

The Evangelist.

IN ESSENTIALS UNITY • IN NON ESSENTIALS LIBERTY • IN ALL THINGS CHARITY

Vol. LXIX.—No. 6.

NEW YORK: FEBRUARY 10, 1898.

Whole No. 3542

THE EVANGELIST.

A RELIGIOUS AND FAMILY PAPER,
ISSUED WEEKLY.

156 Fifth Ave., New York City.

TERMS: \$3.00 A YEAR.

HENRY M. FIELD, Editor

CONTENTS.

ALL ROUND THE HORIZON.....	H. M. F.	3
The eyes of all Europe turned toward Paris—The Dreyfus case: A captain in the army accused of betraying military secrets—Where is the proof?—Which of the powers tempted him to betray his country?—Germany and Austria deny it—Was it Russia?—Zola defies the government—He is put on trial—The witnesses refuse to testify—The first day's trial proves nothing—The government perplexed—Zola in good cheer, even though he may be sent to prison.		
Brave Onesiphorus—A Talk for the Times.	Theodore L. Cuyler.	4
The Bible "Without Note or Comment."	William S. Jerome.	4
A Letter from China: Cities That Bow Down to Wood and Stone.....	Albert A. Fulton.	5
EDITORIAL:		
The Bible Society Not Ready to Give up the Ghost.....	H. M. F.	6
Fac-Simile of the Shorter Catechism.	Charles L. Thompson, D.D.	6
Notable Figures in a Famous Old Church.	H. M. F.	7
That Golden Wedding.....	John H. Dey.	7
Synodical Home Missions.....	Rev. Wilson Phraner, D.D.	8
Two Meetings of Interest.....		8
A Quietist to an Absurd Story.....		8
President Patton on Temperance Laws.....		9
A Noble Life Ended.....	W. A. B., Jr.	11
The Christian Conquest of Asia.	John Henry Barrows, D.D.	11
A Veteran Crowned.....	R. A. S.	12
Cleveland Letter.....	W. H. B.	12
Some Men Whom I Have Known.	Benjamin F. Millard.	12
THE BOOK TABLE.....		13
An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament—A Guide to Biblical Study—Interpretations of Life and Religion—Sidelights from Patmos—The Old Campeador and the Waning of the Crescent in the West—The New Apologetic—Hawaii: Our New Possessions, Book Notes, Literary Notes.		
RELIGIOUS PRESS.....		15
THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL.....		16
Bible Study Union, Ex. I., v. The International Lesson, Matt. x., 2-15.		
CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR. Topic, Every Christian a Missionary.....		17
CHILDREN'S DEPARTMENT.....		18
Two Valentines (poetry)—A Valentine Story—Valentine—Gladbrook; by John A. Campbell—Safeguards for Young Girls—Dog Saved His Master—The Story of a Song.		
Woman's Board of Home Missions.....	H. E. B.	20
Woman's Board of Foreign Missions.....	J. B. S.	21
TENEMENT HOUSE CHAPTER.....		23
Two Social Events.		
How to File and Set Saw-Teeth.....	Eas E. Tee.	23
MUSIC.....		24
What Shall be the Grade of Church Music?—About Enunciation.		
Sermon.....	By Rev. George Nixon.	27
MISTERS AND CHURCHES.....		29
Letter from Chicago.....	Clarence G. Reynolds.	31
HOUSEHOLD.....		31

All Round the Horizon.

This week the eyes of all Europe are turned upon Paris, which is in a fever of excitement. And what for? Is it a question of peace or war? Not at all—nor any matter of importance between France and any other of the great Powers of the Continent. It is only that dreadful "Dreyfus Case" that is up again, though it has already been settled two or three times, and, as the French government fondly believed, put down forever! But somehow it will not stay down. Charles Sumner used to say that "No question is ever settled until it is settled right!" And in spite of all that has been done, there is still in the minds of thousands a deep suspicion that this case has been settled wrong! If so the condemnation was a crime that may have to be paid for in blood! And yet it is all about a single man, who is not in Paris, nor in France, nor even in Europe, but far away across the sea in a penal settlement, where he is enduring a punishment worse than death, when many of those best informed believe that he is innocent of the least crime against his country!

