

THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

No. 48--APRIL, 1899.

I. GENESIS OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY.

For great events in either Church or State there are usually well defined periods of preparation. Such events do not arise suddenly, but come to pass in their fulness of time.

It is with them as with a mighty river. Its vast volume of rushing waters is the product of many smaller streams, and these in turn are made up of many lesser rivulets, which, gathering from distant mountains and flowing through fertile plains, combine to make the great river—the St. Lawrence, the Mississippi or the Amazon; the Rhine, the Danube or the Nile. To understand the river aright, we must trace its various converging streams to their respective sources, in the recesses of lofty mountains, in the depths of trackless forests, or amid the loneliness of distant lakes. Thus explorers have sought the sources of the Nile, the Mississippi and the Amazon, and in this way reliable geography is made.

So it is with the Providence of God, as it works out its great movements, alike in the life of nations and in the history of the Church. These movements can only be rightly understood by tracing the various streams of influence

IX. THE POLEMICS OF INFANT BAPTISM.

The question of the Subjects of Baptism is one of that class of problems the solution of which hangs upon a previous question. According as is our doctrine of the Church, so will be our doctrine of the Subjects of Baptism. If we believe, with the Church of Rome, that the Church is in such a sense the institute of salvation that none are united to Christ save through the instrumentality of her ordinances, then we shall inevitably determine the proper subjects of her ordinances in one way. If, on the other hand, we believe, with the Protestant bodies, that only those already united to Christ have right within his house and to its privileges, we shall inevitably determine them in another way. All Protestants should easily agree that only Christ's children have a right to the ordinance of baptism. The cleavage in their ranks enters in only when we inquire how the external church is to hold itself relatively to the recognition of the children of Christ. If we say that its attitude should be as exclusive as possible, and that it must receive as the children of Christ only those whom it is forced to recognize as such, then we shall inevitably narrow the circle of the subjects of baptism to the lowest limits. If, on the other hand, we say that its attitude should be as inclusive as possible, and that it should receive as the children of Christ all whom, in the judgment of charity, it may fairly recognize as such, then we shall naturally widen the circle of the subjects of baptism to far more ample limits. The former represents, broadly speaking, the Puritan idea of the Church, the latter the general Protestant doctrine. It is on the basis of the Puritan conception of the Church that the Baptists are led to exclude infants from baptism. For, if we are to demand anything like demonstrative evidence of actual participation in Christ before we baptize, no infant, who by reason of

years is incapable of affording signs of his union with Christ, can be thought a proper subject of the rite.

The vice of this system, however, is that it attempts the impossible. No man can read the heart. As a consequence, it follows that no one, however rich his manifestation of Christian graces, is baptized on the basis of infallible knowledge of his relation to Christ. All baptism is inevitably administered on the basis not of knowledge but of presumption. And if we must baptize on presumption, the whole principle is yielded; and it would seem that we must baptize all whom we may fairly presume to be members of Christ's body. In this state of the case, it is surely impracticable to assert that there can be but one ground on which a fair presumption of inclusion in Christ's body can be erected, namely, personal profession of faith. Assuredly a human profession is no more solid basis to build upon than a Divine promise. So soon, therefore, as it is fairly apprehended that we baptize on presumption and not on knowledge, it is inevitable that we shall baptize all those for whom we may, on any grounds, fairly cherish a good presumption that they belong to God's people—and this surely includes the infant children of believers, concerning the favor of God to whom there exist many precious promises on which pious parents, Baptists as fully as others, rest in devout faith.

To this solid proof of the rightful inclusion of the infant children of believers among the subjects of baptism, is added the unavoidable implication of the continuity of the Church of God, as it is taught in the Scriptures, from its beginning to its consummation; and of the undeniable inclusion within the bounds of this Church, in its pre-Christian form, as participants of its privileges, inclusive of the parallel rite of circumcision, of the infant children of the flock, with no subsequent hint of their exclusion. To this is added further the historical evidence of the prevalence in the Christian Church of the custom of

baptizing the infant children of believers, from the earliest Christian ages down to to-day. The manner in which it is dealt with by Augustine and the Pelagians in their controversy, by Cyprian in his letter to Fidus, by Tertullian in his treatise on Baptism, leaves no room for doubt that it was, at the time when each of these writers wrote, as universal and unquestioned a practice among Christians at large as it is to-day—while wherever it was objected to, the objection seems to have rested on one or the other of two contrary errors, either on an overestimate of the effects of baptism or on an underestimate of the need of salvation for infants.

On such lines as these a convincing positive argument is capable of being set forth for infant baptism, to the support of which whatever obscure allusions to it may be found in the New Testament itself may then be summoned. And on these lines the argument has ordinarily been very successfully conducted, as may be seen by consulting the treatment of the subject in any of our standard works on systematic theology, as for example Dr. Charles Hodge's (III, p. 546). It has occurred to me that additional support might be brought to the conclusions thus positively attained, by observing the insufficiency of the case against infant baptism as argued by the best furnished opponents of that practice. There would seem no better way to exhibit this insufficiency than to subject the presentation of the arguments against infant baptism, as set forth by some confessedly important representative of its opponents, to a running analysis. I have selected for the purpose the statement given in Dr. A. H. Strong's *Systematic Theology*, pp. 534 sq. What that eminently well-informed and judicious writer does not urge against infant baptism may well be believed to be confessedly of small comparative weight as an argument against the doctrine and practice. So that if we do not find the arguments he urges conclusive, we may well be content with the position we already occupy.

Dr. Strong opens the topic, "The Subjects of Baptism" (p. 530) with the statement that, "The proper subjects of baptism are those only who give credible evidence that they have been regenerated by the Holy Spirit—or, in other words, have entered by faith into the communion of Christ's death and resurrection"—a statement which if, like the ordinary language of the Scriptures, it is intended to have reference only to the adults to whom it is addressed, would be sufficiently unexceptionable; but which, the "only" advertises us to suspect to be more inclusive in its purpose. This statement is followed at once by the organized "proof that only persons giving evidence of being regenerated are proper subjects of baptism." This proof is derived:

"(a) From the command and example of Christ and his Apostles which show: First, that those only are to be baptized who have previously been made disciples. Secondly, that those only are to be baptized who have previously repented and believed.

(b) From the nature of the church—as a company of regenerate persons.

(c) From the symbolism of the ordinance, as declaring a previous spiritual change in him who submits to it."

Each of these items is supported by Scripture texts, though some of them are no doubt sufficiently inapposite. As e. g. when only John 3:5 and Rom. 6:13—neither of which have anything to do with the visible Church—are quoted to prove that the visible Church (of which baptism is an ordinance) is "a company of regenerate persons;" or as when Matt. 28:19 is quoted to prove that baptism took place after the discipling, as if the words *ραν μαθητεύσαντες βαπτίζετε*, whereas the passage, actually standing *μαθητεύσατε βαπτίζοντες*, merely demands that the discipling shall be consummated in, shall be performed by means of baptism; or as when Acts 10:47, where the fact that the extraordinary power of the Holy Spirit had come upon Cornelius is pleaded as reason why baptism should not be withheld

from him,¹ and Rom. 6:2-5, which only develops the spiritual implication of baptism, are made to serve as proofs that the symbolism of the ordinance declares always and constantly a "previous" spiritual change. Apart from the scriptural evidence actually brought forward, moreover, the propositions, in the extreme form in which they are stated, cannot be supported by Scripture. The Scriptures do not teach that the external Church is a company of regenerate persons—the parable of the tares for example declares the opposite: though they represent that Church as the company of those who are presumably regenerate. They do not declare that baptism demonstrates a "previous" change—the case of Simon Magus, Acts 8:13, is enough to exhibit the contrary: though they represent the rite as symbolic of the inner cleansing presumed to be already present, and consequently as administered only on profession of faith.

The main difficulty with Dr. Strong's argument, however, is the illegitimate use it makes of the occasional character of the New Testament declarations. He is writing a "Systematic Theology" and is therefore striving to embrace the whole truth in his statements: he says therefore with conscious reference to infants, whose case he is soon to treat: "Those only are to be baptized who have

¹ This interpretation of Acts 10:47 must certainly greatly embarrass Dr. Strong when he comes to interpret the case of the Samaritans in Acts 8: For the same falling of the Holy Ghost which was poured out on Cornelius and his friends and exhibited itself in "speaking with tongues and magnifying God" (Acts 10:46); and was made by Peter the plea why water should not be forbidden for baptizing them; not only did not precede baptism in the case of the Samaritans, but actually did not take place until a considerably later date. The Samaritans are baptized, Acts 8:12; but the Holy Ghost had not been received by them, Acts 8:16. and was not received until Peter and John visited them and laid their hands on them, (Acts 8:12). If the case of Cornelius proves that baptism is not administered until after the Holy Ghost is received, that of the Samaritans proves that it precedes the gift of the Holy Ghost. In truth neither passage proves the one or the other, this outpouring of the Holy Ghost referring to the *charismata*.

previously repented and believed," and the like. But the passages he quotes in support of this position are not drawn from a "Systematic Theology" but from direct practical appeals to quite definite audiences, consisting only of adults; or from narratives of what took place as the result of such appeals. Because Peter told the men that stood about him at Pentecost, "Repent ye and be baptized," it does not follow that baptism might not have been administered by the same Peter to the infants of those repentant sinners previous to the infants' own repentance. Because Philip baptized the converts of Samaria only after they had believed, it does not follow that he would not baptize their infants until they had grown old enough to repeat their parents' faith, that they might, like them, receive its sign.

The assertion contained in the first proof is, therefore, a *non sequitur* from the texts offered in support of it. There is a suppressed premise necessary to be supplied before the assumed conclusion follows from them, and that premise is that the visible Church consists of believers only without inclusion of their children—that Peter meant nothing on that day of Pentecost when he added to the words which Dr. Strong quotes: "Repent ye and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins"—those other words which Dr. Strong does not quote: "For to you is the promise and to your children" (Acts 2:38). This suppressed premise Dr. Strong adjoins in the second item of proof which he adduces; but we must observe that it is not a second item, but a necessary element in the first item which without it is invalid. In a word, when we correct the Scripture he adduces and the illegitimate use he makes of Scripture, Dr. Strong's whole argument reduces to the one item of the "nature of the Church, as a company of regenerate persons." It is only on the ground that this is the true idea of the Church that the passages quoted to prove that baptism is to be

administered "only" to such as have previously repented and believed, and those quoted to prove that the symbolism of the ordinance declares a "previous" spiritual change in him who submits to it, will justify the "only" and "previous" in which lies their point. The validity of the proof he offers thus depends on the truth of the assertion that the Church consists of regenerate persons ; and whether this be true or not we need not here stay to examine : certainly the texts he adduces in proof of it, as already intimated, make no approach to establishing it. We rest securely in the result that according to Dr. Strong's argument as well as our own conviction, the subjects of baptism are the members of the visible Church : and who those are, will certainly be determined by our theory of the nature of the Church.

A page or two further on (p. 534) he takes up the question of "Infant Baptism" *ex professo*. This "he rejects and reprehends," and that for the following reasons, viz.:

"(a) Infant baptism is without warrant, either express or implied, in the Scripture.

(b) Infant baptism is expressly contradicted [by scriptural teaching.]

(c) The rise of infant baptism in the history of the church is due to sacramental conceptions of Christianity, so that all arguments in its favor from the writings of the first three centuries, are equally arguments for baptismal regeneration.

(d) The reasoning by which it is supported is unscriptural, unsound, and dangerous in its tendency.

(e) The lack of agreement among pædobaptists as to the warrant for infant baptism and as to the relation of baptized infants to the church, together with the manifest decline of the practice itself, are arguments against it.

(f) The evil effects of infant baptism are a strong argument against it."

Here is quite a list of arguments. We must look at the items one by one.

(a) When we ask after a direct scriptural warrant for infant baptism, in the sense which Dr. Strong has in mind, in

the first of these arguments, we, of course, have the New Testament in view, seeing that it is only in the new dispensation that this rite has been ordained. In this sense of the words, we may admit his first declaration—that there is no express command that infants should be baptized; and with it also his second—that there is in Scripture no clear example of the baptism of infants, *i. e.*, if we understand by this that there is no express record, reciting in so many words, that infants were baptized. When he adds to these, however, a third contention, that “the passages held to imply infant baptism, contain, when fairly interpreted, no reference to such a practice,” we begin to recalcitrate. If it were only asserted that these passages contain no such stringent proof that infants were baptized as would satisfy us on the point in the absence of other evidence, we might yield this point also. But it is too much to ask us to believe that they contain “no reference to the practice” if “fairly interpreted.” What is a “fair” interpretation? Is it not an interpretation which takes the passages as they stand, without desire to make undue capital of them one way or the other? Well, a fair interpretation of these passages, in this sense, might prevent pædobaptists from claiming them as a demonstrative proof of infant baptism, and it would also certainly prevent anti-pædobaptists from asserting that they have “no reference to such a practice.” It should lead both parties to agree that the passages have a possible but not a necessary reference to infant baptism—that they are neutral passages, in a word, which apparently imply infant baptism, but which may be explained without involving that implication if we otherwise know that infant baptism did not exist in that day. Fairly viewed, in other words, they are passages which will support any other indications of infant baptism which may be brought forward, but which will scarcely suffice to prove it against evidence to the contrary, or to do more than raise a presumption in its favor in the

absence of other evidence for it. For what are these passages? The important ones are Acts xvi, 15, which declares that Lydia was "baptized and her household," and Acts xvi, 33, which declares that the jailer was "baptized and all his," together with 1 Cor. i, 16, "And I baptized also the household of Stephanas." Certainly at first blush we would think that the repeated baptism of households without further description, would imply the baptism of the infants connected with them. It may be a "fair" response to this that we do not know that there were any infants in these households—which is true enough, but not sufficient to remove the suspicion that there may have been. It may be a still "fairer" reply to say that whether the infants of these families (if there were infants in them) were baptized or not, would depend on the practice of the Apostles; and whatever that practice was would be readily understood by the first readers of the Acts. But this would only amount to asking that infant baptism should not be founded solely on these passages alone; and this we have already granted.

Neither of these lines of argument are adduced by Dr. Strong. They would not justify his position—which is not that the baptism of infants cannot be proved by these passages, but much more than this—that a fair interpretation of them definitely excludes all reference to it by them. Let us see what Dr. Strong means by a "fair" interpretation. To the case of Lydia he appends "cf. vs. 40," which tells us when Paul and Silas were loosed from prison "they entered into the house of Lydia, and when they had seen the brethren they comforted them and departed"—from which, apparently, he would have us make two inferences, (1) that these "brethren" constituted the household of Lydia that was baptized, and (2) that these "brethren" were all adults. In like manner to the case of the jailer he appends the mystic "cf. vs. 34," which tells us that the saved jailer brought his former prisoners up into his house and set meat before them and "rejoiced greatly, having believed, with

all his house, on God"—from which he would apparently have us infer that there was no member of the household, baptized by Paul, who was too young to exercise personal faith. So he says with reference to 1 Cor. 1, 16, that "1 Cor. 16, 15, shows that the whole family of Stephanas, baptized by Paul, were adults." Nevertheless when we look at 1 Cor. 16, 15, we read merely that the house of Stephanas were the first fruits of Achaia and that they had set themselves to minister unto the saints—which leaves the question whether they are all adults or not just where it was before, i. e., absolutely undetermined.

Nor is this all. To these passages Dr. Strong appends two others, one properly enough, 1 Cor. 7, 14, where Paul admonishes the Christian not to desert the unbelieving husband or wife, "for the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the brother; else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." This is doubtless a passage similar to the others; a passage certainly which does not explicitly teach infant baptism, but equally certainly which is not inconsistent with it—which would, indeed, find a ready explanation from such a custom if such a custom existed, and therefore stands as one of the passages which raise at least a suspicion that infant baptism underlies the form of expression—since the holiness of the children is taken for granted in it and the sanctification of the unbelieving partner inferred from it—but is yet no doubt capable of an explanation on the supposition that that practice did not exist and is therefore scarcely a sure foundation for a doctrine asserting it. Dr. Strong is, however, not satisfied with showing that no stringent inference can be drawn from it in favor of infant baptism. He claims it as a "sure testimony," a "plain proof" against infant baptism, on the grounds that the infants and the unbelieving parent are put by it in the same category, and (quoting Jacobi) that if children had been baptized, Paul would cer-

tainly have referred to their baptism as a proof of their holiness. And this in the face of the obvious fact that the holiness of the children is assumed as beyond dispute and in no need of proof, doubt as to which would be too horrible to contemplate, and the sanctification of the husband or wife inferred from it. Of course, it is the sanctity or holiness of external connection and privilege that is referred to, both with reference to the children and the parent ; but that of the one is taken for granted, that of the other is argued ; hence it lies close to infer that the one may have had churchly recognition and the other not. Whether that was true or not, however, the passage cannot positively decide for us ; it only raises a suspicion. But this suspicion ought to be frankly recognized.

The other passage which is adjoined to these is strangely found in their company, although it, too, is one of the "neutral texts." It is Mat. 19, 14 : "Suffer the little children and forbid them not to come unto me ; for to such belongeth the kingdom of heaven." What has this to do with baptism ? Certainly nothing directly ; only if it be held indirectly to show that infants were received by Christ as members of his kingdom on earth, i. e., of his Church, can it bear on the controversy. But notice Dr. Strong's comment : "None would have been 'forbidden,' if Jesus and his disciples had been in the habit of baptizing infants." Does he really think this touches the matter that is raised by this quotation ? Nobody supposes that "Jesus and his disciples" were in the habit of baptizing infants ; nobody supposes that at the time these words were spoken, Christian baptism had been so much as yet instituted. Dr. Strong would have to show, not that infant baptism was not practiced before baptism was instituted, but that the children were not designated by Christ as members of his "kingdom," before the presumption for infant baptism would be extruded from this text. It is his unmeasured zeal to make all texts which have been appealed to by pædobap-

tists—not merely fail to teach pædobaptism—but teach that children were not baptized, that has led him so far astray here.

