was the confusion of a concentrated life-force pushing out for freedom of action, and containing in itself the organizing power.

We are but using a scriptural image if we call the organization of the church the articulation of the body of Christ. "All the body, fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, maketh increase of itself." And notice how this organizing work is connected with the resurrection of Christ. "When he ascended on high, he led captivity captive and gave gifts to men. And he gave some to be apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers" (Eph. iv. 8, 11, 12). This was organization, from the ascended Lord, through the Spirit.

3. But this very passage shows plainly that these offices, while evidently the creation of the Spirit, are mere means to an end, "unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ;" and the chief place of the Spirit's work is not in them, but in that body to which they minister, and therefore the best evidence of his presence is the deep, broad current of the church's life. If you would see signs of the Holy Ghost, look not at the administrative ability of an apostle, nor the mystery-piercing vision of a prophet, nor the persuasive eloquence of the evangelist, nor the tender care and patient instruction of pastors and teachers, but behold the love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control in the ordinary life of Christian men and women. These are the characteristic fruit of the Spirit. These are born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God, and their persistence in a world of sin is the best evidence of the Spirit's presence. That saying of our Lord, "When the Son of man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?" does not cast doubt upon the fact, but marks it as a miracle of grace. The continuance of faith in a race of men whose effort is to thrust God out of their knowledge; the presence of hope in a world of despair; the persistence of righteousness where all are unrighteous, and where it is the

nature of wicked men to wax worse and worse; and, above all, the abiding of love in a world where selfishness reigns supreme—these are facts which prove the presence of a power above man.

Every attempt to explain Christianity on other grounds is as shallow and foolish as the suggestion, "These men are full of new wine." There is only one adequate explanation: Jesus Christ is alive and seated at the right hand of power, and he hath poured forth this which ye see and hear. The Scriptures are clear and emphatic in their teaching that this abounding, conquering spiritual life is due to the resurrection of Jesus. Speaking of his resurrection and the coming of the Spirit, he said, "Because I live, ye shall live also." And it was in taking leave of his disciples that he spoke of the vine and the branches. Severed from him, we can do nothing.

Paul speaks of "the head, even Christ, from whom, or out of whom as from a source of power, all the body grows." We are here upon the earth, but our life is hid with Christ in God. Every sign of life in his body proves that he lives. The persistence of that life proves that he reigns in power. The gates of Hades have not prevailed, because Christ holds the keys thereof, being alive for evermore.

But some one, forgetting, or ignoring, this teaching of Jesus and Paul, may say that these facts of Christian life prove simply that God is working in the world by his Spirit, as of old; they do not prove necessarily that Jesus rose from the dead. To which it may be said, that as a matter of history, this unprecedented quickening of spiritual life in the world dates from the time when Jesus is said to have ascended to heaven. It may be said further that the spirit of Jesus could not have taken such hold of mankind, if Jesus had not thus been glorified and approved of God, for friend and foe alike looked upon his ignominious death as discrediting his claims.

But the true reply lies deeper. The spirit of Jesus is the Holy Spirit of God, and he could not come from the Father until Christ had returned thither. The proof of the resurrection hangs upon the truth of this assertion, and we should consider well the reasons for it. "The Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was

not yet glorified" (John vii. 39) plainly implies that the coming of the Holy Spirit must wait for the glorifying of Jesus.

In John xvi. 7, Jesus says, "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I go, I will send him unto you." When he says the Comforter "will not come," it is not that he is unwilling to come, but as a matter of fact—a simple future. And in God's affairs matters of fact are matters of necessity. Not that God is compelled, but that he always does the only thing that could have been done. Every event is in its own time. His affairs are thus and so, not by external arrangement, but by their inner nature. When God appoints a thing it is the same as saying that he constitutes it so.

For example, Jesus Christ is our Priest, not by appointment, in the ordinary sense of that word, but by nature, after the order of Melchisedek—inevitably a priest. He could not be among men without fulfilling that office for them. So he is by nature King of men, and Prophet. The same is true of faith as a condition of salvation. It was not arranged so; it *is* so—an eternal and necessary fact. There is nothing arbitrary about what God does, and when Jesus says, "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come," the meaning is that in the nature of things it could not be otherwise.

But, by means of one or two other passages, we may go a step farther, and see what the nature of the case is. Notice the unusual words of Peter in this part of his argument, "Having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit"—a promise, not to the disciples, but to Christ; a promise that he obtained from the Father, not for himself, of course, but for them, and so commanded them to wait for it.

Now see the passage in Ephesians which presents exactly the same fact in another way. "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and"—"received gifts for men," says the Psalm—"gave gifts to men," says the New Testament, looking at the heavenly transaction from the point of view of the earthly experience. Paul leaves no doubt that these gifts were all included in the one great gift of the Holy Spirit. Is there any significance in this indication of time, "when he ascended up on

high"? And is there any necessary relation between "leading captivity captive," and the receiving and bestowing of these gifts? Inspiration is not much given to the fault of superfluous words, and undoubtedly all these words are full of meaning. They tell us in no uncertain way that, by his completed, victorious work as our Redeemer, Jesus had won the right to ask this boon for men, and that when he ascended up on high he made request upon the ground of his victory.

In the light of this passage, read Christ's promise of the Comforter, "I will pray the Father (or "make request"; the word is peculiar, used, in this sense, only of the petitions of Christ), and he shall give you another Comforter."

"I will make request." When? For some reason not then, for while he was yet talking with his disciples, he lifted up his eyes to heaven and prayed—prayed for them. It was his great earthly prayer of intercession, but it contains no hint of this request which he promised to make for them. The time was not yet. Not until, as our great High Priest, by his own blood, he had entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. Then, and not till then, did he ask and receive this gift for men. It was the consummation of his redeeming work, the great purchase of his precious blood, the one thing that makes redemption ours, for it is the Holy Spirit that makes effectual application of it to us.

Thus the Spirit came, sent by Christ from the Father, and with good reason we say he could not otherwise have come. And so his presence here, however manifested, is direct and conclusive evidence that Christ is there.

This is the evidence that belongs especially to us in these last days. We are not without the help of the other two arguments, but the evidence which appeals to us with peculiar force is this last. It grows in strength and in volume with the lapse of time, for our era is the dispensation of the Spirit, and the Spirit's work is progressive, ever widening and deepening. The hearts in which he dwells are numbered by millions now instead of thousands, and, as time advances, his work in individual souls is deeper and more far-reaching; more characteristic of him, and, therefore,

better evidence of his presence. From the early Christian centuries the effects wrought in human life have been more and more evidently his work. If the gift of tongues was proof of the Spirit's presence, much more are those gifts which Paul insisted on as of supreme importance: gifts which shall abide when tongues have ceased and prophecies have failed, gifts which the Spirit is bestowing with increasing fulness and power, constituting evidence that will at last be overwhelming; evidence, too, that makes the resurrected life of Jesus a present reality to us, not far away, either in time or in thought. Every sure sign of the Spirit's presence, especially in one's own experience, is felt to be a contact of the soul with the risen Christ. "I know that Jesus lives, because I live; for really it is no longer I that live, but Christ that liveth in me."

IV. Inquiry into the ethical value of this event is like asking, "Of what use is sunshine in the world?" "There is nothing hid from the heat thereof." This is literally true of the resurrection of Christ. It stands in vital relation to every article of faith and to every principle of conduct, and the inquiry might take almost any direction, but thinking over the considerations which have the strongest influence for righteousness among men, there are three that seem to stand apart as universal and essential, and every one of these depends upon the resurrection of Christ for power.

1. The first, and that of which most men are conscious, is the expectation of judgment. All wickedness, unless it is utterly mad, encourages itself with the thought, "God will not require it. Judgment will never come," or the thought that God is good, and will not be strict to mark iniquity. Right conduct among men depends in large measure upon the strength of the conviction that judgment is certain, and that it will be conducted in righteousness; for judgment upon a false basis would provoke sin to recklessness and bring despair to those who would do right.

The idea of final judgment was widely extended, but indistinct and uncertain till Jesus came. His words made it clear and his resurrection made it sure, both as to the fact and as to the righteousness of it. "God hath appointed a day in which he will

judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."

The resurrection of Jesus assures the world that God is not indifferent to the deeds of men. It has often seemed that he is. Never more so than in the death of Jesus. Had God forgotten? Could sin with high-handed insolence trample upon all that was holy, and God not care? This impression, so congenial to the sinful heart, would have been confirmed by the death of Jesus, but in the resurrection God made bare his arm and showed on which side of this great controversy he stood. It was the vindication of Jesus and the condemnation of his enemies. It was an irresistible declaration that he was the Son of God (Rom. i. 4), and that they were the enemies and murderers of the Holy One (Acts iii. 14). If, in the forbearance of God, punishment is delayed, it is none the less sure, and will be none the less severe. It is not cold and calculated justice. It is wrath: accumulated vengeance on account of those who, through the ages, have suffered wrongfully, have suffered and threatened not, but committed themselves to him that judgeth righteously. Herein Jesus was truly representative. Human sin culminated in its treatment of him. All unbelief shares the guilt, and the world now knows of a certainty that God has seen and will require it. Jesus himself said that the Holy Spirit, in convincing the world of judgment, would do it by means of this signal example, "because the prince of this world hath been judged."

But the resurrection of Jesus gives assurance also of the justice of God's judgment. For it is the resurrection that determines the nature of Christ's death as an atonement, and so exhibits the principle upon which God deals with sin. If Christ did not rise, either God had nothing to do with his death, or, by abandoning, condemned him. But the resurrection showed that he was delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God. He was never more truly God's servant than in laying down his life. "This commandment have I received of my Father." That treatment of his Beloved has no adequate explanation except this, that it was necessary for taking away the sin of the world. God,

therefore, does not lightly pass over sin, but will hold it to strict account.

But both the certainty and the justice of judgment are established by the mere fact that Jesus is alive. Since he lives, it is certain that we must all face him. The Jews killed him to get rid of him. His presence was their continual judgment. The guard placed over his tomb showed their instinctive dread that he might come back. They wished to be sure that they would never see his face again. Now that he lives, judgment is certain for them and for all men. More and more now the world is approaching his judgment bar, and every question of conduct and of character is being brought to trial before him. He is drawing near to final judgment. As, before his incarnation, he was the light that lighteth every man, and was ever coming into the world, so even now he is coming. "Henceforth," said he to the high priest, "Henceforth ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power and coming on the clouds of heaven." That vision grows clearer every day. The dawn is brightening. He will burst upon the astonished view of the world at last. "Every eye shall see him, and they who pierced him"—face to face with him once more.

That is his *parousia*. His presence was judgment once. His second "presence," in the fulness of his glory, will be final judgment. It is inevitable, it is universal, and there will be no question of its justice, for the world will have been convinced in respect of sin and of righteousness, that the one consists in not believing on Jesus, the other in being like him.

2. The fear of judgment is the chief restraint of evil conduct, but the great incentive of the righteous is the conviction that "God is a rewarder of them that seek him." We saw that without proof men have held to this belief even unto death. Despising the treasures of earth, they think that they are laying up treasure in heaven. Caring not to be seen of men, they believe that they have a reward with their Father. Not seeking a return for kindness now, they wait to be recompensed in the resurrection of the just. Expatriating themselves here, they seek a better country. They believe that the city for which they look hath foundations,

that its builder and maker is God, and this belief has ever been the inspiration of the faithful.

But this belief could not have survived the death of Jesus. Others might die unrewarded and the rest not lose heart. These had not wholly followed the Lord. But here is God's Holy One. He trusted in God, if ever man trusted, and it was for the joy set before him that he endured the cross, despising the shame. Let him die and enter the unbroken silence of the grave. Then ask men to believe that God is a rewarder of them that seek him, and you have asked an impossibility. But by his resurrection this belief has been fixed forever, for his reward is glorious. The New Testament writers labor to express the fulness of it, and assure us that he is the forerunner of all the faithful. They shall enter into his joy. They are sure now that there are mansions in his Father's house. They waver not, forasmuch as they know that their labor is not vain in the Lord.

3. But most important of all as a foundation of morality is the belief that "God is," and we may say without hesitation that this faith would have gone out with the life of Jesus. The fool has always said in his heart, "There is no God," and he has based the assertion upon the fact that the wicked can do as he pleases with the righteous, and do it with impunity. They eat up God's people as they eat bread, and God does not interfere. "Then there is no God." This conclusion is natural. It would have been unavoidable if Jesus had not risen, and, speaking with all reverence, it would have been right.

To the Jews, the unavenged sufferings and death of Jesus meant simply that he was not the Christ, but the reasoning could not have stopped there, and will not, even in the case of the Jews, for he was not only the "well-beloved" Son of God; he was "the only-begotten." There is not another, nor ever shall be. Whatever God is able to do for his Beloved must appear in his treatment of Jesus. Mankind would certainly have said with the centurion, "Truly this was the Son of God," but the next step is atheism, if death was the end. As we saw, men are not able to believe in God without believing that he will do the utmost for one whom he loves, and if Jesus was abandoned to the power of death, there is no God.

That this fundamental faith was saved by the resurrection of Jesus, the Scripture plainly teaches. Christians are addressed as those "who through him are believers in God, who raised him from the dead, and gave him glory" (1 Peter i. 21). When we remember how the world's faith was trembling in the balance, it is not too much to say that, without the resurrection, the death of Jesus would have been the death of religion and the end of all righteousness. The religious instinct of the race would have been put to permanent confusion, and the perfection of Christ's character, increasingly recognized, would have served only to confirm this result.

JOS. A. McMURRAY.

Lynchburg, Va.

IV.

THE PROOF OF INSPIRATION.

I AM persuaded that the chief purpose of predictions in the Scriptures is not that men may know the future. If it were, these predictions would not have been obscured as they were. They would have been plainly written, and not covered with other matter, with double meanings, with parable and figure of speech, that seeing we may not see, and hearing we may not understand.

We have seen many people fall into great error in the attempt to read out of the prophecies the future history of nations, and the events of the world before they come to pass. Only yesterday I read of a new sect in Boston, whose chief tenet seems to be that the second coming of Christ will be in the year 1916. A few weeks ago I was much interested in an elaborate discussion, written in 1898, proving conclusively from the Scriptures that the date of the second coming would be in the year 1902. Thus they go on, adding error to error, heedless of the fact that the Saviour has said, "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power" (Acts i. 7).

The Jews made the costly blunder of trying to read from the prophecies the characteristics of the first coming of the Christ. They missed it so far that when he came they crucified the very being for whom they were fondly looking. It is a costly thing to attempt to know the future from that which is written concerning it, except in its barest outline.

Then what are the prophecies for? Let the Saviour answer, "I have told you before it come to pass, that when it is come to pass ye might believe" (John xiv. 29). Prophecy is that by which we may prove the truth of the fact predicted after it has come to pass. This, I undertake to say, is its chief purpose; for if it is found that a thing has come to pass, in an unmistakable

number of particulars, as it was predicted, say, hundreds of years before it has come to pass, there is in that fact an absolute demonstration that God is in both the prediction and the fulfilment.

The great majority of the arguments we hear and read, favoring the inspiration of the Scriptures, seek to furnish us, at best, only presumptive evidence that the Scriptures are inspired of God. This presumptive evidence is sufficient to convince the man who will carefully consider and weigh all the arguments without prejudice; but who is there of us who does not desire a more firm foundation for his faith than the mere inference that the Scriptures are indeed the Word of God, however strong the inference? I have recently read a volume setting forth the arguments for the inspiration of the Scriptures. It is about the strongest array of such arguments I have yet seen, and is indeed very helpful; but it is simply a strong and forceful summing up of the presumptive evidences, a weighing of argument against argument, which results in a preponderance of evidence in support of inspiration. These arguments thus set forth are such as the argument from the history of the Bible, its unity in variety, the historical truthfulness of its contents, its superior literary value, the conspicuous honesty of its writers in the treatment of its characters, its moral code, etc., etc. At best these only increase in our minds the probability of the Scriptures being the Word of God. A skeptic who has recently in my presence heard these arguments, remarked to a friend, "That is very good indeed to a man who has never heard the other side."

It may be reasonably questioned whether this weighing evidence against evidence really convinces any one who is not already a believer in the inspiration of the Scriptures. I do not recall a single instance where Jesus entered into such arguments. His argument, as well as that of the disciples, was the fulfilment of prophecy: the only argument that really proves anything. Let us consider a few of the fulfilled prophecies to see the effect of this argument.

Take the prediction of Jeremiah (xv. 4), about two thousand five hundred years ago, concerning the dispersion of the Jews, "I

will cause them to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth." Also the prediction of Ezekiel (xxii. 15), written about the same time, concerning the Jews, "I will scatter thee among the heathen, and disperse thee in the countries." Now look about you and find the Jew in every country on the earth, his identity so preserved that there cannot be any mistake or room for doubt.

Consider the predictions concerning the destruction of Babylon, that of Isaiah for example (xiii. 19-22), written about twenty-six hundred years ago, when Babylon was yet the world's great metropolis, "Babylon, the glory of the kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldean's pride, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation; neither shall the Arabian pitch his tent there; neither shall the shepherds make their flocks to lie down there. But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there, and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and ostriches shall dwell there, and wild goats shall dance there. And wolves shall cry in their castles, and jackals in their pleasant palaces." To-day men are digging in the great mound that covers the ruins of centuries, where the great city, with its wondrous walls and hanging gardens and splendid palaces, once stood. It is now so desolate and weird a wilderness that it is said the passing Arab will not tent there for the night.

The prophecies concerning Nineveh are no less significant. When the last king of Assyria was warring against the Medes and the Babylonians, while Judah and the surrounding nations were trembling at his power, Zephaniah wrote (ii. 13), "The Lord will stretch out his hand against the north, and destroy Assyria; and will make Nineveh a desolation, and dry like the wilderness. And herds shall lie down in the midst of her, and all the beasts of the nations: both the pelican and the porcupine shall lodge in the chapters thereof: their voice shall sing in the windows; desolation shall be in the thresholds." About seventy-five years before this, the prophet Nahum had foretold that the river should assist in the destruction of Nineveh, saying of her, "The gates of the rivers are opened, and the palace is dissolved." The secular historian tells us that the king met with reverses in his

wars, and his kingdom, with his mighty capital, Nineveh, was overthrown. "The river conspired with fate to overthrow the defenses of the city" (Ridpath). Byron sings of the closing scenes of the empire and the tragedy of the last king who perished on a funeral pyre erected from the treasures of the kingdom by his own direction. Ridpath, the historian, says, "Where Senacherib and Sargon drove their triumphant chariots through the roar of tumultuous thoroughfares, amid the shouts of a victorious soldiery, some half-savage Kurds, sitting on the broken stones of Korsabad or Nimrud, watch a distant flock, and at the fall of night the jackal sets up a howl as he issues from his den in the basement of a ruined palace."

Let us notice briefly a few of the Messianic prophecies whose fulfilment can be definitely pointed out. Isaiah wrote of the Messiah telling of his birth seven hundred years before Jesus was born (vii. 14), "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel."

Micah, more than seven hundred years before Jesus was born in Bethlehem, wrote (v. 2), "Thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou art little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting."

Isaiah, when the Jews were wishing the Messiah to come as a warrior to battle their enemies with the sword, wrote of his gentleness (xlii. 2, 3), "He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench."

Zechariah, about five hundred years before Jesus rode into Jerusalem on the colt of an ass, prophesied, "Behold thy king cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt the foal of an ass." (Zech. ix. 9.)

The Psalmist (xxxv. 11) foretold the false witnesses that bore testimony against him, "False witnesses did rise up, and laid to my charge things that I knew not."

Isaiah foretold his rejection by the Jews, together with his grief, "He was despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows

and acquainted with grief" (Isa. liii. 3). He also foretold the stripes which were laid on his back with the Roman thongs, "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed" (liii. 4). His refusal to answer Pilate, and his meek submission to the death of the cross was foretold also by Isaiah (liii. 7), "He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth." His being crucified between two thieves is thus written of by Isaiah (liii. 12), "He was numbered with transgressors."

That his death was to be by crucifixion is told by the Psalmist (xxii. 16), "They pierced my hands and my feet." Also the giving him gall and vinegar on the cross (Psa. lxix. 21), "They gave me gall for my meat; and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink." The act of the four soldiers who cast lots for his coat at the foot of the cross is foretold by the Psalmist (xxii. 18), "They parted my garments among them, and cast lots for my vesture." The Psalmist has also foretold his very words on the cross (xxii. 1), "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Also the words of the crucifiers (xxii. 8), "He trusted in the Lord that he would deliver him: let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him."

Zechariah (xii. 10) predicts the piercing of his side which they did before they removed him from the cross, "They shall look on me whom they have pierced." The Psalmist tells of the peculiar fact that they would not break his bones as was the custom with those who were crucified, "He keepeth all his bones: not one of them is broken" (xxxiv. 20).

His burial in the tomb of the rich man, Joseph, was foretold by Isaiah (liii. 9), "He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death."

Zechariah foretells the price for which Judas betrayed him, and that it was cast down in the temple, and used to buy a potter's field, "They weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver.

. . . And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord" (Zech. xi. 12, 13).

These are only a few of the Messianic prophecies which have been fulfilled to the very letter. But these will suffice for the end we have in view. Besides the prophecies in verbal form, there are types and figures all through the Bible foreshadowing things that we know have come to pass. For instance, "The blood of beasts on Jewish altars slain," the passover feast with its blood on the door posts, the serpent in the wilderness raised upon the pole to drive out the poison of the serpent bite from him who had faith to look and live, etc., etc. These things are all meaningless and seemingly foolish unless they are seen to be, as they are, prophecies in type. And they have been fulfilled in the death of Jesus of Nazareth.

Consider also the prophecies concerning the coming of the Gentiles into the kingdom of Israel's God. Isaiah, seven hundred years before the kingdom was preached to the Gentiles, in the midst of the Jews who were bitterly opposed to admitting the Gentiles into fellowship with them, wrote what he claimed to be the Word of God concerning the Messiah, "I will give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation to the ends of the earth" (Isa. xlix. 6). Again he wrote, "In that day there shall be a root of Jesse which shall stand for an ensign among the people, and to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious" (Isa. xi. 10). Look about you and consider that there are to-day among the civilized nations of the earth the millions of Gentiles who bow in allegiance to Israel's God through Jesus of Nazareth, and there is no country or isle where the Gentile is not trying to carry the predicted "salvation to the ends of the earth" in humble obedience to him who said, "Go teach all nations."

Jesus predicted the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem, and Matthew made record of the prediction (Matt. xxiv. 2) about thirty years before it came to pass, "There shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." The prediction was literally fulfilled when Titus captured the city.

Now the Mosque of Omar stands where the temple once stood, and the temple is no more.

It was also predicted by Jesus, while he had only twelve apostles and a few disciples besides, that the gospel which he came to proclaim should be preached in all nations, and the prediction was recorded by Matthew (xxiv. 14) before Paul had turned to the Gentiles, or Peter had preached to Cornelius, while yet the church understood not its world-wide mission, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations." Few countries are now left where the gospel has not been preached, and no one doubts that within a few more years this prediction will be fulfilled. Even the most unbelieving skeptic must admit that this prediction of nearly two thousand years ago, which must then have seemed preposterous, is about to be fulfilled before our very eyes.

But enough of this. There are perhaps some who will say the events in the life of Jesus were written to fit the prophecies by the enthusiastic disciples after his death. We can easily show that this is not at all probable; but we are not here stopping to deal with probabilities, however strong. I shall pass this objection, therefore, by simply calling attention to the fact that it can apply to only a few of the prophecies to which I have herein referred. Most of them are in no way dependent on any record written after their fulfilment. The dispersion of the Jews, the desolation of the cities of Babylon and Nineveh, the destruction of the temple, the Gentiles brought into allegiance to Israel's God, the preaching of the gospel in all nations, are things our eyes can see. Besides, the life of Jesus, his character, the fact, manner and many of the circumstances of his death are vouched for by secular historians, as well as by the disciples. The objection, therefore, will not hold in events and incidents numerous enough to confirm the argument and establish the proof. To forestall this objection I have purposely omitted very important prophecies, such as, for instance, those concerning the resurrection.

We have, then, a simple, mathematical problem. The multiplicand, say, is given, and the product is known: find the mul-

tiplier. The multiplicand, say, is three, and the product is six: what is the multiplier? Of all the numbers from one to infinity only the number two will satisfy that problem. The number three, in the case in hand, represents prophecy. The number six represents its known fulfilment. What is the other number? There is but one thing that will satisfy the problem—God. The answer must be God, because it cannot be anything else, God in the prophecy, as well as in its fulfilment. And inspiration is a mathematical certainty.

I grant that this does not prove that all the things written in the sixty-six books of the Bible are given by inspiration, but only that the fulfilled predictions are inspired. This much is clearly proved, however. The rest may be built upon it by presumptive evidence. But let it be held in mind that we have the firm foundation for such a building, and the work will be easy enough. Admit this proof, and the whole plan of salvation will certainly follow, for it is tied to it, or wrapped in it.

The possibility of the truthfulness of Christianity is sufficient to make a reasonable man want to accept it; for in accepting it he has nothing to lose if it were not true, and everything to gain if it is true. What business man would not accept stock in an honorable concern, if it were offered him as a gift, with the full assurance that it would pay him a monthly dividend, and a million dollars at its final success, provided he could not possibly lose anything if it proved a failure at last? Christianity offers a daily dividend of peace and happiness here, and eternal bliss hereafter, all for nothing. The bare possibility of its being true, and certainly the probability of its truthfulness, is enough to prevent any reasonable man from refusing it.

But we do not present it unto men with even these sufficient reasons for accepting it, the possibility, or even probability, of its truthfulness. We present it founded on absolute proof of its fundamental facts and truths. There is much of faith in it, but faith that is built on certainty.

E. E. SMITH.

Owensboro, Ky.

V.

THE PLACE AND USE OF THE BIBLE IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE UNITED STATES.¹

THE subject upon which we are asked to make a report is alike difficult and important. It is difficult, partly because it is by no means an easy task to obtain accurate information from all parts of the country, in regard to the laws and the customs, touching the place the Bible actually has in our public schools. This practical difficulty is increased by the fact that various interpretations prevail among us, as to the bearing of the doctrine of the separation between church and state in this country, upon the use of the Bible in our public schools.

But we are inclined to believe that the subject is as important as it is difficult. The great majority of our people are no doubt agreed that sound morality is essential to the best welfare and true prosperity of any people. And all Christians, and not a few who do not profess to be Christians will agree that the Bible is the very best book to teach sound morality.

But when the questions of where, how and by whom the morality of the Bible is to be taught are raised, differences of opinion at once emerge. Some say that the public school is not the place, nor the school teacher the proper person, to teach the morality of the Bible to the youth of our land. The further problem, as to whether the Bible can be used to teach morality without at the same time inculcating religion, also arises to in-

¹ This article is the substance of a report presented at and adopted by the Executive Commission of the Presbyterian and Reformed Alliance at its meeting in Toronto, in January of this year. It was drawn up by a committee consisting of Francis R. Beattie, D. D., Louisville, Ky., John McNaugher, D. D., Alleghany, Pa., and William H. Black, D. D., Marshall, Mo. It was heartily approved by the Executive Commission, and ordered to be sent to the Liverpool Council.—*F. R. B.*

crease the perplexity of the whole situation among us. And, in addition, the still deeper question, as to whether morality can be successfully imparted when divorced from the sanctions of religion, has also to be considered.