It would not seem very difficult for the French authorities to settle the question of his guilt or innocence, if they would go squarely at it. The weight of evidence seems to be in favor of his innocence, and yet the mob are determined to find him guilty; and how to make the evidence bend to their wishes is the puzzling problem to be solved!

Only look at it! A captain in the army is accused of betraying military secrets to a foreign power! But where and how? And to what power? The military authorities profess to be in possession of secret proofs, which they will not divulge! This is a suspicious thing on their part. Is it that they will compromise themselves? Or others whom they wish to protect?

The inquiry is complicated by the fact that of the great Powers—which might be inculpated as having lured him into treachery, two, or it may be three, Germany and Austria and Italy—have pledged their honor to France and to Europe, that they have had no communications or revelations whatever! This is so far satisfactory, but terribly unsatisfactory in that it narrows the number of those who can be implicated, with the chance that it may prove Russia to be the guilty seducer that led a French officer to betray his trust: and this while Russia is the one power in Europe, with which France desires to be in the closest friendship!

It is an ugly piece of business to try to stifle evidence, and keep the truth from coming out. But this policy might have succeeded under the plea that there were "State secrets" that could not be revealed! "Public safety" is the cloak that covers up many cruelties and crimes. It might have succeeded in this case, if there had not suddenly appeared a new element in the

contest, when the most popular writer in France leaped into the arena, and threw down the gauntlet to the government itself! Emile Zola is known all over Europe as the most famous of French novelists. Whether it was from private information or not, he became possessed of the conviction that Dreyfus was an innocent man, and that the officer who was really guilty, (if such a crime had been committed,) had escaped by throwing the accusation on another!

Here was another complication. The government must meet it, and prove the accusation false, or lie under the odium of persecuting an innocent man and of a false imprisonment! Zola was put under arrest, and on Monday was brought up for trial. He did not shrink from it, but demanded that certain officers of the army should be put upon the stand! One and another was called to the witness box, but refused to testify! Of course this was interpreted as a confession that they could not deny the charge which had been thrown in their faces. The whole effort of the counsel for Zola was to get in evidence, while the effort on the other side was to keep it out.

His counsel first of all summoned the members of the court-martial which had tried Dreyfus, and when they refused to testify, he demanded to know "if they were acting under the orders of the Minister of War or of their own volition?" and then turning to the jury said:

"The proof we wish to show you is so striking that our opponents are trying to prevent its becoming known. Nevertheless, if necessary, I will tell what it is myself without witnesses. If I fail Dreyfus will remain in the prison where he was placed by a law expressly made for him!"

The former President of France, Casimir-Perier, was next summoned, but pleaded that he could not be called upon to disclose secrets that were confided to him when he was at the head of the government!

Next was called the chief of the Intelligence Bureau of the War Department, whom Zola had charged with working up a fraudulent case against Dreyfus because he needed a scapegoat on account of the leaks in his bureau. But he, too, stood upon his dignity, and kept silence. The same excuse was offered again and again, till the advocate of Zola shouted, "One would really think these officers imagine they form a separate caste, superior to all others, above the law and exempt from the respect due to Court."

Here ended the first day's trial, in which the defence may be said to have proved nothing, and yet in reality had proved everything! If such negative testimony could not convince the jury, it must convince the public. Already the feeling outside of France is almost universal in favor of the bold writer, who had dared to defy the government. It may be indeed, if all the witnesses refuse to testify, that he may be convicted and sent to prison. But he would take such a fate very calmly, if not triumphantly!

THEOLOGICAL
NEW YORK

THE EVANGELIST

THE BIBLE SOCIETY

NOT READY TO GIVE UP THE GHOST!