We cannot profess to admire, then, the “fair” interpretations which Dr. Strong makes of these texts. No one starting out without a foregone conclusion could venture to say that, when “fairly interpreted,” they certainly make no reference to baptism of infants. Nevertheless, I freely allow that they do not suffice, taken by themselves, to prove that infants were baptized by the Apostles—they only suggest this supposition and raise a presumption for it. And, therefore, I am prepared to allow in general the validity of Dr. Strong’s first argument—when thus softened to reasonable proportions. It is true that there is no express command to baptize infants in the New Testament, no express record of the baptism of infants, and no passages so stringently implying it that we must infer from them that infants were baptized. If such warrant as this were necessary to justify the usage we should have to leave it incompletely justified. But the lack of this express warrant is something far short of forbidding the rite; and if the continuity of the Church through all ages can be made good, the warrant for infant baptism is not to be sought in the New Testament but in the Old Testament, when the Church was instituted, and nothing short of an actual forbidding of it in the New Testament would warrant our omitting it now. As Lightfoot expressed it long ago (*Horæ Hebraicæ*, on Matt. 3:6): “It is not forbidden” in the New Testament to “baptize infants, therefore they are to be baptized.” Dr. Strong commits his first logical error in demanding express warrant for the continuance of a long-settled institution, instead of asking for warrant for setting it aside.

(b) If thus the first argument is irrelevant as a whole as well as not very judiciously put in its details, is not its failure well atoned for in the second one? His second argu-

ment undertakes to show that "Infant baptism is expressly contradicted" [by scriptural teaching]. Here, at length, we have the promise of what was needed. But if we expect stringent reason here for the alteration of the children-including covenant, we shall be sadly disappointed. Dr. Strong offers four items. First, infant baptism is contradicted "by the scriptural prerequisites of faith and repentance, as signs of regeneration," which is valid only on the suppressed assumption that baptism is permissible only in the case of those who prove a previous regeneration—which is the very point in dispute. Secondly, "By the scriptural symbolism of the ordinance." "As we should not bury a person before his death, so we should not symbolically bury a person by baptism, until he has in spirit died to sin." Here not only that the symbolism of baptism is burial is gratuitously assumed, but also that this act, whatever be its symbolism, could be the symbol only of an already completed process in the heart of the recipient—which again is the very point in dispute. Thirdly, "By the scriptural constitution of the church"—where again the whole validity of the argument depends on the assumption that infants are not members of the church—the very point in dispute. These three arguments must therefore be thrown at once out of court. If the Scriptures teach that personal faith and repentance are prerequisites to baptism, if they teach that one must have previously died to sin before he is baptized, if they teach that the visible Church consists of regenerate adults only—why, on any of these three identical propositions, each of which implies all the others, of course infants may not be baptized—for this again is but an identical proposition with any of the three. But it is hardly sound argumentation simply to repeat the matter in dispute in other words and plead it as proof.

The fourth item is more reasonable—"By the scriptural prerequisites to participation in the Lord's Supper. Participation in the Lord's Supper is the right only of those who

can discern the Lord's body (1 Cor. 11:29). No reason can be assigned for restricting to intelligent communicants the ordinance of the supper which would not equally restrict to intelligent believers the ordinance of baptism." Hence Dr. Strong thinks the Greek Church more consistent in administering the Lord's Supper to infants. It seems, however, a sufficient answer to this to point to the passage quoted: the express declaration of Scripture, that those who are admitted to the Lord's Supper—a declaration made to those who were already baptized Christians—should be restricted to those who discern the Lord's body, is a sufficient scriptural reason for restricting participation in the Lord's Supper to intelligent communicants; while the absence of that Scripture restriction in its case is a sufficient scriptural reason for refusing to apply it to baptism. If we must support this scriptural reason with a purely rational one, it may be enough to add that the fact that baptism is the initiatory rite of the church supplies us with such a reason. The ordinances of the church belong to the members of it; but each in its own appointed time. The initiatory ordinance belongs to the members on becoming members, other ordinances become their right as the appointed seasons for enjoying them roll around. We might as well argue that a citizen of the United States has no right to the protection of the police until he can exercise the franchise. The rights all belong to him: but the exercise of each comes in its own season. It is easily seen by the help of such examples that the possession of a right to the initiatory ordinance of the church need not carry with it the right to the immediate enjoyment of all church privileges: and thus the challenge is answered to show cause why the right to baptism does not carry with it the right to communion in the Lord's Supper. Cf. Cotton Mather, as quoted in Hodge, III, 572. With this challenge the second argument of Dr. Strong is answered, too.

(c) The third argument is really an attempt to get rid of the pressure of the historical argument for infant baptism. Is it argued that the Christian Church from the earliest traceable date baptized infants?—that this is possibly hinted in Justin Martyr, assumed apparently in Irenæus, and openly proclaimed as apostolical by Origen and Cyprian while it was vainly opposed by Tertullian? In answer it is replied that all these writers taught baptismal regeneration and that infant baptism was an invention coming in on the heels of baptismal regeneration and continued in existence by State Churches. There is much that is plausible in this contention. The early Church did come to believe that baptism was necessary to salvation; this doctrine forms a natural reason for the extension of baptism to infants, lest dying unbaptized they should fail of salvation. Nevertheless, the contention does not seem to be the true explanation of the line of development. First, it confuses a question of testimony to fact with a question of doctrine. The two—baptismal regeneration and infant baptism—do not stand or fall together, in the testimony of the fathers. Their unconscious testimony to a current practice proves its currency in their day; but their witness to a doctrine does not prove its truth. We may or may not agree with them in their doctrine of baptismal regeneration. But we cannot doubt the truth of their testimony to the prevalence of infant baptism in their day. We admit that their day is not the Apostles' day. We could well wish that we had earlier witness. We may be sure from the witness of Origen and Cyprian that they were baptized in their infancy—that is, that infant baptism was the usual practice in the age of Irenæus—a conclusion which is at once strengthened by and strengthens the witness of Irenæus. But the practice of the latter half of the Second Century need not have been the practice of the Apostles. A presumption is raised, however—even though so weak an one that it would not stand against adverse evidence. But where is the adverse

evidence? Secondly, Dr. Strong's view reverses the historical testimony. As a matter of history it was not the inauguration of the practice of infant baptism which the doctrine of baptismal regeneration secured, but the endangering of it. It was because baptism washed away all sin and after that there remained no more laver for regeneration, that baptism was postponed. It is for this reason that Tertullian proposes its postponement. Lastly, though the historical evidence may not be conclusive for the apostolicity of infant baptism, it is in that direction and is all that we have. There is no evidence from primitive church history against infant baptism, except the ambiguous evidence of Tertullian; so that our choice is to follow history and baptize infants or to reconstruct by *a priori* methods a history for which we have no evidence.

(d) Dr. Strong's fourth item is intended as a refutation of the reasoning by which the advocates of pædobaptism support their contention. As such it naturally takes up the reasoning from every kind of sources and it is not strange that some of the reasoning adduced in it is as distasteful to us as it is to him. We should heartily unite with him in refusing to allow the existence of any power in the church to modify or abrogate any command of Christ. Nor could we find any greater acceptability than he does in the notion of an "organic connection" between the parent and the child, such as he quotes Dr. Bushnell as advocating. Nevertheless we can believe in a parent acting as representative of the child of his loins, whose nurture is committed to him; and we can believe that the status of the parent determines the status of the child—in the Church of the God whose promise is "to you and your children," as well as, for example, in the State. And we can believe that the Church includes the minor children of its members for whom they must as parents act, without believing that it is thereby made a hereditary body. I do not purpose here to go over again the proofs, which Dr. Hodge

so cogently urges, that go to prove the continuity of the Church through the Old and New dispensations—remaining under whatever change of dispensation the same Church, with the same laws of entrance and the same constituents. The antithesis which Dr. Strong adduces—that “the Christian Church is either a national hereditary body or it was merely typified by the Jewish people”—is a false antithesis. The Christian Church is not a natural, hereditary body and yet it is not merely the antitype of Israel. It is, the Apostles being witnesses, the veritable Israel itself. It carried over into itself all that was essentially Israelitish—all that went to make up the body of God’s people. Paul’s figures of the olive tree in Romans and of the breaking down of the middle wall of partition in Ephesians, suffice to demonstrate this; and besides these figures he repeatedly asserts it in the plainest language.

So fully did the first Christians—the Apostles—realize the continuity of the church, that they were more inclined to retain parts of the outward garments of the church than to discard too much. Hence circumcision itself was retained; and for a considerable period all initiants into the church were circumcised Jews and received baptism additionally. We do not doubt that children born into the church during this age were both circumcised and baptized. The change from baptism superinduced upon circumcision to baptism substituted for circumcision was slow, and never came until it was forced by the actual pressure of circumstances. The instrument for making this change and so—who can doubt it?—for giving the rite of baptism its right place as the substitute for circumcision, was the Apostle Paul. We see the change formally constituted at the so-called Council of Jerusalem, in Acts xv. Paul had preached the Gospel to Gentiles and had received them into the Church by baptism alone, thus recognizing it alone as the initiatory rite, in the place of circumcision, instead of treating as heretofore the two together as the initiatory rites

into the Christian Church. But certain teachers from Jerusalem, coming down to Antioch, taught the brethren "except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses ye cannot be saved." Paul took the matter before the Church of Jerusalem from which these new teachers professed to emanate; and its formal decision was that to those who believed and were baptized circumcision was not necessary.

How fully Paul believed that baptism and circumcision were but two symbols of the same change of heart, and that one was instead of the other, may be gathered from Col. 2:11, when, speaking to a Christian audience of the Church, he declares that "in Christ ye were also circumcised"—but how?—"with a circumcision not made with hands, in putting off the body of the flesh,"—i. e. in the circumcision of Christ. But what was this Christ-ordained circumcision? The Apostle continues: "Having been buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye were raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead." Hence in baptism they were buried with Christ, and this burial with Christ was the circumcision which Christ ordained, in the partaking of which they became the true circumcision. This falls little, if any, short of a direct assertion that the Christian Church is Israel, and has Israel's circumcision, though now in the form of baptism. Does the view of Paul, now, contradict the New Testament idea of the Church, or only the Baptist idea of the Church? No doubt a large number of the members of the Primitive Church did insist, as Dr. Strong truly says, that those who were baptized should also be circumcised: and no doubt, this proves that in their view baptism did not take the place of circumcision. But this was an erroneous view: is represented in the New Testament as erroneous; and it is this exact view against which Paul protested to the Church of Jerusalem and which the Church of Jerusalem condemned in Acts xv. Thus the Baptist denial of the substitution of baptism for circumcis-

ion leads them into the error of this fanatical, pharisaical church-party ! Let us take our places in opposition, along with Paul and all the Apostles.

Whether, then, that the family is the unit of society is a relic of barbarism or not, it is the New Testament basis of the Church of God. God does make man the head of the woman—does enjoin the wife to be in subjection to her husband—and does make the parents act on behalf of their minor children. He does, indeed, require individual faith for salvation ; but he organizes his people in families first ; and then into churches, recognizing in their very warp and woof the family constitution. His promises are all the more precious that they are to us and our children. And though this may not fit in with the growing individualism of the day, it is God's ordinance.

(e) Dr. Strong's fifth argument is drawn from the divergent modes in which pædobaptists defend their position and from the decline among them of the practice of the rite. Let us confess that we do not all argue alike or aright. But is not this a proof rather of the firm establishment in our hearts of the practice ? We all practice alike ; and it is the propriety of the practice, not the propriety of our defence of it, that is, after all, at stake. But the practice is declining, it is said. Perhaps this is true. Dr. Vedder's statistics seem to show it. But if so, does the decline show the practice to be wrong, or Christians to be unfaithful ? It is among pædobaptists that the decline is taking place—those who still defend the practice. Perhaps it is the silent influence of Baptist neighbors ; perhaps it is unfaithfulness in parents ; perhaps the spread of a Quakerish sentiment of undervaluation of ordinances. Many reasons may enter into the account of it. But how does it show the practice to be wrong ? According to the Baptist reconstruction of history, the Church began by not baptizing infants. But this primitive and godly practice declined—rapidly declined—until in the second century all infants were bap-

tized and Tertullian raised a solitary and ineffectual voice crying a return to the older purity in the third. Did that decline of a prevalent usage prove it to be a wrong usage? By what logic can the decline in the second century be made an evidence in favor of the earlier usage, and that of the nineteenth an evidence against it?

(f) We must pass on, however, to the final string of arguments, which would fain point out the evil effects of infant baptism. First it forestalls the act of the child and so prevents it from ever obeying Christ's command to be baptized—which is simply begging the question. We say it obeys Christ's command by giving the child early baptism and so marking him as the Lord's. Secondly, it is said to induce superstitious confidence in an outward rite, as if it possessed regenerating efficacy; and we are pointed to frantic mothers seeking baptism for their dying children. Undoubtedly the evil does occur and needs careful guarding against. But it is an evil not confined to this rite, but apt to attach itself to all rites—which need not, therefore, be all abolished. We may remark, in passing, on the unfairness of bringing together here illustrative instances from French Catholic peasants and High Church Episcopalians, as if these were of the same order with Protestants. Thirdly, it is said to tend to corrupt Christian truth as to the sufficiency of Scripture, the connection of the ordinances, and the inconsistency of an impenitent life with church membership, as if infant baptism necessarily argued sacramentarianism, or as if the churches of other Protestant bodies were as a matter of fact more full of "impenitent members" than those of the Baptists. This last remark is in place also, in reply to the fourth point made, wherein it is charged that the practice of infant baptism destroys the Church as a spiritual body by merging it in the nation and in the world. It is yet to be shown that the Baptist churches are purer than the Pædobaptist. Dr. Strong seems to think that infant baptism is re-

sponsible for the Unitarian defection in New England. I am afraid the cause lay much deeper. Nor is it a valid argument against infant baptism, that the churches do not always fulfil their duty to their baptized members. This, and not the practice of infant baptism, is the fertile cause of incongruities and evils innumerable.

Lastly, it is urged that infant baptism "puts into the place of Christ's command a commandment of men, and so admits the essential principle of all heresy, schism, and false religion"—a good, round, railing charge to bring against one's brethren: but as an argument against infant baptism, drawn from its effects, somewhat of a *petitio principii*. If true, it is serious enough. But Dr. Strong has omitted to give the chapter and verse where Christ's command not to baptize infants is to be found. One or the other of us is wrong, no doubt; but do we not break an undoubted command of Christ when we speak thus harshly of our brethren, his children, whom we should love? Were it not better to judge, each the other mistaken, and recognize, each the other's desire to please Christ and follow his commandments? Certainly I believe that our Baptist brethren omit to fulfil an ordinance of Christ's house, sufficiently plainly revealed as his will, when they exclude the infant children of believers from baptism. But I know they do this unwittingly in ignorance; and I cannot refuse them the right hand of fellowship on that account.

But now, having run through these various arguments, to what conclusion do we come? Are they sufficient to set aside our reasoned conviction, derived from some such argument as Dr. Hodge's, that infants are to be baptized? A thousand times no. So long as it remains true that Paul represents the Church of the Living God to be one, founded on one covenant (which the law could not set aside) from Abraham to to-day, so long it remains true that the promise is to us and our children and that the members of the visible Church consist of believers and their chil-

dren—all of whom have a right to all the ordinances of the visible Church, each in its appointed season. The argument in a nutshell is simply this: God established his Church in the days of Abraham and put children into it. They must remain there until he puts them out. He has nowhere put them out. They are still then members of his Church and as such entitled to its ordinances. Among these ordinances is baptism, which standing in similar place in the New Dispensation to circumcision in the Old, is like it to be given to children.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

Princeton.

NOTES.

I. IS THE STANDARD DECLINING ?

Progress may be judged from either of two different points of view, and the estimate be very diverse accordingly. It depends very much upon whether you measure from the starting point or from the goal ; judged from the goal the progress may appear inappreciable, judged from the starting point it may be vast.

When one hears the devoted temperance orator marshalling statistics and portraying the desolation wrought by the rum-devil, the whole nation seems rapidly being drowned in drink and the effect is depressing well nigh to the verge of hopelessness ; on the other hand, when our oldest people tell us that in their youth whiskey was a part of the regular stock of all "general merchandise" stores, sold as uniformly as coffee and sugar, with no license, restriction or supervision ; that prominent Presbyterian elders regularly manufactured it, and hauled it to town for sale as they now do bacon and flour ; that it was much in evidence on the sideboard and table ; that pious pastors in their visits had it offered without apology and were accustomed to drink it without scruple and sometimes without water—when we hear such things they seem to us incredible, almost. This fact is one measure of the advance of temperance sentiment within the compass of a single lifetime.

There has been a good deal said of late about the decline of scholarship in the Presbyterian ministry ; some very strong statements have been made, and some rather severe indictments have been brought.

It is one thing to assert a low standard, and another to assert a decline of standard ; moreover, a standard may be low absolutely which is not low relatively ; a man, tried by an absolute standard, may be a very poor scholar, whereas

comparatively or relatively his scholarship may be highly creditable.