But this is not all. The fact that there are so many forms of religious beliefs in this country makes the problem all the more serious. If we were all of one faith the case would be comparatively simple. But here we have, among the people whose children are in our public schools, infidels and secularists, Jews and Gentiles, Roman Catholics and Protestants; and Protestantism itself is broken up into a great many different branches. Under these conditions the problem of the Bible in the public schools certainly becomes exceedingly complex. The infidel and secularist claim that religion should have no place in education, and they rule the Bible out of the schools on this account. The Jew objects to the use of the New Testament, as not in any proper sense part of the Bible, so that it has to go. The Roman Catholic steadfastly maintains that religion and morality are essential factors in education, and that the church alone is the proper agent to teach the youth. Hence the demand made by Roman Catholics for separate schools, where religion and morality are to be taught by the proper representatives of the church.

But Protestantism is not free from difficulty in dealing with the problem of the Bible in the public schools. It is true that, in general, the Protestant churches agree in holding that there should be no actual alliance between church and state, by which either is to control the other. Yet there are certain questions, such as marriage, Sabbath observance and education, wherein there are civil and religious factors to be adjusted. In addition, the church holds her title to her property, and is protected in all her property rights, by virtue of the authority of the state.

In regard to these complex questions, especially that of moral and religious instruction in the public schools, Protestants are not in agreement among themselves. Some take the ground that the instruction given in the public schools should be entirely secular, and that all religious and moral teaching should be supplied by the churches, in such ways as they may deem best. Others main-

tain that there should be definite ethical teaching, without reference to religion, imparted by means of the public schools, on the ground that such teaching is necessary for good citizenship, and that moral instruction may be given apart from the inculcation of any definite religious tenets. And still others maintain that the Bible should have more or less prominence given to it in the public schools, either as the means of sound moral instruction, or on the ground that morality and religion ought not to be separated in education.

It is proper to observe that Protestants are generally agreed that religion should control the members of the community in all their public and private relations of life, in order to the production of the best type of citizenship; but they may differ widely among themselves as to the functions of the church and state, respectively, in the inculcation of this religion, with its legitimate ethical results. Still, in spite of differences and difficulty, it is just here that the Protestant seeks to hold a safe middle ground between the secularist and the Romanist. The former sometimes attacks our public schools because there is too much religion in them, especially if the Bible is used in any way; and the latter criticises our public school system because it is largely secular, and has too little religion in it, as they suppose.

Against both of these positions the Protestant usually takes his stand. In doing this he holds fast to two positions. First, he stands for the preservation of our public school system in this country. He believes that it is one of the most potent agencies in unifying the various races and tongues that come to our shores from foreign lands. He feels confident that, when children of various nationalities and different creeds are gathered together in our public schools, there to come under similar educative influences for several years of their early life, a mighty unifying agency is brought into play. We are satisfied that this Alliance, which represents a considerable section of Protestantism in this country, will ever stand for the integrity of our public school system. And, secondly, Protestantism has also stood for the production of a highly intelligent, a definitely moral and a positively religious citizenship, as the type most to be desired. From

this position this Alliance is not likely to recede. In the light of the problem before us in this report, the question is, Whether the Bible can be properly used in the production of such a citizenship in connection with our public school system. The definite subject, therefore, upon which we are now to make report is, "The Place and Proper Use of the Bible in our Public Schools."

As we enter upon the subject-matter of this report, it may be well to keep in mind what a host of children and what a band of teachers are in the public schools of our country. According to the latest statistics there are about twenty-two millions of children of school age—that is, between six and sixteen years—in this country, and the number actually enrolled is upward of sixteen millions. This means that about one-sixth of our population, together with a great army of teachers, is gathered together, for several hours a day, through a number of years, in the school-room. It is surely almost impossible to over-estimate what this means in relation to the influence of the public schools upon the future welfare of our country.

In this report we shall attempt to do two things. In the first place, we shall seek to find out what the precise laws and regulations are in the different States in regard to the place and use of the Bible in our public schools. And in the second place, we shall venture to make some inferences and recommendations for the consideration of the Section.

I. LAWS AND REGULATIONS.

This opens up a very large subject, and we shall seek to compact the materials upon it as much as possible. The laws and regulations are of several distinct sorts. In some cases, only very few, there is allusion to the Bible in the public schools in the constitution of the State. In other cases, a larger number, there are statute regulations bearing upon this particular subject. In still other cases the regulations spring from the boards of education in the State, and in perhaps a majority of the States this is the status of affairs with reference to this matter. In several cases decisions of the courts have had considerable influence in

shaping the practice as to the use of the Bible in the public schools of certain States.

In order to secure information of recent date, we issued a circular letter to about one hundred and thirty persons in every section of our country. Every State superintendent of education, the presidents of many State and other colleges, and the superintendents of the public schools in many large cities were communicated with. The replies were very general, and the result is a vast mass of information, upon which this report is largely based. In addition, the work of others who have travelled over this field has been utilized; but in every case it has been verified by the later information received. And it may be added, that we have consulted the findings of the courts upon several of the more important cases wherein the question of the use of the Bible in the public school was passed upon.

We shall, from all these sources of information, first, indicate the laws upon this subject in each State; and secondly, we shall point out the significance of the decisions of the courts upon the matter now under review.

1. *The Laws in the Several States.*

(1) ALABAMA: The constitution says, "That no money raised for the public schools of the State shall be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school" (13:8). But the school statute is silent in regard to the use of the Bible in the public schools of the State. Superintendents report that "the Bible is very generally read in the public schools of the State."

(2) ARIZONA: The constitution is silent, but the school statute has the following provisions: "It is the duty of the school board to exclude from schools and school libraries all books, publications or papers of a sectarian, partisan or denominational character" (6:50:13); also, "It shall be the duty of all teachers to endeavor to impress on the minds of the pupils the principles of morality, truth, justice and patriotism" (6:13). Superintendents report that the first of these quotations is usually understood to prohibit

the use of the Bible in the public schools, and consequently the Bible is not read in these schools.

(3) **ARKANSAS:** The constitution provides, "That religion, morality and knowledge are essential to good government" (2: 25); also, "That intelligence and virtue being the safeguards of government, . . . the State shall ever maintain a general, suitable and efficient system of free schools" (14: 1). The school statute says that "No teacher employed in any public school shall permit sectarian books to be used as reading or text-books in the schools under their care" (7074). The superintendent of public instruction takes the position that "The law leaves the discretion of reading or not reading the Bible with the school board, and the courts have uniformly refused to restrain, coerce or interfere with this discretion." The result is that there is no uniformity of practice in the schools of the State in regard to the use of the Bible therein.

(4) **CALIFORNIA:** The constitution provides that "No public money shall ever be appropriated for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, . . . nor shall any sectarian or denominational doctrine be taught . . . in any of the common schools of the State" (9: 1). The attorney-general of the State, in reply to an inquiry made by the superintendent of public instruction, gave his opinion (March 20, 1903) that "The reading of King James' Version of the Bible, as a religious exercise or its use as a text-book in the public schools, is prohibited by the constitution and laws of this State." The State superintendent reports "that the Bible is not read in the schools of California."

(5) **COLORADO:** The constitution forbids the use of any public school funds for any religious or sectarian purposes (9: 8). The school statute gives the power to school boards "To exclude from schools and school libraries all books, tracts, papers and other publications of an immoral tendency" (51: 11). The superintendent of public instruction for the State reports that "Moral instruction forms an important part of the course in the public schools of Colorado. In some schools the Bible is read, but not if any objections are made. In some schools the Lord's Prayer is repeated, if there is no objection offered to such exercises."

(6) CONNECTICUT: Both the constitution and the school statute are silent in regard to the reading of the Bible or the giving of religious instruction in the schools of the State. But the State superintendent reports that "In most schools the Bible is used without comment, as a part of the opening exercises in the morning." He adds that "In most schools the Lord's Prayer is repeated," and "In many schools religious songs are sung."

(7) DELAWARE: The constitution has the usual provisions forbidding school funds to be used for religious or sectarian purposes. Superintendents report that "The reading of the Bible, at the opening of the school, is well-nigh universal in Delaware schools," and that in Wilmington "The Bible is read daily, without note or comment, in all the schools of this city," and that "In all of the schools hymns and sacred songs are sung, and in most of them the Lord's Prayer is repeated." This much seems to be done, although the school statute is silent upon the subject, public opinion sustaining the practice.

(8) DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: The District, not being a State, but administered by three commissioners, the conditions are somewhat different. There is a board of education, and a rule of this body provides that "The opening exercises in every school shall consist of reading by the teacher, without note or comment, a portion of the Bible, repeating the Lord's Prayer at the option of the teacher, and appropriate singing by the pupils." This regulation secures the Bible a place in all the public schools of this District.

(9) FLORIDA: The constitution forbids the diversion of any part of the school funds to sectarian purposes. The school statute is silent concerning the reading of the Bible, but it requires the teaching of elementary physiology, especially as it relates to the effects of alcoholic stimulants and narcotics (11). The State superintendent reports that "Most principals read a short passage from the Bible, and open the school with prayer. The patrons favor it, at least a large majority of them, and no one says nay."

(10) GEORGIA: The constitution is silent, but the school statute declares that "The county board of education shall prescribe, from time to time, what text-books and books of reference

shall be used in the common schools of the county; *provided*, that the Bible shall not be excluded from the common or public schools of the State; and *provided further*, that the county boards shall not be permitted to introduce into the schools any text . . . of a sectarian or sectional character" (21). This gives the Bible a legal place in the public schools of this State, and it is very generally used.

(11) IDAHO: The constitution forbids the use of any school funds for religious or sectarian purposes (9:5). It also forbids any religious text of any kind for either teachers or pupils (9:6). Nor shall any "Sectarian or religious tenets or doctrines" ever be taught in the public schools (9:6). The school statute enjoins teachers to "Endeavor to impress upon the minds of the pupils the principles of morality, truth, justice and patriotism, and to teach them to avoid idleness, profanity and falsehood" (89). The statute also enjoins school boards "To exclude from the schools and school libraries . . . all books, tracts, papers and catechisms of a sectarian nature" (134). These provisions of the constitution and statutes have been differently interpreted. Not a few have taken them to exclude the Bible from the public schools. At one time the State superintendent ruled that "Our school law prohibits any reading of the Bible, or at least that is the recognized construction." But recently this has been modified as follows: "In regard to reading the Bible in the schools, the ruling of this office is that it may be." Concerning the repeating of the Lord's Prayer, he further says that "There is no law against it."

(12) ILLINOIS: The constitution neither forbids nor requires the reading of the Bible, or prayer, or any form of religious or devotional exercises in the public schools. And the school statutes are also entirely silent upon the subject (Sup. of Ed.). The superintendent of education reports, "It is a very general custom for the principals and teachers to open school by reading, without comment, a portion of the Scriptures, a repetition of the Lord's Prayer, or music. Frequently all these exercises are used in the opening of the schools. The reading of the Scriptures, without comment, is a practice usually followed in our State schools."

This practice is based upon the school statute, which gives to the school board authority to prescribe "text-books and apparatus" for the schools. In the year 1880 the validity of this was tested by a case, and the rule of a school board introducing the Bible into the school was pronounced "certainly a reasonable one." One statement is that "Out of seventy-one reports from city and county superintendents only twelve say that the Bible is not read, while in all of the others it is read to a greater or less extent."

(13) INDIAN TERRITORY: There are no laws upon the question of reading the Bible in the schools of this Territory, says the superintendent of education. He also reports that "Many teachers open school by reading the Bible, and repeating the Lord's Prayer in concert." "Have heard of no objection to Bible reading in any of the schools."

(14) INDIANA: The constitution secures to every one the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. But the school statute says expressly that "The Bible shall not be excluded from the public schools of the State" (221: 167). "The Bible, without note or comment, is installed in the common schools of Indiana," and "The whole matter of Bible reading and prayers is left with the good judgment of the teachers." The State superintendent reports concerning the general practice that "The Bible is read often, but not regularly, in most places." Another report says that "There is no general usage. Where a majority of the parents object, the Bible is not read."

(15) IOWA: The constitution prescribes that "The General Assembly shall encourage, by all suitable means, the promotion of . . . the moral improvement of the people" (9:3). The school statute declares that "The Bible shall not be excluded from any public school or institution in the State, nor shall any child be required to read it contrary to the wishes of his parent or guardian" (2805). In 1884 a case came before the courts by a patron, who prayed for an injunction to prevent the reading of the Bible in the schools. The court refused to grant the injunction; and, on an appeal, the Supreme Court sustained this decision. It left the matter with "the individual option of the teachers." The State superintendent reports that "The general

custom among superintendents, principals and teachers in this State is to read selections at the opening exercises of the school, making no note or comment."

(16) KANSAS: The constitution says that "The Legislature shall encourage the promotion of intellectual and moral . . . improvement" (6:2). The school statute declares that "No sectarian or religious doctrine shall be taught or inculcated in the public schools of the city, but nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the reading of the Holy Scriptures." This is the law for cities of the first class (125). For cities of the second class the law is that "No sectarian doctrine shall be taught or inculcated in any of the public schools of the city, but the Holy Scriptures, without note or comment, may be used therein." The State superintendent says, "In my judgment a majority of the teachers in the State conduct religious exercises every day. Moral instruction is given generally. The reading of the Scriptures would also permit the repeating of the Lord's Prayer." Another, and a later, statement is that "Many teachers have Scripture reading in their schools."

(17) KENTUCKY: The constitution has the usual prohibition of the use of school funds for church or sectarian purposes (189). The school statute provides that "No books . . . of a sectarian, infidel or immoral character shall be used or distributed in any public school" (6). The superintendent of education reports that, "As we construe the law, the teacher is left free to choose his literature from which to give lessons in morals." Under this exposition the Bible is used in many of the schools of the State. The superintendent of the schools in the city of Louisville reports that "The rules of the board require that the schools shall be opened daily by reading a portion of the Bible, without note or comment, and may be closed with singing, without prayer." This practice prevails generally throughout the State.

(18) LOUISIANA: The constitution declares that "No funds raised for the support of the public schools of the State shall be appropriated to, or used for, the support of any private or sectarian schools." This and other somewhat similar provisions have usually been taken, in the peculiar conditions which exist in

this State, to exclude the Bible from the public schools. The superintendent of education reports that "It is not read in any of the public schools."

(19) MAINE: The constitution declares that "It is made the duty of all instructors of youth . . . to take diligent care . . . to impress on the minds of children and youth . . . the principles of morality and justice, and a sacred regard to truth, love to their country, humanity and universal benevolence, sobriety, industry, frugality, chastity, moderation and temperance, and all other virtues." This has been construed to allow, if not really require, the use of the Bible in the schools. A test case, where an effort was made to exclude King James' Version in favor of the Douay Version, established the right of the former to a place in the public schools. The State superintendent reports that "I am very happy to be able to report that the opening exercises in most of the schools of this State consist of reading a passage of Scripture by the teacher, and repeating the Lord's Prayer by the teacher and pupils. This custom is so general that it is unnecessary, I think, to attempt to collect any statistics upon the matter in this State."

(20) MARYLAND: The constitution is entirely silent upon this subject, but the school statute says that "School books shall contain nothing of a sectarian or partisan character." The Bible is pretty generally read in the schools of this State. The city superintendent for Baltimore sends a copy of the rules of the board of that city, which contains this, "Each school, either collectively or in classes, shall be opened by the reading, without comment, of a chapter in the Holy Bible, and the use of the Lord's Prayer. The Douay Version may be used by those people who prefer it" (19). On this basis the superintendent reports that "When a building has an assembly hall, the schools in that building are assembled for opening exercises; otherwise they are held in the class-rooms." He also says that "The Bible is read daily in our schools. The Lord's Prayer is also recited."

(21) MASSACHUSETTS: The constitution asserts that "Wisdom and knowledge, as well as virtue, diffused generally among the people, is necessary for the preservation of their rights and

liberties" (5:2). The school statute prescribes that "The school committee shall require the daily reading in the public schools of some portion of the Bible, without note or oral comment, but they shall not require a pupil whose parent or guardian informs the teacher in writing that he has conscientious scruples against it to read from any particular version, or to take any part in the reading" (44:32). The Supreme Court in an important decision upholds this law in a case in which the authority of the school committee to make a rule requiring the reading of the Bible and prayer at the opening of the school each morning was called in question. In 1855 it was announced in the public statutes that "It is the settled policy of the State to require the use of the Bible in the public schools." The superintendent of the city schools of Boston reports that the regulation under which they act is as follows: "The morning exercises of all the schools shall begin with the reading in each class-room, by the teacher, of a portion of Scripture, without note or comment; and no other religious exercise shall be allowed in the public schools." There is reason to believe that the Bible is pretty generally used in the schools of this State. One report says that "Many teachers ask their pupils to repeat together the Lord's Prayer after the reading of the Bible" (Pres. Eliot).

(22) MICHIGAN: The constitution is absolutely silent on this subject. The words "Bible, sectarian instruction," do not appear anywhere (39, 40, 41). The usual clauses about liberty of worship and the support of any religious sect by public money are found. The superintendents report that "Some form of religious worship is practically universal in our schools. It takes the form of Bible readings, prayer, reciting the Lord's Prayer, etc. In grades below the high school many Psalms are committed and recited" (Pres. Angell). In December, 1898, an important decision of the Supreme Court of Michigan was favorable to the reading of the Bible in the public schools, and the practice is now quite general. Another report says that "The usage varies. Some teachers always and in all their schools read the Scriptures, and make extempore prayer; others use simply the Lord's Prayer. In some cases the Bible is not used at all."

(23) MINNESOTA: The constitution says that "The stability of a republican form of government depending mainly upon the intelligence of the people, it shall be the duty of the Legislature to establish a general and uniform system of public schools" (8:1). It also says that none of the school funds shall be devoted to sectarian purposes, but is silent concerning the use of the Bible in the schools, as also is the school statute. The State superintendent prior to 1901 said that "Moral instruction is given by precept and example, that the Bible is not generally read, nor the Lord's Prayer repeated, because such exercises are contrary to the State constitution." The attorney-general of the State ruled that the decision of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, which excluded the Bible from the public schools, applies to Minnesota. But a later report states that a book, known as *Readings from the Bible*, is very generally used throughout the State, while the Bible itself is read in a portion of the schools. It would appear that the practice in this State varies a good deal.

(24) MISSISSIPPI: The constitution provides that "No religious test as a qualification for office shall be required," and also that "The free enjoyment of all religious sentiments and the different modes of worship shall be held sacred." It also adds that "The rights hereby secured shall not be construed to justify acts of licentiousness injurious to morals, or dangerous to the peace and safety of the State, or to exclude the holy Bible from use in any public school of this State" (3:8). Here we find in the constitution itself what is in the school statute in some other States. Under such a provision, we would expect the Bible to be very generally read in this State, as is really the case.

(25) MISSOURI: There is nothing either in the constitution or in the school statute of this State concerning the use of the Bible in the public schools. The matter is left in the hands of the school boards in the different districts to settle as they deem best. The State superintendent reports that "The Bible is generally read without comment." Another report states that "Moral instruction is given in the schools of Missouri." One report says that the attorney-general has interpreted the constitution and law "to prohibit any religious ceremonies in the public

schools," and that he has expressed the opinion that "The reading of the Bible . . . for religious instruction can be enjoined and prohibited in the public schools of this State." But in spite of this opinion the reports show that many teachers continue to use the Bible, and to draw from its literature in their teachings. The city superintendent of St. Louis says that "The Bible is not used in the schools of that city, but that the readers contain extracts from the Bible."

(26) MONTANA: The constitution provides that no religious test shall be required of any teacher (11:9); that teachers shall impress the principles of morality and good citizenship upon the minds of their pupils is enjoined in the school statute (1845). One report says that "The superintendent of education announces that the law forbids the reading of the Bible." As the use of the Bible is thus left to the local authorities, the practice concerning it may be expected to vary. Reports would indicate that "In some schools the Bible is read regularly, in others occasionally, and in others not at all."

(27) NEBRASKA: Neither the constitution nor the school statute makes any specific mention of the Bible in the public schools. There is a clause in the constitution forbidding sectarian instruction in the public schools (8:2). The superintendent of education says that "Moral instruction is given in the schools of Nebraska, that religious songs are sung, and that in many schools the Bible is read, the Lord's Prayer repeated, and the Ten Commandments recited." A later report states that "The general custom is to read a selection without comment." Several cases have come before the courts in this State for decision. It has usually been held that the law does not exclude the Bible from the public schools, and that the Bible is not a sectarian book. In one recent case the court decided that the way a teacher in a certain school used the Bible was sectarian, but this decision applied only to that particular case, and was not general in its scope.

(28) NEVADA: There is nothing in the constitution or school statute upon the use of the Bible in the public schools. The constitution forbids sectarian teaching in the public schools (11:9). The school statute says that "No books which are of a sectarian

or a denominational nature are to be introduced into any school" (13:5). The State superintendent says that "The Bible is not generally read in the schools of this State, and there is an obscure decision of the Supreme Court which has been quoted against using the Bible in the schools."

(29) NEW HAMPSHIRE: The constitution contains the usual provision concerning sectarian or denominational teaching in the schools, and concerning the teaching of sound morality (82). The school statute forbids the use of any book in the school "Which favors any particular religious sect or party" (8:92). The State superintendent says that "It is a common custom with our teachers to open the daily session with Bible reading, followed by repeating the Lord's Prayer by the pupils."

(30) NEW JERSEY: The constitution is silent upon the subject, but the school statute prescribes as follows: "It shall not be lawful for any teacher, trustee or trustees to introduce into, or have performed in, any school receiving its proportion of public moneys any religious service, ceremony or forms whatsoever, except reading the Bible and repeating the Lord's Prayer." This is a limitative regulation. The State superintendent reports that "It is the custom of teachers and principals to read a selection or chapter from the Bible responsively with the school, and for the teacher and the school to repeat the Lord's Prayer in concert."

(31) NEW MEXICO: The constitution and statute are silent upon the subject. Sectarian instruction in the schools is forbidden, and the superintendent of education says that "No religious instruction whatever is given in the common schools of this state." The information we have is very meagre.

(32) NEW YORK: There is no specific provision in either the constitution or school statute in regard to the use of the Bible in the public schools. An effort was made in 1838 to have the Bible excluded, but the bill received only one vote in the Legislature. In 1851, in 1882, and 1901, action was taken by the Legislature refusing to allow school boards to exclude the Holy Scriptures, without note or comment, from the public schools. In this way the Bible has had its place made secure in the schools of this State. The school board of the City of New York has the fol-

lowing by-law: "All the schools under the jurisdiction of the board shall be opened with reading a portion of the Holy Scriptures, without note or comment." It thus appears that in New York State and City the Bible is very generally read in the public schools.

(33) NORTH CAROLINA: The constitution has this provision, "Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools . . . shall be forever encouraged" (9:1). The school statute authorizes school boards "To adopt text-books," and forbids "sectarian teaching." Teachers are also by this statute enjoined "to encourage morality." The State superintendent reports that "The Bible is generally read as a part of the morning devotional exercises."

(34) NORTH DAKOTA: The constitution is silent upon the Bible in the schools, but the school statute has definite provisions as follows: "The Bible shall not be deemed a sectarian book. It shall not be excluded from any public school. It may, at the option of the teacher, be used in school, without sectarian comment, not to exceed ten minutes daily. No pupil shall be required to read it, nor to be present in the school-room during the reading thereof, contrary to the wishes of his parents or guardian" (12:734). The State superintendent reports that in the schools of this State "the Bible is usually used daily."

(35) OHIO: The constitution declares that "Religion, morality and knowledge being essential to our government, it shall be the duty of the General Assembly to pass suitable laws to protect every religious denomination, . . . and to encourage schools and every means of public instruction" (1:7). It adds that "No religious or other sect or sects shall ever have any exclusive right to, or control of, any part of the school funds of this State" (6:2). The school statute leaves the management of the public schools in the hands of the school boards. The school board of Cincinnati, as far back as 1869, passed regulations prohibiting religious instruction, including the use of the Bible, in the public schools. The superintendents report that the Bible is not read in the schools of Cincinnati and Cleveland, but that its use is quite general in the schools in smaller towns and throughout the State.

(36) OKLAHOMA: We have not been able to learn what the law is in this new region, but the superintendent of schools reports that "In the schools moral instruction is given, the Bible is read, the Lord's Prayer is repeated, and religious songs are sung."

(37) OREGON: Neither in the constitution nor in the statutes are there any direct provisions concerning religious instruction or the use of the Bible in the public schools. The State board of education has this provision, "Teachers in the public schools shall, to the uttermost of their ability, inculcate in the minds of their pupils correct principles of morality." The school boards have authority to permit or prohibit the use of the Bible in the public schools of this State.

(38) PENNSYLVANIA: The constitution has the usual prohibition in regard to sectarian instruction and the use of public funds for sectarian schools. The school law gives the Bible a place in the schools of the State in the following terms: "The Scriptures come under the head of text-books, and they should not be omitted from the list in use in public schools." The State superintendent reports that "The school boards are vested with power to decide whether the Bible shall be read in the public schools." There is also a law forbidding the teacher wearing any distinctive religious garb while in discharge of duty in the public schools. The superintendents report that "The Bible is read in nearly every school in the State." One report says (1897) that of the 18,565 schools in the State, the Bible was read in 15,980.

(39) RHODE ISLAND: Both the constitution and the school statute are silent upon the subject of the Bible in the schools; but the school law contains the following provision for moral instruction: "Every teacher shall aim to implant and cultivate in the minds of all the children . . . the principles of morality and virtue" (61:7). On this basis the school authorities are careful to impart thorough moral instruction, and the commissioner of public schools says that "Of the means used to secure moral and virtuous development, we naturally consider the Bible first." The result is that the Bible is very generally read in the schools. One report says that "In all but twelve of the thirty-eight towns

and cities in the State the reading of the Bible is required or permitted, and that the Lord's Prayer is also used."

(40) **SOUTH CAROLINA:** The constitution is silent upon the subject; but the statute requires that "Morality and good manners be taught." The State superintendent reports that "As a rule the Bible is read in the schools of South Carolina, though not required by law." "The practice in Charleston for more than thirty-five years has been to have the Bible read daily in the public schools." The superintendent of the schools of Columbia says, "Our morning devotionals consist of Scripture readings, the Lord's Prayer, and a hymn. Selected Bible stories are taught in each grade. Our teachers frequently require their pupils to memorize Bible verses." In this State the schools are usually opened with the reading of the Bible.

(41) **SOUTH DAKOTA:** The constitution has nothing upon the subject, but it has a clause laying stress upon morality in order to good government (8:1). The school statute gives great emphasis to this, and enjoins every teacher to impress upon the minds of their pupils the importance of cultivating the cardinal virtues (6:6). The statute further prescribes that "No sectarian doctrine shall be taught or inculcated in any of the schools of the corporations; but the Bible, without sectarian comment, may be used therein." Reports show that the Bible is read in many of the schools of this State.

(42) **TENNESSEE:** Both the constitution and the school statute are without provisions for reading the Bible in the public schools. Moral teaching is to be given, but the use of the Bible is left with the teachers. The school authorities encourage the practice, and the State superintendent reports that "The reading of the Bible is generally practiced in all the schools of the State."