A few weeks since—on the last day but one of the old year—there came a wail out of the West that gave a sadness to the opening of the new year. A rumor was abroad in the air that the great Bible Society, which had been the glory of our American churches, had waxed old and was ready to vanish away. To be sure there was a little vagueness in the report. We could not quite understand how it was that we should receive the news from a point hundreds of miles distant, when the Bible House is but a few minutes' walk from where we now write. If we had been duly advised of the sad event, we should at least have paid the venerable institution the respect of going to the funeral. But perhaps the managers were so overcome by the sudden demise that they wished to have the last rites private, and therefore preferred to bury the dead in silence, in the darkness of the night.

But the mere announcement was sufficient to call forth comments from different quarters. A correspondent in Washington thought it a proper occasion to moralize on the event, which, after all, sad as it was, could have been expected because of the nakedness and bareness of the old Bible that was sent abroad "without note or comment," while other editions of the same Holy Book had an air of freshness and novelty, as they were made attractive by innumerable illustrations, and by all the side-lights that could be thrown upon the sacred page from history, and from discoveries in the ruins of ancient cities that were buried thousands of years ago.

This was at least an interesting subject for discussion, when the interchange of views was interrupted by a notice from the officers that the Bible Society is not dead nor dying: that old as it may be it is like an ancient oak, which is so rooted in the earth that it may well stand the storms of another hundred years. Although it comes with the surprise of a *post mortem* communication, it is but just to let it speak for itself:

CORRECTION FROM THE BIBLE HOUSE.

DEAR DR. FIELD: It appears to us at the Bible House that your editorial in this week's Evangelist and the letters of your two correspondents are not only damaging to the American Bible Society, but also entirely unsupported by facts. I would like very much, with your permission, to discuss with Dr. Egleston the question of limitations which affect the Society's work, but that can wait a little. But I must beg you without delay to do something to counteract the impression to which you have given currency that because of reduced income the Bible Society has proposed to abandon the manufacture of Bibles and to offer its building for sale.

The true state of things is shown in the enclosed extract from the November number of the Bible Society Record, which as you will see puts things in a very different light. Matters have not changed since then except that there has been a gratifying increase in donations. And furthermore at the stated meeting of our Managers yesterday it was decided to purchase at once two new printing presses of an improved character, upon which to print the Bibles for which there is the greatest demand.

I am very truly yours,

EDWARD W. GILMAN,
Corresponding Secretary.

This is a surprise, but a very agreeable one, and we give the old Society our best wishes, hoping that it may live and flourish for another century.

But while we love it and bid it God speed, it is not above suggestions from without. The Bible itself is a sacred thing which we touch reverently, but the Society is not so sacred as to be above criticism, if it be not offered in the spirit of fault-finding, but for its increased usefulness. We understand perfectly the reason why the Bible is printed "without note or comment." It is that there may be no occasion for any body of Christians to say that the old English Bible, which has been handed down from our fathers, has been manipulated in the interest of any particular creed or denomination.

But if the Society makes a virtue of printing the Bible "without note or comment," why does it violate its own rule by "prefixes" and "affixes," and "marginal notes" that tell the reader as plainly as any commentary could, just how the text of Scripture is to be interpreted or understood? Some of these "head-pieces" given by a correspondent on the fourth page are so grotesque that we can hardly understand how they have been continued unto this day. Well may he ask, "Why should not the American people have the best translation of the Bible that is possible?"

But we are obliged to part from him when he asks with full assurance of faith, "What is so good as the Revised Version?" If I am compelled to give my own private opinion, it is that in hundreds—yes, in thousands—of cases, the changes made by the Revisers are no improvements! I am sorry to say this, for I know well for how many years my friends, Dr. Schaff and Dr. Howard Crosby, and a score of other eminent American scholars, labored upon the Revision in the Bible House, as the first scholars of England exhausted all their learning upon it in the Jerusalem Chamber in Westminster Abbey.

Why then do I prefer the old to the new? Is it that the old translation is more correct? Perhaps it is not. But if it is as good as the other, respect to the past should leave it undisturbed, if it were only for its precious associations. Does any one think he can change the words of the Lord's Prayer, or of the Sermon on the Mount, without grating harshly on every devout listener? If it makes no difference to some, it does to others, of whom I am one. If I were on my death bed, and were to ask the one dearest to me in all the world to read the twenty-third psalm, would it be just the same if the old words, that had comforted millions of pilgrims as they came down to the brink of the river, had been changed by some new translation? I am happy to say that this psalm was too sacred for the revisers to touch.