Once more ; as to the matter of a decline, the measure is still different, even a comparatively low standard is not necessarily a declining standard.

I have been connected with two Presbyteries only, and my term of ministerial service is not a very long one, but during the whole of it in both Presbyteries I have been concerned in the examination of candidates, and my department has been that of the ancient languages, the Greek, the Latin and the Hebrew, just the field singled out by critics and by them stigmatized as most farcical.

Now, I do not undertake to speak for the whole church, but I do most solemnly affirm that constant and close observation, based upon numerous examinations in this very department, warrants the confident assertion that, so far from there having been a decline of scholarship, there has, on the contrary, been a decided elevation of the standard.

I can recall very distinctly the examination given me ; at that time the first two verses of Genesis seemed to be universally the passage selected for the Hebrew, and for Greek the corresponding verses in John's gospel. I wish to say that for four years or more I have not in a single instance assigned a candidate a passage for examination in either Greek or Hebrew without being first assured that he had never before read the passage.

As a matter of interest I append here the latest examinations I have given. The publication of the papers is an afterthought ; there was no idea of the sort in my mind at the time they were assigned, but I have been advised by several friends to publish them as a contribution to the discussion. Let the reader understand that the candidate had never before read either passage in the original and that he had the help of no lexicon, grammar or translation and signed the same pledge that colleges require appended to such papers :

HEBREW.

Judges 19:1-3 inclusive.

- I. A literal translation :
- II. Discuss :
לִדְבַר ; וַתִּבְיָאָהּוּ ; לְהַשִּׁיבּוּ ; וַתִּלְךְ ; בִּירְכָתִי ; דָּהָם ; וַיְהִי
- III. Compare and distinguish אָשָׁה in verse 1 and אִשָּׁה in verse 3.
- IV. Inflect through tense occurring in text, omitting ו conversive : וַיִּרְאֶהוּ וַתֹּן נָה ; וַיְהִי
- V. Analyze into component parts : מֵאֲחָז ; עַל-לֶבָה ; לְקִרְאָתוֹ
- VI. Give complete synopsis (3rd pers. sing. only in Perf. and Imperf.) omitting ו conversive : וַיִּקָּם ; וַיִּקָּח ; וַיְהִי
- VII. GRAMMAR :
 1. Methegh ; definition and chief uses ?
 2. Daghesh-forte ; how many kinds, and chief uses ?
 3. Some discussion of tone-shifting.
 4. Number in nouns ; how many kinds of ? Illustrate formation of each in both Masc. and Fem.
 5. Construct Case : What is it ? Illustrate formation and use in both genders and in each number.
 6. Translate into Hebrew :
 - (1) And the Lord said unto Moses.
 - (2) And he called upon the name of the Lord.
 - (3) And he arose and went into the house of the Lord.

GREEK.

Mat. 14:1-5 inclusive.

- I. Translation.
- II. Discuss : *ἐκέλευε*, &c., *κρατήσας*, *διὰ*.
- III. Decline : *παισιν*, *τούτο*, *γυναικα*, *Ἡρώδης*, *Ἡρωδιάδα*.
- IV. Syntax of : *ἀκοήν*, *γυναικα*, *ἔξεστι*, *σοι*, *ὥς*.
- V. Principal parts of : *ἤκουσεν*, *ἔθετο*, *ἔχειν*, *ἀποκτείνειν*.

- VI. Conjugate through tense occurring in text : *ἐνεργούσιν* and *ἔδησεν* and explain the accent in each word, taking some one form for illustration.
- VII. Etymology and meaning of *τετραρχης*.
- VIII. GRAMMAR :
1. How many declensions ? An example of each ?
 2. How many conjugations ? An example of each ? Which is older ?
 3. Difference in *significance* between : The 1st Aor. and 2nd Aor. ? between the 1st Aor. and Imperf. ?
 4. How many classes of contract verbs ? Give one example of each.
 5. Difference between *μή* and *οὐ*.
 6. How many ways of expressing purpose in Greek ?
 7. The forms of the conditional sentence ?
 8. Explain the syntax of the phrase : *ἐν τῷ τόδε ἰδεῖν*.

I may add that six hours' work on the examination brought papers which "passed" very creditably. There is nothing in the examination that need worry a man who has been a faithful student, it was not designed for that purpose; but I humbly submit that few readers will call it farcical.

It is altogether likely that other Presbyteries are equally serious.

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

Columbia, S. C.

II. "IN THE NAME OF GOD, AMEN."

BY WM. FROST BISHOP, D. D.

The dialect of the New Testament is not classic Greek. It is not the speech of Thucydides or Plato, but a species known as "Hellenistic." By this we mean the Greek spoken by foreigners who learned it as a secondary tongue, specially around the Mediterranean coast. It is mixed with forms of Hebrew speech. There are departures from the grammatical tongue. Much of the synthetic terseness of the best Attic is lost to us in the Greek of the New Testament. However, we have really lost nothing. While a dialect may be less ideally perfect, it may be more available for specific purposes. St. Augustine is more forceful than Tully, and Tertullian more impassioned than Cicero, although their Latin is inferior as a language. The New Testament Greek had to convey new ideas. Fortunately it was plastic for the reception of new conceptions. As Canon Farrar has aptly said: "The seething ferment of the new wine could no longer be contained in the old bottles, however perfect their external finish."

Grateful as we are to Dale for his labors in this field, we need to be on our guard. Hellenistic Greek has a genius of its own. A thing may be possible in Matthew's syntax which is not possible in Attic. While the loftiest eloquence of the Apocalypse is not incompatible with a dialect proverbially uncouth, and even ungrammatical. The Greek of Inspiration has a genius of its own. It is deeply dyed with Hebrew words and idioms. It is a fuller tongue than the classic and must be interpreted by its own canons of speech.

We are well nigh shut up to a consideration of the New Testament dialect alone, with but little hope for extraneous aid. And as to our present discussion—the question of

the baptismal formula—it is unsafe to venture beyond the five historical books, the four Gospels and the Acts. There are theoretical liberties and metaphorical forms of speech in the Epistles, that render deductions doubtful. The Epistles contain what might be called the philosophical statement of Gospel principles in familiar and colloquial language, where allegorical phraseology is entirely admissible.

The formula of baptism belongs to and is imbedded in the historical books, and the meaning attached to the formula in the historical books establishes and limits the meaning of the formula in all other writings. We ought by this time surely to have learned something from the experience in debate of the familiar words: "Buried with him in baptism." We will not say this phrase has fallen among thieves, like the man that went down from Jerusalem to Jericho; but we will say that it has certainly suffered many things at the hands of both Priests and Levites.

Looking then solely within the lids of the Gospels and the Acts (historical books, strangely unimpassioned and without color of emotion on the part of the authors) we find:

1. That, if the phrase (*εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*) in the baptismal formula is to be translated "into the name," it is the only place in Matthew's Gospel where such translation is possible. Everywhere else in his Gospel it must be translated "in the name," as for example, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Matt. 18:20. He makes use of the phrase five times and in every case we can translate "in the name" and make sense.

2. That Matthew's use of the phrase *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* makes it the equivalent of *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνοματί*, which can never mean "into the name" (compare Mat. 10:41 with Math. 18:5). In the other case it is: "He that receiveth a prophet in the name (*εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*) of a prophet shall receive a prophet's

reward." In the other case it is: "And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι) receiveth me."

3. That the word "baptize" is not always joined with εἰς. Consult Acts 2:38, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ." Here we have ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι, which can never mean "into." Consult Acts 10:48, "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Here we have ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, which also can never mean "into." In the Book of Acts no special significance is attached to the preposition εἰς, even when conjoined with "baptize." If its author, St. Luke, is infallible, our opponents are wrong by insisting upon a shade of meaning which is peculiar to εἰς and which cannot be borne by the prepositions ἐπὶ and ἐν.

4. That the Revised Version itself does not always translate εἰς as "into," when conjoined with "baptize." Consult I Cor. 10:2, "I would not, brethren, have you ignorant, how that our fathers were all under the cloud, and passed through the sea, and we were all baptized unto Moses." The Victorian Version does not always translate εἰς by "into" when conjoined with "baptize."

5. The much vaunted Revised Version retains the old familiar formula, and does not hesitate to translate "baptize in the name." And, if so, why should we? Here are the exact words of the baptismal formula, so far as the disputed phrase is concerned, in the New Version: "Repent ye and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ," Acts 2:38. Again we read in the New Version, "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ," Acts 10:48. The phrase εἰς τὸ ὄνομα occurs at John 10:12, and the Revised Version reads, "To them that believe in his name." Also at John 3:18, Heb. 10:10 and John 5:13 the New Version translates εἰς τὸ ὄνομα to mean "on the name" or "toward the name." In other words, the familiar words of the ancient formula are still found in the New Bible; why not, also, then in the new Directory?

Let me remind Dr. Primrose, that the triumphant theory is that which takes in all the facts. By translating εἰς τὸ ὄνομα to mean "in the name," we can go straight on through the Gospels and the Acts without any trouble. But he, on his theory, must change his hypothesis no less than three times in considering only three texts: at Mat. 28:19 he translates "into the name," at Acts 10:48, to avoid a difficulty fatal to his theory, he has to change the natural order of the words; while at Acts 2:38 he is actually driven to the necessity of importing words into the text which are not there at all. Were this a controversy instead of a friendly conference, such liberties would be allowed not for one moment. We know when a train is off the track, by the frequent bumps and jolts. Something must be wrong when three distinct hypotheses are needed in as many texts.

As to changing the order of the words, I shall never forget the shock that came to us when the Rev. John Miller, of most blessed memory, through stress of weather, changed the natural order of the text: "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise, (Luke 23:43,) and made it read, "To-day, I say unto thee, thou shalt be with me in Paradise." It was as though the sun had been stricken from the sky. It is a dangerous device.

And, as to importing words into the text which are not there at all, let us try Dr. Primrose's expedient upon a familiar text, which supplies all the conditions upon which he insists. Take the text: "For many shall come in my name, saying, I am the Christ; and shall deceive many." The good doctor says that with ἐπὶ τοῖ ὀνόματι (as the phrase is here,) we must understand the omitted word "believing" (making us complete the sense "believing upon the name"). Now, let us try this device. Here is the result: For many shall come (believing) in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many." Comment is unnecessary. That is the triumphant theory which takes in all the facts and does violence to none.

In what follows, any allusion to Dr. Primrose is disavowed. But it may be necessary to call to mind that *eis*, as a Greek preposition, has a variety of meanings, one shade of which is expressed by "into." Another shade of which is expressed by "in," as "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." And, as a clear case where *eis* cannot mean "into," we have the running of the two disciples to the tomb of Christ, in which John came "to" (*eis*) the tomb, but did not enter, while Peter came up and went "into" (double *eis*) the tomb straightway.

But to a much graver view of the discussion. In the Bible "name" generally means "nature," and it may be that some hold that the ordinance of baptism makes the subject *ipso facto* a partaker of the Divine nature. This may be the lurking motive of some in their contention. If so, then the time has come for another Reformation and the hour has struck for another Martin Luther.

It is no more possible to get Gospel honey out of the flinty rock of the Law, than a radical change of heart out of the machinery of ritual.

Some time ago, two years perhaps, the *Observer* laughed good-naturedly at an article of mine, because in it there were nineteen objections to the new reading of the baptismal formula. The laugh gave no offense. But it supplies an opportunity to say that the writer will engage to furnish, not alone nineteen arguments against the new reading, but arguments enough to fill an entire issue of the *Observer*, even to the exclusion of advertisements. The chief of such arguments would be the citations from history, to show the pernicious influence of such phrases as "baptize into the name," where "name" means "nature," and the vicious *opus operatum* heresy is taught.

Baptism in the hands of a Protestant minister is a teaching symbol; it is neither antecedent nor supplementary to the Gospel; it is an integral part of it, in its preceptive or declarative form,

Scripture nowhere ascribes to baptism a special function in consequence of its symbolical character.

If baptism *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς*, etc., designates the subject as partaker of the Divine nature, the Protestant minister cannot formally imitate a function peculiar only to the Holy Spirit.

The Protestant minister cannot ascribe to any function of his office a higher validity than to the office itself.

Hence, the change of "in the name of" to "into the name of" in the formula of baptism, has given an unscriptural significance to the function and office of the Protestant minister.

The writer never saw the truth as it is in the Lord's Supper—never felt sure of his ground—till he read a remarkable exposition of that ordinance in the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY some years ago by Dr. Thos. E. Peck. His cardinal position was: "The simpler our views of the sacrament (of the supper) the better." Allow me to add, the simpler our views of the sacrament of baptism the better.

WM. FROST BISHOP.

Liberty, Mo.

EDITORIAL.

COMMENTS.

Rev. F. R. Beattie, D. D., was the originator of the movement in this country to celebrate the 250th anniversary of the Westminster Assembly, which has been so happily carried out, first in the Southern and then in the Northern Church. His article on the Genesis of the Westminster Assembly will be read with added interest on that account. The Woman Question is ably discussed by Rev. P. D. Stephenson. His array of facts and statistics is appalling. We need just such careful researches as he has made, and the *QUARTERLY* is here for the sake of giving the results to the church, but the reader will bear in mind that this is but one side of the truth about Woman in America. Not by design, but with the appearance of presenting another side, Dr. Quarles publishes a delightful article on the Higher Education of Women. Rev. W. S. Bean, D. D., writes a thoughtful disquisition on the philosophical distinction between soul and spirit, which is in striking contrast to the crude output of Dr. Trumbull in the *Sunday School Times* last year. Rev. R. A. Lapsley presents the Doctrinal Issues of the Houston Case in a calm, clear and convincing way. Rev. Neal L. Anderson's article on Evolution and Teleology will repay careful consideration. Rev. W. P. McCorkle has become an authority on Christian Science, his two former articles on the subject in the *QUARTERLY* having been much in demand in the North and West, where the mischief of the delusion has been most manifest. But this science, falsely so-called, is becoming a living issue in the South, a church of Christian Scientists having been re-recently organized in Atlanta. Mr. McCorkle traces the "science" back to the old Gnosticism and shows that Theosophy is another face of the same old enemy. Rev.

Julius W. Walden, D. D., discusses the theme, Salvation Is of the Jews, from the Pre-millennial point of view.

It is an able presentation from that point of view. We presume that most of our readers will part company with him where he parts company with history and begins his interpretation of prophecy. We are compelled to believe that the attitude toward the Jews which many Christians have assumed, that they are not to be converted to Christianity by the ordinary methods of the Gospel, but must wait until the coming of Christ, and the reunion of Judah and Israel in Palestine, then themselves becoming the missionaries of the nations, is an actual discouragement to the work of preaching the gospel of repentance and faith in Jesus Christ.

Dr. Warfield, of Princeton, a long time contributor to the QUARTERLY, supplements the work of his Southern brethren in this number with an article on the Polemics of Infant Baptism, which is worthy of closest study and should serve as an armory for those who desire equipment for the defence of the baptismal covenant.

Dr. S. M. Smith writes an interesting "note" answering in the negative the question, "Is the Standard Declining?" Dr. Wm. Frost Bishop and Dr. J. W. Primrose have been carrying on a controversy in the religious papers on the Baptismal Formula, which is in a measure transferred to the QUARTERLY. Dr. Bishop's note, however, was written before Dr. Primrose's article in the last QUARTERLY appeared. The text of Westcott and Hort relieves the latter of a difficulty and takes away an argument from the former, by reading *ἐν* instead of *ἐπὶ* in Acts 2: 38. There is thus, according to the best authority, no instance of a conjunction of *βαπτίζω* and *ἐπὶ* in the New Testament. The two instances, Acts 2: 38 and 10: 48, in which the phrase, *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* occurs with baptise, may well be discriminated from the sixteen instances in which *βαπτίζειν εἰς* is employed.

Winer (Grammer of the New Testament Diction, pp. 432, 433, 436) proves that this discrimination is necessary. In the two instances Peter probably meant just what he did when he said, "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk." In the other sixteen references we must either say "baptize into" or mean that when we say "baptize in." Dr. Bishop carefully excludes all Hellenistic Greek except the New Testament, and then confines us to the Gospel and Acts. He thus throws Paul's exposition of the rite out of court. However, as long as Paul could speak of baptism "into Christ," "into his death," "into one body," we need not hesitate to speak of baptism "into the name of Christ." If Paul had asked, "Were ye baptized by the authority of Paul?" (*in* the name), he would have been questioning his apostolic power in the very chapter in which he expressly asserted it.

The other references in which *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* must be translated "in the name" are simply explained by saying that the English idiom requires *in*, as after verbs of believing, where the Greek requires *εἰς*. And as to the *opus operatum* heresy, Dr. Bishop must first attack the Standards, which are explicit enough as to the "ingrafting into Christ," "into whom we are baptized;" after which he may settle the matter with Calvin and Turretin who changed the "*in nomine*" of the Vulgate into *in nomen*, as giving the accurate translation of the phrase *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*.

We have noticed this article particularly because the amendment to the Directory of Worship, substituting "in" for "into," is to come before the Southern Assembly for enactment. We confess to some pride that our Church has taken an advanced position, justified by Christian scholarship everywhere, that baptism is "into the name." The Catechism of the English Evangelical Churches has followed the example set by our Directory, and other churches will without doubt adopt the same reading. In the face of

the overwhelming authority for the present rendering the change seems worse than needless. As to a "baptismal formula," we doubt if one can be discovered in the New Testament.