(43) **TEXAS:** The constitution prohibits sectarian teaching in the schools (7:5). The school statute states the branches which may be taught in the schools, but is silent regarding moral instruction. "But neither the constitution nor the statute prohibit the reading of the Bible." Hence in practice there is no uniformity in the use of the Bible in the schools of this State. In not a few cases "The Bible is read, prayer offered, and religious

songs are sung." "The Bible is read in all the schools of Houston."

(44) UTAH: The constitution provides for a uniform school system free from sectarian control (10:1). The statute prescribes that "No atheistic, infidel, sectarian, religious or denominational tenets shall be taught in any of the district schools of the State." As to the practice, our report says that "While morality is taught and inculcated in all the public schools of this State, the Bible is not read in any of them." A later report says that in some cases "The Bible, without comment, is read." The impression is prevalent in this State that to introduce the Bible into the public schools is to incur the danger of bringing in sectarian teaching, and on this account it is not much read.

(45) VERMONT: The constitution says that "Laws for the encouragement of virtue . . . ought to be constantly kept in force and duly executed; and a competent system of schools ought to be maintained in each town for the convenient instruction of youth" (2:41). The school statute does not require the reading of the Bible in the public schools, but the State superintendent says that "We encourage Bible reading in all public schools." He also says that "The Bible is read in devotional exercises." Another report says, "The Bible is read in nearly every school. The Lord's Prayer and Bible verses are quite frequently recited." Sound morality is also emphasized.

(46) VIRGINIA: There is no law, either in the constitution or in the statute, concerning moral instruction and the reading of the Bible in the public schools. The school statute provides that "Nothing of a partisan or sectarian character shall be taught in the schools." As to the practice, the superintendent reports that as a general rule "Brief selections from the Bible constitute part of the opening exercises of the schools of this State." The superintendent of the city schools of Richmond says that "Where the patrons are united in their estimation of the Bible it is usually read. If our patrons are not at one in this, those parts are read which are of a general character."

(47) WASHINGTON: The constitution has the usual provisions concerning sectarian instruction. The school statute requires

moral instruction. The attorney-general of the State has written an opinion, and ruled that "The stated reading of the Bible in the public schools of this State is a religious service within the meaning of the constitution, and as such is hereby prohibited in Sec. 11, Art. I., of that document," which relates to sectarian instruction. The result is that the reading of the Bible does not widely prevail in the schools of this State. The superintendent of the Tacoma schools, however, reports that "The Bible is used quite freely for reference in the interpretation of the allusions found in literature."

(48) WEST VIRGINIA: The constitution requires the Legislature "To foster and encourage, by a system of free schools, moral . . . improvement" (13:12). In 1898, the Supreme Court, in deciding a case which prayed that the King James' Version should be excluded from the schools, ruled that "The reading of the Bible in King James' Version cannot be prohibited." The court held, also, that it could neither compel nor prohibit the reading of the Bible. From reports, it appears that the Bible is read in a good many schools of this State.

(49) WISCONSIN: The constitution has provisions about freedom of worship and sectarian instruction in the public schools (1:18). It also requires the founding of free public schools in which "No text-books shall be permitted which have a tendency to inculcate sectarian ideas" (514). An important decision of the Supreme Court of the State ruled that the Bible was a sectarian book, and that its use should be prohibited, in accordance with the constitutional provisions upon the sectarian instruction in the public schools. The State superintendent reports that "Conformity to the Supreme Court decision is the rule in this State." This means that the Bible is not usually read in the schools.

(50) WYOMING: Both the constitution and the statute are without provisions upon this subject. But when an attempt was made to pass a law against the use of the Bible in the public schools in the Legislature, it failed. Hence the Bible holds its place in the schools of Wyoming, and is read not infrequently in them, though it cannot be said that its use is general.

2. *The Decisions of the Courts.*

(1) First of all, it is worth noting that every attempt made in any State Legislature to pass a bill excluding the Bible from the public schools has utterly failed. This indicates that when the people by their representatives face the general proposition of excluding the Bible, they have pronounced against any such legislation. This is true of New York and other States.

(2) In a number of cases when the question of excluding the Bible from the schools came before the courts or school boards, the decision has been in favor of retaining it. This is the case in Arkansas, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, Maine, Michigan, West Virginia and Wyoming. By reason of these decisions the Bible has its place more fully secured in the schools of these States. In many of the States where the Bible is generally read in the schools the question has never come before the courts. Public custom or law has decided for its use.

(3) Then there are a number of States where court decisions or the interpretation of the law by the school authorities have been adverse to the use of the Bible in the schools. Sometimes it has been excluded on the ground that its teaching is sectarian, and hence to use it conflicted with the constitution. In a few cases the objection has been to the King James' Version of the Bible.

In Arizona there seems to be a general impression that the use of the Bible is really inconsistent with the prohibition about sectarian teaching, though no formal decision has been given.

In California the State superintendent and attorney-general ruled that the use of King James' Version was unconstitutional, and this did much to exclude the Bible from the schools of this State.

In Idaho there have been different rulings by the school authorities. This has led to confusion, so that the Bible is little read in the schools of this State.

In Louisiana it is excluded, chiefly on account of the large Roman Catholic population, who object to the use of King James'

Version. In Nevada there is an obscure decision of the court which is quoted against the use of the Bible in the schools there.

In Minnesota, Missouri and Washington the interpretation by the attorney-general of the laws bearing upon the subject has been adverse to the use of the Bible in the public schools. This explains why the Bible is not much read in the schools of these States.

In Nebraska and Wisconsin there have been decisions of some importance, bearing upon these subjects, made by the Supreme Court in these States. In Nebraska the case was that of a teacher who, it was shown, was really making a sectarian use of the Bible in a certain school. The court held that in this particular case there was sectarian teaching, and that such teaching should cease. But the court in its finding was also careful to say that "The law does not forbid the use of the Bible in the public schools; it is not proscribed either by the constitution or statute, and the courts have no right to declare its use unlawful." . . . "The point where the courts may rightfully interfere to prevent the use of the Bible in a public school is where legitimate use has degenerated into abuse." It is evident that this decision affected only this particular case, but did not exclude the Bible from all the schools of the State (1903).

In the case of Wisconsin, the decision of the Supreme Court was much more sweeping. The case was brought by certain Roman Catholics, whose main objection was against reading King James' Version. They asked for a writ of mandamus of the court to cause the school board to discontinue the reading of the Bible in the public school where their children attended. The Circuit Court denied the petition, and the parties appealed to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court reversed the action of the lower court, and directed it to issue a peremptory writ of mandamus as prayed for in their petition (1900). This decision, so far as we know, stands, and the State superintendent for this year reports that "The schools act in accordance with this decision." These are two cases of recent interest and importance, and only one of them rules the Bible out of all schools in the State.

II. SOME INFERENCES AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

This report also presents some inferences from the foregoing exposition, and some recommendations for the consideration of the section.

1. *Some Inferences.*

(1) Speaking generally, it may be concluded that the Bible is widely read in the public schools of this country. Of the fifty States and Territories noted in the former part of this report, eleven, either in the constitution or the statutes or the rules of the school authorities, have provisions requiring that the Bible be read in the public schools. In at least thirty-six of these States and Territories the Bible is very generally read in the schools. In about four others it is read to some considerable extent. In ten it can scarcely be said to be read at all, owing to decisions of the courts and public opinion. In only two have we definite declarations of the courts that the reading of the Bible in the public schools is prohibited by the constitution. These are Wisconsin and Nebraska; but only that of Wisconsin plainly declares this, as that of Nebraska only held that the sectarian use of the Bible was unconstitutional. So far, therefore, as the action of the courts is concerned we have no need to be discouraged.

(2) It is evident from the exposition, also, that stress is laid by our school system upon the importance of sound and positive moral teaching for good citizenship and secure government. The law of almost every State has in some form provisions to this effect. No particulars need be given here; for the whole school system, if true to itself, must be permeated by sound ethics, and every school-room ought to be a nursery of all the virtues. The importance of this is emphasized by the reports which came to the committee in response to its circular letter. The almost uniform testimony is twofold: First, that morality is absolutely necessary to good citizenship and government; and secondly, that the public schools should make a large contribution to the production of this morality.

(3) Our school system evidently makes a distinction between morality and religion, in the stress it lays upon moral instruction

in the public schools, on the one hand, and the equal stress it puts upon the exclusion of sectarian religious teaching on the other. These two features are found in the laws of very many of the States side by side. We do not here undertake to pronounce upon the soundness of this distinction, or how far it can be carried into actual practice. We simply call attention to this fact as one to be reckoned with in all serious discussions of the problem now in hand.

(4) From the exposition just given it also appears that there is difference of opinion as to how far the Bible is necessary in order to teach virtue or morality, and as to whether the Bible can be used to teach morality without any reference to its religious tenets. These are both very difficult problems, and neither our school laws nor the public schools seem clear upon them. It is not clear, for example, whether reading the Bible at the opening of the school is a religious act, or a means for moral teaching, or partly both. We do no more than point out this confusion all through our school system, both in its law and practice. We may also gather from the exposition already made that there are serious difficulties in the way of securing the Bible a larger place in the school-room than it now has. On the one hand, we have the legal prohibitions in regard to sectarian teaching, and on the other separation between church and State as it is in this land. Then the question as to whether the Bible itself is a sectarian book is raised from time to time. And, in addition, the still deeper question of the right of the State, through its public schools, to teach morality and religion, and of the right of the church alone to teach these things. Are we to face the issue that the schools should be entirely secular, and that all instruction in morality and religion should be given by the churches? Or are we, as hinted already, to divorce morality and religion in the schools, and say to them, "You may teach the former, but not the latter?"

2. *Some Recommendations.*

The committee ventures to submit some recommendations to the section for its consideration and adoption. These are made

mainly with the view of giving this report some practical effect in connection with this vital question.

(1) We recommend that copies of this report be sent to all the State superintendents of education, and also to the heads of the leading colleges and universities of the United States.

(2) We recommend that copies of this report be sent to the more influential religious journals of the country; and that they be asked to make use of it in their columns, as they may deem best.

(3) We also recommend that copies of this report be sent to the supreme judicatories of the various branches of the Alliance in this country, with the request that they give this matter consideration.

(4) We further recommend that this Section consider the propriety of having this subject given a place for discussion on the programme of the next General Council at Liverpool; or, if it be too late to secure this, to have copies of this report sent to the general secretary of the Alliance before this council convenes.

(5) We still further recommend that this Section express its sincere gratification that so much stress is laid upon sound moral training by our school system, and that the Bible is so largely read in the public schools of this country; and it also expresses the earnest hope that this desirable condition may continue through all the days to come.

(6) We, in addition, recommend that this Section express its regret that confusion should have been introduced into the practice regarding the use of the Bible in our public schools, by reason of the inconsistent decisions by the courts and the varying interpretations given by school authorities in different places of practically the same constitutional and statutory provisions, and that the Section advises the officers and people of the churches of the Alliance in this country that they should seek to exert a prudent Christian influence upon public sentiment in their respective localities upon this subject.

(7) We finally recommend that this Section express its judgment that moral instruction and ethical training are necessary

for good citizenship, and should have a place in our public school system, and that this is possible without inculcating any denominational tenets; and further, that this Section expresses its judgment that the Bible is the very best instrument to impart this moral instruction and training, in connection with our public schools.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Louisville, Ky.

VI.

LAY CO-OPERATION IN CHURCH WORK.

THE principle of coöperation is essential to the production of the best and largest results in every sphere of human thought and action, to the realization of the highest ideals in life, and to the enjoyment of the greatest earthly pleasures. Separation is weakness, limitation; combination is strength, extension. It is the law of divinely constituted society, and applies to man in all his social relations. The individual is not the unit of the human race; but the family is. Coöperation is necessary in politics, commerce, letters, war, art, science, religion. The preservation of our lives, liberty and property, for example, does not depend upon one man or department; but upon many men who are associated under the Federal Constitution, and upon the three great departments of State, the legislative, executive and judicial. Commercial prosperity in hamlet, city, commonwealth and nation depends upon coöperative effort. Bacon fancied that he could take an "inventory of all the possessions of the human mind," but the task was too great for any individual, though his immortal sayings are like "jewels, five words long, that on the stretched forefinger of all time, sparkle forever."

If there had not been comparative unity of effort and action in military and naval circles and on the field, the United States would not have so quickly conquered Spain in the recent conflict. The principle is equally applicable in art, science and religion. We do not undervalue the marvellous work of individuals who have started reforms or founded schools, colleges and universities, or organized churches or become martyrs to science, discovery or religion. But if much can be done by individuals, more can be done by joint labor, and it is of the last importance that clergy and laity, pastor and people, work together in the interests of the kingdom of the Lord.

I. It is absolutely necessary to the minister. He cannot do all the work without the help of the church. Mr. Moody once said that it was better to put ten men to work than to do the work of ten men. Such coöperation is solemnly promised on the presentation of the call for a pastor, and when he is installed, the church answers the following questions in the affirmative, to-wit: Do you promise to receive the word of truth from his mouth with meekness and love, and to submit to him in the due exercise of discipline? Do you promise to encourage him in his labors, and to assist his endeavors for your instruction and spiritual edification? The duties of ministers are so varied, numerous and onerous that it is impossible for them to discharge all their obligations acceptably and successfully without the efficient aid of their people. Their profession is voluntarily and intelligently chosen, and they would not exchange its pleasures and responsibilities for any other; but their being and energies are limited, and their divine call does not render them either omniscient or almighty. In addition to domestic and social obligations, they have to perform ministerial and pastoral duties in all their details. They should give themselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word. It is expected, too, that clergymen will acquaint themselves with current literature, contribute articles to newspapers and magazines, attend committee meetings, keep in perfect touch with all the societies in the church and encourage every moral reform, as well as aid in the Sunday-school, prayer-meeting and Home and Foreign Mission work. They are to support educational and eleemosynary institutions, and be faithful in doing the work the Presbytery, Synod and Assembly require of them, in addition to all their obligations as citizens. It is manifest that the coöperation of every layman is necessary, if the several interests of the church are to be conserved and advanced. The sanctified common sense, business sagacity, rich experience, extensive observation and knowledge of human nature, and of the needs of the people, of those who fill the pews, are potent factors in the wisest and best management of the affairs of the visible church.

II. It is absolutely necessary to the laity. When a soul is

born again, it has in germinal form all the beautiful graces that constitute Christian character, just as the boy has every physical and intellectual characteristic of the man. But it needs development, and its harmonious and complete development depends largely upon activity in proper environment. Many of the best latent energies of the church are not used, and much of her culture, intellect, money and strength are either not unreservedly consecrated to God, or turned into other channels. In a recent address in Washington, D. C., an eminent minister said, "Among our resources we must count the latent power in individual Christian lives, which is mightier than the developed and revealed. This is always true of the latent power in numbers and in capacity for work in our churches, and in the latent financial resources of our membership. Let the nominally Christian people of this country go to praying, and then go to living and acting in accordance with their prayers, and instead of assembling to determine how best to defeat the devil, we should soon assemble to welcome the descending Lord back to a world that crucified him, but now made ready to crown him. Pentecostal blessing would liberate all these latent energies."

Active, individual, faithful work by the rank and file of the membership is necessary to their spiritual life and growth. The dead tree does not grow.

III. Lay coöperation in church work is expressive of the divine and eternal unity of the invisible church of Jesus Christ. There is, there can be, but one true church on earth or in heaven; and all who hold the Head, whatever be their name or denomination, are members of that church. Christ has but one bride. Christ is the foundation, the church is the superstructure; Christ is the Vine, the church the branches; Christ is the Head of the body, the church the members. Each part of the building is essential to its perfection; every branch receives its being, beauty and fruitfulness from the vine, and every part of the body, the heart, lungs, limbs, muscles, nerves and bones, is necessary to the whole. One cannot discharge the functions of another, and if all do not perform their duty, the entire body suffers. The principle of division of labor is applicable in the world of the church as in

every other work. "For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office, so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another. Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation; he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness." (Romans xii. 4-8.) The minister cannot discharge the duties of elders, deacons or individual members in a well-organized church without permitting his own distinctive work of preaching and praying and visiting and ruling to suffer. Nor can the member or officer do the official work of the minister. Each has his gifts, graces, duties and sphere of labor. Christ gives "to every man his work." (Mark xiii. 34.) Not to do that work given each of us by his sovereign Lord is to become wicked and slothful servants, and it is to be doomed, unless we repent and reform. It is to deny the Lord that bought our bodies, souls, time, opportunities and persons with his blood, and it is to retard the progress of his church in its divine, redemptive mission. Coöperative effort, therefore, in the different departments of Christian activity is expressive of a real unity in diversity of the church of Christ.

IV. Every consecrated energy of clergy and laymen is imperatively needed at the present time. If we consider the number, strength, experience and organization of the foes of God, man and the church, the truth of this statement will immediately appear. Among them are the saloon, socialism, secularism, Romanism, infidelity, lust, Mormonism, Christian Science, ignorance, indifferentism and covetousness which is idolatry. The continued existence of the church in the presence of such foes is a miracle. But it represents the truth of God, and the truth is never utterly overcome.

"Truth crushed to earth shall rise again,
The eternal years of God are hers;
But error, wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies amidst its worshippers."

It is impossible to estimate the pernicious influence of intemperance. "The great underlying evil, which paralyzes every effort to get good laws, and to secure the enforcement of such as we have, is the system of local politics, which gives the saloon-keepers more power over government than is possessed by all the religious and educational institutions in the city." This organized evil calls for the hearty coöperation of moral and religious people who value the salvation of their sons, the virtue of their daughters and the prosperity of their country.

Socialism does not as yet prevail in the South, but it is described as saying, "Away with private property! Away with all authority! Away with the state! Away with the family! Away with religion!" It would destroy the divine institutions of the family, the church and the state, and enthrone anarchy. It is invited by every disregard for law in our country.

The prevalence of the secular spirit in our churches, cities and commonwealths is appalling; while the aggressiveness of Mormonism in scattering seeds of error and making converts in our territory is deplorable. Moreover there is an organization in our midst that is opposed to civil government, liberty of conscience, freedom of the press, free schools and an open Bible. Of its head, Cardinal Bellarmine says, "If the pope should err by enjoining vices or forbidding virtues, the church would be obliged to believe vices to be good and virtues bad, unless it would sin against conscience." It is sometimes asserted that it is right to do wrong to accomplish a greater good. Romanism is modified in America by Protestant civilization, but its principles are the same everywhere. Time and space do not permit us even to hint at the other dangers to the church that have been pointed out, and give emphasis to them. At this period in the development of America, we need the cordial coöperation of men and women of courage, patience, piety and wisdom; men who can read the signs of the times; men who know and love and live the truth; men who value purity more than place, and men who expect the triumph of righteousness and believe that there are more for us than against us.

V. Hindrances to lay coöperation in church work. There are

many that arise from different causes, but we can at present mention only two.

(1) Negative Christians. There are many professed Christians that stand for nothing; there is nothing deep and positive in their convictions, and they give no clear and strong testimony for Christ in their lives. They have the form of godliness, but not its power. They are parasites on the trees of righteousness. He that is not with Christ is against him. The useless limb is a burden to the body. It is observable that the Judge of all the earth at the last day will not condemn those on his left hand for committing great sins, but for not doing good. "Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not up to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty." (Judges v. 23.)

(2) Faultfinders. It has been said that "the great majority of people seem to be too busy in finding fault to ever have any time left to devote to actual work. They are the people who can get into the way of others; they can hinder every good work, defeat every good effort. They predict failure, and then exert themselves to secure the fulfilment of their own prophecies. It has been said that every congregation is composed of two classes: workers and grumblers. The workers never grumble, and the grumblers never work."

VI. Practical application of these principles. These principles will be applied by different persons in different denominations in different ways, but all the organizations for work should be kept under the supervision and control of the authorities of the denomination of which they are parts. The Epworth League, the Baptist Young People's Society, the Brotherhood of Saint Andrew, the Christian Endeavor Society, and the Young Men's Christian Association afford opportunities for many of the young people especially to labor regularly for the extension of the kingdom. In these societies many are taught and trained to become useful members and officers in our churches. Those who have a mind to work can teach a class in Sunday-school, visit the sick, welcome the stranger to divine services, distribute to the poor, conduct prayer-meetings, encourage the formation of mission and

Sunday-school libraries, circulate religious and denominational literature, confer with persons about their spiritual interests or organize a mission Sunday-school. We are not only workers together, but co-workers with God, and he will reward every one according to his works. Our works follow us. They are immortal.

EDWARD PAYSON DAVIS.

Opelika, Ala.

VII.

THE IDEA OF BEAUTY INHERENT IN THE WESTMINSTER STANDARDS.

A GREAT many have a misconception of the science of the beautiful, with its allied conceptions and emotions. Such consider things beautiful only when they are pleasing to the sense of sight. To them a rose, or a face, or a picture is beautiful only when, through the sense of sight, pleasant emotions are awakened in the heart.

Although the province of this science is not very definitely fixed, and there is still some ambiguity about the meaning of the term *æsthetics*, arising from its etymology and various uses, yet the above conception is regarded as far too limited, and out of harmony with man's actual experiences.

It was Baumgarten, the noted German writer on the science of the beautiful, who argued, that as truth is the end and perfection of pure knowledge, and good the end and perfection of the will, so beauty must be the supreme aim of all sensuous knowledge.

But, as we have already affirmed, it is using the term, we think, in a far too limited sense to confine it to this comparatively narrow class of sensations and perceptions.

To have anything like an intelligent conception of this science, it must be viewed subjectively as well as objectively, and all the leading metaphysical, as well as empirical problems, must be considered.

Since the time of Socrates down to the present, almost every age has had its champion of this science, and it is extremely interesting to note the diversity of opinion among these writers as to what really constitutes the beautiful.

It is not surprising to know that it was among the Greeks, a people so productive of noble *æsthetic* creations, that the first

speculations on the science of the beautiful arose. Plato tells us that the beautiful was made a special department in their teaching.

Socrates was the first of the Greeks who so formulated his speculations as to give to the world a clear and intelligent statement of his theory concerning this interesting science.

From the time of Socrates down to the present, with all the writers in this field of speculation, one great question has been clamoring for an answer, viz.: What really constitutes the beautiful?

Now it is the purpose of this paper, as is suggested by its subject, to show that the various answers made to this question, by the different writers, are all strikingly applicable to the Westminster standards.

I. In the first place, Socrates, if we accept Xenophon's account of his views in the *Memorabilia*, regarded the beautiful as coincident with the good, and both of them resolvable into the useful. With Socrates, then, a thing is beautiful just in proportion as it is useful. According to this theory a thing is beautiful in so far as it serves some rational end, whether it be the security or the gratification of man. Indeed, Socrates is reported as having gone to the extent of saying, that pictures and other purposeless works of art, when used to adorn a house, hindered rather than furthered enjoyment, because of the space they took from useful objects. From this it would seem as if he did not regard the gratification of man's æsthetic nature, through the sense of perception, as being worthy of a place in this science. With him only that which is useful is worthy of being called the beautiful.

Now it is not our purpose to consider the correctness or incorrectness of this theory, but only to mention it so as to show that the Socratinian idea of the beautiful is applicable to our standards.

If a thing is beautiful because it is useful, then certainly the idea of beauty, looked at from this standpoint, is inherent in our standards.

But this suggests another question, viz.: Wherein consists the usefulness of the Westminster Standards? The answer is seen in

the fact that it is the bond of union with the largest Protestant denomination the world has ever seen. There are at least thirty million Protestant Christians in the world who hold to the Calvinistic system of theology and Presbyterian polity as formulated by our Standards.

But some argue that a large number is no decided test of strength or usefulness. To decide this point, however, in this particular case, it will be necessary to ask, What is this large body of Protestant Christians doing to execute the last will and testament of our blessed Lord?

The commission to evangelize the world is the one great work of the church, and the church that is not actively engaged in world-wide evangelization is not worthy of the name. So we ask, What is this Calvinistic body of Protestant Christians doing to carry out this one great purpose of the church?

Statistics, which are worthy of our consideration, show that at least one-fourth of all the mission work that is being done in the world is under the supervision of, and supported by the Calvinistic churches.

If, then, this great body of Christians is doing more to realize the primary purpose of the church than any other Protestant denomination, and the Westminster Standards is the bond of union with these Christians, then certainly their mission is a very useful one.

And, according to Socrates, if a thing be beautiful just in proportion as it is useful, then the idea of beauty is largely inherent in our Standards.

II. In the second place, when we study the science of the beautiful as held by Aristotle, we find that with him a thing is beautiful just in proportion as it is definite or determinate.

He viewed the question of the beautiful from the scientific rather than the metaphysical standpoint. He was the one Greek who set forth the ends of the fine arts as the vehicles to the mind of the ideas and delights of beauty.

Unlike Socrates, he almost drew a fine line of demarcation between the beautiful and the good. Also in the *Politics* he seems to set the beautiful above the useful.

With him the universal element of the beautiful is the definite or determinate.

Now we believe that this Aristotelian idea of the beautiful is clearly applicable to our Standards.

According to this theory, then, any production like our Standards is beautiful when it speaks with no uncertain sound.

You may read after the world's greatest literati, and you will find no more definite or determinate statements, which are worthy of man's consideration, than the statements of our own Standards.

Take, for instance, the answer to the question, What is the chief end of man? "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever."

No question of greater importance can possibly be suggested to the mind of man than this, and all the books which have ever been written upon this subject by the philosophers and sages of all the ages, have not added one jot or tittle to this definite and determinate statement as found in the Westminster Shorter Catechism.

Take again the blow aimed at the monstrous doctrine of polytheism. In all the monotheistic theology of the world you cannot find a more definite or determinate statement than that found in the Westminster Standards, viz., "There is but one God only, the living and the true God." At one blow, in one short, definite and determinate statement, this doctrine is forever settled, so far as Calvinists are concerned.

Abishai, desiring to slay Saul when he was at the mercy of David, said, "Now, therefore, let me smite him, I pray thee, with the spear even to the earth at once, and I will not smite him the second time." As there would have been no need of Abishai giving Saul the second blow, so there has been no need of the Calvinistic world giving the second blow to the monstrous doctrine of polytheism, for long since its carcass has decayed upon the desert sands of time.

Again, we find that one of the most stupendous facts in all the universe is the fact of sin. From the time of Adam down to the present it is a fact that every age, every nation, and every individual has had to face.

And one question, viz., What is sin? has ever called for an answer. But while men have spent much time in speculating upon this question, no more definite answer has ever been made than that made by the fathers of the Westminster Assembly, viz., "Sin is any want of conformity unto or transgression of the law of God."

So we might go on and single out almost every subject treated of in these Standards, and we believe that it would be clearly seen that they are definite or determinate statements.

If, then, Aristotle be right in saying that a thing is beautiful just in proportion as it is definite or determinate, we are certainly justified in claiming that the Aristotelian idea of beauty is inherent in our Standards.

III. In the third place, according to the theory of Baumgarten, the principal element in the beautiful is strict imitation.

After the days of Plotinus, the great Alexandrian mystic, there was little speculation on the science of the beautiful until we come to the modern writers.