But how many passages have they turned topsy turvy? I will take only one line, and a short one at that: "There shall be no more death"—only six words, but what a majestic rhythm is there in them! I turn to the Revised Version, and we have the same words, but transposed so that it reads, "Death shall be no more," whereby the old line, that sounded in our ears like the roll of the sea, is made flat and commonplace. If that is scholarship, the Lord deliver me from it!

Is there not something due to the majesty of our mother tongue? Over twenty years ago I was in London and spent an afternoon with George Eliot, who certainly knew how to use the best English, if any living writer did. In the conversation there was something said about the "Old English," and I remember how the Bible was spoken of as the most magnificent illustration of the tongue in which Milton and Shakespeare wrote. What English scholar would not be disgusted at an attempt to translate Shakespeare into modern English! Is not the taste quite as bad that would strike out every quaint old phrase of the Bible? When I read the Psalms, they are not dull prose to me, but poetry of the highest order. And so when I read the prophecies of Isaiah, I see the prophet on the

top of Mount Carmel, looking out upon the Mediterranean when the tempest is abroad, and echoing in his mighty words the roll and thunders of the waves that are breaking at his feet. Does it not savor of impertinence to try to "modernize" poets and prophets by translating their inspired words into the common-place language of our every day life?

Some years after that notable afternoon with George Eliot, I met Spurgeon at Mentone, on the Riviera, and I remember how he spoke of the New Version, saying that he had no doubt that the revisers were great scholars, and understood Greek and Hebrew, but he regretted that they did not seem to be so familiar with their own best writers of the seventeenth century, out of whose writings they might draw from "the well of English undefiled."

But why need we make an opposition between the Old Version and the New, since we can have both, and thereby be doubly furnished out of the holy oracles? For myself I have long been in the habit of reading out of the New Testament which has the two versions paralleled on one page, so that if there be any obscurity, the eye passes instantly from one to the other. *But I always read from the Old Version!* Others may prefer the taste of the new wine. But for myself, if I must choose, I answer in all simplicity, For me the Old is better! H. M. F.

FAC-SIMILE OF THE SHORTER CATECHISM

By Charles L. Thompson.

Perhaps one of the most notable events connected with the celebration of the 250th anniversary of the completion of the Shorter Catechism is the issuing of a fac-simile of the first edition of the Catechism by our friend, William Carruthers, F.R.S., lately keeper of Botany of the British Museum. There is no better living authority on the literature of the Catechisms than Mr. Carruthers, who has made it the special study of many years.

The reception of this interesting volume issued by the Publication office of the Presbyterian Church of England, recalls pleasantly the hour we spent with Mr. Carruthers and other British friends in the Jerusalem Chamber of Westminster Abbey, when Dean Bradley of the Abbey gave us a vivid description of the scenes which transpired in that Chamber in the years from 1645 to 1648. "It is a fair room, well hung, wider at the end nearer the door, and on both sides are stages of seats with room for 100 or 120 persons." Here the great works of the assembly which have exerted so wonderful an influence on the theological history of the last two centuries were produced. We seem to be looking again into that historic Chamber, as we turn over the pages of this fac-simile of the copy in the Library of the British Museum.

How little could Palmer, or any of the other men concerned in the issuing of these immortal documents, have dreamed of the influence they were to exert when they presented them at the doors of Parliament with this quaint title, "The humble advice of the Assembly of Divines now by authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster concerning a Shorter Catechism presented by them lately to both houses of Parliament." The fac-simile issue of the Catechism is made doubly interesting by the historical account which Mr. Carruthers gives of its formation, by the Bibliography which describes all the editions of the Catechism to the present time, including the translations of the Catechism into other languages, and also a catalogue of the expositions of the Catechism in Europe and America.

Mr. Carruthers is much to be congratulated on what has been to him a labor of love, and what will be of perpetual interest to all branches of the Presbyterian Church.