Another amendment to be voted on by the Presbyteries and the Assembly is the clause permitting the ruling elder appointed on an installation committee to deliver the charge to the people, thus denying him by implication the right to deliver the charge to the pastor. As the law now stands, according to the interpretation of the Assembly of 1898, the ruling elder can deliver the charge to both pastor and people. To put the distinction into our organic law would be to deny the parity of the eldership for which the Southern Church has so earnestly contended.

But while our Southern Assembly has only these trivial questions before it, a heavy shadow hangs over our Northern brethren. The McGiffert case is as yet unsettled and there seems as yet no escape from the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline. The Presbytery of Pittsburg called the attention of the last Assembly to Dr. McGiffert's work, *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, and overtured the Assembly, to take suitable action in the premises. The Bills and Overtures Committee offered three reports to the Assembly, one, practically to let the matter rest; another, ably advocated by Rev. W. S. Plumer Bryan, D. D., to order the Presbytery of New York to proceed to a trial of the case; and the majority report which was adopted, from which we extract the following :

The General Assembly deplores the renewal of controversy occasioned by the publication of this book at a time when our recent divisions were scarcely healed. It sympathizes with the widespread belief that the utterances of Dr. McGiffert are inconsistent with the teachings of Scripture, as interpreted by the Presbyterian Church and by evangelical Christendom. And the Assembly stamps with its emphatic disapproval all utterances in the book called to

its attention by the Presbytery of Pittsburg, not in accord with the Standards of our Church.

The Assembly, therefore, in the spirit of kindness, no less than in devotion to the truth, counsels Dr. McGiffert to reconsider the questionable views set forth in his book, and if he can not conform his views to the Standards of our Church, then peaceably to withdraw from the Presbyterian ministry.

Dr. McGiffert has given no sign either of retraction or of a purpose to withdraw from the ministry. Recent utterances of his have rather aggravated the situation. It will be impossible for the Assembly not to continue the case to the bitter end, now that it has decided that his views are not only not Presbyterian but not even evangelical. Without going into particulars, unitarianism could ask for no better premises for its argument against the Divinity of Christ than Dr. McGiffert's positions. The issue is a much more serious one than that presented by the Briggs' case—the infallibility of Scripture. Dr. McGiffert is in the Assembly's hands, and unless it wishes to endorse his views he must cease to represent the Assembly as a Presbyterian minister.

As the case stands now, there is nothing for the Assembly to do but adopt the plan indicated by Dr. Bryan last year and proceed to a trial for heresy. And those who are willing to make this sacrifice for the purity of the Church will have well nigh the unanimous support—so far as sympathy goes—of their Southern brethren.

Rev. P. P. Flournoy, D. D., sends us a letter from Mr. Theo. G. Pinches, of the British Museum, from which we quote: "Your very appreciative article upon the tablets that refer to Ari-Eaku, Tudhula, Kudurlahgamal, etc., has gratified me greatly, and I hasten to thank you for it as well as to answer the query in the letter that accompanied it. Emphatically the last word has not yet been said upon the subject. The tablets that I have published remain unaf-

fectured by Mr. King's book. What Mr. King has discovered is that Father Scheil was wrong in reading the name that he found as Kudur-lahgamar." (See editorial note on Dr. Flournoy's article in the January QUARTERLY on "The Discovery of the Kings.")

We may be permitted to call attention to the enlarged size of the QUARTERLY under the present management as well as to express our appreciation for the hearty support of the review by old friends and new. The January edition has been entirely exhausted.

We offer to send to those who are subscribers to neither periodical, the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY and the *Bible Student* and *Religious Outlook*, for \$3.00 a year, introductory price.

Also the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY and the *Presbyterian Standard* for \$4.00 a year. To ministers, \$3.00. This is an introductory price to new subscribers only.

RECORD AND REVIEW.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN—MORTUARY REPORT.

At the beginning of the year 1898 the Southern Presbyterian Church had upon her roll the names of four great men: R. L. Dabney, J. L. Girardeau, M. D. Hoge and B. M. Palmer. Within the circle of the year she was called to mourn the departure of the first two, the third entered into rest January 6th, 1899, while the other, with eyes dimmed to the scenes of earth, waits for the breaking of the heavenly radiance upon his enraptured vision, and would check the prayer that rises from many a heart that he may be long spared to our beloved Zion.

They were all great as scholars, preachers and masters of assemblies. If comparison be made between them, it would probably be agreed that Dr. Dabney was the profoundest scholar, Dr. Girardeau the most impassioned orator, Dr. Palmer the most influential presbyter, and that

Dr. Hoge possessed in rare and happy combination the qualities that distinguished the other three. A prince has fallen in Israel. And no one who has ever come under the spell of that eloquent voice but feels a sense of personal loss. It will be long before the Southern Church has so able a representative before the Presbyterian or Evangelical assemblies of the Old World or the New.

Moses Drury Hoge came of a long line of godly ancestors. The Hoges were Scotch Presbyterians who settled in Frederick County, Virginia, in 1736. On the maternal side he was descended from the Lacys, another colonial family of the Old Dominion. His two grandfathers, Moses Hoge and Drury Lacy were both distinguished preachers and educators, and among the first Presidents of Hamden-Sidney College, where their grandson, named for both, was afterwards educated, showing first in its society halls his remarkable gifts of eloquence.

He was born on September 25, 1818, and reared in Prince Edward County, Virginia. After his graduation from college, he studied theology for a while and preached in a country church in Mecklenburg county, Va., to which he would have been called but for the fact that one of the elders doubted his ability to fill the pulpit. He was called to be assistant pastor to Dr, William S. Plumer, of the First Church, Richmond. The zealous young minister soon gathered together a congregation of his own, which was organized into the Second Presbyterian Church. He remained as pastor of this church to the day of his death, growing with the growth of Richmond, until he was universally recognized as its First Citizen. Four years ago the fiftieth anniversary of his pastorate was observed. His long career was most eventful. He was in the prime of life when the Civil War began, and he performed distinguished service to the Confederacy, not only as the tireless minister to the spiritual wants of the soldiers but as a diplomat in Europe. He had been distressed at the scarcity of Bibles

in the Confederate camps, and as a representative of the Virginia Bible Society he embarked on one of the blockade runners and went to England, where a public address of his was instrumental in obtaining a free grant of 400,000 Bibles, or parts of the Bible, for the Southern soldiers. Leaving London he went to Paris on a joint mission with L. Q. C. Lamar, for the purpose of obtaining recognition from the Confederate Government from the Emperor Napoleon III. The Emperor was, however, persuaded by the United States agents not to give him an audience, and he returned home, successfully running the blockade a second time.

He remained loyal to the sentiments and principles of the Lost Cause, yet no Southern minister has done more toward uniting the two sections. His voice was ever for peace and reconciliation. He was a Presbyterian by strongest conviction, yet few men have done more to cultivate the spirit of Christian unity in the different denominations. One of the constant efforts of his life was to avoid personal enmities in his stand for principle.

One of his most striking characteristics was the readiness with which he could draw upon his resources of knowledge and experience. At the Alliance of the Reformed Churches which met in Copenhagen, Denmark, one of the expected speakers failed to appear and the presiding officer called on Dr. Hoge to take the subject, just as he entered the auditorium. He at once delivered an extemporaneous address that captured the vast assembly and was published on two continents. He had no peer in his generation, for saying the fitting word at the right time. The public occasions at which he has been the chief figure, would require a volume to be described. One of the most notable of his orations was at the unveiling of the Stonewall Jackson statue in Capitol Square, Richmond, in 1775. He delivered an eloquent discourse in Dr. John Hall's pulpit on President Garfield's death. One of his more recent funeral orations was on the death of North Carolina's great

Senator, Vance. The most distinguished company that could be found in America were gathered in the Senate Chamber. Dr. Hoge began with the quotation, "There is nothing great but God." His last appearance on such an occasion was at the funeral of Miss Winnie Davis. He had been asked to lead in prayer. But during a pause in the service he stepped forward, and with that glance of his that held every eye said: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

His pulpit and pastoral work, his varied benevolences, his sympathy with every good enterprise, his tenderness in the chamber of suffering and bereavement, his interest in all that concerned his Church and his country are too well known to need comment here. Once only did he enter the political arena, in defense of the honor of Virginia, proclaiming in phrase that deserves to live: "That which is morally wrong cannot be politically right." At rare intervals he would let fall an epigram from his pulpit that showed how keen an interest he took in public affairs, as when, after some Indian outbreak, he spoke of the same Government having given "the bullet to the Indian and the ballot to the Negro."

And now the eloquent tongue is still to the ears of men, and his body sleeps in beautiful Hollywood, which he has seen grow into a vast city of silence. Scholar, Patriot, Man of God. His memory will be revered while men honor nobility and virtue.

Rev. Joseph Crockard was born in Ontario, Canada, April 18, 1868. After graduation from the Normal School, Toronto, he engaged in teaching for a few years and then continued his studies at the University of Canada one year and at Knox College two years. He came South to avoid the severity of his native air, and studied theology in Columbia Seminary, graduating in '94. He served Summerton, Tirzah and Wedgefield churches, in South Carolina, until two years

ago, when he accepted the call from Mulberry and Mt. Holly churches in Mecklenburg Presbytery. After a faithful ministry to this people, which endeared him to all hearts, and which was sealed with the Divine blessing, he was called to the higher service of Heaven. After an operation at St. Peter's Hospital, Charlotte, which revealed an incurable disease, he gently and peacefully fell on sleep. He was conscious to the last, and his triumphant death was a testimony to the power of the Gospel of Christ that has already borne its fruit. His last words were, "Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning."

Rev. James Whitfield Graham passed quietly away at the home of his daughter, Mrs. Henry C. Giddens, in Tampa, Fla., on New Year's night. He lacked but a few years of rounding up his 85th year. During that time his experience had been varied and he had served his race in manifold ways.

Jonh Bailey Adger, D. D., died in Pendleton, South Carolina, on the 3d of January, in the 89th year of his age.

Dr. Adger was born of Scotch-Irish parentage in Charleston, S. C., December 13, 1810. He graduated when 18 years of age at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1833, of which, at the time of his death, he had been for some time the senior surviving alumnus. Shortly after his ordination by the Charleston Union Presbytery in 1834, he went as a missionary to the Armenians, under appointment of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and served in this work for twelve years at Constantinople and Smyrna, until the failure of his eyes and other circumstances compelled his withdrawal from the foreign field. During his missionary service he translated into Armenian the New Testament, Pilgrim's Progress, the Shorter Catechism, and other books, which translations are still in use among that people.

After his return home he engaged in work among the

negro slaves in his own native city. A church, connected with the Independent Presbyterian Synod, whose house of worship stands hard by his late residence in Pendleton, is appropriately named for him, "The Adger Memorial Church."

Upon the withdrawal, in 1856, of Dr. Palmer from the Chair of Ecclesiastical History and Church Polity in the Columbia Theological Seminary, Dr. Adger was elected his successor, and filled that position with great zeal and ability for seventeen years. After his retirement in 1874, although he had then reached the age of 64, he entered with energy and vigor upon the pastoral work in his own Presbytery of South Carolina, which he continued until, having attained the age of 83, he was reluctantly constrained, by physical infirmities, to give up the public preaching of the Gospel.

At this advanced age, and amid these hindering infirmities, with courage and energy, he undertook what was perhaps the greatest task of his life, the writing of a large book, which he called "My Life and Times." His life had been a long one, the times through which he had passed, eventful in Church and State ; and he undertook to write a history and discussion of the various questions he had to meet and help to solve. With the assistance of a devoted daughter, and such other help as he could procure, he gathered up the facts, studied out the questions, and dictated chapter after chapter of his book. His mind, still clear and vigorous, and his body wonderfully strong and active, he labored systematically and diligently for several years at this work. And almost as soon as the last chapter was finished, the last page written, and the valiant servant of God had laid down his fruitful pen, the Master called him to the everlasting rest.

Rev. John Hunter, D. D., died at his home in Jackson, Miss., Sunday morning March 12. He had been pastor of the First Presbyterian Church for forty-one years ; for the

past three years occupying the position of pastor *emeritus*. He was born in Ireland, and his wit and eloquence were characteristic of his race. He graduated at Center College, Kentucky, in 1852, at Danville Theological Seminary in 1856, and was ordained pastor of the First church, Danville, in 1858. Two years afterward he went to Jackson.

He was an eloquent preacher and a beloved pastor. His work was well done, and he has left behind him the record of a useful, honored life.

John Montgomery, D. D., died on February 10, at the age of eighty-eight. He was born at Danville, Kentucky, educated at Centre College and Princeton Seminary. After preaching for seventeen years at Harrodsburg, Kentucky, he went to Missouri as a Home Missionary, and did noble work for the Master there. For two years he was President of Westminster College.

Rev. G. E. Chandler had just undertaken the work of raising funds for the Assembly's Home, at Fredericksburg, when he was stricken down with pneumonia, dying in Richmond, at the home of Dr. Kerr. He was thirty-eight years of age. He had been pastor at Selma, Alabama, West Point, Mississippi, and had labored as an evangelist in Missouri with great success.

Rev. S. I. Reid died at Sylvania, Arkansas, January 21, at the age of eighty. He had been a useful and effective Home Missionary for forty-three years in Mississippi and Arkansas.

Rev. William T. George graduated at Louisville Seminary in 1898, and was ordained last fall by Dallas Presbyterian pastor of Iowa Park and Wichita Falls, Texas. He was an earnest and faithful minister.

NORTHERN PRESBYTERIAN.

JANUARY.—Dr. Howard Agnew Johnston, of Chicago, becomes pastor of Madison Avenue Church, New York,

made vacant by the election of Dr. Charles S. Thompson to the Secretaryship of Home Missions.

Dr. Thomas C. Hall, of Chicago, son of John Hall, has been elected professor of Christian Ethics in Union Seminary, New York. Dr. George W. Knox has also been appointed professor of the Philosophy and History of Religion. Dr. Knox was formerly a missionary to Japan and professor in the Imperial University in Tokio.

Bishop Nicholas, of the Greek Church in Alaska, made an attack upon Sheldon Jackson, the great pioneer missionary of the Northwest, whom the Northern Assembly recently honored with the Moderatorship, that has brought this remarkable man into notice again, besides giving an insight into the influence of Russia in Alaska. Bishop Nicholas wrote a letter to President McKinley, referring to the abuses of administration in Alaska, and charging that appointments were made solely on the recommendation of Sheldon Jackson, from whom Alaska must be delivered.

Dr. Jackson replied that he had nothing to do with the appointments, and then showed that the Greek Church was the enemy of the public schools, even imprisoning young boys to keep them from school, but that the Church was fast disintegrating in spite of the \$60,000 a year which the Russian government pays for its support.

FEBRUARY.—Rev. Charles S. Robinson, D. D., died at his home in New York on February 1. He had filled many places of responsibility in the church and gave as liberally of his means as he did of his talents for the Master's work. He had been pastor of the Park Presbyterian Church in Troy, N. Y., of the First Church, Brooklyn, and of the Madison Avenue Church, New York City, whose building was erected during his pastorate and largely with his financial aid. But Dr. Robinson's chief service to the Church was in editing the series of hymn books that bear his name. *Songs of the Church*, *Songs for the Sanctuary* and *Laudes Domini* have done more than any other collections to elevate the standard of American hymnology.

Dr. Henry Van Dyke, now the foremost Presbyterian preacher in New York City, has received two tempting offers to leave the pastorate; one to become professor in Johns Hopkins University, and the other to take the chair of English Literature at Princeton University. He refused the first offer and accepted the second, though he intends to remain with his church for some time to come. He is eminently fitted for the English Literature chair, though his removal from New York will be a blow to Presbyterianism in that city.

MARCH—Rev. T. DeWitt Talmage, D. D., has offered his resignation as pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Washington, and the people offer no opposition to his withdrawal. He was called to the church after the destruction of the Brooklyn Tabernacle—Dr. Sunderland and Dr. Allen being co-pastors. Soon afterwards, under the vicious system by which the trustees are allowed to control even the spiritual interests of the church, Dr. Allen was forced to resign, Dr. Talmage taking both services on Sunday. Later Dr. Sunderland resigned leaving Dr. Talmage in full possession. The result has not been gratifying to the trustees while it should be to all who are opposed to subordinating the spiritual interests of a church to its financial. The debt, to raise which Dr. Talmage's drawing powers were employed, remained unpaid, the crowds who attended his preaching added nothing to the financial strength of the church, and the dissatisfaction at the total lack of pastoral work alienated the most useful members of the church. The Presbytery will undoubtedly dissolve the pastoral relation existing.

There are only two excuses for sensationalism in the pulpit, namely, that the crowds who go to feed upon it will bring more members into the church or more cash into the treasury. It is hardly probable that this generation will produce a sensational preacher whose genius can compare with that of Dr. Talmage. And this is written with no idea

of decrying the good that he has undoubtedly done, but to impress the chief lesson of his life—that neither the membership nor the finances of a church can be built up by his methods. Sensationalism in the pulpit does not pay.

CANADIAN PRESBYTERIAN.

The Canadian Presbyterian Church sustained a heavy loss in the death of Rev. John King, D. D., principal of Manitoba College, Winnipeg. He was born in Scotland. After studying in the universities of his native land and of Germany he came to Canada, giving the whole of his ministerial life to the service of the Canadian Presbyterian Church. He was appointed by the General Assembly principal of Manitoba College in 1883, and did excellent and lasting work in removing the debt resting on the college and establishing a good theological department.

CONGREGATIONAL.

FEBRUARY.—The most noteworthy event in Congregational circles this quarter has been the resignation of Lyman Abbott, pastor of Plymouth Church, and the election of his successor Newel Dwight Hillis, of Chicago.