And among the modern writers, Baumgarten, the German, was the first who undertook to reduce this science to anything like a complete system of philosophy. With him, as truth was the object of logical knowledge, so beauty was the object of æsthetic knowledge. He did the world a great service in making the distinction between the provinces of logic, ethics and æsthetics. And in his speculations on æsthetics he concluded that as nature was the highest embodiment of beauty, so art must seek as its highest function the strictest possible imitation of nature. Holding to this theory, we see why it was that he made STRICT IMITATION the principal element in the beautiful. With him a picture was beautiful just in proportion as it conformed to that which it was supposed to represent.

Now, we believe that this theory of the beautiful, as held by Baumgarten, is also applicable to our Standards.

Just here the question arises, Of what are the Standards a representation? The purpose for which the Westminster Assembly was convened was to give to the world a picture, or a perfect representation, of the great teachings of God's Word. As this

was the primary purpose of the Westminster Assembly, then the Standards as formulated by that Assembly, according to the theory of Baungarten, are beautiful just in proportion as they give us a perfect picture, or complete representation of that Word.

This we believe has been done to a more perfect degree in the Westminster Standards than in any other system of doctrine yet given to the world. By even a casual study of our Standards, in the light of the proof-texts, it will be seen that every one of the great fundamental features of God's Word are imitated. While it will not be necessary to make specific comparisons to justify this claim, yet we cite you to a few points to "stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance." The Standards teach salvation by grace, and the Bible teaches, "For by grace are ye saved through faith."

They emphasize that salvation is the free gift of God's love and mercy in Christ, and the Bible emphasizes the fact that, "God hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." The Standards teach a FREE salvation, and the Bible teaches that salvation is "the GIFT of God." They teach a present salvation, and the Bible declares that, "He that believeth on Christ hath everlasting life." The Standards teach a complete salvation, and the Bible declares, "Ye are complete in him." They teach an everlasting salvation, and Christ declares, "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish."

The Standards teach that God "embraces the sinner in the arms of unchanging love," and the Bible declares that nothing "shall separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." They teach that God's child is secured by the bonds of an everlasting covenant, and the Bible declares, "The mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed, but the covenant of my peace shall not be removed, saith the Lord."

The Standards teach an "unclouded prospect of final victory for the redeemed," and the Bible tells us of "an inheritance that is incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved

in heaven for you who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." They teach us that God's love was from everlasting, and God himself declares through his Word, "I have loved you with an everlasting love."

So we believe that this imitation would be seen if we would compare with the Bible every truth as set forth by our Standards. Nor do we wonder at this fact when we consider the circumstances under which these Standards were formulated. Every Monday morning the members of the Assembly were required to make anew the following vow, "I do seriously promise and vow, in the presence of Almighty God, that in this Assembly, whereof I am a member, I will maintain nothing in point of doctrine but what I believe to be most agreeable to God's Word." And to the end that they might know what was "most agreeable" to God's Word, much time was spent in prayer. A prayer oft repeated by George Gillespie, the youngest, yet one of the ablest of the members of this Assembly, was, "More light, Lord! More light, Lord!" The remark of Dr. C. A. Briggs concerning that Assembly is perhaps true, "Such a band of preaching and praying ministers as gathered in the Westminster Assembly the world had never seen before." Then, as we all know perhaps once every month, throughout the five and a half years of its sittings, an entire day was given to fasting and prayer. These words then from *The Creed of Presbyterians*, in such a discussion, come to us with peculiar force, "All that training the most complete and thorough, learning the most profound and extensive, intellect the most acute and searching, coöperation the most wide and helpful, labor the most intense and protracted, could do to make our Standards the most perfect mirror of Scripture truth, was done."

If, then, we hold with Baumgarten, that strict imitation is the principal element in the beautiful, we are forced to conclude that the Baumgartian idea of the beautiful is inherent in our Standards.

IV. Passing over Kant, who was perhaps the next to give us an original philosophical treatise on the beautiful, we come, in the fourth place, to consider Schelling's theory. With him, the

principal element in the beautiful was a perfect relationship between subject and object. According to his theory there must be a definite existence of subject and object, yet they do not exist independently of each other. The subject and object may be conceived of as two poles, such as the two poles of the magnet, each having its own definite existence, yet inseparably joined by the magnetic bar. So it has been truly said that "According to Schelling's philosophy of art, the ego must succeed in actually perceiving the concord of subject and object, which is half disguised in perception." According, then, to his speculations, it is through the "creative activity of the artist that absolute beauty reveals itself in a perfect relationship between subject and object." Accepting this theory of the beautiful as advocated by Schelling, we see that it also is applicable to our Standards.

When we look into those Standards, we find that three of the greatest objects considered are God, Law, Eternity, and over against them three of the greatest subjects considered are Man, Duty, Destiny. And upon a careful consideration of these objects and subjects, we find that while they have a definite existence, they are as inseparably joined in Christ as the two poles of the magnet, in the magnetic bar. God the object and man the subject are thus connected, for Christ is very God and very man. Law the object and duty the subject are thus connected, for Christ came to fulfil the law, and at the same time to set man a perfect example of how he should discharge his duty to both God and men. So also eternity the object and destiny the subject are thus connected, for while eternity is wrapt up in the very being of Christ, man's eternal destiny is settled by his relationship to this Christ. We believe the same will be found to be true if we consider other subjects and objects emphasized by our Standards. So, then, according to the science of the beautiful as set forth by Schelling, we see that the idea of beauty is inherent in our Standards.

V. In the fifth place, according to St. Augustine, Hegel and Hutcheson, the principal element in the beautiful is harmony. With them the cause of beauty is not any simple sensation from an object, as color or tone, but a certain harmony among the parts,

or to use Hutcheson's own words, "Uniformity amidst variety." In perfect sympathy with this theory, Hegel defines the beautiful as "Unity of the manifold," or a mutual dependence of parts. And in the expression, "Omnis porro pulchritudinis forma unitas est," St. Augustine taught that unity or harmony is the form of all beauty. We believe that this theory of the beautiful is also applicable to our Standards, for by a careful study we see that there is a perfect unity or harmony of all the parts. For instance, the whole plan of redemption is in perfect harmony with man's need. Our Standards, as a perfect mirror of God's Word, picture man as dead in trespasses and in sins. And being dead, he is unable to help himself, or devise any way of escape. So if man is ever saved it must be through some outside agency. In other words it must be of grace. And salvation by grace is the salvation that is taught by our Standards, so we see that the plan of salvation they offer is in perfect harmony with man's actual condition or need.

We see also a perfect harmony between God's justice and his mercy. Our Standards speak with no uncertain sound in regard to God's justice. They tell us that he is an holy God, and that he cannot look with any degree of complacency upon sin. They teach us that God's very nature demands that sin be punished. But these same Standards tell us that our God is a God of mercy; that he delights in showing mercy unto the children of men. And in order that he might be just, and yet exercise mercy, or in order that there might be perfect harmony between God's justice and his mercy, he sent his only begotten Son into the world that he might take man's place under the law, and assume all the liabilities that come to him as the result of having violated that law.

In doing so Christ was obedient to the law, he suffered under the law, and died under the law. Not only so, but in this obedience, and suffering, and death, he met the penalty and removed the guilt. So in the awful tragedy enacted upon Calvary, God's justice was fully satisfied, and the floodgates of his eternal mercy were opened for man. Like God's Word itself, our Standards emphasize these two great truths, and thus preserve the harmony of these two great attributes of God's nature. So, then, if accord-

ing to this theory, harmony be the principal element in the beautiful, the idea of beauty is inherent in our Standards.

VI. In the sixth place, Lord Shaftesbury tells us that the principal element in the beautiful is spiritual enjoyment. According to his speculations, the principle of beauty is not perceived with an external sense, but with an internal or moral sense. He says that it is this moral perception which affords man his only delight, namely, spiritual enjoyment.

This theory we also believe to be applicable to our Standards. We might ask, What is it that affords spiritual enjoyment? The answer is found in the great fact of spiritual assurance. But another question arises here, namely, What is the ground of our assurance? The answer to this question is found in the great fact of our covenant relationship with God the Father. Our Standards clearly teach the method of grace by covenant. When we consider the covenant of redemption, or the covenant between God the Father and God the Son, we find that the one great condition of the covenant was the perfect satisfaction of Christ for his people. But did Christ fulfil that condition? Did he make a perfect satisfaction for his people? When we go to Calvary, and there see the work that he did in fulfilling the condition of the covenant of redemption; when there upon that consecrated spot, sitting as it were under the very shadow of the cross, we catch the full meaning of the atonement, we see that he did make a perfect satisfaction for his people. That atonement was both Godward and manward in its effect. It was Godward in that it reached up and satisfied divine justice, and it was manward in that it reached down and purged away man's guilt. Then, when we consider the covenant of grace, or the covenant between God and his elect people, we find that the one condition of the covenant is faith in Christ who is the Mediator of the covenant. Then, if I have fulfilled the condition of this covenant; if I have centred my faith in Christ who is the Mediator of this covenant, I may have the blessed assurance of this covenant relationship with God the Father. It is only in such a relationship with God that we can fully appreciate the words of Christ when he said, "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall

any man pluck them out of my hand." And it is only in such a relationship that we can say with Paul, "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day."

Now these are the great fundamental truths of the Westminster Standards. They emphasize as do no other theological teachings man's covenant relationship with God. It is this covenant relationship which is the solid ground of our assurance, and out of this spiritual assurance comes our spiritual joy. If, then, according to Lord Shaftesbury, spiritual enjoyment be the principal element in the beautiful, the idea of beauty is certainly inherent in our Standards.

VII. In the seventh place, we find that Hogarth, Hemsterhuis, and Herbert Spencer, claim that that which affords the largest number of ideas, in the smallest possible compass of space and time, constitutes the principal element in the beautiful. Hogarth, in his *Analysis of Beauty*, names six elements, and the second of these, which is the one perhaps upon which he places the most emphasis, is "variety in as many ways as possible." And Spencer says that the highest possible form of beauty is that which carries into activity the greatest possible number of emotions. These theories seem to be in perfect accord with that of Franz Hemsterhuis, the Dutch writer of the eighteenth century. While he admits that all knowledge comes through the senses, yet he maintains that the only faculty of true knowledge is an internal sense, or the soul. And the soul desiring immediate and complete knowledge, and being limited in its activities by its union with the senses, which are themselves incapable of simultaneous action, strives to gain the greatest number of ideas in the shortest possible compass of space and time. Just in proportion as this effort of the soul is successful will knowledge be attended with enjoyment. From this he argues that as the highest possible measure of delight is given by beauty, so beauty in turn may be defined as that which affords the highest possible number of ideas in the smallest possible compass of space and time. In a peculiar sense do we believe that this idea of beauty is inherent in our Standards. So familiar are we with these Standards, especially

the Catechisms, that it will not be necessary to burden one with concrete illustrations to justify this claim. Yet so strikingly true is this of one answer in our Shorter Catechism we cannot refrain from calling attention to it. We refer to the answer to the question, What is God? "God is a spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable, in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth." This remarkable answer, given in prayer, as an answer to prayer, contains but eighteen words, yet it introduces the reader to twelve distinct ideas, almost as many ideas as there are words, yet stated in a form which, for beauty and elegance and grace, bids defiance to the pen even of a Chaucer. We believe that if one would carefully search through all the literature of the world, one could not find another sentence which affords so large a number of distinct ideas in so few words as is found in this sentence. This is true, we believe, but, perhaps, in a more limited degree, of every statement in our Standards. If, then, these speculators in the science of the beautiful be right in claiming that the principal element in the beautiful is that which affords the largest possible number of ideas in the smallest possible compass of space and time, then we are certainly justified in believing and asserting that this idea of beauty is inherent in our Standards.

VIII. The last two speculators in this field of science we will but briefly mention, as their theories are somewhat akin to theories already discussed.

In the eighth place, Reid seemed to consider the idea of the beautiful from a purely spiritual standpoint. He held that beauty exists in objects independently of our minds. With him a thing is beautiful just in proportion as it is perfect for the end for which it was created. The earth was created as a dwelling place for man, and just in proportion as it is perfect for that end is it beautiful. The Bible was given as a revelation of God's will to man, and just in proportion as it is perfect for that end is it beautiful. So the Westminster Standards were given to the world as a systematic statement of God's Word. And as an evidence of the fact that they are perfect for the end for which they were created, we remind you of the fact that for over two

hundred and fifty years, more than one-fifth of the Protestant Christian world have regarded them as the most perfect statement of Scripture truth the world has ever known.

Being, then, perfect for the end for which they were created, we may justly conclude that Reid's idea of the beautiful is inherent in them.

IX. In the ninth place, Sir William Hamilton, in his lectures on Metaphysics, claims that a thing is beautiful just in proportion as it occupies the imagination and understanding in a free and full activity. This element of the beautiful we believe is also applicable to our Standards. For what subjects will occupy the mind in a freer and fuller activity than the thought of God, his being, his attributes, duty, destiny, heaven, hell, and man's individual responsibility to God as well as to his fellow man? These, and other subjects which might be mentioned, all clearly emphasized in our Standards, call upon man to dig to the lowest possible depths of understanding, and climb to the sublimest possible heights of imagination. So we conclude that Sir William Hamilton's idea of the beautiful is also inherent in our Standards.

In this review, commencing with Socrates, five hundred years before Christ, we have brought you down to the present, by making a brief study of the principal element of the beautiful as held by thirteen of the leading philosophers of the world, and in every case we have seen that what each individual philosopher thought to constitute the principal element in the beautiful is strikingly applicable to our Standards. In the light, then, of this very interesting fact, we may assert with justifiable pride that the idea of beauty is inherent in our Standards to a degree unsurpassed, if indeed equalled, by any other system of doctrine yet given to the world. We are not surprised, then, at hearing John Morley assert that "Calvinism has exalted its subjects to a pitch of heroic moral energy that has never been surpassed." Or Froude when he asserts that "Whatever exists at this moment in England and Scotland of conscientious fear of doing evil is the remnant of the convictions which were branded by the Calvinists into the people's hearts." Or of Wilson, when he declares that "The world has never known a higher type of robust and sturdy

manhood, nor a gentler, purer, or more lovable womanhood than have prevailed among those people who have imbibed the principles of the Calvinistic creed." Says Henry Ward Beecher, "They tell us that Calvinism plies men with hammer and chisel. It does; and the result is monumental marble. Other systems leave men soft and dirty; Calvinism makes them of white marble to endure forever." Says John Richard Green, "It is in Calvinism that the modern world strikes its root, for it was Calvinism that first revealed the worth and dignity of man."

Why could such assertions be made by men, some of whom were not in sympathy with Calvinistic theology? The answer is found in the fact that the elements of true beauty, as held by the world's best thinkers in all ages of her history, are inherent in the Standards of Calvinistic theology.

In the language, then, of Dr. Smith, "With a past rich in glorious achievement, and a present marked by world-wide extension, and triumphing missionary enthusiasm, the future of the Presbyterian Church is radiant with promise. Who can doubt that through historic development, through centuries of special experience, through stern battles with relentless enemies, as well as through the silent sweeter nurture of his love, God has constituted the Presbyterian Church one of his elect agencies in the fulfilment of that gracious purpose which includes not ourselves only, but the whole world."

While the history of the past is glorious, let us not be satisfied with that history; but with hearts thrilled with the consciousness of our matchless heritage, keeping step with the music of heaven's orchestra, and fighting under those Standards which we believe to be the most perfect mirror of Scripture truth, let us go forth as loyal soldiers of the eternal King to conquer the world.

CHAS. P. FOREMAN.

New Albany, Ind.

VIII.

SENTIMENTAL REASONS FOR PRESBY- TERIANISM.

IN this era of universal enlightenment, when no denomination of the Christian Church has the temerity to assert for itself the exclusive right to dispense the ordinances of God, the rationale for membership in one denomination rather than another is shifted from the attenuated argument of visible continuity to scriptural and sentimental reasons.

Waiving the more forceful arguments of Scripture that indisputably substantiate the Presbyterian polity and dogma, the writer would present for the consideration of those who are already Presbyterians a series of sentimental reasons why they should unflinching cling to the church of their fathers.

(1) Presbyterianism was born in the convulsive period of the Reformation. Luther, the destructive hero of the hour, with sledge-hammer blows, burst into a thousand fragments the visible church, and left it, from a world-wide point of view, without organism and without power. Then Calvin, the constructive genius, penetrating, painstaking and with unparalleled power of detail, presented Presbyterianism to the world as the scriptural organism, perfect for doctrine, perfect for polity. The Reformation needed Presbyterianism. Presbyterianism was the Reformation religion that could be ground to pieces but not destroyed. Every convulsive period of the world's history projects into being individuals and institutions that are indispensable to human progress, and they are immortelles in God's garden of the ages.

(2) Presbyterianism from the period of parturition to the present time, has been the martyr church of every land. Born in convulsion, nurtured in martyrdom, the blood of her blue banner bearers has crimsoned every country. The suppressed screams of her Waldensian heroes, still echo and reëcho in the valley of

the Vaudois. The Huguenots, whose history written in blood, via St. Bartholomew and the Revocation of Nantes, were Presbyterian in polity, Calvinistic in dogma, Coligny in character. Bushels of Covenanter blood is the Caledonian response to Presbyterian principles. Every highland loch and lowland lake is tinged with Scotland's gift to "conscience' sake." Hungary and Holland, Palatinate and Portugal, Switzerland and Spain, all have their quota of heroes who have bared their breasts to pontiff and prelate, in defence of Presbyterian principles.

(3) "By their fruits ye shall know them" is the Master's method. See some of the fruits that insist upon her right to live and be loved. She has resisted to the point of victory the tyranny of prelatism. Presbyterianism, not prelacy, is to be the dominant ecclesia of the twentieth century. She has unshackled the slave in every land, and stood for a civil liberty that knew no king save the King of Kings. She has uplifted the illiterate of every land, and stood for a literacy as widespread as humanity. An educated ministry means an educated constituency. She has advocated a world-wide evangelism, and shown her faith by furnishing money and men for every heathen land. She has shown the fitness of her polity and preaching for every kind of man. The practical Japanese, the plodding Chinaman, the philosophic Hindu, the African, Indian and Esquimaux, as well as all the civilized nations of the earth, have found in Presbyterianism a form of church suitable to their environment and temperament. She has produced individuals of overtowering proportions in every field of human endeavor. The names of preëminent Presbyterians are innumerable. Calvin and Kuyper, the theologians; Coligny and William of Orange, strategists and statemen; Guizot and Carlyle, literati; Hampden, Pye and Patrick Henry, patriots; Dawson and Kelvin, scientists; Moss and MacCormick, inventors; Chalmers and Talmage, pulpit orators. And on and on. She has evolved communities of cultured citizens, famous for sobriety, integrity and intelligence. It is almost an adage that the best people are Presbyterians, and the Presbyterians are the best people.

(4) "I know what I believe" is the battle cry of the Presbyte-

rian host, and she has always formulated her faith in clear-cut creedal statements. Her creed makers may have erred, but they have never equivocated. Believing a dogma meant formulating the dogma, however distasteful to the carnal mind. The Presbyterian Church is a creed church. It is an easy matter to find out her faith. Every elder, ruling or teaching, accepts the same system of truth. This unity of belief develops a denomination-alism, not sectarianism, that is homogeneous and harmonious.

(5) The fact of her creed throws the Presbyterian Church on the defensive, and as a matter of history her whole career has been one of attack and defense. The world, which hates Christianity as a religion of supernatural origin and influence, strikes the Presbyterian Church, when it would destroy the book of revelation. Violent attacks on the doctrine of inspiration are covertly made by fighting the faith of the Presbyterians. When the Bible is attacked, it is Presbyterianism to the forefront, or the forces of the faithful falter. When weak-kneed Christianity wavers in its loyalty to God, it is the Presbyterian doctrine of "his sovereignty" that suffers. Presbyterianism is forced from time to time to shatter the shibboleths of the enemies of God who wage war only for the apotheosis of man. The right to live is wrapped up in the fact of living, for only the fittest could have survived the four hundred years of incessant warfare that has harried the Presbyterian host.

(6) The history of Presbyterianism is resplendent with glory. She, with an humble origin, unaided by earthly potentates, has grown gradually from insignificant numbers to the point where her members are more numerous than any sect in the Protestant sisterhood. And her four hundred years of growing have accumulated a history that stirs the pride and fixes the affection of those conversant with her career. Her religious literature, devotional, theological, exegetical, ethical, or philosophical, is unparalled in the realm of thought. Her literati have affected human thought, and levied it within religious lines for centuries. Her scientists and soldiers, sailors and statesmen have been and are "statues of liberty enlightening the world" in every haven of humanity. Her propaganda has "girdled the globe" and filled the earth with

heroes and heroines, who have lived and died in imitation of the Master. Her universities and schools are famed far and wide for accurate and aggressive scholarship. Her ministers, learned and elegant for generations, have impressed their Christian characters upon the multitude, and lifted the world to loftier living.

(7) Presbyterianism is tolerant and wide-visioned. While sect after sect is posing as the repository of divine grace, and arrogating to itself an exclusiveness in its dispensation, Presbyterianism from its inception has stood for the tolerant and now universally accepted view that all sects, however diverse in ritual or dogma, that hold to the essentials of Christianity, are part and parcel of the visible church of Christ. This liberalism has ever made Presbyterianism first in interdenominational work. She finds in every division of the army of God Christian patriots battling for those principles of Christ that are the heritage of all Christianity. Presbyterianism has poured out its money and men for the maintenance of interdenominational Bible societies, tract societies, Sunday-school societies, endeavor societies, missionary societies, and all institutions of whatever name, that have as their function the development of Christianity. Presbyterianism glories in the statement of Moody that eighty per cent. of the money for interdenominational work comes out of Presbyterian pockets. Presbyterianism is as jealous of the good name and success of Methodism or any other ism that stands for a triumphant Christianity as she is for her own.

(8) A strong sentimental reason for Presbyterianism is her international character. Presbyterianism is the only international Protestantism. Episcopalianism is English, Lutheranism is German, but Presbyterianism is international. The Roman Catholic is sometimes said to be the only universal religion, but it can be said, without fear of contradiction, that wherever you hear the rubric of the prelate, you hear the preaching of the presbyter. In the United States there is a striking object lesson of this universality, for here the gospel is preached from Presbyterian pulpits in almost every tongue. In scanning the Minutes of the General Assembly, you see Scotch, Welsh, English, Dutch, Irish, French, Italian, Bohemian, Scandinavian, Alaskan, Ger-

man, Portuguese, Spanish, Slavonic, Chinese, African and Japanese churches in this land of polyglot. In this cosmopolitan church there is strength and beauty. Presbyterianism will in the end "cover the earth as the waters cover the sea."

(9) Her foundation is indestructible. "Every heresy in doctrine or morals works itself first or last into a frenzy against Calvinism" (or Presbyterianism), but as the waves of the mad sea recede from Gibraltar and lose themselves in the bosom of the great deep, so the frenzies of her foes are lost and she lives on. The victor of any contest is laurel crowned, but the victor of this contest, will be crowned with a diadem of jewels from the tiara of the Christ-King.

(10) Her future is glorious. "The crowning day is coming" is the stimulus of heroes in every sphere of action. The truth shall prevail was the inspiration of past Presbyterianism, and however dark the way, forging forward was her work, and, unwearied, her heroes were ever looking for the day of triumph. The triumph is at hand. Presbyterianism battling for the truth is her past record; Presbyterianism battling triumphantly will be her future. Now like an army that has reached vantage ground she exults in anticipation of greater victories. The dream of Calvin is to be fulfilled, a Pan-Presbyterianism, a world-wide organism for Paulinism pure and simple. Popery and Presbyterianism are to wage for the victory. In every land it is to be priest or presbyter. Those who have a vision, know that the victory is to the four and twenty elders.

The obligation of the age for the ages is that every Presbyterian cling to his church with an inexpressible devotion, for it means the speedy girdling of the globe with the gospel of the God-man. Disloyalty or desertion now means delay to the consummation of the long looked-for and long longed-for period of millennial peace.

JOHN W. MOSELEY, JR.

Okolona, Miss.

IX.

PRACTICAL AND HOMILETIC NOTES.

THE UNIVERSITY CONSOLIDATION MOVEMENT.

Two great questions have been before the church during the past quarter for discussion, both of them involving peculiarly the South-western section of our territory. One is the proposal to consolidate two existing institutions of learning, the University at Clarksville, Tenn., and the Seminary at Columbia, S. C., with a movement in Atlanta to make one institution of expected great wealth and commanding influence. The other is the proposed, and very probable, union between the Northern Presbyterian and the Cumberland Churches.

In the university consolidation movement the leading feature of the quarter was the meeting in Atlanta, Ga., of the representatives of the seven Synods immediately interested, in a conference to inquire into the feasibility of the consolidation and to devise methods, should it be deemed feasible, to carry the measure into execution.

The conference met in Atlanta, Ga., January 19th. Representatives were present from the Synods of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee, those from the last named Synod being present, not to take part in the conference, but to show for their Synod the reasons which led their Synod to regard the proposed consolidation impracticable. Rev. W. McF. Alexander, D. D., of the Synod of Louisiana, was elected chairman, and Rev. J. J. Chisolm, D. D., of the Synod of Mississippi, secretary. The representatives of the Synod of Tennessee were invited to sit as visiting brethren, and to participate in the discussion.

Dr. Theron H. Rice, of Georgia, stated that all the deliberations and investigations prosecuted thus far had had as their basis the subscription raised in Atlanta, and proposed that the Conference should first of all hear the facts and figures in regard to this basis of the movement. Thereupon Hon. Hoke Smith and Mr. S. M. Inman, of Atlanta, were heard, setting forth the fact that of the \$260,000 sub-

scribed, \$258,500 is in *bona fide* and binding form, and that of this amount seventy-five per cent. is composed of subscriptions of \$500 or more each, and of these every one is worthy of acceptance by a bank, with the possible exception of one \$500 subscription, and that of the remainder, smaller subscriptions, at least seventy-five per cent. is good, and that other contributions will be made, at least one of \$10,000 being already known.

On Wednesday morning, immediately after the meeting was called to order, the representatives from the Synod of Tennessee were heard. Mr. G. W. Macrae, of Memphis, and Rev. Dr. J. H. Lacy made addresses. Mr. Macrae argued the impracticability of the removal of the Southwestern Presbyterian University, because of the nature of an institution as a growth. He showed that the Southwestern Presbyterian University is already as well manned as one could be at Atlanta. He expressed the belief that the contention in regard to this university would bring about hard feeling, and would have an injurious effect upon the institution.

After some discussion, it was resolved that the conference divide into two sections, one composed of the commissioners representing the Synods controlling the Southwestern Presbyterian University, and the other of those from the Synods controlling Columbia Seminary. The commissioners of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina met at once, Dr. Walden presiding, and held a full discussion, and appointed a committee, consisting of Drs. McKay and Little, to prepare its report and submit it to-morrow morning. It was understood that this report would be favorable to the consolidation scheme. The commissioners of the Synods controlling the University at Clarksville, with Rev. Dr. Patterson, of Alabama, presiding, met at 7:30 P. M., the representatives of Tennessee being present by request. Several hours were spent in discussion, without any conclusion being reached.

At the morning session, on Thursday, a partial report of the Columbia committee of commissioners was made, as follows:

"From the consideration of the papers submitted to the committee and the reports of the secretary and treasurer, it appears:

"1. That the property of the Columbia Seminary is valued at about \$296,707.70, of which \$226,707.70 is an endowment fund; and

"2. That there are no patent legal objections to a removal of this amount to any place where the purposes of the Seminary may be accomplished."