Dr. Abbott has the satisfaction of turning over Plymouth Church to his successor in very much better condition than when he became the successor of Henry Ward Beecher. He continues his work as editor of the *Outlook*, a work which is congenial to him and for which he is eminently fitted. And yet we believe that it would have been better for his fame, as well as for the development of his church, if he had resigned his pastorate five years ago. Since he began to give out from Plymouth pulpit the latest results of the radical criticism, he has ceased to be one of whom it could be said, the common people heard him gladly. His attacks upon the traditional views of the historicity and inspiration of the Bible have made him an authority with every infidel in the country. It is true that a meaning has

been put into his words for which he is hardly responsible, yet his position of favoritism with skeptics is a "bad eminence" for a preacher of the gospel to occupy. If we know anything of human nature, especially of redeemed human nature, his people have hungered for something better. And Plymouth Church has called a man who preaches Christ. Dr. Hillis is antipodal to Dr. Abbott. Not so strongly intellectual perhaps, nor so accurate a scholar, but with an eloquence that is nothing less than genius, with a love of fellowmen that is almost a passion and above all, with a consuming desire to magnify the name of Jesus, he has already won his place in the hearts of his people.

EPISCOPAL.

FEBRUARY.—Rt. Rev. John Williams, Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, died at Middletown, Conn., Feb. 7th. He was a voluminous author, a teacher of rare gifts and influence, and having been Bishop since 1851, occupied a large place in the esteem and affection of his denomination.

The ritualistic controversy in England still continues to agitate the British mind. Mr. Kensit, whose public protests in church against the "lawless" acts of the clergy called attention to the abuses, has been cast into the background by such a leader as Sir Vernon Harcourt. With the *Church Times*, the High Church organ, declaring that "not the very smallest allusion to Protestantism can be found by microscopic search" in the worship and creed of the Church of England, and Sir Vernon Harcourt protesting that the offending clergy "need not lay the flattering unction to their souls that they are going to carry off the Protestant plant of the National Church in order to carry on their Romish manufactures," the crisis of the conflict would seem to be not far distant. Parliament will have something to say now that the orders of the Bishops have so signally failed,

and once in English politics there can be but one end—dis-establishment.

LUTHERAN.

JANUARY.—Two hundred ministers and many laymen, representing the General Council, the General Synod and the United Synod of the South, met in Philadelphia in a general convention. The three bodies together number 650,000 communicants and were united before 1860. And while the question of Organic Union was not discussed, much was accomplished in the line of co-operation in the Home and Foreign Fields. The meeting was noted for its harmony and cordiality, and no doubt the way was made easier for union in the future.

INTER DENOMINATIONAL.

JANUARY.—The Seventh Annual Conference of Foreign Mission Boards of the United States and Canada met in New York. Interesting and valuable discussions were had of the "living link" idea, that is the support of missionaries by individual churches; of the training and qualification of missionaries; of denominational comity; and of the Ecumenical Conference of Foreign Missions in 1900. Plans were perfected and the business arrangements made for this great conference.

A formal appeal from the missionary societies of the Baptist, Congregational, Episcopal, Methodist, Presbyterian and Reformed Churches has been sent to Congress against the seating of Representative Brigham H. Roberts, of Utah, a polygamist. As Congress is the sole judge of the qualifications of its members it is hardly possible that the unanimous Christian sentiment of the country will be disregarded, in favor of a man whose life is a violation of law and whose election is an affront to the government which trusted too implicitly the solemn pledge of the Mormon Church.

The Federation of Free Churches, through its committee, appointed for the purpose, has issued its Catechism, as a "monument to the unity of evangelical faith." The committee represented the Congregational, Baptist, Presbyterian and Methodist Churches—the last including four varieties of Methodists. The Catechism has received a large amount of criticism favorable and unfavorable. While it cannot compare in terseness and vigor with the Shorter Catechism, it is yet a remarkable expression of the common faith of the evangelical churches. It will serve the purpose of calling renewed attention to the essential injustice of the Establishment, and hasten the day of the complete separation of Church and State in England.

The Dissenting Churches now actually number more members in England and Wales than the Established Church, and are growing at a more rapid rate, while of course, in Scotland and Ireland the Episcopal Church is still more in the minority. For a minority church to enjoy the privileges of the Establishment will soon be impossible in a country with a representative government. And the situation is further aggravated by the fact that the English Church is divided into conflicting camps, and that the Evangelical Churches have just indicated their oneness of faith by this Catechism. Clear-sighted Episcopalians, such as the editor of the *Southern Churchman*, already declare that the days of the Establishment are numbered.

Under the auspices of the Chicago University Principal Fairbairn is lecturing in India, and his addresses on Christianity have met with a remarkable reception. The learned Buddhists have been particularly impressed with the logic and eloquence of his demonstration that Christianity is the only religion.

[The July QUARTERLY will contain valuable reviews of the Presbyterian Assemblies and the meetings of other Church Courts.]

I. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

ABBOTT'S LIFE AND LETTERS OF PAUL.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF PAUL, THE APOSTLE, *by Lyman Abbott.*
Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company. The Riverside Press, Cambridge. 1895. Pp. viii., 332.

The topic treated in this work is one of neverfailing interest, and it loses none of its interest under the skillful pen of the retiring pastor of Plymouth Church. It is an eminently stimulating book, and there is not a dull page in it.

As stated in the preface, it is an attempt "to apply the principle of evolution to the elucidation of spiritual truths," and to trace the progress of doctrine in the writings of Paul.

We are not of the number of those who believe that Saul of Tarsus began his ministry with a system of theology thoroughly elaborated, and that there was no need for study, and no room for growth. On the contrary, we believe that there were many points which as yet had never occurred to him, and that by study and meditation, under the Divine guidance, he gained a deeper, and yet deeper insight into spiritual truth, and that there was a growth in knowledge as well as in grace. But while we hold this most tenaciously, we also hold that his growth was a genuine growth—an evolution, if you please—and that his progress was ever onward, like that of a tree.

Dr. Abbott holds a radically different view. He holds that the Apostle made progress by a series of mistakes; that he arrived at truth by finding error untenable. He is often in the dark. "Sometimes it is difficult to tell whether he is a critic or an advocate of a doctrine; sometimes, like Browning, he hardly knows himself which he is" (p. 15). At one time he holds and teaches as Gospel truth a doctrine, and then afterwards discovers that he is entirely mistaken, and so it comes to pass that at different times he teaches doctrines diametrically opposed. Under such circumstances chronology becomes a matter of the greatest moment, and it is to no purpose to show that Paul held a particular view, unless you can also show that it is his "latest." Dr. Abbott is in doubt as to whether the Pastoral Epistles came from the pen of the Apostle, though he admits that they are Pauline in character, and so we are left in painful uncertainty as to what were his latest views.

In order to understand the book, the author assures us that it is necessary to lay aside all theological preconceptions, and to look at the Apostle from his point of view. He says: "First of all, we have to realize that Paul is a prophet, a seer. Some men grope their way to truth; some men rise like birds upon wings, and, looking down upon truth from above, see it spread out beneath them in God's sunlight.

These are poets and seers. Such a man was Isaiah, Plato, Carlyle, Emerson, Browning; such a man was Paul. He has been studied as though he were a logician, a deducer of truth from premises, a formulator of a system's sake, an ancient John Calvin. The student has been puzzled to trace the logical connection in his Epistles; often there is no logical connection. Paul is not a logician; he is often unlogical, sometimes illogical. He uses arguments, not because they are philosophically sound, but because they will accomplish his purpose. He was born and bred in a dialectic age, educated in a dialectic school, and speaks to audiences trained in dialectics. He therefore uses this dialectic method. But he does not arrive at truth by logical processes; he perceives it" (pp. 10, 11).

An assumption so violent as this, and so contrary to the almost universal verdict of the ages, needs the strongest evidence to support it. The evidence presented in this volume is so utterly inconclusive as to almost drive us to the conclusion that Dr. Abbott is himself a "seer," and "just knows it," without any reference to the reasons for or against it. Take for instance this account of Paul's sermon at Antioch. "In the synagogue at Antioch Paul begins by praising the history of the Jewish people, breaks off in that history; narrates the birth, the death, and the resurrection of Christ, and brings his discourses to a conclusion with a picture of a judgment which this Christ will initiate at his coming" (p. 790).

It is very evident that the author sees in this only a rambling and disconnected discourse. We think, however, that it can be easily shown that this discourse is a thoroughly logical one from beginning to end. Is it possible that a trained mind like that of Dr. Abbott fails to see the direct bearing of these introductory statements? When one does not see fit to accept the conclusions of another, it is easy to say that he is illogical, but this does not by any means prove it.

He does indeed give him credit for being an "orator," but this is a very doubtful compliment, for he is represented as being unscrupulous; the only question with him being whether an argument would accomplish the end in view, little caring whether it was sound or not. Profit to his hearers is his standard in teaching. He doesn't care whether he is consistent or not, for to him, as to Emerson, "consistency is the vice of small minds" (p. 16). How different is this from the Apostle's indignant repudiation of the principle that we may do evil that good may come!

But let us come now to the body of this book. It might well have been entitled, "The Mistakes of Paul," for only by a series of blunders which are fortunately discovered, does he arrive at the truth. We can but rejoice at the attainment of truth in the end, but we feel a deep sympathy for all his earlier converts upon whom he imposed his crude and erroneous notions, backed by all the authority of an Apostle.

The book is so full of statements and positions which we regard as erroneous and untenable, that we are at a loss to know where to begin,

and will content ourselves with giving a few samples only: (1). At the time of his visit to Thessalonica, Paul held certain clear-cut views as to the second coming of Christ, "What he believed, as we gather from his earlier writings and his sermons, was that Jesus who died and rose again would presently descend to the earth; that he would bring with him the celestial forces from heaven; that he would gather together Israel: that he would put himself at the head of this army, celestial and terrestrial; that he would conquer—utterly, absolutely, entirely, and forever; that he would extricate the enemies of God, and would reign King over kings and Lord over lords" (p. 71). Again he says: "Paul believed that the Messiah was to come again, and to come in his own generation—but Paul was mistaken, not only in his conception of the time of the Messiah's coming; he was mistaken also in his conception of the secret of the power of the kingdom" (pp. 89, 90). Still laboring under this delusion the Apostle writes his first Epistle to the Thessalonians, reiterating his former erroneous teachings. The effects of his teachings were very different from what he had expected, and in the short interval between his two letters, "in some way or other Paul reached the conclusion that the kingdom of God could not come until the kingdom of evil was itself perfected" (p. 88), and now he writes that Christ will come as he taught, but not immediately.

Now upon the assumption that the views and teachings of the Apostle had undergone a change, was it honest in him to try to make it appear that he had never advocated the position now discarded? How could he say to them, "we beseech you to the end that ye be not quickly shaken from your mind, nor yet be troubled either by spirit or by word, or by epistles as from us, as that the day of the Lord is now present. Remember ye not that when I was yet with you, I told you these things?" (2 Thess. 2:2, 3). Does not the Apostle here affirm that he had never taught that the coming of the Lord was "present," and yet according to Dr. Abbott, this was precisely what he did teach when he was among them, and also reaffirmed it in his first letter. We are consequently driven to the conclusion either that the author is mistaken in affirming that the Apostle advocated such views, or else that the Apostle, instead of acknowledging his mistake, shamelessly sought to preserve his own reputation as a teacher by a direct falsehood as to his former views.

In this connection our author makes a number of sweeping assertions, which are not borne out by the facts in the case. Speaking of his visit to Corinth, he says, "Up to this time in Paul's experience he has said nothing of the crucifixion, except incidentally to refer to the death of Christ as a basis for setting forth the resurrection of Christ. From this time forth he has little to say about the resurrection of Christ; so little apparently, in his preaching to the Corinthians, that some of the church came to the conclusion that there was no resurrection, and he writes them at length on the subject" (p. 112). But what are the facts? In Acts, 15: 27-29, and again in 17: 5, his death is distinctly set forth as a proof of his Messiahship, while in 1 Thess., 4: 14, it is presented as an

article of faith, and again in 5: 10 it is the basis of our salvation. Up to this time we can point to seven references in his writings to the death of Christ, as against four references to his resurrection.

Again he says: "In his previous sermons and in his previous letters to the Thessalonians he has *nothing* to say about the crucifixion and much to say of the second coming; in his future letters, *little* to say of the second coming" (p. 112).

We grant that the second coming is quite prominent in these two epistles, but the assertion that in his later letters he has little to say on the subject, does not accord with the facts, as may be readily seen by a reference to the following passages: 1 Cor. 1: 7, 8, 4: 5, 5: 5, 11: 26, 15: 25; 2 Cor. 4: 14, 5: 10; Phil. 1: 6, 3: 20, 21, 4: 5; Col. 4: 5; 1 Tim. 6: 14; 2 Tim. 1: 18, 4: 8; Titus 2: 15. Thus it will be seen that he presents it in all except four of his epistles that follow, and if he has discarded the doctrine why present it to the very last?

According to Dr. Abbott, Paul's visit to Corinth was an epoch in his life. Now after full two-thirds of his ministry has passed, his views undergo a mighty change—a change as radical as that which took place when he forsook Judaism to become a follower of Jesus of Nazareth (p. 114). His work in the past has been a failure. "Nothing had come of his mission. . . . In no single place had he been able to stay more than a few days, or a few weeks at the utmost. . . . He reviewed the past, and saw that his message of a second coming of Christ within the present generation to revolutionize the world had accomplished nothing" (p. 102). "Christianity becomes more and more to him a present life, less and less a mere hope of the future life. It is after this that he writes to the Romans that men are justified by faith alone. It is after this that he writes to the Philippians that because Christ hath humbled himself, and taken the form of a servant, and been obedient even unto death, and that the death of the cross, therefore God hath highly exalted him. . . . From this time forth he is the preacher of two things: First, the glory of self-sacrifice; and secondly the mystical life of the inward faith. . . . In the third stage of his experience he is no longer a Pharisee, and he is no longer a Pharisaic Christian. . . . Along with this change comes a change in his conception of his function and his work. He begins to see now that the Roman Empire is to last. He begins to see that the Christian religion must be made the religion of the Roman Empire. He no longer goes from place to place as a mere herald of a coming king. He stays a year and a half in Corinth; he stays two years in Ephesus. He plans also to extend his missionary tour. He resolves that he will go to Rome" (pp. 113-115). But is there any evidence that the views of the Apostle underwent any material change, such as that here described?

Dr. Abbott accepts the "South-Galatian theory, and hence the gospel the Apostle preached to the Galatians represented that gospel in its earliest form, as also the Apostle himself expressly declares (Gal. 1: 11, 12), and yet after this alleged change has taken place he writes to them:

"But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema." (Gal. 1:8).

(2). Perhaps the most remarkable change of view attributed to the Apostle is that touching the resurrection. Up to the time of that memorable visit to Corinth, he held the prevalent view of the Pharisees and others, that there would be a resurrection of both the just and the unjust at the last day, but along with other superstitious notions this is now laid aside. "He had been brought up in the Pharisaic faith that all men's bodies would wait in the grave until some general resurrection, their spirits in the meantime remaining in an intermediate state until the day of general resurrection, when the graves would open and the bodies would come forth and the spirits would be rehabilitated. But he had been down to the gates of death, and had looked through the mystic door into the unknown world beyond, and this hope in a general resurrection of the just and of the unjust. in some far off day, did not sustain him any more than it sustained Martha and Mary to believe that their brother would rise in the general resurrection at the last day. . . . Never again shall we find Paul thinking of a day in which all the dead shall rise from their graves and the sea shall give up its dead" (pp. 175, 176). But what of the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians, which was written after this alleged change in his views? Oh, well, there is no trouble upon that score, for he says: "Many scholars have read the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians as an argument for the resurrection of the body. It seems to be clearly, explicitly, palpably, unmistakably, a cumulative argument against the resurrection of the body" (p. 153). After such a feat as this it would not be very difficult to explain away such statements as those made in Phil. 3: 11, 20, &c., but we are still puzzled to know how he would reconcile the statement that the Apostle had forever renounced the old Pharisaic doctrine of a general resurrection at the last day with the Apostle's explicit declaration in the council: "Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question" (Acts 23:6)? And then, as if to leave no loophole of escape, a few days later he reiterates this statement, saying, "And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust" (24: 25, Cf., also 24: 21). Was the Apostle simply lying, in order to divide the council and to secure the support of the Pharisees in that body.

But hear him again: "If the New Testament means to teach the resurrection of the body, if Paul means to teach that doctrine, it is very strange that the phrase never occurs in the New Testament. The notion that the body which is laid in the grave must rise again in order to preserve personal immortality is a relic of paganism which ought long since to have been forgotten. The body that lies in the grave will rise in grass and flowers only. . . . Every death is a resurrection; and the mother who stands looking down into the grave and hearing the clod falling upon the coffin should turn and lift her eyes and see the loved

one at her side trying to caress her. For she should know, not that there will be, but that there is a spiritual body, and that the last gasp on earth is contemporaneous with the first great inhalation of a new spiritual life in the celestial sphere." (p. 162).

Even Dr. Abbott admits that there is a resurrection, but of what? He thinks it strange that if it is the body that phrase never occurs in the New Testament. We retort that if it is something else that is raised up, it is passing strange that that phrase never occurs. If it is not the body, what is it? Can that be raised up which does not die? We have in mind numbers of passages which most clearly imply that it is the body and that alone; but we are afraid that we will be told that this is nothing but a lingering trace of the old Pharisaic notion. Now our author graciously admits that our Lord held correct views on the subject, though he was misinterpreted by others, and we can content ourselves by giving one explicit declaration of our Lord on the subject: "The hour cometh, in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." (Jno. 5:28, 29). Will Dr. Abbott please explain what will come forth from those graves in that great day?

(3) The author's view on the subject of the Atonement are fully set forth in his discussion of the Epistle to the Romans. As might be expected, the vicarious work of Christ is emphatically set aside, for the simple reason that there is no need of it. The idea that the claims of justice must be satisfied is nothing but an old pagan idea. But let him speak for himself: "Sin produces two different effects upon the human soul. It disorders the soul itself and it estranges the soul from God. . . . A little child disobeys the mother, pouts, is angry, cries. The crying shows the discomfort and the disorder within. The mother takes the child into her lap. The child struggles to get away, jumps down, and runs away again, showing estrangement between the child and the mother. . . . As the two effects of sin are one, so the two remedies are one. . . . The moment the child ceases to be disobedient, the moment love comes back into the child, that moment the child is ready to climb into the mother's lap. Nor is it ready to climb into the mother's lap and take the mother's caresses and be at one so long as it is disobedient to her. . . . It is impossible that God should declare a man to be right when God sees him to be wrong. That would make God a liar, because he sees in the penitent the beginning of righteousness he accepts it as righteousness, recognizes it, fosters it, develops it. . . . The beginning of righteousness is in him, and therefore the reconciliation between him and God is accomplished." (Pp. 229-251).

According to this scheme, man virtually saves himself. The Prodigal arises and returns to his father, and there is nothing for that father to do but to receive him (p. 250.) But has Christ no part in this work? Oh yes! he is one who "comes to earth, searches men out; suffers in their suffering, bears the burden of their sinning and offers to fill

them with himself that they may become like him" (p. 238). By the power of his personality ("magnetism" the author suggests) which he imparts, he inspires men, just as the Little Corporal did at the Bridge of Lodi, or Sheridan at the battle of Winchester (?) (p. 240).

Summing up, he says: "Thus there were in Jewish history three systems—the Pagan system, the Mosaic system, and the intermingling of the two in the Levitical systems" (p. 520). Christ rejected all of them, but "the disciples did not understand, and after Christ died they interpreted this message of the gospel through Mosaism, and later theology modified it to make it harmonize with Leviticism. To Paul, above all the Apostles, we owe the interpretation of this gospel of Christ, as contrasted with Paganism, and even with Mosaism. . . . So Paul says the Pagan is wrong, there is no wrath of God to be appeased by sacrifice; the Jew is wrong, there is no distance from God to be bridged by a priest, and an altar and a Jewish ritual; the Pharisee is wrong, there is no satisfaction of God to be purchased, no reconciliation with him to be bought, by obeying the laws which he has issued. We are simply to take the free gift of God—his life—and then live freely, spontaneously, naturally, because we have received it." (Pp. 522-3).

(4) The author's treatment of the question of Divine Sovereignty is, to say the least, unique. The ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters of Romans, he says, are confessedly the most difficult portion in all his writings, not only by reason of the difficulty of the theme, but also because Paul's arguments are archaic and ineffective, and it is also difficult, "by reason of the fact that in America, where individualism has received its highest development, and where popular sovereignty has become a popular cry, there is a disinclination to recognize any sovereignty but popular sovereignty, any law above that which men make for themselves, anything greater than human free will." (P. 255).

Evidently it is the doctor's aim to formulate a doctrine of Divine Sovereignty which will not conflict with his American "disinclination," but notwithstanding this benevolent desire, and his skill in distorting language, he still finds it difficult to get rid of Paul's plain statements. He at length solved the difficulty by the discovery that Paul himself was sorely puzzled, and in the very midst of the epistle changed his mind, and repudiated the views he had expressed in the former part. "Paul was himself in perplexity. He did not himself understand how to reconcile this new faith which was a part of his new life, and this old faith which was a part of his old life. . . ." Then Paul stops. We can imagine that in his dictation he has gone as far as he can when he reaches that calculation, and he says to his amanuensis, "I will wait a little." There is clearly a break between the eighth chapter and the ninth. During this break in time he ponders this question within himself: How is it that this free gift of God is given? How can I reconcile the universality of this gift with my belief in the election of Israel? How can I commend it to a people who believe either in necessity or in fate, or in an arbitrary Jehovah? The ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters are his answer to

these questions. (Pp. 260-2). Paul's conclusion is that "the end and object of sovereignty, the purpose which it inflexibly maintains, the result which it will achieve, is "mercy upon all." (P. 265). In order to leave no doubt as to his meaning, the author quotes approvingly in a footnote, the following from Dr. C. A. Gordon: "The affirmation that God has a Christian purpose toward our entire humanity involves an extension of the field of redemption so enormous as to make obsolete, at a single stroke, the whole theological map of the traditional view. And what seems worse, while all clear seeing men are aware that this does not necessarily imply universal salvation, it is true that it looks that way. If God shall succeed, universal salvation will be the final result." (P. 267).

There are a number of other points we had intended to notice, but time forbids. Dr. Abbott professes great admiration for the Apostle to the Gentiles, rating him far above all the other apostles, and yet he cannot conceal his contempt for his narrow and contracted views. How patronizingly he speaks of his religious views: "He was orthodox of the orthodox. . . . He believed that the law had been given to Moses in the Mount; that every word and every letter had been so given. He would have been a great deal more impatient with the Higher Criticism than the most impatient critics of that criticism are in our time. He would have had none of it. He believed that Moses wrote every word and every letter of the Pentateuch, including the account of his own death; and that Moses wrote this by dictation, word for word, as God gave it to him; unless, indeed, he went still further and believed, as some Pharisees did, that God wrote the book himself in heaven and handed it down to Moses on the Mount, finished and ready for reading. (P. 22).

Or take again his comments upon Paul's argument as to the position of woman in the church: "This is an excellent illustration of Paul's oratorical temperament. . . . He uses those arguments which he thinks will appeal to them, and which are suggested by his rabbinical training. . . . Some of his arguments, few, if any, American readers believe to be sound. They do not believe that woman was made for man. They believe that God made man, male and female, in his own image; not for woman man, more than for man woman; but each for the other, and both for their God." (P. 145). What a pity Paul was not born an American!

T. R. ENGLISH.

CHRIST IN THE DAILY MEAL; or, The Ordinance of the Breaking of Bread. *By Norman Fox, D. D.* Cloth, 16mo., New York: Fords, Howard & Hulbert. 50 cents.

This little book is the expansion of a paper read before the Baptist Ministers' Conference of New York and vicinity and published in *The Independent* (March, 1895). Since the appearance of Dr. McGiffert's *Apostolic Age*, and the discussion of the Lord's Supper which it has caused, the author, Dr. Norman Fox (late Professor of Church History in William Jewell College, Missouri), has been encouraged to enlarge his essay and put it forth in book form.

He makes a protest against the sacramentarianism which he finds in all the churches. He thinks that certain mediæval ideas about the Lord's Supper still survive even in the most Protestant circles. It is his aim to get rid of these inherited superstitions, and get back to Apostolic simplicity.

He holds that whenever the believer eats and drinks, even in his daily repast, he is commanded to do it in remembrance of Christ; that not only the bread and wine on the church table, but all bread and wine represent the body and blood of Christ, and that his command is that as often as we eat and drink (in the daily meal), we are to do it in remembrance of him; that the modern ecclesiastical supper, the taking of a morsel of bread and one swallow of wine, directly and solely for memorial purposes, instead of for the purpose of satisfying hunger, is not what Jesus instituted; that one disciple may observe the command alone; that there is no necessity for sacerdotal ministration; that it is only by virtue of its color that wine represents Christ's blood, and so unfermented juice is as good, or the red juice of some other berry than the grape could be used.

This is strange doctrine for which to claim the authority of the Scriptures, yet it is claimed that the argument is strictly Biblical. It seems to us a clever attempt to fix on the words of Scripture a meaning which might be possible if they stood alone, or in another context, but which cannot be the true meaning when the context in which they occur is considered. The author seems to take advantage of little accidents and peculiarities of language to uphold his preconceived views in a manner which is not worthy of a candid interpreter of the Bible.

For instance, he lays great stress on 1 Cor. xi. 25, last clause, "this do ye, as oft as ye drink, in remembrance of me." Now the context evidently supplies "this cup" after "drink," and this is so evident that there is no difference of opinion about it among translators and commentators. And yet our author takes it to be, not a particular command with reference to this cup, but a general command to remember Christ every time we eat and drink. The clause as it stands cannot possibly have this meaning, as any one who has regard to the context will see. This is only one instance of the way our author wrests Scripture, yet it is the strongest scriptural argument he has to uphold his position.

Not only does he make a wrong use of the Scripture, but he is also in error as to his ideas of symbolism. He claims that bread and wine are natural symbols of Christ's body and blood, and always have been in their very nature. In the words of institution he understands Christ to mean: "This is my body, as it has been indefinitely heretofore." He says: "The bread and wine are not arbitrarily appointed remembrances, they are remembrances by their very nature. . . . There is no symbolism in one loaf which is not found in every loaf. . . . The symbolic theory makes every loaf Christ's body, all wine his blood."

There is great confusion here. It is very evident that bread and wine have a fitness for the use to which our Lord puts them in the Supper,

but they become to us symbols of Christ's body and blood because of his appointment, and that bread and wine when given and received in the manner of his appointment have a memorial quality which they did not possess before, and which they do not possess on other occasions.

Our Saviour did not say: "Bread is my body," and "Any red drink is my blood," (as our author understands him to say). In saying: "This is my body" and "as oft as ye do this," he particularizes and confines the statement to the eating and drinking of bread and wine in the particular manner of his appointment.

Our author is wrong in saying that wine represents Christ's blood only by virtue of its color, and that the red juice of some other berry than the grape could represent his blood. He finds the symbolism of the bread to consist not in its color but in its use as food, why does he not find the symbolism of the wine also in its use. Bread nourishes, wine exhilarates ("maketh glad the heart of man" according to scripture). So the soul finds its nourishment and exhilaration in eating Christ's body and drinking his blood. And is there anything that can rejoice the heart with such unspeakable joy as the appropriation of this blood of the covenant shed for many for the remission of sins? It is fitly symbolized by wine, and it would not be proper to substitute anything else for the wine.

But why insist on changing the institution, and substituting something else for the element which it is agreed Christ appointed? Who that loved a friend would wish to substitute something else for the sacred moments of friendship left him; who would be searching about for something better to put in its place? Would such conduct not show dislike for the real memorial arising from a lurking disgust for the taste and judgment of the friend who left that memorial?

Our author is wrong in holding that the Lord's Supper must be a full meal for the purpose of satisfying hunger. He objects very earnestly to "a purely ceremonial eating," "the mere imitation of a meal," taking simply "a morsel of bread and one swallow of wine."

If the disciple eat but a morsel and drink but a sup has he not obeyed the command to eat and drink? The quantity is not made essential. There is no evidence that it was ever intended that these elements should be eaten to satisfy hunger, as a full meal, for while often taken by the early church in connection with a meal, they never constituted the meal itself. A full meal to satisfy the hunger is not made from bread and wine alone.

For his view that single individuals may celebrate this rite alone, he gives no Scripture warrant, and in fact there is nothing in the Scripture record to even remotely indicate that a believer ever ate the Lord's Supper alone. On the other hand the apostle writes of them "coming together to eat the Lord's Supper."

Our author says his purpose is not to level down, but only to level up, that he only wishes to make sacred the daily meal. His purpose may be good, but the practical outcome, if he could get the men to believe and practice what he advocates, would only be to destroy the Lord's Supper

as divinely instituted. He, however, does not expect his book to have much effect, he says, on account of established conceptions, habitual training and personal prejudice, which argument can not change. He says: "Though every unbiased reader declared the argument in the foregoing pages as conclusive as a demonstration in Euclid, one could not expect it to have any very great effect."

With the author's own estimate of the practical results expected from this book, we fully agree.

J. W. LAFFERTY.

Berkely, Springs, W. Va.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE PROGRESS OF MAN, as illustrated by Modern Missions. *By W. Douglas MacKensie.* Chicago, New York, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co. Cop. 1897. 16 mo. Pp. 250. \$1.25.

"How the one universalistic religion has been molding the life of the one race of mankind during the nineteenth century—that is the subject of this little book."—*Preface.*

In this instructive volume there are ten chapters. The first, which is introductory, gives a forecast of what is to follow. Then the second treats of the Universalism of Christianity; how at first and largely in all other religions, except Buddhism and Confucianism partially, patriotism is so blended with the religion as to be identified with it, to prevent any missionary effort on the part of its adherents and forestall its adoption by aliens, except at the edge of the sword. But Christianity, even in its earlier phase of Judaism, by recognizing the unity, sovereignty and fatherhood of God; the unity, dependence and brotherhood of man, and the suffering Messiah, coming as God's son and man's brother to atone for sin, was prepared to be the religion of man, not merely of a nation. While the Christ limited his work to the Jewish race, it was under a divine restraint, and the gospel shows clearly enough that when he is lifted up from the earth he will draw all men unto him. Into all the world, to every creature, his followers must go, and he with them. The simplicity of his gospel, God's grace and man's faith are in keeping with this. Then from Pentecost, where the Babel of tongues were made one again, as it were, on down how rapidly did it spread. Even in the Dark Ages, when its activity largely ceased, it was mastering the most powerful and intellectual nations of the earth, the nations of Europe, thus preparing a base of operations for its future conquests. Propagandism was not entirely forgotten, and after the intellectual awakening the work began anew and increased till our own century, which marks a vigorous foreign movement into every land.

The third chapter treats of the Missionary as Pioneer, as he has gone into the unexplored and undiscovered parts of earth. Much has he contributed to geography and ethnology, to meteorology, zoology and botany. He has been the means of the interchange of influences and ideas, and thus becomes a factor in the unification of the race.

The fourth deals with the Missionary as Translator, detailing the

wonderful self-denying labors which have put the Bible into the vernacular of nearly all of mankind. A thoroughly instructive chapter, not prosy even to one who is already familiar with the main facts. He shows the philological value of all this work, and its use in unifying the race. But these were incidental; the Bible in the vernacular has been the power of God for man's salvation. It has preceded, attended and succeeded the Missionary, and won men by its own inherent power under the Spirit's direction.

Chapter five shows us the Missionary as an Educator. Missions and education have necessarily gone together. Evangelical Christianity is the only religion that does not tolerate ignorance. Examples such as Madagascar, Turkey, India and others, are discussed at large. It is a moot question to what extent the Missionary should employ the higher education in his work. But to us it seems that the Missionary awakens the desire, and if he does not gratify it a Bible-less education will be sought and secured, and Spencer will reign where Christ should.

Chapter six treats of the Missionary as Martyr. The meliorating and mollifying effects of his self-sacrifice are great. The author turns aside to discuss the value of martyrdom from an evidential standpoint. He determines a real difference between Christian martyrdom and that of fanaticism.

The Missionary as Civilizer supplies the matter for consideration in the next chapter. On this all are practically agreed. The case is ably presented here.

Perhaps the best chapter of the book is the eighth, which treats of the Missionary in relation to other religions, showing what is common ground on which he can meet their devotees and at the same time exhibiting the great superiority of Christianity. The heathen have already noted this extensively, and are destined to observe it more and more.

This prepares the way naturally for the next chapter—"The Missionary as Saviour." Everything else looks to this one supreme object of the true missionary—is ancillary to it; he wants to establish Christ as Master in the heart of everyone of these degraded, sin-cursed, devil-deceived, priest-ridden, idolatrous sons of our common Father. "Even for this cause came I into the world;" even for this cause he foregoes all the amenities of life, if possibly he may be the means of saving some. To do this he must be able to proclaim what Christ has done for him, and he must show Christ, evidently set him forth in his own life. Medical missions furnish a great opportunity for this. What it has been able to do for man is one of the most palpable arguments for the divine origin of Christianity. The apologetic value of missions is great.

The title of the book is also the title of the last chapter. A valuable chapter it is. The elements of progress he determines to be the elaboration of social relations, triumphs over nature, and unification of the race. Then progress is dependent upon character, it is identified with development of character. This is only the expression of moral improvement. Morality cannot be dissociated from religion. As a man's

god is so will he be. Christianity then furnishes the true basis for progress. It alone puts man in fellowship with the true, the perfect God. It alone gives us the perfect man in association with God in Christ. It alone gives the high ideal; it alone holds out a purifying and ennobling hope. It has as a matter of fact uplifted every race with which it has come in contact. The author accepts evolution, and considers Christianity a great factor in social evolution. He may use the word "evolution" in the sense of "development." In that sense his statements are not generally objectionable. Nevertheless at one point in the book he evidently regards Christianity as itself a product of evolution, and minimizes, if he does not ignore divine interference. Huxley's dark forecast is the only logical outcome of a consistent evolutionary philosophy; and Christianity has no place in that picture. Whether man is a product of evolution or not—and we firmly believe the negative—Christianity could never have been evolved; the Bible and its religion could only have come by direct communication from an all-wise and infinitely gracious God. The sense of sin and need of a God-man Savior could never have unfolded itself in the consciousness of an animal-descended being, no matter how high a degree of intelligence he may have reached. Conscience ever would be no more than the voice of expediency.

This volume will repay careful perusal.

"The book is rich in illustrative matter drawn from almost every missionary field and contains copious references to the most valuable literature on the subject. Each chapter is suggestive and thoughtful, and a pastor could do no better thing for his people than to plan a course of sermons along this line of Christian Evidences."

The mechanical execution, the paper, the binding are good.