The conference then adjourned, in order to give the Clarksville committee an opportunity to meet and formulate a report. This committee met and continued its discussion, Rev. Dr. Alexander and Mr. D. W. Pipes arguing the impossibility of removing the Southwestern Presbyterian University, as such a removal would be both an immoral and illegal act. Hon. Calvin Wells, of Mississippi, and Rev. A. A. Little, of Alabama, discussed the matter from the practical and legal aspects of the question of removal, and from an examination of the purposes of the donors of funds to the University at Clarksville. Hon. John Miller, of Alabama, was appointed as a committee of one to prepare a report to the conference.

The two committees having reported to the conference, the latter, by a vote of fifteen to three, determined to recommend to the Synods the consolidation of the Columbia Theological Seminary and the Southwestern Presbyterian University in a larger institution at Atlanta, Ga. A committee was appointed to draw up a plan of combination, to be suggested and recommended to the Synods. Its report as finally adopted was as follows:

"The committee of six appointed to suggest a form of report to be made to the six Synods and also to suggest the basis on which the contemplated consolidation should take place, begs leave to report:

"First. We recommend that the Synods controlling the Southwestern Presbyterian University and the Columbia Theological Seminary agree to the plan for the consolidation of the two institutions in a university to be located at or near Atlanta.

"Second. We recommend that each Synod elect at once two directors to meet in the Central Presbyterian Church, Atlanta, Ga., November 23, 1904, for the purpose of perfecting this consolidation and the location of said university.

"Third. We recommend that this board of directors be authorized:

"1. To receive all properties coming to the university in the proposed consolidation; and also all other monies for the support of the same.

"2. To adopt a plan of union and to secure a charter for the new university.

"3. To act as directors until succeeded by such directors as may be provided for by the plan of union, to be elected by the several Synods at their next meeting.

"Fourth. We recommend that this board of directors be author-

ized to release to such persons and under such trusts as may be designated by the present board of directors of the Southwestern Presbyterian University: The \$50,000 received from the city of Clarksville, under certain conditions; the \$35,000 given by Stewart College; the lands, of about five acres, and the buildings thereon transferred by the Stewart College to the Southwestern Presbyterian University by deed dated April 29, 1876, with all their appurtenances—this property thus released to be used for such educational purposes under Presbyterian control as the proper authorities may elect.”

In the discussion of this report, which, as originally presented, made no provision for leaving any part of the endowment fund to Clarksville except the \$50,000 given by the city of Clarksville, Rev. R. L. Walker, of Florida, and Drs. Patterson and Mack, of Alabama and Mississippi, plead for more liberality towards Clarksville.

A minority report, submitted by Drs. Alexander and McKay, and Mr. Pipes, was received, and, on the motion of Dr. T. H. Rice, ordered to be transmitted to the Synods with the majority report of the conference.

A committee was appointed to transmit the reports to the Synods of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina, and the conference then came to a close.

The minority report, signed by Hon. D. W. Pipes, of Clinton, La., by Rev. W. J. McKay, D. D., of South Carolina, and by Rev. W. McF. Alexander, D. D., of New Orleans, La., which states the objections to the removal, and which will go before the Synods with the other, is as follows:

“The undersigned members of the conference appointed to meet in Atlanta, Ga., and consider the feasibility of the consolidation of the Southwestern Presbyterian University and Columbia Theological Seminary, at Atlanta, Ga., present the following report:

“Whereas, after a due consideration of all the facts and documents concerning the removal of the Southwestern Presbyterian University to Atlanta, Ga., we are convinced that said removal is impossible without the violation of a most sacred, binding and legal contract, and the misappropriation of trust funds; therefore, we recommend:

“That the Synods decline to consider the removal of said institution as either advisable or feasible, for the following reasons:

“1. Such removal would violate the contract entered into by the board of directors of the Southwestern Presbyterian University, and

the board of trustees of Stewart College, and the city of Clarksville, in which the board of directors accepted \$186,000 as a pecuniary inducement to locate and maintain the institution at Clarksville.

"2. This conference was notified that any attempt at removal would be resisted to the full extent of the law.

"3. The Synod of Tennessee has already declined to consider such removal on moral and legal grounds.

"4. The needs of Presbyterian education demand the maintaining of the institution with all its endowments in the Mississippi Valley.

"5. The Synod of South Carolina has not only expressed no desire for the proposed consolidation, but has emphatically declined to express an opinion pro or con."

THE PROPOSED UNION OF CHURCHES.

As soon as the indications pointed to an acceptance by the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America of the revision of its Confession, Presbyteries and Synods of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church began to prepare overtures looking to early organic union with the revising body. These overtures were received variously in different quarters. Many in the Presbyterian Church who favored revision feared their effect, in showing the popular judgment upon the revision movement, and intimated that such overtures were not only untimely, but meddling. Others hailed them with delight. The press, as a rule, was quiet, and dealt with the matter very cautiously. Many Cumberland brethren joined vigorously in an effort to stop all such movements for a time, and to an outsider it looked as if the overture making was rather precipitately and hurriedly "squelched."

The adoption by the Los Angeles Assembly of the revision flung the door wide open, and at once steps were taken looking towards an entering in. The Cumberland Assembly, in session at Nashville, appointed a committee on "Presbyterian Fraternity and Union," and the Los Angeles Assembly appointed a general committee to confer with any churches of the Reformed family which might come conferring about union. These committees met twice, and finally, in February, agreed upon a Basis of Union between their churches, and unanimously agreed to recommend it to their Assemblies.

This report, after a proper preamble, presents the matter in a threefold form, of, first, a Plan of Reunion and Union of the two

churches; second, Concurrent Declarations to be Adopted by the Respective General Assemblies meeting in 1904; third, Recommendations.

The Plan, after reciting that a union will be to the glory of God, the good of mankind, and the strengthening of testimony at home and abroad, and that the manifest providential developments, present conditions, etc., justify reunion, offers the following:

"The union shall be effected on the doctrinal basis of the Confession of Faith in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, as revised in 1903, and of its other doctrinal and ecclesiastical standards.

"Each of the Assemblies shall submit the foregoing basis of union to its Presbyteries, which will be required to meet on or before April 30, 1905, to express their approval or disapproval of the same by a categorical answer to this question:

"Do you approve of the reunion and union of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America and the Cumberland Presbyterian Church on the following basis:

"The union shall be effected on the doctrinal basis of the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, as revised in 1903, and of its other doctrinal and ecclesiastical standards and the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments shall be acknowledged as the inspired Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

"Each Presbytery shall before the 10th day of May, 1905, forward to the Stated Clerk of the Assembly with which it is connected a statement of its vote on the said basis of union."

The concurrent declaration, around which, doubtless, the main discussion will turn, and which is recommended to the Assemblies, is as follows:

"The two Assemblies agree to adopt the following concurrent declaration as, in their judgment, proper and equitable arrangements and agreements:

"In adopting the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, as revised in 1903, as a basis of union, it is mutually recognized that such agreement now exists between the systems of doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith of the two churches as warrant this union—a union honoring alike to both.

"Mutual acknowledgment also is made of the teaching and de-

fense of essential evangelical doctrine held in common by these churches, and of the divine favor and blessing that have made this common faith and service effectual.

"It is also recognized that liberty of belief exists by virtue of the provisions of the Declaratory Statement, which is part of the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and which states that 'the ordination vow of ministers, ruling elders and deacons, as set forth in the Form of Government, requires the reception and adoption of the Confession of Faith, only as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures.' This liberty is specifically secured by the Declaratory Statement, as to Chapter III. and Chapter X., Section 3, of the Confession of Faith. It is recognized also that the doctrinal deliverance contained in the Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith, adopted in 1902 by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 'for a better understanding of our doctrinal beliefs,' reveals a doctrinal agreement favorable to reunion.

"The official records of the two churches during the period of separation shall be preserved, and held as making up the history of the one church.

"As soon as practicable after the union shall have been effected, the General Assembly shall reconstruct and consolidate the several permanent committees and boards, which now belong to the two Assemblies, so as to represent, with impartiality, the views and wishes of the two bodies constituting the reunited church.

"All the ministers and churches included in the two denominations shall be admitted to the same standing in the united church which they may have held in their respective connections up to the consummation of the reunion.

"The boundaries of the several Presbyteries and Synods shall be adjusted by the General Assembly of the United Church.

"The institutions of learning, together with endowments and other property, real and personal, owned by them, which are now under the control of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, shall remain in charge of and be controlled by the boards of trustees or other managers, respectively, now in charge of such institutions, endowment and property, or by their successors similarly appointed or elected; and no greater control of such institutions, their property or affairs shall be exercised by the General Assembly or other ecclesiastical court or body of the reunited church than is now exercised

by the General Assembly or ecclesiastical court or body of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.

“Provided, that the governing board of any of said institutions of learning shall be at liberty to enter into such special arrangement or agreement with the ecclesiastical body controlling it, as may enable said institution to preserve its integrity and maintain its present policy. And also provided, that nothing in this declaration shall affect the relationship or control of any of the institutions of learning now connected with the General Assembly, or other ecclesiastical court or body, of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.”

“The corporate rights now held by the two General Assemblies and by their boards and committees shall be consolidated and applied for their several objects as defined and permitted by law.

“It should be regarded as the duty of all judicatories, ministers and people to study the things which make for peace, to guard against all needless and offensive references to the causes which have divided us, and to avoid the revival of past issues.”

The recommendations are as follows:

“It is recommended that such a change be made in the form of government of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America as will allow additional or subsequent Presbyteries and Synods to be organized in exceptional cases, wholly or in part, within the territorial bounds of existing Presbyteries or Synods, respectively, for a particular race or nationality, if desired by such race or nationality.

“The foregoing basis of union and concurrent declarations shall be submitted to the respective General Assemblies of 1904, and the above recommendation shall be submitted to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America meeting in 1904.

“This entire plan of union shall be operative when said basis of union, concurrent declarations and recommendation, numbered 1, shall have been adopted in their entirety. and where necessary by presbyterial action.

“That the blessing of the great Head of the church may rest upon the results of our efforts for reunion and union, it is earnestly recommended to the congregations throughout both branches of the church, that they observe Sabbath, September 18, 1904, as a day of fervent and united prayer to Almighty God, that he would grant unto us all

'the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord,' and in the new relation now contemplated, enable us to keep 'the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.'"

We have thus given the general facts of the proposed scheme, that they may be known in connection with the discussion which is likely to follow. Manifestly the debate will be chiefly about the concurrent declarations. To the Southern Church the relation of the entire matter is one of a practical rather than of a theological nature. The effect upon the Southern Church of the sudden conversion of a great multitude of people, entirely out of sympathy with our Calvinism and methods of work, into nominal Presbyterian churches right alongside of us will be practical and far-reaching. It is a problem the forcing of which upon us is greatly deplored in many quarters. The majority of the Cumberland Church is in the territory occupied by the Southern Church, and while the relations between the two peoples have always been pleasant, the affiliations of the Cumberland Church people have always been very much closer with the Methodists in both doctrine and methods.

PROPOSED UNION OF PRESBYTERIANS.¹

THE ATTITUDE OF SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIANS.

Are we Southern Presbyterians ready to consider the question of our entering into the proposed union of the Northern and Cumberland Presbyterian Churches, on the basis of a common acceptance of the Westminster Confession of Faith, as recently revised by the Northern Presbyterian Church?

It is to be noted that to the Southern Church it is not yet a practical question. We are not called to take any official action on it. It is for us to consider only whether our church shall in the future take any action looking to union with a body yet to be formed.

On the other hand, to our Cumberland Presbyterian brethren it is an immediately practical question whether their church shall unite with the Northern Presbyterian Church, on a basis proposed to them, and recommended by their committee of conference. At their approaching General Assembly action must be taken for or against union.

¹ A paper read at a social meeting of the ministers and elders of the Southern and Cumberland Presbyterian Churches in Nashville, Tenn.

The union of all the forces and resources of Christ's kingdom in one great outward organization for the conquest of the world for God not only appeals to the imagination by its splendor, but it also appeals to the highest sentiments and the noblest impulses of the heart. Surely it is "a consummation devoutly to be wished," provided it can be effected with loyalty to truth, and without the sacrifice of conscience and of principle.

But we need something far more firm than mere sentiment as a basis for permanent union and effective service. An outward unity of form does not insure real unity of spirit or coöperation in effort. The great divisions of Christ's church into various denominations have not been an unmixed evil. These divisions have had a reason for their existence. They have arisen from circumstances or conditions which called for separation at the time, if men would be faithful to the Lord. And they have been used of God for good in extending his kingdom.

The evil has been that in many cases the divisions have been perpetuated, often in bitterness, long after the reasons for them have ceased to exist.

It is of the utmost importance that Protestantism present a united front against the powers of darkness, and that its forces be so organized as to work together, and not against each other, in extending the kingdom. To this end, the reunion of Protestantism should begin in the union of those denominations or divisions which are nearest akin in historic and doctrinal position. Thus the various families of Baptists might be more closely allied, and so of the families of Methodists and of Presbyterians.

The matter of the reunion of the various bodies of Presbyterians is in the air, and it is the part of wisdom to consider its desirableness and its possibility. The Northern and Cumberland Presbyterians, through their joint committees, have proposed a plan for the organic union of the two churches, the proposed union to be on the basis of the Westminster Confession of Faith as revised by the Northern Church in 1903.

We are asked, Is the Southern Presbyterian Church ready to come into such a union on the same basis?

If real union is to be accomplished, it must be founded on real unity in fundamental principles and doctrinal beliefs. Of course, we recognize that there should be liberty in non-essentials, and that differences which do not invalidate a system should not keep us

apart. But our church has ever stood for clearness in doctrinal belief and statement, because we think that the great doctrines of the Bible are essential to the formation of Christian character and the exercise of Christian living. In a word, we believe that the Bible ideal is true doctrine translated into good life.

In considering the question of union it is well to bring to mind the origin and historic position of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church and the Southern Presbyterian Church, to see whether there are insuperable barriers to union and to see what facts favor union with each other and with the Northern Presbyterian Church. And I am free to say that I shall rejoice if the barriers are small and the reasons for union are large. And in this discussion I may be pardoned some personal references, inasmuch as my relations to the origin of the two churches are closer than those of many of my brethren. One of my ancestors was one of the founders of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and I am the only Southern minister or elder here who was a member of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States and of the Nashville Presbytery when the latter joined in the organization of the Southern Presbyterian Church in 1861. Samuel McAdoo (or McAdow), in whose house the Cumberland Presbyterian Church was organized, was an uncle of my grandfather and grandmother.

Samuel McAdoo was a Presbyterian minister of learning and piety. He was a man of sincerity and candor, who would sacrifice any earthly advantage for his conscientious convictions. In the great revival of 1800-'10 he was active. The Cumberland Presbytery, to which he belonged, to meet the demand for ministers to carry forward that great work, ordained several men who did not come up to the educational standard of the Presbyterian Church, and the Synod of Kentucky, at the instance of the anti-revival leaders, called in question and finally condemned this action. Again, in the preaching of the revivalists there was larger emphasis laid on the freeness of the gospel, upon man's free will and responsibility in the work of salvation, and they were charged with a denial of the doctrine of God's sovereignty and decrees, and so they were arraigned for heresy in doctrine. Thus the two grounds on which the Presbytery was condemned were that they had violated the standards of the Presbyterian Church in order and in doctrine.

The controversy grew bitter, and, of course, there were faults of temper and of action on both sides. But now we can see that a spirit

of concession and of gentleness and patience would have prevented a split. There was probably an orthodoxy that was too stiff and formal on the one side, and a zeal and enthusiasm on the other which savored of radicalism.

But the new movement stood for the evangelizing of the masses. It was a sincere attempt to meet extraordinary conditions. They saw the great need of more ministers, and felt that they could not wait for the slow process of a learned training. So they did what seemed best—used the best material they could lay their hands on. They were only doing on a larger scale what our Presbyteries are now doing in a smaller way, that is, ordaining men, in extraordinary cases, who have not received academic training. It is unfair to say that they advocated an uneducated ministry. They took their action only to meet an exigency, and it was an emergency which lasted for many years in a new country. The record of the church in education is an answer to the charge of favoring an ignorant ministry, though doubtless there may be found in the church fanatics who decry education.

Then as to the charge of heresy in doctrine. At the beginning there was no absolute break with the Confession of Faith. In an old edition of Buck's *Theological Dictionary*, which was in my grandfather's library, I have read a paper which was adopted as the basis of the church's creed. In it they say that they object to the doctrine of fatalism, which seems to be taught in the mysterious doctrine of predestination; but that if any minister can adopt the Confession of Faith, without making that exception, it shall be no bar to his entrance into their ministry.

The great revival movement brought out more fully and clearly man's responsibility and his freedom. It emphasized more the fullness and freeness of God's grace—while, no doubt, many carried their preaching to a denial of God's sovereignty in salvation.

The old manner of preaching, illustrated by Jonathan Edwards, laid chief stress on man's helplessness and his absolute dependence on sovereign grace. It was the kind of preaching needed in that time and in those conditions. Edwards' sermon, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," could hardly be tolerated now. Yet it was a mighty instrument of revival then. I remember that a pioneer preacher of Texas once said to me, that in the early days of the State the only way to reach men's consciences was to preach "hell-fire" to them.

In the beginning of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church an

uneducated ministry was only a method of meeting extraordinary conditions, and the doctrinal divergence from the Confession of Faith was really very slight. It was more a different emphasis on certain doctrines.

McAdoo was educated according to the Presbyterian standard, and I have heard from the older ones of our family that he accepted the Confession. He and his companions hesitated about organizing the new church. But when Ewing and King visited him, to discuss the matter, he spent the whole night in prayer, and when the morning came he was satisfied, and at once the Presbytery was organized. In the following twenty-five years the growth of the new church was remarkable, and the blessing of God on its labors seemed to justify the action of its founders.

The Southern Presbyterian Church was organized in 1861, as a consequence of the war between the States, which had just begun. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church met in Philadelphia, and over the protest of some of its ablest members, both Northern and Southern, it passed a series of resolutions defining the duty of all its members in the pending conflict, asserting that their allegiance was due to the Federal Government rather than to the State Government, and denouncing all who upheld the State against the Union as rebels and traitors, to be disciplined by the church. The Southern Presbyteries held that this action was political and beyond the sphere of the church, and that the conditions and institutions of the South could only be ministered to by a separate organization. The church then organized was a protest against the political deliverances of the Assembly, and was also justified by geographical position.

The action of the Northern Assembly was for several years after the war in the line of its original deliverance, and effectually prevented fraternal relations. And when finally it withdrew or disavowed its utterances impugning our Christian character, the message of its Moderator, Rev. Dr. Herrick Johnson, so modified or cast doubt on its action that it was several years before there was any cordial fraternity. That "Herrick Johnson rider" practically insisted that we Southerners are rebels and traitors, though we are not schismatics and blasphemers. Still it is only fair to say that our Northern brethren claim that their reunited church should not be held responsible for the deliverances of the old school or the new school branches, made before reunion, unless those deliverances have been specifically

reaffirmed. Since the war the question of the ecclesiastical relations of the negroes has been differently treated by the Northern and Southern Churches. But the plan of union adopted at St. Louis seems to concede the Southern view.

Also the Southern Church has very strenuously opposed the preaching or bearing rule by women in the church, as being contrary to the divine order. On this subject we have been somewhat dubious as to the position of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. But we believe their experience has satisfied them, and they "won't do it again."

The time has come in the providence of God for a calm, fair, candid discussion of union. The tendencies of Christians are to closer fellowship, and the forces of opposition to Christianity are driving its defenders together.

The state of the case seems to be this: The old Westminster Confession of Faith has been revised by the Northern Church, not so as to eliminate its Calvinism, but to explain its statements, where there are two interpretations. That Confession, the grandest of the Reformed creeds, was prepared in times of fierce doctrinal controversy, and is in a sense a controversial document, framed to meet errors of doctrine. So all the great historic creeds sprang out of controversy. And their statements are to be interpreted in the light of history, and in view of the errors they combat. On some of the statements of the Confession there has been difference of interpretation, some saying that they teach one thing; some say they do not so teach. As an instance, the Cumberland Presbyterian says the clause about "elect infants" teaches that some infants dying in infancy are lost. The Presbyterian says that the clause does not teach such a doctrine. The purpose of the revision is to clear up doubtful statements, and to give fuller and clearer expression to certain truths inadequately stated. Now the Cumberland Presbyterian said, "We understand the creed to mean so and so." The old church says, "No, this is the true interpretation." Then says the other, "If that is the meaning we accept it. If that is authoritative Calvinism, we are Calvinists." The Southern Church then says, "In the revision, we find no departure from Calvinism, nor surrender of distinctive doctrine." The old church replies, "No, we give up no doctrine, we only make our meaning plain." If this is the actual state of the matter, then it seems to me the way to union is plain. In the year 1863 a conference of the Old School and New School branches of the Presbyterian Church

in the South made a declaratory statement, showing their doctrinal agreement, and in 1864 they united on the basis of the Confession of Faith. So if a conference of the churches shows that they agree on the Confession as revised, it seems to me they ought to unite.

And surely the times demand that all the forces of the Reformed churches holding the Calvinistic system should be joined, as the mightiest conservative agency of Christian thought and life.

A crisis is near which threatens the very existence of Protestantism. The social, political, economic, religious unrest demands for its settlement the proclamation of the great fundamental spiritual realities which the Bible reveals. Superstition with its formalities, rationalism with its doubts and criticism, secularism with its materialistic commercialism—these are the foes which are assailing the Protestant world, and to meet the crisis we need not only a union of forces, but also a virile doctrine to be preached.

The namby-pamby æstheticism that takes the place of the gospel; the “culture” which seeks to supplant Christ the Saviour; the unmanly softness that passes for religion; the many organizations that are sapping the distinctive church life—all these things are largely responsible for the weak Christian character, the grievous falls of elders, deacons, Sunday-school officers, the sad dishonesties of church members. Preaching too often is an appeal to the weaker elements of our nature, instead of a trumpet-call to duty. We need doctrines that take hold of the depths of the soul; that touch men’s consciences with fingers of fire; that bring men and women face to face with God and eternity. Doctrines like these—strong statements of truth—form strong characters, put iron into the blood and stiffness into the spine. There is nothing like the old Calvinism to make the profoundest truths realities in human experience—realities for which men and women die. It was this Calvinism that made Scotland and Holland lands of martyrs and homes of civil and religious liberty, and it is this Calvinism that is the glorious heritage of the Presbyterian Churches of this land. Would God our children knew its magnificent history!

The sovereignty of God needs to be again emphasized. The freedom of man has been asserted almost to the point of making him a law unto himself. The church should proclaim that the only true freedom is to be the servant of God in carrying forward his eternal purposes, and that what he requires of us is obedience, whether we can understand or not. The highest faith submits to God’s will with-

out curious questioning as to his reasons. And this need for the proclamation of God's rights in his own universe is coming to be recognized by candid minds who do not accept our doctrine of predestination. A recent writer in the *London Quarterly*, a magazine representing the higher Arminianism, declares that the world is losing sight of the fact that God is an absolute sovereign, who rules in righteousness and love, and he insists that the old conception of God needs to be restored to its proper place in men's thoughts and lives. The Calvinistic system of theology makes God and his rights the foundation rather than man and his needs.

Now, if union is to be properly effected, there are certain preliminary requirements in the discussion of the question.

1. There must be absolute candor and sincerity. Each party must give the other credit for conscientious faithfulness to the truth, as God gives us to see the truth. There must be no evasions in stating our views. There must be no slurring over of differences, no gush of sentiment which shall discount strong, clear statements of doctrine. And so there must be no magnifying of differences which do not involve essential truth. We all ought to come to the discussion with a sincere desire to find essential agreement if it be possible.

2. We must take time for the discussion. It will require patience and brotherly love to discover the best method of union. We are not to rush into it impulsively, trusting the future to correct mistakes. Neither are we to give up the effort as soon as we find obstacles in the way. With prayerful diligence we can solve the difficulties if the union ought to be accomplished. There are many details of order and administration to be settled, as well as statements of doctrine. We shall need the wisdom that can wait as well as act.

3. There must be no spirit of boasting one over the other, claiming that there has been a surrender by either side. Neither party must claim that the other has yielded essential points. We must understand that, in uniting, we both are true to our convictions of truth; and that we find those convictions in essential agreement. In a word, that our outward union is founded on a real unity of doctrine and sentiment.

4. It will require, for a cordial union, that all parties to it withdraw and disavow all the bitter expressions and denunciations of former times. All expressions impugning Christian motive or character were uttered in the heat of controversy, or in days of excitement, and were really spoken in a misunderstanding of each other, and should be heartily withdrawn.

Of course, these expressions stand on record as parts of history. They show what was thought in the past to be true. But we are not to be bound by anything that we now know was not true. As Christian brethren we are to join in this union, confident in each other's character, and unwilling to dishonor our past by preserving its mistakes and prejudices; while, at the same time, we honor the fidelity of the fathers to truth as they saw it.

J. H. McNEILLY.

Nashville, Tenn.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

"There is no power but of God, the powers that be are ordained of God."—ROMANS xiii. 1.

IT is the glory of the religion of the Bible that it touches human life at every point, and wherever it touches, its effect is to purify, elevate and ennoble. It touches the individual life of man, making every man who receives it and lives it a better man. It touches the domestic and social life, expounding the right relations between husband and wife, parents and children, man and woman, friend and friend, by the observance of which, and in no other way, the home may be made happy and society kept pure. It touches the commercial life, laying down those principles of integrity, honesty and regard for the rights of others, without which commerce ceases to be peaceful industry and becomes a brutal struggle for supremacy or for bare existence. It touches the civil life, laying down those basal truths on which civil government is founded, and defining the mutual relations and duties of the governing and the governed.

Many seem to think religion has nothing to do with our civil life or with politics, for politics in its true sense is the science of civil government and the conduct of state affairs. We are reminded that our Federal and State constitutions expressly prohibit the union of church and state; and, therefore, any mingling of religion and politics is stoutly resisted in some quarters as a crime against our liberties, and the cry is often raised, "Don't mix religion and politics; you cannot do it if you would, and you must not do it if you could;" and so it has come about that there is practically no religion in the politics of our time and country.

But an important distinction is needed here. We rejoice in the separation of state and church. History proves that the union is an

impractical and often a very hurtful one. But there is a difference between the church and religion. The church stands for and ministers to religion, but it is not religion. The church also stands for a powerful organization, whose purpose is primarily spiritual and not temporal. This ecclesiastical organization has no place in politics; the latter is not in its sphere. Ecclesiasticism and politics should ever be kept separate.

But if we separate politics from those great principles of Bible morality and religion which should govern all departments of human life and activity, we rob politics of the only salt that can keep it from utter corruption and death. And already this has been done to such an extent in some sections that many of our best men morally and religiously will not touch politics for fear of being defiled, and many who enter politics leave their religion behind, while the immoral and irreligious have come to regard politics as their peculiar field. In this way a bad state has become worse, so that a distinguished United States Senator of wide experience and observation could say, some years ago, that "the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount have no place in practical politics, and honesty in modern politics is an iridescent dream." Especially is this true of municipal government in America, for American cities of the larger class are said to be the worst governed in Christendom.