D. J. BRIMM

Columbia, S. C.

TERRY'S BIBLICAL APOCALYPTICS.

BIBLICAL APOCALYPTICS: A Study in the Most Notable Revelations of God and of Christ in the Canonical Scriptures. By *Milton S. Terry, D. D.*, Professor in the Garrett Biblical Institute. New York: Eaton & Maine, Cincinnati: Curts & Jennings. 1898. Pp. 513, 8vo. \$3.00.

Professor Terry has published many books. The one before us is the middle one of a series, the first in the series being *Biblical Hermeneutics*, and the third, not yet issued, is to be *Biblical Dogmatics*.

The subject-matter and the author's ability to set down his sentences bring this volume to the verge of fascination, but it is sadly blemished by its exorbitant concessions to radical criticism. He makes these concessions, not because he agrees with the critics, but because he wants to show that we may grant all they ask without losing the Bible as a guide to God and to Christ. To put weapons into the hand of an enemy just to show that you can out-parry him, is nothing less than foolish, if your cause is great and your zeal is earnest.

The author selects for exposition those "portions of the Holy Scrip-

tures which are remarkable for symbolic presentations of the works and ways of God." His task is that of the artist who seeks to translate pictures into prose.

He gives an introduction, in which he discusses the hermeneutical laws of apocalypics, and the apocalyptic elements in Hebrew song. Then follow his comments upon the interpretations of such special apocalypses as those of Creation, the Fall, the Deluge, the Babel Dispersion, Abraham, Dreams, the Exodus, the Tabernacle, sundry passages in Jewish history, Isaiah, Ezckiel, Zechariah, Joel, Daniel, and certain portions of the Synoptic Gospels. But of course the larger part of the book is devoted to the Revelation of John. There is finally an appendix on the Apocryphal Apocalypses.

The author does not attempt a textual commentary upon the portions of Scripture brought into the discussion, but he aims simply to translate the symbolism. Sometimes he does it to your satisfaction, but often you feel that he takes the view he does because he desires to show that the positions of the higher critics do not destroy the religious value of the Bible. But the book is certainly worth careful study.

R. A. WEBB.

DIVINE PENOLOGY. *By the Rev. L. B. Hartman, D. D.* New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. 306. \$1.25.

There is a growing and alarming hostility to theology's doctrine of penalty. Much thought is expended in the effort to eliminate it altogether; other schemes are advanced for the purpose of scaling it to a minimum. "Flabby theories" and "molluscous formations" are offered to men as substitutes for the strong, but offensive, doctrine of hell.

Dr. Hartman, with loyal heart and with a clear head, and with a well trimmed pen, comes to the defence. His book is a philosophical study of the wide doctrine of Divine Retribution and Future Punishment of the impenitent and incorrigible. He considers his subject in the light of Reason, Science, Revelation and Redemption. Everywhere he finds law; everywhere he finds the transgressor of law pursued by penal consequences. The "penal element" is a topic in all philosophies, a deduction from all the sciences, a fact revealed in the Bible, and clearly exhibited in the atonement of the gospel.

In preparing this book, and for the purpose of refuting the slander that the Church of to-day has surrendered its traditional doctrine of future punishment, Dr. Hartman submitted this question to fifty-five prominent leaders of thought: "What will be the ultimate destiny of the finally impenitent and incorrigible sinner?" The persons addressed were of all denominations, preachers, authors, professors, presidents, bishops, editors. He gives their answers in his twenty-eighth chapter. They all answer, in varying language, his question with the awful word, "Hell," except two. Dr. E. B. Andrews, President of Brown University, answers with the one word, "Annihilation," and Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., University of Pennsylvania, says "I don't know." These testi-

monies prove that the Church of to-day is holding firmly to the doctrine of future punishment, so preaching and so teaching.

Dr. Hartman says concerning his work, "There has been no effort at scholastic display; the constant aim has been simplicity; scientific and other technicalities have been studiously avoided, as far as possible, and all subjects have been treated in a manner to interest the ordinary reader." He has written tenderly, piously, but firmly. Though handling the most awful of all subjects, he has not harrowed the feelings of his reader by the use of coarse language or distressing figures. The man who wishes the doctrine of hell were not true, if he reads this book will feel that he must hold it, however terrible, however sorrowful, it may be to his own soul. The man who feels tempted to look upon the gospel as a mere scheme of religious culture, if he reads this little volume will feel that the educational and refining influences of Christianity are the least significant of all its influences. The man who is tempted to preach "another gospel," will, if he reads this author, feel that he must "preach Christ and him crucified" or make his ministry a mere mockery of the miseries of men.

R. A. WEBB.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE AND ITS PROBLEMS. *By J. H. Bates, Ph. M.*
New York: Eaton & Mains. Curts & Jennings. Price 50 cents.
Pp. 141.

This little volume gives a very clear and satisfactory discussion of a number of the salient points of Christian Scientism. The opening chapter, on the Immanence and Transcendence of God, is especially valuable, as bearing against the chief negations of Mrs. Eddy and her school. The author's discussion of life, in his second chapter, is, however, weakened by his pronounced evolutionism, and his effort to uphold the faith of Christendom by his fling at creeds. We cannot imagine what good is to be accomplished by such statements as these, for instance: "The art of Christ has been distorted and obscured by the artifice of the church. Creeds, devised with ever so good an intent, and performing no little service in their way, have, nevertheless, hidden the simplicity that is in Christ. Weary of the problems of metaphysical theology, of a benumbing scholasticism, we welcome the call of the age that turns us back again to the archetypal, historical and immanent Christ," etc. The fact is, a creedless Christianity is an invertebrate and powerless Christianity, and the people who are doing as much as Mrs. Eddy and her worshippers to turn men away from the simplicity of the truth as it is in Jesus, are those who are making common cause with all the enemies of the faith in denouncing the historic creeds of the church. "Integumentary doctrines," as our author, in his blundering tirade, terms credal statements, cannot be dispensed with, save at the cost of having a doctrinal system, as it were, flayed alive, exposed and bleeding at every pore.

Mr. Bates' discussion of the philosophy of Christian Science is in the main, creditable, and his chapter on cures, showing the abundant ground for refusing to give credence to this new ism because of its vaunted suc-

cess, is a very valuable compilation of facts bearing on the subject. The closing paragraphs on Christianity and Health, are interesting and suggestive in some degree. We regret to note, however, that our author's views of the plan of salvation are strongly tinged with the naturalism of John Watson, and others. Christ is able to save, he tells us, by "leading us back to nature, and persuading us that nature is a safe guide." And he defines the faith that saves as "faith in nature." The book closes with statements than which we can imagine none more misleading and contradictory of evangelical truth.

God, according to Mr. Bates, "has left man to work out his own salvation, a task that man is steadily accomplishing through the systematic methods of science. He has opened the world before us to be conquered by intelligence, a conquest in which man is to rise into strength and moral beauty, into harmony and communion with God."

This is good evolutionism. Salvation is wrought by science, and holiness evolved in the ordinary development of the human intellect and in the natural progress of human knowledge. This is, unmistakably, the new gospel of culture, which is as much an enemy to true Christian faith as is the crazy creed of Christian Scientism. Indeed, the points of resemblance between the views of Mrs. Eddy and those of Mr. Bates are numerous and striking. Not to mention others, we note that both are fond of using the terms of revolutionary philosophy, both are undisguisedly hostile to creeds, and both are agreed in teaching that men are to be *saved by science*. On the latter point the only difference between them is, that Mrs. Eddy has a private science factory of her own, and is therefore startlingly original, while Mr. Bates borrows his "saving knowledge" from Darwin, Huxley, and others.

Against these new fads of rationalism we urge the statement of the beloved disciples: "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith," and the faith that saves is not mere faith in the invariable sequences of natural laws, but faith in Christ as a personal, all-sufficient, Divine Saviour, Teacher and Exemplar—our Prophet, Priest and King. Such a faith impels to all holy obedience, and conduces to the largest health of both soul and body. To assert that we are to overcome all evil simply by following nature and by practicing self-culture, is to contradict the word of God.

We regret that a book which is for the most part so attractive in its style, so happy in its treatment of the prominent features of a very dangerous heresy, and withal so clearly satisfactory in its exhibition of the unscripturalness of Mrs. Eddy's teaching, and the absurdities of her philosophy, is itself so signally weak and misleading in its attempts to state the fundamental truths of the Gospel. WM. P. MCGORKLE.

Graham, N. C.

THE MEDICAL MISSION. Its Place, Power and Appeal. By W. J. Wanless, M. D. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 1898. 16mo. Pp. 96.

Wanted! 750,000 trained and consecrated medical missionaries in the

Foreign field alone! And then the proportion of physicians and surgeons to the population will be two and one-half times as great in the United States as in the missionary territory. This little book, by a medical missionary of the Northern Presbyterian Board, is directed primarily as an appeal to medical students and intended, secondarily, to arouse all and stir them up to greater efforts. It is a well written book. It deserves wide circulation. It will accomplish good wherever it goes. Why cannot the Church as a Church and individual Christians throw off some of this corroding selfishness and do more for the suffering, sin-stricken, disease-racked, priest-ridden and quack-persecuted myriads of millions of our degraded and unfortunate brothers. Their condition is pitiable in the extreme. This book draws the curtain and gives us a glimpse. The opportunity for serving God in Medical Missions is wonderful almost beyond imagination, and here it is shown as well as can be in as brief a compass.

THE SETTING OF THE CRESCENT AND THE RISING OF THE CROSS; OR KAMIL ABDUL MESSIAH: A Syrian convert from Islam to Christianity. *By the Rev. Henry Harris Jessup, D. D.* Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1898. 16 mo. Pp. 156.

This little book has besides the narrative by Dr. Jessup, an introduction by F. F. Ellenwood, and an appendix on "The Arabian Mission," by S. M. Zevmer. It is a truly interesting sketch. No one can read it without drawing several lessons, viz: (1.) That Raymund Lull, Henry Martyn and a host of others have been right in maintaining that even high-class Mohammedans can be converted to Christianity; (2) that missionaries need be perfectly familiar with the religions, ideas and sacred books of those among whom they labor; (3) the tenacious hold that Islam has upon the Moslem; (4) what a beautiful character is one thoroughly molded to God's will and imbued with Gospel principles. It is a good book for the Sunday School library. It cannot fail to benefit anyone that reads it.

ISLAM; OR THE RELIGION OF THE TURK: *By Rev. E. M. Wherry, D. D.* New York: American Tract Society. 16mo. Pp. 64. Cloth 35 cents.

There is considerable information compacted into this brief tractate, presented in concise but popular form. The purpose is to show that the faith of Islam is behind the American atrocities which have so horrified the Christian world. The Koran, Ahadis, Ijma and Qigas, the foundations of the systems are described first. Then the system erected on this foundation is depicted—the Kalima and other meritorious exercises; on top of all the Jihad or crusade against those of other faiths. The author finds hope in the number (150) of influential and bitterly opposing sects.

The author says (p. 36). "The God of Islam is undoubtedly the true God," the objections being to the Moslem's conception of him. If we understand the statement we certainly cannot accept it. While we are

glad to see and acknowledge that there are elements of truth and good in all false systems of religion, we have not yet been educated in Comparative Religion up to the point of believing that there is more than one true God—the triune Spirit of absolute perfection and infinite in every attribute, as made known to us in the Bible. Islam's conception of God is Islam's god, and beside the true God it is little short of a monster. The Moslems are just as surely—though of course not as grossly—*ἄθεοι* as any people on earth.

The author is mistaken in claiming that Islam, next to Christianity, has the greatest number of adherents of any of the world religions (p. 57). Buddhism has about 500,000,000 adherents, and Mohammedanism, not more than 200,000,000.

Lastly, we venture to criticise the pedantic spelling of Arabic words. It is, of course, more accurate to say "Makkah" for "Mecca," "Madina" for "Medina," "Quran" for "Koran," "Darweesh" and "Muazzin," but many a reader will fail to detect the familiar words in the new dress, and the old is too well established to change, in popular works. Strangely, he does not give the False Prophet's name as "Muhammed," but the common "Mohammed."

D. J. BRIMM.

BOOK NOTICES.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM. By Local Application ; Not by a Total Covering.
By Rev. A. H. Caldwell, Senatobia, Mississippi. Paper. Pp. 183,
12mo New Orleans: E. S. Upton. 1898.

This is another attempt to run the Baptist into a rat-hole and plug him up. The author undertakes to prove that immersion is positively unscriptural. He does so by showing that all the elements employed to symbolize truths in religion were applied in some other mode than immersion. All the doctrines of salvation are symbolically included under the terms Blood and Water—the Blood symbolizing the objective elements, and the Water the subjective elements. Now the Blood and the Water were historically sprinkled ; the subject was never represented as totally covered by either. Immersion is out of line ; no elements were ever used in that mode.

THE MIRAGE OF LIFE. *By W. Haig Miller.* Illustrated by Teuniel.
Vol. 4, No. 68 of "The Colportage Library." November, 1898. Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Association. 12 mo. Pp. 121.
10 cents.

"Vanity of vanities, all is vanity." The author has attempted to prove by many historical examples that those who pursue happiness by unsanctified lives in the various spheres of human activity, enterprise and recreation are like the famished desert traveller that pursues the natural mirage till he sinks down exhausted. He takes examples of the Man of Fashion, Beau Brummell; the Man of Wealth, William Beckford; the Hero, Lord Clive; the Statesman, William Pitt; the Orator, Richard Brinsley Sheridan; the Artist, Haydon; the Man of Literature, Scott; the Poet, Byron; the Man of Wit and Humor, Hood; the Man of the World, Chesterfield; the Beauty, Lady Hamilton; the Monarch, Napoleon. A number of other characters are introduced incidentally. Profitable reading.

THE STORY OF JOHN WESLEY. Told to Boys and Girls : *By Marianna Kirlew.* New York: Eaton and Mains, Cincinnati: Curtis and Jennings.

This work is an effort, a successful effort, to tell the story of the founder of the Methodist Church, so as to render it intelligible and interesting to young children. As we should naturally expect, the history of his childhood days in the humble rectory at Epworth, with his conscientious father, his wise and pious mother, and his eighteen brothers and sisters, are told with some fulness. Next we see him as a school boy at the Charterhouse school in London and Westminster, and as a college boy at Oxford, where he won college honors and a fellowship. But his character as a minister of the gospel and self appointed missionary to the

poor and degraded, and the founder of a great church are not less faithfully described. In some cases we cannot but think that the simplification has been carried to an unnecessary extreme, but altogether it is a beautiful book for children, and suggests the thought that if books of a historical or biographical character constructed on the plan of this were substituted for the works of fiction which now compose the larger part of our Sunday School literature, it would be better for the children.

OUR BIBLE. Where Did We Get It? *By Rev. Charles Leach, D. D.* **TEN REASONS WHY I BELIEVE THE BIBLE.** *By R. A. Torrey.* Pp. 132. Paper. 15 cents. Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Association.

This is a short history of the Bible as a book. The object of the work is to prove that the Bible, as we have it to-day, is true, by considering where it came from, who wrote it, and when and where it was written, and how it has come down to us. The contents are as follows: Part I.—Introduction; Christ Before the Apostles; The Three Oldest Bibles in the World; The Ancient Fathers of the Church; The Apostolic Fathers; Polycarp; Papias; Ancient Versions of the Scriptures. Part II.—The Old Testament; Our Lord's Bible; The People's Bible Before Christ; The Fountain Head. Part III.—Our English Bible; The First Versions; The Scriptures in Anglo-Saxon; John Wycliffe; William Tyndale; Authorized Versions; The Revised Version. The book then closes with *Ten Reasons Why I Believe the Bible is the Word of God.* Many interesting and useful facts are gathered here for ready reference. And no doubt many perplexed seekers after truth will be guided to a happy decision by the ten simple, plain, practical reasons given by Mr. Torrey for believing the Bible to be the Word of God.

R. A. WEBB.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE BIBLE: *By Walter F. Ardney, M. A.* Pp. 88, 16 mo., cloth, 50 cents. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1898.

This book consists of two lectures which were given at the Chautauqua in Matlock in the summer of 1897. The title is a little misleading. By "The Construction of the Bible" the author does not mean the origin of its contents in the minds of the writers, but rather the "putting together" of the several parts of Scripture in one volume. It is more a history of the Bible text. The study of construction is, therefore, literary and historical. The usual divisions of the Bible are made, and the construction of these considered separately and in order. Of course the work is too small to allow any extended study of the questions, but many helpful facts are gathered. While we might not agree with the author in the application of certain terms he employs, yet the book is, in the main, reliable and will be found handy.

R. A. WEBB.

THE BREMEN LECTURES.

THE BREMEN LECTURES ON GREAT RELIGIOUS QUESTIONS OF TO-DAY: *By Various Eminent European Divines.* Translated from the Orig-

inal German. *By David Heagle, D. D.* Professor in the Theological Department of the Southwestern Baptist University. New and Improved Edition. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1898. Pp. 406.

These are excellent *lectures*, noble defences of evangelical truth, valuable contributions to Christian apologetics. They were delivered and first published in the city of Bremen, in 1868, the occasion being "certain disorders of an ecclesiastical nature existing in Bremen." Thirty years put many books out of date, but the topics here discussed, and the "disorder" here combatted, are not decrepit, and these *lectures* are not antiquated. While not wishing to endorse every sentiment expressed by the various lecturers, we wish for this volume a very wide circulation, and believe it will buttress the Christian faith wherever it goes.