Now the Bible conception of civil government would change all this; it would lift politics out of the mire, purify it with the salt of morality and religion and make it what it ought to be, the administration of public affairs by our best men in the interest of the prosperity and safety of the state. Let us get that conception.

The basic truth in the Bible conception of civil government is this: Civil government is an ordinance of God. According to the Bible, God has ordained two great institutions for the wellbeing of the human race, viz., the church and the state. We always think of the church as of divine origin, a Christian institution, and of its ministers as of divine call and appointment. But the state is also of divine origin, a divine institution. It stands side by side with the church, of distinct sphere and purpose, but both equally divine as to origin and authority.

All authority and power have their source in God. One of our presidents has given us the phrase, "Government of the people, by the people and for the people," and a grand sentiment it is; may it be fully realized in this beloved republic of ours! But we quote it

so often, and emphasize it so strongly, that many have come to think the people are the beginning and end of civil government, the final source of all authority and power. This is a great mistake.

We should not forget that back of the people and above the people God over all is the final source of all power. No man, and no body of men, can rightly possess or exercise authority over their fellow-men except as God delegates this authority to them. "There is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God." When the Saviour of men stood before the judgment seat of Pilate, the Roman governor, the latter represented Tiberius Cæsar on the imperial throne of Rome, back of whom were the invincible Roman armies and the limitless resources of a worldwide empire; but when he said to the divine prisoner before him, "Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee?" the reply was, "Thou couldst have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above." We have the history of only one nation written by the inspiration of God, viz., that of ancient Israel. In this history God is represented as giving the people their civil rulers, as well as their ministers of religion. He called to his high office Moses the lawgiver and statesman as truly as he did Aaron, the priest. He gave them Joshua, the military chieftain, Gideon, the judge, and David, the king, as truly as he gave them Eleazar and Zadok, the priests, or Elijah, the prophet, and he gives every nation its civil magistracy. By him "kings reign and princes decree justice."

The state is, therefore, an institution of God as truly as is the church. He instituted it for his own wise and beneficent purposes. It is as truly essential to human well-being as is the church under present conditions. When men are left without civil government, "every man doing that which is right in his own eyes," anarchy is the result. So true is this that the poorest government on earth is better than no government at all would be.

From this fundamental truth that civil government is ordained of God, certain other truths follow as corollaries. Let us notice some of these.

1. God's law for the state is the law of righteousness. God himself is righteous, and every ordinance of his is for righteousness, and is under the law of righteousness. Civil government is designed of God for his glory and human good. It is designed to protect and encourage the good and to be a terror to the evil. Mr. Gladstone said that it should be the aim of government "to make it as easy as possible for a

man to do the good, and as difficult as possible for him to do the evil," and this agrees with the Bible when it says, "Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil."

Now, for civil government to pursue an unrighteous end, to use unrighteous methods, to become oppressive and hurtful, instead of helpful to the governed, to discourage the good and encourage the evil, this is a perversion of the very end of its being, and every such government must fall and come to an end. God has no use for it, and he will set it aside. A striking illustration of this truth is seen in the history of ancient Israel. Whenever a king and his administration "did that which was right in the sight of the Lord," they grew and prospered; when they "did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord," they grew weak and failed, and when the evil course was persisted in, they perished, and when the nation failed to secure and maintain a righteous government it perished also.

The history of all nations confirms this truth. The world empires of Egypt, Assyria, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome fell, crushed by the weight of official and private unrighteousness, set aside of God as useless. A few centuries ago Spain was the foremost nation of Christendom; it was almost true of her as of England to-day, that the sun never set on her possessions. But Spain forgot God's law, and became unrighteous; she oppressed God's chosen people; she harbored the horrible inquisition; she treated the weaker peoples of the old and the new worlds with unspeakable cruelty and injustice, and for years Spain has been a dying nation. Frenchmen are among the brightest and bravest of people; but France forgot God's laws of righteousness, her king perpetrated the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day; she slew thousands of her best citizens in cold blood; she banished by cruel edicts many thousands more; she oppressed and despised the common people, till finally these in desperation arose and hurled the government from its seat and went to the opposite extreme of anarchy; they sought to abolish God and eradicate religion; they enthroned a young woman—an opera singer—as the Goddess of Reason and worshipped her. Meantime, lawlessness was triumphant and the streets of the cities of France ran with blood, and had not France quickly come back to righteousness and to God she would have perished from off the map of the world. The Bible is true when it says, "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." The strong points of a government are its righteous points; the weak points of a government are its unrighteous points.

The same thing is true of a city or any civil community. Yet some think that Sabbath desecration, race track and other forms of gambling, low dives and other abodes of vice are good for a city. It is said these things bring to a city people and business and money, and help to make it great, and so the cry goes up for a "wide-open" town. How can these things be good for a city, when by universal acknowledgment they are bad for the individual? They constantly sink individual men and women in shame, crime and death. How can that be good for a city which is death to the individuals who compose the city? Good people do not believe in the "wide-open" theory. They do not believe in the "wide-open" man or woman, receiving into heart and life the vices of humanity; they do not believe in the "wide-open" home, where sin is welcomed and free-loveism and divorce abound; they do not believe in a "wide-open" church, where open wickedness is condoned and purity and character count for naught; nor do they believe in a "wide-open" town, where acknowledged vices are invited, encouraged and protected. These are sources of weakness, not of strength. "Wide-open" in this sense is but another name for Christ's "Broad way that leadeth to destruction." Not in a year, perhaps, nor in a decade, nor even in a century, but in the end these things lead a city or a nation to destruction, for "the eternal ages are God's." All civil government is ordained of God; it must obey his law of righteousness or perish.

2. Whoever renders service to the state renders service to God, for the state is God's institution; and it claims the service of all good men. In our republic every man ought to cast his ballot in every election as conscientiously as he prays; it is a Christian duty. A desire to hold office in the state is not blameworthy as some suppose, but praiseworthy, provided the motive be right. The inspired apostle, speaking of office in the church, says, "If a man desires the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work." It is also true that if a man desires office in God's other institution, the state, he desireth a good work. But we despise a man if he seek office in the church of God simply through personal ambition or for "the loaves and fishes." Such a man cannot render the church the highest service, for he is not serving the church, but himself. Neither can a man render the state the best service who seeks and enters its offices simply from motives of personal ambition or of selfish gain. All honor to the public official whose dominant motive in holding office is to serve God and the state, and not himself!

3. Officers of the civil government are ministers of God.

We are familiar with the thought that officers of the church are ministers of God, and we call them by this name. The Bible calls officers of the state by the same sacred name. The Apostle says of the civil officer, "He is the minister of God to thee for good," and again, "He is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." And again, of civil officers, "They are God's ministers attending continually upon this very thing," *i. e.*, managing the business of the state. There is a sense, therefore, in which officers of the state are as truly ministers of God as are officers of the church, called of God to represent him in the exercise of power in government.

Now, we demand that church officers be men of pure, honest, righteous character. We should make a similar demand of officers of the state, from the highest to the lowest of those who exercise any authority in the making or execution of our laws. This is not an unreasonable nor impossible demand. Many offices in the judicial, legislative and executive branches of our government are filled by men of this character. One of the best chiefs of police in the South is a man of stainless character, who represented the church to which he belongs in its highest court, and his predecessor was a Christian gentleman of the same type. One of the bravest patrolmen that ever served on the police force of any city, and who lost his life in the fearless discharge of his duty, in one of our large Southern cities, was an honored officer in his church, and a teacher in his Sunday-school. All honor to such men and to those who appoint or elect them to office.

But what are we to think when men of openly profane and wicked life are chosen or appointed to responsible offices in the state? A violator of the laws chosen to enforce the law? A blasphemer of God's holy name chosen to be a minister of God? What a travesty! The ballot-box has been called our American "Ark of the Covenant." It is the sacred palladium of our liberties, civil and religious. The men who bear it and guard it should be clean, honest, righteous men, as it is written, "Be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord." What are we to think when notoriously wicked and even criminal men are appointed to bear this sacred vessel, the priceless gift of God to our nation? When God's ideal of the state is so perverted and trampled under foot, is it surprising that lawlessness and crime run riot? Is it not surprising that the government stands at all?

But let us not despair. There was a time in the history of the church when those filling many of its offices, even the highest, were men of notoriously corrupt life, and the church tolerated it, in a blind, helpless sort of a way, even as we now sometimes tolerate such men in state offices. But nearly four hundred years ago the death knell of this condition of things in the church was sounded; and now, in our country at least, no man of profane and unholy life is tolerated in the ministry of the church. May we not hope for a reformation and a revolution in public opinion that will demand that those who seek to be ministers of God in the offices of the state shall also be in character worthy of him whom they represent?

4. To righteous officers of the state we should render obedience, tribute, honor. Says the Bible, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers." To violate or resist or disobey the laws of right civil government is to resist the ordinance of God. This is the teaching of Christianity. No man can be a good Christian, and at the same time be a bad citizen. But if the powers that be become disloyal to God, forsake him, misrepresent him and require of us a wrong thing, then we must resist them and obey God. When the king of Babylon commanded the Hebrew youths to worship the image he had set up, they refused, and they were right. When the king of Persia ordered Daniel not to pray to the God of his fathers, Daniel was right to disobey him. When the authorities commanded the apostles not to preach in the name of Jesus, they replied it was right to obey God rather than man, and they continued to preach. But when ruling justly, righteously and in the fear of God, we must obey the powers that be, even as we obey God, whose ministers they are.

We must also pay tribute, as says the Bible again, "Render tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom." These are taxes on land and goods, and taxes are for the maintenance of the divine institution of civil government, and for the support of God's ministers, its officers. We should pay them fully, honestly, cheerfully. No Christian will evade paying his just dues.

Once more, we must honor our righteous ruler. "Honor to whom honor," says the Bible again. As a nation, we fall short at this point. Ours is an age of irreverence for things secular and divine. How severely our rulers are arraigned! How contemptuously they are spoken of! The modern cartoon, doubtless, has its legitimate uses. It is a kind of pictorial satire, and Elijah used satire; not, however, against the servants of God and their country, but against

the enemies of God and of the country, the idolatrous priests of Baal. But no public official of to-day, however righteous, can escape the hideous cartoon if he be of the opposite political party. This is a great abuse of the cartoon and is hurtful. The cartoonists are thought by many to have been in part responsible for the assassination of our late President, Mr. McKinley, a noble, Christian gentleman and a righteous ruler. He was unmercifully lampooned and cartooned by certain newspapers as a pusillanimous nobody, under the leading strings of a United States Senator, who was his master and boss. This is the stuff that anarchists feed on. What wonder that one of these madmen, inflamed and inspired by these false caricatures, should think he was doing the country a good service in ridding it of so worthless and contemptible a ruler! God's word to his ancient people and to us is this, "Thou shalt not revile the judges nor curse the ruler of thy people." And an inspired writer, describing the deeply wicked of his day, said, "They despise dominion and speak evil of dignities." If our public officers are not worthy of our honor, let us, without passion, but resolutely, replace them with others that are. This is not only our privilege, but our duty under our form of government. But let us remember that no man is perfect; all have their faults, and when we have rulers that are upright in character and life, and are making an honest effort to administer the affairs of state according to God's law of righteousness, let us uphold them, support them, obey them, honor them, and, above all, pray for them. With such rulers and such citizens, peace, purity and prosperity will abound throughout our borders and we will be "that happy people whose God is the Lord."

A. B. CURRY.

Memphis, Tenn.

X.

CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

BEATTIE'S "APOLOGETICS."

APOLOGETICS; OR, THE RATIONAL VINDICATION OF CHRISTIANITY. *By Francis R. Beattie, B. D., Ph. D., D. D., LL. D.* In three volumes. Volume I.: FUNDAMENTAL APOLOGETICS. Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication. Cloth, 8vo, pp. 605. \$2.50 net.

Ever since Paul confounded the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, there has been call for the rational vindication of the gospel, for the defence of which [εἰς ἀπολογίαν] he declared he was set. Nor has this call ever failed of response through all the succeeding centuries; at some epochs of its history the Christian church has been particularly blessed in its defensive literature. This has been markedly true of the nineteenth century; but while the period has been prolific, the product has been inadequate. Many minds have been concerned with the subject, and many valuable works have been published dealing with limited sections of the territory, but the field as a whole has been long waiting for some one to give it a comprehensive survey and present it in its entirety.

Some idea of this inadequacy, its character and its reasons, may be gathered from Dr. Warfield's thoughtful *Introduction* to the volume before us; in which it is made plain that only lately, if at last, has Apologetics come into its own, having heretofore received niggard recognition at the hands of those whose special province it is to apportion the field among the theological disciplines, giving to each its portion in due season.

Readers who have kept even moderately abreast with modern tendencies in religious thought and literature will recognize a very real and a very urgent need for Apologetics; not in the line of mere mental gymnastics, nor in the interests simply of a symmetrical comprehension, nor yet for sake of forensic drill or theological parade, but of absolute necessity and in grim war. Is it not somewhat clearly evident that the time is not far distant when Christianity must recognize that it is on the defensive for the fundamentals of its very life, and that the old battle with Deism is to be joined afresh and fought to the finish? Let the doubtful reader meditate upon the fact of the election of a prominent Unitarian minister, with wide and loud applause, to the position of chaplain of the United States Senate, one of whose first acts is to have the sessions of this highest *representative* body of an ostensibly Christian nation opened with prayer by a Jewish rabbi! Surely to point the moral would be an impertinence to the readers of this QUARTERLY.

Dr. Beattie possesses some eminent qualifications for his task. First of all, his tastes lie in this direction, which was indicated early in his career, and which led to his being called from Canada and the pastorate to South Carolina and a professorship in Columbia Theological Seminary dealing specifically with this field. Then, again, he is a man of patient system and of indefatigable industry. This natural bent of taste, disposition and habit has had the development and discipline of nearly twenty years' actual and active work in the class-room, an experience which combines many elements of an almost ideal preparation for this truly great enterprise. It is an achievement that could fitly come only at the "long suit of years," and even then to him alone in whom patience has had her perfect work.

At the same time, paradoxical as it must seem, our author's advantages are going to act to his disadvantage, and his virtues create the effect of vice. Critics are likely to find fault with the work in some particulars, but the defects that will be suggested by such readers are nothing other, so to speak, than the shadows of its very excellence.

For example: some are going to complain of a multiplicity and mechanical character of the divisions in the matter of treatment and arrangement; they will charge that our author sometimes pulverizes rather than divides, and apportions his space by a foot-rule of almost arithmetical impartiality.

Again, there will be an impression of repetition that a limited class is sure to resent. This impression has a twofold origin: it will be created by a certain minuteness of analysis which results in an inevitable overlapping of characteristics common to several members of the same generic class, and this impression is aggravated by the very admirable recurrent summations of which the author makes such efficient use.

Once more: the simplicity and clearness both of thought and style will discount the author's ability; the reader will bowl along so easily that he will ignore the faithful work which has macadamized this highway over a difficult territory.

This conviction begets a desire, on the part of the present critic, to *signalize* Dr. Beattie's achievement. That he has made everything clear we do not undertake to say, for there are some things which from their very nature are incapable of being made clear. We doubt, *e. g.*, if any mere man since the fall hath ever been able perfectly to understand and clearly to state just exactly what Hegel held; though when lucid intervals both on Hegel's part and that of the reader happen to coincide, one occasionally indulges, for a time at least, the fancy that he understands him. But while not prepared, therefore, to claim that he has made everything clear, we do believe he has made it about as clear as was possible, and we cannot recall a work of the kind which surpasses it in this respect. In applauding this feature we are not oblivious of the use of technical terms, to which allusion (doubtless jocose) has been made in some fugitive criticism that suggested difficulty in the work. Technical terms are absolutely necessary unless an author resort to intolerable paraphrase. Let a reader attempt to furnish a compact substitute for *euhemeristic*, *e. g.*, and he will find how simply silly such criticism is. Dr. Beattie, we repeat, has made the treatment so clear

that reflection will be required to appreciate his achievement; with the average reader a certain amount of obscurity is necessary to ground profundity.

But to recur to our paradox: most of the probable, if not all of the plausible, criticism which will be made against the book may be summed up in the statement that *the teacher somewhat dominates the author*; the pupil, we imagine, often obtrudes, and this is no defect; for while it may discredit the volume with a select few, it will operate to the inestimable advantage of a vast multitude.

One of the chief merits of the work is its style, generally noticeable for great perspicuity, and sometimes challenging admiration for positive elegance; but we regret to say that there are a few instances of what seems to be a carelessness that is unaccountable in a writer of such marked and uniform excellence. These instances are few and unimportant; in a work of lower merit they might pass unchallenged, but to discover them in the work of a writer whose style shows carefulness apparent is one of the curiosities of literature, and is a fault from which even the greatest masters of style are not free.

We regret to see such a writer as Dr. Beattie countenance the use of "transpire" in the sense of occur. This word at present occupies a niche in our language which will be left vacant if good writers ignore or confuse its exact meaning.

Such matters are mere blemishes, sure of swift correction. There is in the volume, however, one paragraph which is possibly open to serious objection. It is that discussing the Will. We have no idea that our author is anything but sound on this crucial doctrine, but we fear that the severe restraint of brevity has been the occasion of a partial lapse from his conspicuous clearness and characteristic caution. It would be well to add here a few lines guarding against any theory of the Will which regards as *therein resident* "the power of contrary choice." Dr. Beattie writes:

"If the sensibility be the basis of self-expression in man, then will is the source of self-determination. If the former produced desire, the latter effects choice; if the former is voluntary, the latter is volitional."¹ A natural hesitation to criticise such an author on such a point is aggravated by the fact that we are not sure we understand his meaning; the paragraph is not clear to us, but so far as we do understand it, we fear that it will tend towards the encouragement of an erroneous doctrine of the Will.

In such classification the sensibilities are usually regarded as purely passive; activity resides in the appetencies, and these, not the sensibilities, produce desire; it is the appetencies, therefore, that are the source of self-determination, while the will is the faculty through which that self-determination finds expression.

With this view of the matter, we venture the opinion that the truth would have been more exactly stated by writing:

"If the appetencies be the source of self-determination in man, the will is the organ of self-expression."

Lastly in this connection, we suggest that in the second edition of the volume our author insert a half a dozen lines where the word *monism* first occurs, giving one of his happy definitions of it.

Passing now to more positive, more important, more pleasant criticism, the reader will note as general characteristics, pervading the work as a whole: its reverence, its devoutness, its conservatism, its poise, its tact, and its caution; these features, reflected everywhere, render its author pre-eminently a *safe* man; united with the ample evidence of wide reading and long thought, they inspire trust and beget and strengthen the growing conviction that he who follows Dr. Beattie will be in no danger of setting his watch by a comet!

The gracious courtesy, so characteristic of the man, is in evidence everywhere. Of all the multitude of theorizers he is called upon to discuss, some of whom most critics would handle with scant consideration, two alone would resent the author's reference to them, and these are the dramatic Mr. Dowie and the oracular Mrs. Eddy; and these a less thorough author would have felt justified in ignoring as being probably too eccentric and ephemeral to deserve place in such a work.

The author's judicial temperament, his splendid poise, leads him to do ample and utmost justice to whatever shred of truth or of good there may be in any position by whomsoever held, and his supreme caution makes him acutely discriminating in criticism; as some one once said of a pin, he may have a pretty sharp point, but his head invariably prevents his going too far.

As example of this caution, note his reference to Mansel: in speaking of Spencer's perversion of the positions of Kant and Hamilton to the support of agnosticism, he says:

"Herbert Spencer has ingeniously used both of these names in support of agnosticism in a way never intended by them. But the door was opened for him to do so, and the efforts of Mansel were not entirely successful to close it."¹

In the words we have italicized we think Dr. Beattie lays himself liable to indictment upon the charge of carrying a concealed joke. It is possible that a broad smile illumined the genial countenance of the author as he penned that sentence; it is certain that at least one reader smiled when he read it.

Advancing now to somewhat more specific criticism, we mention as signal excellencies in the work:

Its *comprehensive scope*, and the confidence imparted thereby.

In the preface—which no one, in justice to the author or to himself, can afford to omit—Dr. Beattie takes the reader by the hand and leads him to an exceeding high mountain, and shows him a wonderfully wide horizon. We do not envy any man who can read that preface without a thrill or can pass on into the discussion with no whetting of his appetite. So doing, he will be impressed with the author's grasp of the subject as a whole, and its thorough and systematic division in detail. Here again the natural seems the obvious; the theme unfolds like the opening of a great flower.

¹ Page 239.

He will be struck with the emphasis put upon a sound *epistemology* as fundamental to all intelligent discussion, and this, together with the soundness and the clearness of the author's own epistemology.

The reader ought to be particularly pleased with the author's keen and relentless pursuit of *empiricism*.

We are of the opinion that empiricism, sometimes latent, sometimes obvious, is the deadliest foe to a sound philosophy, and so to an orthodox theology; and modern theories are fairly saturated with it. Of which fact both Hume and Spencer are eminent instances and also eminent types.

There is something beautiful in the velvety way in which Dr. Beattie squeezes the life out of a variety of plausible presentations of a *causeless causality*, and this by the simple insistence upon efficiency as the very essence of causality.

Another capital feature is his cordial endorsement and vindication of the *intuitional philosophy*, his exposition of it, and his discrimination between innate ideas and innate aptitudes; a discrimination which we regard as fundamental.

Indeed, exposition and discrimination are two constant and conspicuous characteristics of the whole work; the exposition is not simply lucid, it comes very near being lucent; were it less admirable, we should be tempted to say that the work is too predominantly expository; but we cannot find it in our heart to find fault with work so excellently well done; as a medium of transmission Dr. Beattie is as nearly faultless as any writer within our acquaintance.

Coördinate with this is his remarkable discrimination already referred to; his opening up of a subject is reminiscent of that unique *status questionis* of Francis Turretine, who in our judgment is first, and there is no second.

Illustrations of this discrimination abound *cursim*; as specimens only, may be mentioned:

The nature of the proof for the theistic postulate;¹ the rise of religion in the race;² belief and knowledge;³ the indefinite, the infinite, the absolute, the divine;⁴ his criticism of Kant;⁵ his discussion of evolution.⁶

As a sort of summary of specific criticism, we commend the work as a striking illustration of the light shed by three great luminaries upon discussion, viz., division, definition and discrimination.

We note with interest that Dr. Beattie seems disposed to rescue the old *ontological* argument from some of the discredit that has fallen upon it in modern times.¹

All readers will notice the amplitude of bibliography prefacing the chapters of the book. This will doubtless prove eminently serviceable to those who wish to study certain phases of the subject with a fulness impossible in such a volume. For the benefit of such students, it would be well for the

¹ Pp. 253 ff.

² Pp. 140 ff.

³ Pp. 105 ff, 255 ff.

⁴ Pp. 291 ff.

⁵ Pp. 274 ff.

⁶ Pp. 378-381.

¹ Pp. 281-289.

author in his next edition to indicate the comparative value of this multitude of authorities, that the reader may have some guide in selection.

The extent to which this critique has grown warns its writer of undue length; but even at the risk of proving wearisome the following summary is hazarded in order to give readers some idea of the magnificent scope of the work undertaken by the author. It aims to be a single comprehensive treatise, binding the entire defense and vindication of Christianity into a well organized whole, presenting thus in scientific form a complete apologetic for the Christian system, drawn from its inner nature, as the only redeeming religion.

Entering upon this task it finds Christianity presenting itself in three well defined relations: its philosophical foundations, its historicity and divine authority, and its practical results in the world. These clearly marked relations give three great branches into which apologetics naturally falls:

I. *Fundamental Apologetics*, or that which construes Christianity in relation to its underlying philosophy.

II. *Christian Apologetics*, which interprets Christianity in the light of its unique redemptive history.

III. *Applied Apologetics*, in which the character of Christianity is tested by its splendid fruitage in the world.

Our author purposes devoting a volume to each of these great divisions, and aims by his discussion to make it plain that Christianity has philosophic validity, historic reality, and redemptive sufficiency.

The second and third volumes are in preparation, and are promised without undue delay; the first has been published, and forms the subject of this review.

This volume our author begins with an Introduction of five chapters, embracing the Sphere, the Scope, the Spirit, the Definition, the Aim, the Nature, the Place, the Method, the Divisions of Apologetics, the Theory of Knowledge, and the Philosophy of Belief.

With this very helpful introduction, *Fundamental Apologetics* is divided into two great departments:

1. The Psychology of Theism.
2. The Ontology of Theism.

The Psychology of Theism, with an introductory chapter on the Nature of Religion and Theistic Belief, furnishes eight chapters devoted to a discussion of the Origin of Religious and Theistic Belief; the Fetichistic Theory; Naturism and Animism; Spiritism and Ancestorism; Henotheism; the Function of Reasoning and Conscience; Idealistic Evolution; the Function of Revelation; the Accepted Theory.

The question then emerges, Has the subjective theistic belief objective validity? This brings us to the second great division of the subject, and we enter upon *The Ontology of Theism*, this division in turn breaking into two branches:

1. The Existence of God.
2. Antitheistic Theories.

For the establishment of the theistic postulate the author draws on three

great sources of argument—the Psychical, the Cosmic, the Moral. To the first he devotes four chapters; to the second, four; to the third, three, with a concluding chapter on the Kantian Criticism, and a Summary of Theism. He then takes up the Antitheistic Theories which have been offered as substitutes for Theism. In this concluding section we have thirteen chapters treating of Atheism, Semi-Materialism, Pure Materialism, Psychological Materialism, Materialistic Evolution, Positivism, Agnosticism, Deism and Rationalism, Pantheism, Pessimism and the Problem of Evil.

The foregoing outline, inadequate as it is, will give the reader some idea of the breadth and fulness of the discussion. We have indicated already our estimate of the work. We read it with pleasure and with pride. In our judgment it is a credit, not to the author alone, but to the great church which he represents. In it he has given hostage to the public which the two succeeding volumes will not find it easy to redeem.

Columbia, S. C.

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

DENNEY'S "THE ATONEMENT AND THE MODERN MIND."

THE ATONEMENT AND THE MODERN MIND. *By James Denney, D. D., Professor of New Testament Language, Literature and Theology, United Free College, Glasgow (Scotland).* New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1903. Small 8vo. 159 pp.

About two years ago Dr. Denney gave us a very valuable book—*The Death of Christ*—in which, by a very careful exegesis of the New Testament teaching upon this subject, he gave a most satisfactory explanation of the fact, and presented a well-defined view of the sacrificial nature of the death of Jesus Christ on the cross. This book was received with much favor by those who were in sympathy with evangelical views of the atonement; but certain criticisms seem to have been made upon the book by some who were out of sympathy, for one reason or another, with such views. To meet these various criticisms, Dr. Denney recently published three articles in *The Expositor*, and they were also delivered as a series of lectures at a Summer School of Theology held in Aberdeen during the past summer. They are now published in a neat little book, and may be properly regarded as a supplement to the author's treatise on *The Death of Christ*.

He here treats of the Atonement as he understands the death of Christ to be, in its relation to what he terms "the modern mind," which is in many cases out of sympathy with, if not in actual revolt against, the scriptural doctrine of the atonement. Our author at times is in direct opposition to the modern mind, in some cases he is in sympathy with it, and in a few instances he really seems to capitulate to it. As the subject is a vital one in our own day, we may give this little book some careful attention.

The titles of the three chapters are, Preliminary Definition of the Subject, Sin and the Divine Reaction against it, Christ and Man in the Atonement. But these titles are very brief, and give but little idea of the scope of the discussion. Hence some further explanations are necessary, that the reader may know what this little book contains, and that its strength and its weakness may be made evident.

In the first chapter the terms "atonement" and "modern mind" are explained. In regard to the first term he takes substantially the same view of the atonement as he elucidated in his previous book on the death of Christ. He takes it to be a great reality about which there can be no compromise, since it is the very heart and essence of the Christian religion. The gist of this great truth is that "Christ died for our sins" that thereby "the forgiveness of our sins may be mediated to us through Jesus Christ." God assuredly "forgives sins," but only "through Christ" and "by the blood of his cross." God "freely forgives," but "at this cost to himself and to the Son of his love." Our author takes this to be the teaching of the New Testament.

He meets some objections to this view, especially the claim that God can forgive freely and in a sovereign way without any reference to atonement. He answers by saying that the point at issue is "not the freeness of the pardon," but "the cost of it"; not "the spontaneity of God's love," but "the necessity under which it lay," that "God might be true to himself." Here he turns the tables on those who adduce the parable of the Prodigal Son to support this objection, by pointing out that if there be no atonement in it, there is no Christ either, so far as the terms of the parable are concerned. Hence he concludes that the truth of the atonement which is to be commended to the modern mind is, "That there is forgiveness with God, and that this forgiveness comes to us only through Christ, and signally or specifically through his death."

In explaining what our author means by the modern mind he very properly points out the fact that it is a temper of our time which arises largely from certain presuppositions "as to the relations subsisting between God and man" which have "no place," or find no need for the atonement of Christ. If the modern mind, he adds, "is rooted in a view of the world which leaves no room for Christ and his work as Christian experience expresses them, then that view must be appreciated by the evangelist." This is a point well taken, for we are convinced that much of the antipathy which is felt in certain quarters in our day to the teaching of Scripture concerning the death of Christ has its source in an unsound philosophy. Hence the vital import of a fundamental apologetics, which shall construe, by a sound theistic philosophy, the relations which subsist between God, man and the cosmos, is self-evident. So, too, those who would begin their apologetic with either Christ or the Bible, without reference to the fundamental problems of the theistic philosophy, as against both deism and pantheism, are not on the most secure apologetic ground. We go with our author heartily here.

He next mentions and briefly expounds three factors in the thought of our time, which have had much to do with the production of the modern mind. The first is "the enormous development of physical science." He here shows that the tendency of this science in physics, chemistry and biology is to lead men to think "that everything is fixed," and that even human life itself is "a closed system," incapable "of helping or being helped." This perforce tends to remove the atonement from the sympathetic regard of the modern mind. The second influence at work in our time is the potency in it of "the great idealist movement in philosophy" which "began with Kant and culminated in Hegel." This our author very correctly says "gives a certain

stamp to the mind." It teaches "the essential unity of God and man," and "forecloses the question of the atonement." Our author very acutely asserts that "this philosophy can make no room for Christ's consciousness of himself." The third factor in the modern mind is produced "by the devotion to historical study," which marks our own time. The historical temper consciously or unconsciously has done not a little "to strike at the life of the Christian religion," and "especially at the idea of the atonement." Hence arises the modern plea for "the historical" rather than "the dogmatical" interpretation of the death of Christ.

Our author notes two subsidiary elements in the modern mind which are to be properly considered. One is the demand that everything shall "be based on experience." When this is applied in the sphere of religion it means that the verdict of Christian experience is to be placed above the authority of Scripture. The other is that the modern mind "desires to have everything in religion ethically construed." What "violates ethical standards must be excluded from religion." This the atonement does, and so must be set aside. This demand appears in two ways according to our author. First, there is "the demand for analogies to it (the atonement) in human life," and secondly, there is the demand that "the atonement shall be exhibited in vital relation to the new life in which sin is to be overcome." Our author concedes the legitimacy of these demands, but argues that they are not inconsistent with the scriptural fact of the atonement.

In the second chapter our author deals with "sin and the divine reaction against it." He undertakes "to so present the atonement that it shall excite the least prejudice, and find the most unimpeded access to the mind of this generation." He begins by defining man's relation to God as *personal*. He uses the term *personal*, not in an individual, but in a universal sense. He also uses the word *personal* as in a certain sense in contrast with *legal*, though he warns us "that personal relations, though distinct from legal, are not independent of law." This simply means that man's relation to God "is not lawless," and that as *personal* "these relations have a moral meaning, and are determined by something of universal import." They are "not merely personal, but ethical."

In this connection, it is to be observed that our author is in sympathy with the modern mind in one respect. With some impatience he repudiates all sympathy with the "forensic," or "legal," or "judicial" doctrine of the atonement. He says that "there is nothing which I should wish to reprobate more whole-heartedly than the conception which is expressed in these words." By the term "forensic" he means "regulated by statute." Sin is a breach of a statute, and "the sinner becomes a criminal," and God stands in the relation of judge to man. Still he does not commit himself to the idea of universal fatherhood, because he says that to take "the relation of father and child does not get us past the difficulty involved in the relation of judge and criminal." He prefers to speak of these relations as universal, or "as determined in a manner which has universal validity." This is true also of the relation of parent and child, unless we hold that there is nothing moral in this relation. It is a relation where "certain things are forever obligatory," and "some things forever impossible."

He further confesses that "he entirely agrees with those to whom forgiveness resting on a judicial transaction does not appeal at all." He seems to hold that "there is a moral order or constitution in which we have our life in relation to God and each other." Only by assuming this can sin and righteousness, atonement and forgiveness, have any meaning. The relation of men to God expresses itself, not by statutory statute in any forensic sense, "but by a moral constitution." This constitution must be maintained, and sin is a reaction against it. The atonement, then, means that "forgiveness is mediated through One in whose life and death the most signal homage paid to law"; the very "glory of the atonement is that it manifests the righteousness of God." This is a refinement which gets us over the difficulty in hand only by landing us upon the ground of the governmental theory of the atonement, for it is the moral constitution rather than the holy nature of God that sin reacts against. He says in so many words that "in the widest sense of the word, sin, as a disturbance of the personal relations between God and man, is a violence done to the constitution under which God and man form one moral community, share, as we may reverently express it, one life, have in view the same moral ends." We regret to have to say that this seems to us only a very refined governmental scheme, and defective even in the light of our author's book on "the death of Christ."

In particular "the abiding reaction" of sin against this constitution gives rise "to the bad conscience or the sense of guilt." Here our author has a searching and scriptural discussion of the relation between sin and death; and, although he says doubtful things about the way in which the third chapter of Genesis is to be understood, yet his exposition is informing. He brings out the point that death is both natural and spiritual reaction, for he says that "sin is the act or state of the whole man, and the reaction against it is the reaction of the whole order, at once natural and spiritual, in which man lives." He thus binds the natural and spiritual orders closely together, and thus he concludes that a point of view is furnished which may enable the modern mind "to appreciate the atonement," which consists in the fact that "forgiveness, as Christianity preaches it, is specifically mediated through Christ's death."

The third chapter has for its theme, "Christ and man in the atonement." Here some deeper aspects of the atonement as above explained come into view. First, "it becomes credible that there is a divine necessity for it," which means that "there is no forgiveness possible without it." This is good, and is in keeping with what Anselm has taught the ages upon this profound theme. The atonement becomes an act "by which God does justice to himself," and in it "grace and righteousness" are included. Then, secondly, "there is a human necessity for the atonement" also. This means "that apart from it the conditions of being forgiven could no more be fulfilled by man than forgiveness could be bestowed by God." He carefully guards against the moral influence theory of the atonement and the view that no atonement is necessary since God can pardon without it on the condition of repentance. He says that "man cannot repent without a motive," and "the motive which makes evangelical repentance possible is the way God makes himself known in the death of Christ." "All true penitents are children of the cross." Here

we cannot but feel that our author is scarcely careful in his statement. He should certainly have taken into account the work of the Spirit in giving the dispositions to be thus affected by the vision of the death of Christ. Those who were eye witnesses of it did not show that they were in many cases affected in this saving way by it.

In this chapter he repudiates the idea of imputation entirely. He will not deny that Christ died as our substitute, and that his death was sacrificial, but he denies all transfer of merit when he says that "merit and demerit cannot be mechanically transferred like sums in an account." He adds that the substitutionary view of Christ's atonement must not be taken "to suggest the idea of a transference of merit, the sin of the world being carried over to Christ's account, and the merit of Christ to the world's account." Here we are inclined to think our author has capitulated, in part at least, to the modern mind. He tries to save himself by drawing the contrast between "a representative" and "a substitute." He says that Christ was "our substitute, but not our representative."

Here we are prompted to make two remarks. First, in denying imputation, or "transference of merit," as he calls it, our author fails to distinguish between guilt and demerit. Guilt as liability to penalty is imputable, even though personal merit or demerit is not. Those who teach the doctrine of imputation do not teach the transference of merit as our author seems to think. The other remark is that if our author had placed the covenant principle under his feet, he would have had no such difficulty as he seems to feel with the word representative. Indeed, we felt this to be a weakness in his book on the death of Christ, and it is now more evident. Then, with the covenant under our feet, we have no difficulty in giving proper scriptural meaning to both imputation and representation.

But we must conclude. We are sorry to have to say that we find here some toning down of the exegetical results which our author brought out so finely in his former book. This book, therefore, may be a little more agreeable to the modern liberal mind, but it is just that much the less satisfactory to the modern evangelical mind, which believes not only that Jesus Christ died *for our sins*, but that he died *for us*.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Louisville, Ky.

ORR'S "DAVID HUME AND HIS INFLUENCE ON PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY."

DAVID HUME AND HIS INFLUENCE ON PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY. *By James Orr, D. D., Professor of Apologetics and Systematic Theology, United Free Church College, Glasgow, Scotland.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1903. Pp. ix.-241.

This is one of an interesting series of books known as "The World's Epoch Makers." About a dozen have been already published, and this is one of the very best. Those who know Dr. Orr's ability and fitness for the task assigned him are prepared to find this a good treatment of a difficult subject, and we are sure they will not be disappointed when they read the book now before us.

Hume's philosophy has had a peculiar history. In his own day it had little influence, and his books nearly all "fell flat" when first issued. Then later on it revived for a time when empiricism became influential. Again,

this was followed by a period of decline, due in part to the Kantian criticism. But in our own generation, since modern agnosticism lifted up its voice, Hume's skepticism has been brought forth as from the dead and rehabilitated. Hence the remarkable revival of interest in Hume's philosophy in our own time.

Dr. Orr was limited in his treatment of the subject, yet he has put a great deal into very little space.

There are eleven chapters. The first is introductory, then follow three chapters telling of Hume's life and literary labors. We scarcely know where to get in so brief a space such a good account of the man, with his good nature and self-conceit, as in these three chapters.

This is followed by four chapters which give some account of Hume's philosophy. First, his relation to previous philosophy, with the skeptical result, is sketched. Then his destructive doctrine of the first principles of knowledge is a valuable chapter. The problems of cause and effect and of free will are also carefully expounded. Here, in a sense, is really the point of departure for Hume's system. Hume's denial of the reality of substance, both material and spiritual, is also made the subject of close investigation.

The discussion concludes with a presentation of his extreme utilitarianism in morals, with his critique on miracles in the sphere of theology, and with his miscellaneous writings in history and in political economy. In an appendix there is some account given of Hume's various writings and their chief editions.

We content ourselves with saying that this is a capital little book from a most competent hand, and its perusal will give any careful reader a good idea of Hume and his philosophy.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Louisville, Ky.

VERNER'S "PIONEERING IN CENTRAL AFRICA."

PIONEERING IN CENTRAL AFRICA. *By Samuel P. Verner.* Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1903. Svo. Cloth. Pp. vi.-500. Price, \$2.00.

In furnishing a critique of this book, the writer labors somewhat under the embarrassment of what is popularly known as "the personal equation," due to a long and close acquaintance and intimacy with its author and his family, and a practical and personal relation to the enterprise of which it is at once the fruit and the explanation.

The author, the Rev. Samuel Phillips Verner, is a son of the Hon. J. S. Verner, of Columbia, S. C., and grandson of the late lamented and distinguished Dr. Charles Phillips, for years eminent as a professor in the University of North Carolina, and one of the leading preachers of that Synod. The grandson inherits something of his grandfather's physique, mental gifts, and constitutional characteristics. His youth was spent in the city of Columbia, S. C., where he studied in the State University, from which he graduated with distinction, but at the expense of his health. Immediately upon graduation, largely for purposes of physical recuperation, his father secured for him a situation as mechanic in the railroad shops of Columbia.

It was while working in these shops that the idea of going to Africa took

definite form, having its origin and inspiration first in an intense admiration of the heroic career of David Livingstone; once taking form, it was fed by an omnivorous reading of everything concerning Africa that fell in his way; thus fed it grew into a passion with the youth.

In the opening of his book he refers to the opposition of family and friends to his plans for Africa. It is due to the latter to say that this opposition was based solely on the author's youth and his uncertain health; he was a mere boy, as such immature and undeveloped, and older friends very naturally felt that such a far-reaching decision was premature; more than this, he had left college with a constitution over-taxed by long strain and with health trembling on the very verge of nervous collapse. With these serious considerations in mind, his parents and his pastor insisted most imperatively that he should at least defer so important an enterprise until he had had time for mature reflection and until his health should be established and strengthened.

After a year's work in the railroad shops, he secured a position in the faculty of the Tuscaloosa Institute for Colored Ministers, then under the superintendency of his maternal uncle, Rev. A. L. Phillips, D. D., and we in Columbia supposed that our ends had been attained, and that the mission to Africa would bide the growth and development of the boy. In a few months, however, we were surprised to learn that he had been accepted as a missionary to Africa, and was on the eve of sailing to the land of his dreams and his hopes. The event proved the wisdom of our forecast and justified the pleas we pressed so urgently for delay. Phillips soon returned, alas! a complete nervous wreck, and months of careful nursing and expert treatment at great expense were required to restore his health to its present vigorous condition.

This book is the record of his experience, really a personal story beginning with his graduation and ending with his return from Africa to New York. It is, too, an exceedingly interesting story, characteristic of the author throughout: of his intense individuality, his vigorous mind, his wide and close observation, his rare union of the speculative and the practical.

The reader will be much struck with the multifarious character of the topics touched upon in the course of the narrative, the wide-openness of both eyes and mind; and he will vote it a very unusual book to be written by one who spent his twenty-first birthday on his voyage out.

It has, of course, both the virtues and the defects of youth, but the balance is very decidedly in favor of the former: the freshness, the vigor, the superb self-confidence, the enthusiasm of youth palpitate all through it, and invest it with a vivid and sustained interest. He has "views," and he advances them without hesitation on all the topics that emerge in his comprehensive discussion. If at times they seem to illustrate what some one has prettily styled "the sublime audacity of youth," they nevertheless seem invariably to be worthy the serious consideration of those who are older.

The author is not only a pioneer in Africa, but a pioneer also in authorship; the experiment in both spheres augurs well for future usefulness.

The work is marred by some errors which indicate that the proof-reader was "nodding" at times.

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

Columbia, S. C.

XI.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

STUDIES OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS. *By H. B. Pratt, Spanish translator of Seymour's "Evening with the Romanists," and author of "Modern Version" of the Bible into the Spanish tongue. Translated from the Spanish and published to provide a permanent fund for printing Spanish Commentaries. (Sample Pamphlet.)*

At the Synod of Georgia, meeting in Lagrange before the civil war, the writer of this notice was quartered with the author, then a missionary under appointment by the United Presbyterian Church for South America. The address of the young missionary is recalled. He spoke from the text, "Brethren, pray for us." Doubtless, in the long subsequent years of honorable missionary life he felt the need of the home intercessions of the church. His long missionary experience of work among Spanish-speaking peoples, as well as his scholarly attainments, eminently fitted him for the work of translation done under the auspices of the American Bible Society. Realizing the need of sound and popular commentaries in Spanish, Dr. Pratt is now endeavoring to raise the funds needed to publish his work. From the specimens examined in translation, the comments seem strong, sound and fresh. Others must judge of the original. It is highly commended by Protestant Spanish journals.

THE BOOK OF JOB. *By Principal J. T. Marshall, D. D., Manchester Baptist College, England. 8vo, pp. 131. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1904.*

We are glad that the Baptist brethren are preparing and publishing a commentary on the Old Testament to set alongside of their magnificent *American Commentary on the New Testament*, one of the most valuable series of commentaries ever issued in this country. The volume before us is on Job. An introduction of seventeen pages gives the author's position on most of the agitated points as to this book. He calls it a theodicy, a vindication of divine providence. He gives a good analysis of its contents, following the usual and familiar outline. The book is a theology as well as a theodicy, and shows the growth of Job's conception of God and divine truth. Job is accepted as an actual, historic personage. The book is regarded as composite in authorship. The date is placed subsequent to the patriarchal age, and is made post-Solomonic, with parts even post-exilic. The question of authorship is not discussed.

IS MAN IMMORTAL? and GOD IN NATURE. *By Rev. W. C. Black, D. D., Nashville, Tenn.* Dallas Publishing House of the M. E. Church, South, Big-
ham & Smith, Agents. 1903.

Introduced by a graceful and appreciative notice by Bishop C. B. Gallo-
way, the author, with few alterations, has put in more permanent form two
admirable lectures very extensively delivered. Both important topics are
treated from the standpoint of one who is evidently conversant with ancient
and modern skepticism on these vital themes, master of the literature bear-
ing on both subjects, and able to give them attractive shape in simple, lucid
style. He "utters by his tongue words easy to be understood." The reason-
ing is cogent and unanswerable, and not infrequently eloquent. Two things
we are disposed to emphasize as worthy of stress: his reasoning with the
materialist, and the vindication of the theological argument. Our attention
was the more strongly drawn to the former by recollection of similar reason-
ing in "The Young Irishman," in Spencer's Pastoral Sketches, which our
author probably has never seen. The honest skeptic was convinced by the
minister by actual cataloguing of qualities that he knew more of spirit than
he did of matter, and that knowledge of spirit was fundamental to any ac-
quaintance with matter. As for the other, it is well known that evolutionists
discredit the argument from design as unscientific, and, to borrow the best
phrase in which to describe it from Topsy, maintain that the universe was
not made, but simply "grewed." Our author shows the folly of arguing
design from the construction of a telescope and finding no omnipotent, intelli-
gent creative designer in the similarly constructed human eye. We heartily
commend this little work, whose ability and information are out of all pro-
portion to its bulk.

BEYOND DEATH. *By Hugh Johnston, D. D.* Small 8vo, pp. 330. \$1.25. New
York: Eaton & Mains. 1903.

In a preface, introduction and twelve chapters the author discusses the
subjects of eschatology, embracing in that study the special subjects of death,
life beyond death, the intermediate state, Messiah's kingdom, the millen-
nium, the second advent, the general resurrection, the end of the world, the
general judgment, hell, and heaven. It is his attempt to give a work which
is not critical or formal, though theological and expository, and designed to
strengthen the faith of Christian men and women, and to help them in their
daily lives. In treating of the intermediate state he rejects the idea of a
post-mortem probation, or of a "larger hope," as it has been euphemistically
called. He does not hold to the idea of a personal reign of Christ on earth,
and rejects most of the principles of the premillennial faith.

THE PRESENT PROBLEMS OF NEW TESTAMENT STUDY. *By William Bancroft
Hill, Professor of Biblical Literature in Vassar College.* 12mo, pp. 68.
New York: Edwin S. Gorham, Fourth Avenue and Twenty-second Street.
1903.

A very brief treatise, in general and popular terms, upon the subject of
the two lines of study, textual and higher criticism, of the New Testament.

The compass of the work forbids any very elaborate or detailed consideration of the topics. The book is more in the nature of an approach to the subject. Its special feature is the clearness with which Dr. Hill sets forth the fact that there is a legitimate higher criticism, and that it is to be guarded against the misunderstandings and prejudices which have arisen from the association of the name with the distinctive rationalistic criticism. It is delightful to know that the young ladies at Vassar have so sound and conservative, and withal so able a guide as Dr. Hill, in their studies of the Word of God.

THE PEDAGOGICAL BIBLE SCHOOL. A Scientific Study of the Sunday-school with Chief Reference to the Curriculum. *By Samuel B. Haslett, Ph. D.* Cloth. 12mo. \$1.25. Fleming H. Revell Company, Chicago.

Too much philosophizing and scientific methodizing are the features of the book. The pedagogical principles that may obtain in secular education can hardly be applied sharply in this other department of study. And the doctors differ very materially among themselves as to the proper pedagogical method in secular work. We patiently wait until they settle the matter.

OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY. *By the Rev. O. R. Barnicott, LL. D.* 132 pages. Price, 30 cents net. J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia.

An outline, very brief but clear, of the leading events of Old Testament history. It is one of the Temple Series of Bible Hand-books, edited by Oliphant Smeaton, M. A.

SELECT NOTES. A Commentary on the International Lessons for 1904. *By the Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D. D., and M. A. Peloubet.* Thirtieth Annual Volume. Price, \$1.25. W. A. Wilde Company, Boston.

Dr. Peloubet's series of Notes on the International Lessons is so familiar and so widely known that it seems almost superfluous to do more than announce this, the thirtieth, volume of the usual help in explanations, references, light from various sources, illustrations, plans and maps are found in rich abundance.

ARE THE CRITICS RIGHT? Historical and Critical Considerations against the Graf-Welhausen Hypothesis. *By Wilhelm Moller. With an introduction by Prof. C. Von Orelli. Translated by C. H. Irwin, M. A.* Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. \$1.00.

The nature of the subject of this book involves, to some extent, technical statements, but, at the same time, even those who are not practically familiar with the critical apparatus will find it of interest. The sub-title indicates the purpose of the volume. The study is limited in the main to the Book of Deuteronomy and its date.

THE EXTRA-CANONICAL LIFE OF CHRIST. Being a Record of the Acts and Sayings of Jesus of Nazareth Drawn from Uninspired Sources. *By Bernhard Pick, Ph. D., D. D.* Cloth, 12mo, pp. 312. \$1.20 net. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company. 1903.

An introductory chapter of some forty pages gives a very good resume of the sources of the apocryphal lives and sayings of Christ, together with a very complete bibliography of the subject. About one-half of the remainder of the volume is given to narratives referring to the life of Mary, and the birth, childhood, and manhood of Jesus. The second part of the volume tells of the extra-canonical accounts of the later incidents in the life of Jesus, especially concerning his crucifixion and resurrection, together with miscellaneous matter, as the sayings of Christ, traditions concerning his personal appearance, etc.

THE OLDEST CODE OF LAWS IN THE WORLD. The Code of Laws Promulgated by Hammurabi, King of Babylon 2285-2242. *Translated by C. H. W. Johns, M. A., Queens College, Cambridge.* Price, 75 cents net. Published by T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, and imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

The recent remarkable developments in Assyriology, and the increasing knowledge of the times covered in the researches will give special interest to the study of this, one of the most ancient codes of laws known to the world. It will confirm the Mosaic record, and show how early thinkers and writers drank at a pure fountain, the stream from which they afterwards made turbid by the admixture of human thought. The discovery in 1902 of the monument containing the code was one of the great events of the day.

TOBIT AND THE BABYLONIAN APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS. *Edited by the Rev. A. H. Sayce, D. D., LL. D.* WISDOM AND THE JEWISH APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS. *Edited by W. B. Stevenson, M. A.* J. M. Dent & Co., London; J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia.

Two additional volumes of the Temple Edition issuing from the Lippincott Press. The first named is of very special value to the student of apocryphal writings.

TO-DAY IN SYRIA AND PALESTINE. *By William Eleroy Curtis.* Illustrated. 8vo, 524 pp. \$2.00 net. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1903.

To the many who read Mr. Curtis' letters from Palestine in the *Chicago Record-Herald*, in 1901, this book, embracing those letters, will be most valuable, as putting in permanent form one of the most interesting series of letters ever written from that land. To all others it will open fresh and suggestive lines of thought. The details are sometimes a little inaccurate, as, for instance, the statement that Mount Hermon may be seen from Beirut, the statement that the Maronites deny the resurrection of the body, etc. Mr. Curtis' letters are especially noteworthy for the fact that he recognizes and appreciates the work of missionaries.

JOURNEYING IN THE LAND WHERE JESUS LIVED. *By Gerard B. F. Hallock, D. D.* 298 pp. Price, \$1.50. American Tract Society.

A friend of ours lately just starting on a tour to Palestine declared this to be one of the best books he had read in preparation for his journey. It grew out of Dr. Hallock's companionship with some eight hundred or more tourists in 1902, to whom it is dedicated. It is picturesque and vivid. It is one of the best of the travel books.

THE HISTORY AND USE OF HYMNS AND HYMN TUNES. *By Rev. David R. Brعد, D. D., author of "The Preparation of the World for Christ," etc., and Professor in the Western Theological Seminary.* 8vo, pp. 364. \$1.50. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1903.

The study of hymnology will receive a decided impulse from this admirable volume. The preparation of it grew out of the author's needs in classroom work, as the instructor of young men in practical theology. It is a text-book, and designed for use as such, but is in popular enough form for general reading. It is historical, analytical and practical. It tells of the development of sacred verse, in ancient times, and of the modern hymnology, the latter considered under the three periods entitled the doctrinal and didactic, the missionary and evangelistic, and the devotional and experimental. The growth and development of sacred music is also thoroughly studied and described. In the treatment of the hymns, many sketches of writers and their best known works are given. Altogether the book is one of the best in its department that has ever been given to the public.

PENANCE AND REPENTANCE. A Sermon. *By Rev. James I. Vance, D. D., North Reformed Church, Newark, N. J.*

A characteristic sermon by Dr. Vance, formerly of our church, fresh, vigorous, epigrammatic, on the text, "Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance." It considers the subject chiefly in a contrast between penance and repentance. Penance is a false doctrine. It is not the doctrine of the Bible. It misrepresents God. It discredits the sufferings of Christ. It creates new sins. It is disastrous to the community. Repentance, on the other hand, is not fear of penalty. It is an awakened conscience. It is an apprehension of the mercy of Christ. It is hatred of sin. It is abandonment of sin. It is Christian. It glorifies God and exalts Calvary. It brings peace to a guilty conscience. It releases ransomed powers for useful service. Penance is the religion of negation, repentance is the religion of salvation. Penance is the gospel of the gallows, repentance is the gospel of the cross. Such are a few of Dr. Vance's points and contrasts.

FROM SUNDAY TO SUNDAY. *By Rev. H. C. G. Moule, D. D., author of "Thoughts for Every Sunday of the Year."* Cloth. 12mo. \$1.50. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.

The Bishop of Durham presents us here with an excellent manual of devotion. The merits of a devotional book can be determined only by its use. The name and ability of the author, combined with his well-known spirit, will commend this book in advance.

THE EDUCATION OF THE HEART. *By William F. Watkinson, D. D., author of "The Bane and the Antidote."* Cloth, 12mo. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1903.

A collection of fifty-two chapters, short and direct, bearing upon the development of the life of the soul. They magnify Christ and his work in the heart, and are evangelical and earnest.

ONENESS WITH CHRIST. *By Bishop W. R. Nicholson, D. D., of the Reformed Episcopal Church.* Cloth, 12mo. \$1.50. New York: Alliance Press Co. 1903.

Thirty-two expository lectures on Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, bringing out especially the practical bearing upon Christ's people of the teaching, of the discussion, and of application of this epistle.

THE NEW DAY; OR FRESH OPPORTUNITIES. A Book for Young Men. *By President Russell H. Conwell, of the Temple College, Philadelphia, author of "Acres of Diamonds," etc., etc.* 16mo, pp. 117. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1904.

A series of very practical, earnest and hopeful talks to young men on the openings of life, preparation for them, and the opportunities offered by the various trades, professions and callings. While containing nothing specially new, the chapters are delightfully readable. They will be found very stimulating and helpful. A strong, healthy spirit breathes through all of them.

THE CALLED OF GOD. *By the late A. B. Davidson, D. D., LL. D., Litt. D., Professor of Hebrew, New College, Edinburgh; Edited by Professor J. A. Paterson, D. D., with Biographical Introduction, by A. Taylor Innes, Advocate.* Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. \$2.00 net.

A volume of sermons dealing with many of the profound problems of theology, but discussing them in a style very attractive by its clearness, and in a manner helpful by its practical nature.

HID IN THE HEART. Scriptures That a Child of Ten Should Know. *Chosen and Edited by George E. Horr, D. D.* Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1904. 50 cents net.

Very daintily printed, with illuminated initial letters. The selections, which are of simple scriptural passages, such as the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, Christ's Summary of the Law, The Beatitudes, etc., are excellent, and as stated by the editor are such as should be familiar to all.

SERMONS ON INTERNATIONAL SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS FOR 1904. *By the Monday Club.* Twenty-ninth Series. Special price, net, 90 cents. The Pilgrim Press, New York, Boston, Chicago. 1903.

A series of able discourses by noted ministers of Boston, giving, as in previous issues, some of the salient features or general teachings, of the International Lessons of 1904. The volume will be of advantage and interest to very advanced students or teachers.

THE LIFE OF EDWIN WALLACE PARKER, D. D., Missionary Bishop of Southern Asia, forty-one years a missionary in India. *By J. H. Messmore. With an Introduction by Bishop James M. Thoburn.* 332 pp. \$2.00. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Jennings & Pye. 1903.

The author of this most interesting story of a missionary and his career was closely associated with the subject of the biography throughout the greater part of the latter's missionary life. The book is a welcome addition to a well-equipped missionary library.

THE GREAT AWAKENING OF 1740. *By Rev. F. L. Chapell.* 12mo, pp. 144. Cloth; net, 75 cents. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1903.

This small volume embraces some lectures delivered before the Baptist Church of Evanston, Ill., the Second Baptist Church of Chicago, and other churches, and is published by request in *The Standard*, and used for the Gordon Missionary Training School, Boston. It describes most sympathetically and analyzes the work of John Wesley, in Great Britain, Jonathan Edwards, in New England, Gilbert Tennent, in the Middle Colonies, George Whitefield, the cosmopolitan evangelist, and James Davenport and the Disorders. A final lecture studies the results and lessons of the Great Awakening.

OPTIMISM. *An Essay by Helen Keller, author of "The Story of My Life."* With portrait frontispiece. Price, 75 cents net. New York: Thos. Y. Crowell & Co. 1903.

In vigorous language and graceful style Helen Keller shows in this brief work the secret of that ability which has made her so marvellously successful in overcoming the difficulties which have been in her way. Her grasp of thought and power of expression, for one blind and deaf and dumb, are inconceivable. The title of this little volume expresses her belief and attitude toward the world in which she lives.

CHILD LIFE IN MANY LANDS. *Edited by H. Clay Trumbull, D. D.* Illustrated. 12mo, pp. 215. \$1.00 net. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1903.

A collection of articles gathered mostly from the pages of the *Sunday-school Times*, and representing twenty or more writers. These articles depict child life in different lands, some of the latter being regions with which we are not generally familiar, as Porto Rico, Alaska, etc. One very striking chapter is that by Mrs. Ballington Booth, on "Baby Footprints in the Slums."

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

GEORGE SUMMEY, D. D., LL. D., EDITOR.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D.	F. R. BEATTIE, PH. D., D. D.
R. C. REED, D. D.	R. A. WEBB, D. D.
SAMUEL A. KING, D. D., LL. D.	

VOLUME XVII.

1903-1904.



RICHMOND, VA.:
WHITTET & SHEPPERSON, PUBLISHERS.

PRINTERS :
WHITTET & SHEPPERSON,
RICHMOND, VA.

CONTENTS.

VOL. XVII.

Active Obedience of Christ,	<i>S. M. Tenney,</i>	207
American Revised Version,	<i>David G. Wylie,</i>	113
Anthony the Great, St.,	<i>Henry E. Dosker,</i>	339
"Any of This Way,"	<i>R. Q. Mallard,</i>	418
Athanasius,	<i>R. C. Reed,</i>	466
Attitude of Southern Presbyterians,	<i>J. H. McNeilly,</i>	572
Baptism of Christ, The,	<i>John W. Caldwell, Jr.,</i> ...	384
Barnes' <i>The Red Miriok,</i>		308
Barnicott's <i>Old Testament History,</i>		604
Bean's <i>Teachings of the Lord Jesus,</i>		304
Beattie's <i>Apologetics,</i>	<i>Samuel M. Smith,</i>	588
Beattie's <i>Apologetics; or, The Rational Vin-</i> <i>dication of Christianity,</i>		441
Beauty in the Westminster Standards,	<i>Chas. P. Foreman,</i>	545
<i>Best Church Hymns, The,</i>		307
Bible, The, in the Public Schools,	<i>F. R. Beattie,</i>	512
Bingham's <i>Geographic Influence in American</i> <i>History,</i>		448
Black's <i>Is Man Immortal? and God in Nature,</i>		603
Breed's <i>History and Use of Hymns,</i>		606
Bruce's <i>Apologetics,</i>	<i>Jas. A. Quarles,</i>	428
Burkett's <i>Agriculture for Beginners,</i>		449
Burrell's <i>A Quiver of Arrows,</i>		158
Calming Life's Storms,	<i>R. C. Anderson, Jr.,</i>	424
Candler's <i>Christus Auctor,</i>	<i>S. C. Byrd,</i>	303
Catechisms in Family and School,	<i>C. T. Thomson,</i>	138
Christ's Baptism,	<i>John W. Caldwell, Jr.,</i> ...	384
Christ's Resurrection,	<i>Jos. A. McMurray,</i>	480
Church History, The Study of,	<i>D. K. Walthall,</i>	264
Church, The, and Criticism,	<i>F. P. Ramsay,</i>	189
Church Work, Lay Coöperation in,	<i>E. P. Davis,</i>	538
Citizenship and Mormonism,		415
Civil Government,	<i>A. B. Curry,</i>	580
Coe's <i>Religion of a Mature Mind,</i>	<i>R. A. Webb,</i>	287
Coleman's <i>Social Ethics,</i>	<i>F. R. Beattie,</i>	437
Confession, The Revised,	<i>R. A. Webb,</i>	451
Conner's <i>Glengarry School Days,</i>		448
Consolidation of Universities,		564
Cowl's <i>Digging Ditches and Other Sermons,</i>		306

Criticism of the Old Testament,	<i>F. P. Ramsay,</i>	189
Criticism, The Higher,	<i>W. M. McPheeters,</i>	1
Criticisms and Reviews,	146, 287, 427, 588	
Crozier's <i>Resurrection of Christ</i> ,		445
Cumberland and Presbyterian Union,		568
Curtis' <i>The Loss of North Siam</i> ,		447
Curtis' <i>To-day in Syria and Palestine</i> ,		605
Davidson's <i>The Called of God</i> ,		607
"Dead Line," The Ministerial,	<i>J. Preston Scarle,</i>	130
Denney's <i>Death of Christ</i> ,	<i>R. A. Webb,</i>	295
Denney's <i>The Atonement and the Modern</i> <i>Mind</i> ,	<i>F. R. Beattie,</i>	594
Divorce,	<i>T. C. Barret,</i>	101
Dixon's <i>The Christian Science Delusion</i> ,		448
Dixon's <i>The One Woman</i> ,		449
Dualism, The, of Truth,	<i>L. G. Barbour,</i>	325
Duty,	<i>R. V. Foster,</i>	49
Edwards, Jonathan,	<i>R. C. Reed,</i>	311
Eldridge's <i>Unto Heights Heroic</i> ,		160
Fairbairn's <i>Philosophy of the Christian Re-</i> <i>ligion</i> ,	<i>F. R. Beattie,</i>	146
Faunce's <i>A Young Man's Difficulties</i> ,		444
First General Assembly,	<i>R. Q. Mallard,</i>	255
Flournoy's <i>New Light on the New Testament</i> ,		294
Funk's <i>Next Step in Evolution</i> ,	<i>F. R. Beattie,</i>	300
General Assembly of 1903,	<i>R. Q. Mallard,</i>	122
General Assembly, The First,	<i>R. Q. Mallard,</i>	255
General Notes,		255
Giles' <i>China and the Chinese</i> ,		157
God in Nature,	<i>M. W. Doggett,</i>	275
Gospel to the Hebrews,	<i>Parke P. Flournoy,</i>	28
Government, The Civil,	<i>A. B. Curry,</i>	580
<i>Graded Course of Instruction in Sabbath-</i> <i>Schools</i> ,		158
Graves' <i>Handbook of Christian Doctrine</i> ,		442
Hallock's <i>Journeying in the Land Where</i> <i>Jesus Lived</i> ,		606
Hallock's <i>Upward Steps</i> ,		307
<i>Hammurabi's Code of Laws</i> ,		605
Haslett's <i>The Pedagogical Bible School</i> ,		604
Headland's <i>Christian Heroes</i> ,		157
Hebrews, The Gospel to,	<i>Parke P. Flournoy,</i>	28
Henry's <i>By Order of the Prophet</i> ,		309
Higher Criticism,	<i>W. M. McPheeters,</i>	1
Hill's <i>Present Problems of New Testament</i> <i>Study</i> ,		603
Hilprecht's <i>Exploration in Bible Lands</i> ,	<i>George Summey,</i>	433
<i>History of Presbyterianism in Arkansas</i> ,		445

Homiletic Notes,	133, 264, 404, 418, 564
Imputation,	<i>Robert Reid Howison</i> , 221
Inspiration of the Old Testament,	<i>Clarence K. Crawford</i> , ... 370
Inspiration, The Proof of,	<i>E. E. Smith</i> , 504
Internal Evidence, Value of,	<i>J. W. Primrose</i> , 65
<i>Jefferson's Bible; The Life and Morals of</i> <i>Jesus</i> ,	306
Jesus Christ and Him Crucified,	<i>Ernest Thompson</i> , 143
Johnson's <i>From Love to Praise</i> ,	159
Johnson's <i>Life and Letters of Robert Lewis</i> <i>Dabney</i> ,	<i>R. Q. Mallard</i> , 427
Johnston's <i>Beyond Death</i> ,	603
Jonathan Edwards,	<i>R. C. Reed</i> , 311
Ketler's <i>The Tragedy of Paoting Fu</i> ,	156
King's <i>Reconstruction in Theology</i> ,	155
King's <i>Why We Believe the Bible</i> ,	157, 444
Knox' and Others' Christian Point of View,	153
Lanier's <i>Kinship of God and Man</i> ,	155
Laws' <i>Bible Study of the Obstacles, etc.</i> ,	443
Lawson's <i>Short Method with Christian</i> <i>Science</i> ,	160
Lay Coöperation in Church Work,	<i>E. P. Davis</i> , 538
Legacy of Christ, The,	<i>E. D. McDougall</i> , 284
Lowrie's <i>David the Hero</i> ,	159
Mallard's <i>Martha's Fault and Mary's Choice</i> ,	159
Margolinth's <i>Religions of Bible Lands</i> ,	157
Marshall's <i>The Book of Job</i> ,	602
McCorkle's <i>Christian Science</i> ,	306
McGarvey's <i>Authorship of the Book of Deu-</i> <i>teronomy</i> ,	155
Miner's <i>China's Book of Martyrs</i> ,	446
Ministerial "Dead Line,"	<i>J. Preston Searle</i> , 130
<i>Missionary Circles, No. X.</i> ,	156
Moller's <i>Are the Critics Right?</i>	604
Moncrieff's <i>History of the Christian Church</i> ,	<i>R. C. Reed</i> , 152
Moorehead's <i>Outline Studies in Acts, Romans,</i> <i>etc.</i> ,	155
Moule's <i>From Sunday to Sunday</i> ,	606
Mormonism and Citizenship,	415
Newman's <i>Manual of Church History</i> ,	<i>R. C. Reed</i> , 290
New Philosophy, The,	<i>Charles Gray Shaw</i> , 239
Nicholson's <i>Onewness with Christ</i> ,	607
Notes,	133, 255, 404, 564
Obedience, Christ's Active,	<i>S. M. Tenney</i> , 207
Old Testament Criticism,	<i>F. P. Ramsay</i> , 189
Old Testament, The, in Our Times,	<i>R. E. Vinson</i> , 161
Old Testament, The Inspiration of,	<i>Clarence K. Crawford</i> , ... 370
Orr's <i>David Hume and His Influence, etc.</i> ,	<i>F. R. Beattie</i> , 599

Criticism of the Old Testament,	<i>F. P. Ramsay,</i>	189
Criticism, The Higher,	<i>W. M. McPheters,</i>	1
Criticisms and Reviews,	146, 287, 427, 588	
Crozier's <i>Resurrection of Christ</i> ,		445
Cumberland and Presbyterian Union,		568
Curtis' <i>The Loss of North Siam</i> ,		447
Curtis' <i>To-day in Syria and Palestine</i> ,		605
Davidson's <i>The Called of God</i> ,		607
"Dead Line," The Ministerial,	<i>J. Preston Searle,</i>	130
Denney's <i>Death of Christ</i> ,	<i>R. A. Webb,</i>	295
Denney's <i>The Atonement and the Modern</i> <i>Mind</i> ,	<i>F. R. Beattie,</i>	594
Divorce,	<i>T. C. Barret,</i>	101
Dixon's <i>The Christian Science Delusion</i> ,		448
Dixon's <i>The One Woman</i> ,		449
Dualism, The, of Truth,	<i>L. G. Barbour,</i>	325
Duty,	<i>R. V. Foster,</i>	49
Edwards, Jonathan,	<i>R. C. Reed,</i>	311
Eldridge's <i>Unto Heights Heroic</i> ,		160
Fairbairn's <i>Philosophy of the Christian Re-</i> <i>ligion</i> ,	<i>F. R. Beattie,</i>	146
Faunce's <i>A Young Man's Difficulties</i> ,		444
First General Assembly,	<i>R. Q. Mallard,</i>	255
Flournoy's <i>New Light on the New Testament</i> ,		294
Funk's <i>Next Step in Evolution</i> ,	<i>F. R. Beattie,</i>	300
General Assembly of 1903,	<i>R. Q. Mallard,</i>	122
General Assembly, The First,	<i>R. Q. Mallard,</i>	255
General Notes,		255
Giles' <i>China and the Chinese</i> ,		157
God in Nature,	<i>M. W. Doggett,</i>	275
Gospel to the Hebrews,	<i>Parke P. Flournoy,</i>	28
Government, The Civil,	<i>A. B. Curry,</i>	580
<i>Graded Course of Instruction in Sabbath-</i> <i>Schools</i> ,		158
Graves' <i>Handbook of Christian Doctrine</i> ,		442
Hallock's <i>Journeying in the Land Where</i> <i>Jesus Lived</i> ,		606
Hallock's <i>Upward Steps</i> ,		307
<i>Hammurabi's Code of Laws</i> ,		605
Haslett's <i>The Pedagogical Bible School</i> ,		604
Headland's <i>Christian Heroes</i> ,		157
Hebrews, The Gospel to,	<i>Parke P. Flournoy,</i>	28
Henry's <i>By Order of the Prophet</i> ,		309
Higher Criticism,	<i>W. M. McPheters,</i>	1
Hill's <i>Present Problems of New Testament</i> <i>Study</i> ,		603
Hilprecht's <i>Exploration in Bible Lands</i> ,	<i>George Summey,</i>	433
<i>History of Presbyterianism in Arkansas</i> ,		445

Homiletic Notes,	133, 264, 404, 418, 564
Imputation,	<i>Robert Reid Howison</i> , 221
Inspiration of the Old Testament,	<i>Clarence K. Crawford</i> , ... 370
Inspiration, The Proof of,	<i>E. E. Smith</i> , 504
Internal Evidence, Value of,	<i>J. W. Primrose</i> , 65
<i>Jefferson's Bible; The Life and Morals of</i> <i>Jesus</i> ,	306
Jesus Christ and Him Crucified,	<i>Ernest Thompson</i> , 143
Johnson's <i>From Love to Praise</i> ,	159
<i>Johnson's Life and Letters of Robert Lewis</i> <i>Dabney</i> ,	<i>R. Q. Mallard</i> , 427
Johnston's <i>Beyond Death</i> ,	603
Jonathan Edwards,	<i>R. C. Reed</i> , 311
Ketler's <i>The Tragedy of Paoting Fu</i> ,	156
King's <i>Reconstruction in Theology</i> ,	155
King's <i>Why We Believe the Bible</i> ,	157, 444
<i>Knox' and Others' Christian Point of View</i> ,	153
Lanier's <i>Kinship of God and Man</i> ,	155
Laws' <i>Bible Study of the Obstacles</i> , etc.,	443
<i>Lawson's Short Method with Christian</i> <i>Science</i> ,	160
Lay Coöperation in Church Work,	<i>E. P. Davis</i> , 538
Legacy of Christ, The,	<i>E. D. McDougall</i> , 284
Lowrie's <i>David the Hero</i> ,	159
Mallard's <i>Martha's Fault and Mary's Choice</i> ,	159
Margolinth's <i>Religions of Bible Lands</i> ,	157
Marshall's <i>The Book of Job</i> ,	602
McCorkle's <i>Christian Science</i> ,	306
McGarvey's <i>Authorship of the Book of Deu-</i> <i>teronomy</i> ,	155
Miner's <i>China's Book of Martyrs</i> ,	446
Ministerial "Dead Line,"	<i>J. Preston Scarle</i> , 130
<i>Missionary Circles</i> , No. X.,	156
Moller's <i>Are the Critics Right?</i>	604
Moncrieff's <i>History of the Christian Church</i> , <i>R. C. Reed</i> ,	152
Moorehead's <i>Outline Studies in Acts, Romans,</i> <i>etc.</i> ,	155
Moule's <i>From Sunday to Sunday</i> ,	606
Mormonism and Citizenship,	415
Newman's <i>Manual of Church History</i> ,	<i>R. C. Reed</i> , 290
New Philosophy, The,	<i>Charles Gray Shaw</i> , 239
Nicholson's <i>Oneness with Christ</i> ,	607
Notes,	133, 255, 404, 564
Obedience, Christ's Active,	<i>S. M. Tenney</i> , 207
Old Testament Criticism,	<i>F. P. Ramsay</i> , 189
Old Testament, The, in Our Times,	<i>R. E. Vinson</i> , 161
Old Testament, The Inspiration of,	<i>Clarence K. Crawford</i> , ... 370
Orr's <i>David Hume and His Influence</i> , etc.,	<i>F. R. Beattie</i> , 599

Papacy Under a Searchlight, The,	Parke P. Flournoy,	352
Pattison's <i>The History of Christian Preach-</i> <i>ing</i> ,		445
Pedagogic Instruction in Seminaries,	F. R. Beattie,	133
Peloubet's <i>Select Notes, for 1904</i> ,		604
Philosophy, The New,	Charles Gray Shaw,	239
Pick's <i>Extra-Canonical Life of Christ</i> ,		605
Pierson's <i>The Keswick Movement</i> ,		443
Practical Notes,	133, 264, 404,	564
Pratt's <i>Studies of the Book of Genesis</i> ,		602
Preacher's Relations to his Work,	Alexander Sprunt,	282
Presbyterian Polity,	T. M. McConnell,	409
Presbyterianism, Sentimental Reasons for,	Jno. W. Moseley, Jr.,	559
Proof of Inspiration,	E. E. Smith,	504
Proposed Union of Churches,		568, 572
Proudfoot's <i>Systematic Homiletics</i> ,	F. R. Beattie,	435
Public Schools, The Bible in the,	F. R. Beattie,	512
Randolph's <i>Reason, Faith and Authority in</i> <i>Religion</i> ,	J. A. Quarles,	298
Recent Publications,	154, 303, 441,	602
Resurrection of Christ, The,	Jos. A. McMurray,	480
Reviews and Criticisms,	146, 287, 427,	588
Revised Confession, The,	R. A. Webb,	451
Revised Version, The American,	David G. Wylie,	103
Rotherham's <i>The Emphasized Bible</i> ,		442
Sayce's <i>Tobit and the Babylonian Apocrypha</i> ,		605
School Hymnal, The,		307
Selleck's <i>Spiritual Outlook</i> ,	R. C. Reed,	293
Seminaries, Pedagogic Instruction in,	F. R. Beattie,	153
Sentimental Reasons for Presbyterianism,	Jno. W. Moseley, Jr.,	559
Shaw's <i>Theology for the People</i> ,		154
<i>Short History of American Presbyterianism</i> ,		444
Sloan's <i>Social Regeneration the Work of</i> <i>Christianity</i> ,		447
Southern General Assembly of 1903,	R. Q. Mallard,	122
Speer's <i>The Situation in China</i> ,		307
Standards, The Westminster,	E. C. Gordon,	79
St. Anthony the Great,	Henry E. Dosker,	239
Stephen's <i>Organization of the Cumberland</i> <i>Church</i> ,		307
Stillman's <i>Fools' Gold</i> ,		308
Stryker's <i>The Well by the Gate</i> ,		159
Sydenstricker's <i>Nameless Immortals</i> ,		159
Taylor's <i>The Christian Science Cult</i> ,		160
Terry's <i>The New and Living Way</i> ,		154
Testament, The Old, in Our Times,	R. E. Vinson,	161
Thanksgiving for Reverses,	George Summey,	422
Things Above, The,	Joseph Rennie,	280

Trumbull's <i>Old Time Student Volunteers</i> ,	156, 446
Truth, The Dualism of,	<i>L. G. Barbour</i> , 325
<i>Twentieth Century New Testament</i> ,	<i>Jas. A. Quarles</i> , 438
Union of Churches,	568, 572
University Consolidation Movement,	564
Vacancies, The Evil of, and Remedy,	<i>Chas. D. Gilkeson</i> , 404
Value of Internal Evidence,	<i>J. W. Primrose</i> , 65
Vance's <i>Penance and Repentance</i> ,	606
Vance's <i>The Simplicity of Life</i> ,	449
Verner's <i>Pioneering in Central Africa</i> ,	<i>Samuel M. Smith</i> , 599
Walker's <i>American Baptist Year-Book</i> ,	158
Weekly's <i>Getting and Giving</i> ,	443
Westminster Standards, Beauty in,	<i>Chas. P. Foreman</i> , 545
Westminster Standards and the Scriptures, ..	<i>E. C. Gordon</i> , 79
Wilson's <i>Princeton for the Nation's Service</i> ,	308
Woman Question, The,	<i>James M. Chaney</i> , 391
Wright's <i>That Printer of Udell's</i> ,	304
<i>Year-Book of Prayer for Foreign Missions</i> ,	156

PRINTING!

BOOKS belong to the "high art" of Printing. There are first-rate carpenters, but the cabinet-maker can turn out work the carpenter cannot do; and there are good house-painters, but the artist is away above him in handling the brush. So, in Printing, Bookwork stands in the same relation.

WHITTET & SHEPPERSON love to put into elegant garb the work of the Theologian, the Literary Genius, and the Poet. Their Bookwork is of the best.

The following works are some of the more recent issues from their presses, and they would respectfully refer authors and publishers to them as the class of work which, with the aid of skillful workmen and the most efficient machinery, they are enabled to present:

Life and Letters of Rev. Moses D. Hoge, D. D.

Life and Times of Rev. Dr. Adger.

Discussions of Philosophical Questions, by Dr. Girardeau.

Sermons, Apologetic and Doctrinal, by Dr. C. R. Vaughan.

The Threefold Fellowship, by Dr. B. M. Palmer.

The Universal Salvation of Infants, by Dr. Staggs.

Apologetics, by Rev. Francis R. Beattie, D. D., LL. D.

Life and Letters of Robert Lewis Dabney, D. D., LL. D., by Rev.

Thos. C. Johnson, D. D., LL. D.

Also numerous volumes for Sunday-school Libraries, published by the Presbyterian Committee of Publication.

As examples of Magazine Printing, they would refer to those numbers of THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY which have been issued since July, 1902, and also to THE UNION SEMINARY MAGAZINE.

They make a specialty of printing MINUTES OF PRESBYTERIES AND SYNODS, undertaking to relieve the Stated Clerks of the distribution of the printed copies. The arrangement has been very satisfactory, and they are desirous of extending this line of work, and invite correspondence.

WHITTET & SHEPPERSON,
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA.

THE ENVELOPE SYSTEM

of Raising Church Moneys.

The envelope system has been so uniformly successful in our churches whenever it has been fairly and faithfully tried, that its general use is recommended as a solution of the difficult problem of raising the necessary funds for the various branches of church work. It has some variations, and is adaptable to the circumstances of any church.

To its success, as of every other method, perseverance, system and proper management are essential; but with these the result will be most gratifying.

The prices given for the envelopes include the subscription card, which we place on the top of each package, numbered to correspond to the package which it accompanies, and also free delivery to any part of the United States.

For packages of 65 envelopes each (52 envelopes for the Weekly Offering, and 13 for the General Assembly's Causes), printed with the name of church, dated for each Sabbath in the year, with subscription card, and package numbered throughout, and enclosed in a neat case, and delivered, the prices are as follows:

1 to 25 Packages, . . . 17c.	per package	75 to 100 " . . . 10½c.	per package
25 to 50 " . . . 14c.	" "	100 to 300 " . . . 9½c.	" "
50 to 75 " . . . 11c.	" "	Over 200 " . . . 9c.	" "

For a Treasurer's Book, Clarke's Record Book will be found to fill all requirements, and is supplied in the following sizes, at the prices named, postage prepaid:

No. 2, Four hundred names,	\$1.00
No. 4, Eight hundred names,	1.50
No. 5, Fifteen hundred names,	2.50

The system is being successfully used in a great number of churches, and the increased orders we receive each year attest its usefulness and popularity. Make a trial of the system. Order of

Whittet & Shepperson, Richmond, Va.

50 YEARS' EXPERIENCE

PATENTS

TRADE MARKS
DESIGNS
COPYRIGHTS & C.

Anyone sending a sketch and description may quickly ascertain our opinion free whether an invention is probably patentable. Communications strictly confidential. HANDBOOK on Patents sent free. Oldest agency for securing patents.

Patents taken through Munn & Co. receive special notice, without charge, in the

Scientific American.

A handsomely illustrated weekly. Largest circulation of any scientific journal. Terms, \$3 a year; four months, \$1. Sold by all newsdealers.

MUNN & Co. 361 Broadway, New York
Branch Office, 625 F St., Washington, D. C.

7186
10