That mighty man who has given us *Modern Doubt and Christian Belief*, and whose open face and magnificent countenance inspires confidence and begets love in the hearts of those who never saw him, Theodor Christlieb, D. D., University preacher and professor at Bonn, discusses "The Biblical Conception of God." Then follow "The Doctrine of Creation and Natural Science," by Dr. Otto Zockler; "Reason, Conscience and Revelation," by Dr. Herman Cremer, the professor of Theology at Griefswald, and eminent Greek lexicographer; "Miracles," by Rev. M. Fuchs, pastor at Oppin; "The Person of Jesus Christ," by Chr. E. Luthardt, D., professor of Theology at Leipsic; "The Resurrection of Christ as a Soteriologico—Historical Fact," by the great Court Preacher, Dr. Gerhard Uhlhorn, "The Scriptural Doctrine of Atonement," by W. F. Gess, D. D., professor at Gottingen; "Authority of our Gospels," by Constantin Tischendorf, D. D., professor of Theology at Leipsic, and well-known to all Biblical critics; "The Idea of the Kingdom of God as Consummated, and what it tells us regarding Historical Christianity," by that great Commentator, J. P. Lange, D. D., professor in Bonn; "Christianity and Culture," by Rev. Julius Disselhoff, pastor and inspector in Kaiserswerth. With candor, with breadth, with logical force, with zeal for Christian truth, these great representatives of the evangelical and orthodox party in Germany have discussed these topics at their best. Every lecturer seems to have been on his mettle.

The title page tells us that this is an improved edition, got out by one of the professors in the Southwestern Baptist University at Jackson, Tennessee. These improvements are in the main, three: (1) a splendid portrait of each lecturer; (2) a condensed biographical sketch which helps us to get acquainted with the men whose words are read, and (3) a good "summary" of each lecture, given at the beginning, so that the reader has a chart as he sails into each discussion.

The purpose of this notice is to commend this volume as a brave, worthy, edifying, and quickening defence of Christian truth, without subscribing to every sentiment.

Clarkesville, Tenn.

R. A. WEBB.

UNION Theological Seminary,

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA.

SESSION OPENS FIRST WEDNESDAY IN OCTOBER.

SESSION CLOSES FIRST WEDNESDAY IN JUNE.

FACULTY.

THE REV. WALTER W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D.,
Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature.

THE REV. CHARLES C. HERSMAN, D. D., LL. D.,
Prof. of Biblical Literature and the Interpretation of the Testament.

THE REV. THOMAS C. JOHNSON, D. D.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Polity.

THE REV. THOMAS R. ENGLISH, D. D.,
Professor of the English Bible and Pastoral Theology.

THE REV. GIVENS B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology.

For catalogue, or other information as to course of study, apply to
Dr. ENGLISH,
Clerk of Faculty, Richmond, Va.

For information as to rooms, &c., apply to
Dr. JOHNSON,
Intendant, Richmond, Va.

THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

No. 49—JULY, 1899.

I. SOME PERILS OF MISSIONARY LIFE.¹

I suppose we all recognize that missionaries are the cream of Christians. They may say with Paul, in the whole length and breadth of his meaning, that unto them the grace has been given to preach unto the heathen the unsearchable riches of Christ (Eph. iii., 8). They are the bold and faithful spirits who bear the banner of the cross courageously to the front. We who abide at home, hope that we are at home by the will of God and to his glory; but we cannot withhold our admiration from those whom God has chosen to form the advance-guard of his conquering host. We recognize that these "picked men" are the *elite* of the army of the cross. Their bearing justifies this recognition. There is no body of men in the world of equal numbers who so thoroughly meet the trust reposed in them and the lofty sentiments entertained towards them by their fellow Christians.

So exalted is our well-founded appreciation of the character of missionaries in general that it comes with something of a shock to us to discover, as we are now and then led to discover, that even missionaries are, nevertheless, men, and are sometimes liable to the temptations, and shall

¹ An address to a body of prospective missionaries.

we not even say, the failings? that are common to men. In the difficult situations in which they have been placed, they have exhibited, in general, a wisdom, a faithfulness, a power of adaptation, a devotion, which seems almost superhuman, and which can be accounted for only as the fulfilment of the promise with which the Lord accompanied their marching orders—that he would be with them to the end of the world. But in the midst of this general marvelous success, we find just enough of short-comings to warn us that there are dangers attending the work of the missionary which it is requisite to face and to guard against. I do not here speak of such dangers as that of spiritual pride, which may be thought to lie very close to a calling which is recognized among us as one which in an especial manner undertakes the work of God and may lay particular claim to his smile, and which may be peculiarly near to men who are everywhere esteemed, and may haply come to esteem themselves, as the *elite* of Christians. I am bound to testify that I have seen very little of anything resembling spiritual pride among missionaries, though doubtless it here and there exists, as how could it fail to exist? The dangers I wish to speak of are not those which spring from the very essence of the calling, but rather such as attend the work missionaries are called on to do, and such as show themselves in the manner of its prosecution. Here, too, the greatest danger is that we may fancy there is no danger. To be forewarned is to be partially, at least, forearmed; at all events it places it in our power to forearm ourselves.

Let us spring at once *in medias res* and mention at the beginning the supremest danger which can attend a missionary in his work—the danger that he who has gone forth to convert the heathen may find himself rather being converted by the heathen. The idea is monstrous, you may think. But the danger is an actual and a real one, and its working is not unillustrated by sad examples. It is no doubt

exceedingly rare that a missionary is so fully converted to heathendom that he lays aside his Christian profession and adopts in its entirety the religion of those whom he was set to convert, though even this is not absolutely unexampled. Dr. A. J. Behrends, for instance, in his little volume of missionary addresses delivered on the Graves' foundation at Syracuse University ("The World for Christ," p. 102), tells of a classmate of his own to whom even this occurred. He says:

"I had a classmate in the Theological Seminary who, thirty years ago, went as a missionary to China. He abandoned his calling and his faith, became a Mandarin of the 'third button,' and for many years has been associated with the Chinese legation in the courts of Europe. He writes of the 'iced champagne' which he drinks when the heat of summer is oppressive, and talks flippantly of the 'so-called' Holy Land and of the 'historic cross of the carpenter philosopher,' which annoys him at every step from Munich to St. Petersburg. He has developed into a Confucianist."

It much more frequently happens, however, that the impact of the heathen mind upon his thought has led the missionary only to modify his belief until he has laid aside the fundamentals of Christianity, or even now and then, under the ethical influences of his surroundings, has made shipwreck of faith in a practical sense and adopted the ethical views and fallen into the debased modes of life of his community. All this, of course, unhappily occurs to the pastor at home exceedingly frequently, despite the conserving energies of the society in which home pastors are immersed. The forces of the world impinging upon them, and reinforced, it may be, by native tendencies of thought and feeling, draw them away from their adopted lines of thought and gradually assimilate them to worldly views and modes of life. That it happens comparatively rarely among the missionaries in the far severer strain to which they are subjected, isolated as they are from the Christian community, and surrounded by a society the very grain of which is heathen, is only another proof that they are the *elite* of Christendom. But it does happen occasionally among them, too.

A classical example of a missionary becoming thus the convert, or at least the pervert, of his catechumens, is supplied by the famous Bishop Colenso, the pioneer of the present outbreak of rationalistic Biblical criticism in England. Bishop Colenso was bred in the evangelical faith of the Low-Church party of the Church of England, and had received in his youth the essentials of the faith as held by that body of nobly-witnessing Christians, though certainly in a somewhat traditional way. When he went to Natal as a missionary, however, he had never given that deep and careful study to the elements of his faith which alone would guarantee their stability. It happened thus that his mind was first thoroughly awakened to the difficulties of his religion through the questions and objections of the "intelligent Zulu," to whom he sought to teach it. Under these objections he gave way, first discarding the fundamentals of evangelical religion, and then his belief in the Bible as the infallible Word of God; and thus became the protagonist of critical rationalism on English ground. Here is his own account of the final stage of his perversion :

"Since I have had charge of this Diocese, I have been closely occupied in the study of the Zulu tongue, and in translating the Scriptures into it. . . . In this work I have been aided by intelligent natives, . . . so as not only to avail myself of their criticisms, but to appreciate fully their objections and difficulties. Thus, however, it has happened that I have been brought again face to face with questions which caused me some uneasiness in former days, but with respect to which I was then enabled to satisfy my mind sufficiently for practical purposes, and I had fondly hoped to have laid the ghosts of them at last forever. Engrossed with parochial and other work in England, I did what, probably, many other clergymen have done under similar circumstances—I contented myself with silencing, by means of the specious explanations, which are given in most commentaries, the ordinary objections against the historical character of the early portions of the Old Testament, and settled down into a willing acquiescence in the general truth of the narratives, whatever difficulties may still hang about particular parts of it. . . . Here, however, as I have said, amidst my work in this land, I have been brought face to face with the very questions which I then put by. . . . I have had a simple-minded, but intelligent, native—one with the docility of a child, but the reasoning powers of ma-

ture age—look up and ask, 'Is all that true?' I dared not, as a servant of the God of Truth, urge my brother man to believe that which I did not myself believe, which I knew to be untrue, as a matter-of-fact, historical narrative. I gave him, however, such a reply as satisfied him for the time, without throwing any discredit upon the general veracity of the Bible history. But I was thus driven—against my will at first, I may truly say—to search more deeply into these questions. . . . And now I tremble at the result of my inquiries." [The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined. By the Right Rev. John William Colenso, D. D., &c. New York, 1863. Pp. 4-7.]

The circumstances of this wonderful conversion to disbelief in the Christian Scriptures are no doubt capable of being looked at from two points of view—according as our attention is engrossed with the high and noble honesty of heart which considered not the humbleness of the questioner, or with the previous neglect of duty which left the questioned the prey of the first restless spirit which should attack him. Bishop Colenso's sympathetic biographer, Sir G. W. Cox, contemplates it from the first point of view, and this is his account of it:

"There can be but little doubt, rather there is none, that the choice of Mr. Colenso for missionary work in a heathen land, was a blessing not only to the heathen to whom he was sent, but to his countrymen, to the cause of truth, to the Church of England, and to the Church of God. Up to this time, his moral sense and spiritual instincts lacked free play; and, had he remained in England, those circumstances probably would never have arisen, which were made the means of evoking the marvellous strength of character evinced in the great battle of his life. It was just that appeal of the honest heart which was needed to call into action the slumbering fires. That appeal, and his instantaneous obedience to that appeal, were sneered at as stupid, childish and contemptible; but the questions of the 'intelligent Zulu' became for him questions like those which led Luther to nail his theses on the church door at Wittenberg, and enabled him to break with the force of a Samson the theological and traditional withes by which he had thus far been bound." [The Life of John William Colenso, D. D., Bishop of Natal. By the Rev. Sir George W. Cox, Bart., M. A., &c. London. 1888. Pp. 50. Vol. I.]

Our own Dr. W. H. Green, in his trenchant review of Bishop Colenso's first book on the Pentateuch, contemplates it from the other point of view, and this is the way he puts it:

"The difficulty is in the whole attitude which he occupies. He has

picked out a few superficial difficulties in the sacred record, not now adduced for the first time, nor first discovered by himself. They seem, however, to have recently dawned upon his view. He was aware, long before, of certain difficulties in the scriptural account of the creation and deluge; and instead of satisfactorily and thoroughly investigating these, he was content, he tells us, to push them off, or thrust them aside, satisfying himself with the moral lessons, and trusting vaguely, and, as he owns, not very honestly, (p. 4) that there was some way of explaining them (pp. 4, 5). The other difficulties, which have since oppressed him, he then had no notion of; in fact, so late as the time when he published or prepared his Commentary on the Romans, (p. 215) he had no idea of ever holding his present views. As there is nothing brought out in his book which unbelievers had not flaunted and believing expositors set themselves to explain long since, we are left to suppose that his theological training as a minister and a bishop, and his preparation as a commentator, could not have been very exact or thorough. . . . His mission to the Zulus, however, fortunately or unfortunately, as the case may be, broke the spell. He went out to teach the Zulus Christianity, and now at length he is obliged to study the Bible on which that religion is based."—[The Pentateuch, Vindicated from the Aspersions of Bishop Colenso. By William Henry Green, &c. New York. 1863. Pp. 112].

I have been thus lengthy in exhibiting the fundamental elements of the case of Bishop Colenso, because I desired to bring out the source from which the danger to which he succumbed arose. Clearly its roots were set in this: he became a teacher before he was himself taught. The remedy is that missionaries should not fancy that a zeal for God and a love for Christ is all the furnishing they need to enable them to win the world to Christ; if they do, they may haply find themselves like Bishop Colenso, rather won to the world. Those who expect to go forth as missionaries can read themselves the lesson. As certainly as men go, mentally unprepared for their task and its dangers, so certainly will they expose themselves to unnecessary peril and their work to unnecessary likelihood of failure.

It is the same lesson that is read us by the somewhat parallel case of Francis W. Newman, whose autobiography detailing the changes in his belief, published under the title of "Phases of Faith," created quite a sensation half a century ago. He was the brother of John Henry Newman, equally

or more highly gifted, and, like him and Colenso, was bred in the evangelical faith. It is perfectly evident, however, to the reader of his own account of his religious life, that he never gave that labor and thought to the faith which he professed which were its due, and by which alone it could be firmly anchored in his soul. In one of the phases of his faith he joined Mr. Groves (in 1830) in his mission at Bagdad, and it is plain that he was led to give up the doctrine of the Trinity—one of the earlier stages of his drift away from the truth—by the pressure of Mohammedan objection. He felt uneasy from the first, as with his foundations in Christian thinking, one fancies he well might feel uneasy, whenever the thought crossed his mind: "What if we, like Henry Martyn, were charged with Polytheism by Mohammedans, and were forced to defend ourselves by explaining in detail our doctrine of the Trinity" (p. 32). Then he discovered that religion was not the peculium of Christianity. There is a vividly drawn scene in a carpenter's shop in Aleppo which, one feels, must have had a significant place in his development.

"While at Aleppo," he tells us, "I one day got into a religious discussion with a Mohammedan carpenter, which left on me a lasting impression. Among other matters, I was peculiarly desirous of disabusing him of the current notion of his people, that our Gospels are spurious narratives, of late date. I found great difficulty of expression, but the man listened to me with much attention, and I was encouraged to exert myself. He waited patiently till I had done, and then spoke to the following effect: 'I will tell you, sir, how the case stands. God has given you English a great many good gifts. You make fine ships, and sharp pen-knives, and good cloth and cotton; you have rich nobles and brave soldiers; you write and print many learned books (dictionaries and grammars); all this is of God. But there is one thing that God has withheld from you and has revealed to us, and that is, the knowledge of the true religion, by which one may be saved.' When he had thus ignored my argument (which was probably unintelligible to him) and delivered his simple protest, I was silenced, and at the same time amused. But the more I thought it over the more instruction I saw in the case." [Phases of Faith. By Francis William Newman, &c. London. 1870. P. 52].

The instruction he got out of the case was that, as the possession of a deep religious experience was not depend-

ent on the possession of any one form of religious teaching, therefore all forms of religious teaching are alike useless or worse, and the religion of the individual's own consciousness is the only true religion. He was in other words converted to heathenism by the discovery that man has universally a religious nature.

Something of the same kind seems to have happened to Mr. James Macdonald, a missionary of the Free Church of Scotland, to Africa, and author of a readable book called "Light in Africa." He has more recently published a more pretentious and really very instructive volume called "Religion and Myth" (London, 1893), from which it appears that he has been deeply moved by the discovery that even the lowest savages may have a religious consciousness, exercise religious faith, and enjoy religious certitude. By this discovery he has been led, theoretically at least—let us hope it is wholly unassimilated theory with him—to confound all religions together as being higher or lower stages of the development of man's religious capacities and insight, dependent not on objective revelation but on growing intelligence and the progressive working of human thought upon religious material. Pressed to its legitimate meaning this is pure naturalism, elevated heathenism. Here is the conception of the origin of Christianity to which Mr. Macdonald has been brought: Religion began in reverence for a human king, to whom men looked for good, issuing in the conception that the king controlled natural forces; then from habit they still looked to the king for help after he had died, and hence arose a doctrine of souls; thence sprang a conception of personal and separate divinities, slowly gravitating towards the idea of one Supreme God; after awhile the conception arose that this one Supreme God became incarnate in time, by the substitution of the idea of a single incarnation revealing the will of God for the multitude of prophets—from rain-doctors up—who claim to hold converse with the unseen. Students of the literature of the

subject will easily recognize this sketch. To us it seems that instead of converting the Africans to Christianity, Mr. Macdonald has himself been converted to a form of scientific heathenism.

The lesson of all these instances is obviously the same. The missionary is not prepared for his work until he has been forced to face all those problems raised by modern criticism and by modern thought—problems of comparative religion, of critical analysis, of philosophical unbelief; has faced them at home, worked through them, and mastered them. Unprepared by this mental discipline, he goes forth at his peril. There is danger in the foreign field for a man who has been too indolent at home to meet the difficulties of unbelief prevalent at home, fairly and squarely, and reason himself through them. He may quiet the doubts that rise in his own soul, but the heathen are not amenable to his lazy Peace! peace!—they will press these doubts upon him. If he parries them, they will justly despise him and he loses all fruit of his work. If he entertains them he is unprepared to deal with them, and—well, some men have lost their faith by that road. We would better prepare ourselves earnestly before we go.

If we fancy that so extreme a peril as that we have been picturing must be rare, let us glance at an analogous danger which necessarily attends all mission work, and which is at bottom only a less acute form of the same evil we have been discussing, though it often grows out of a different root—the danger namely that in striving to commend Christianity to the heathen and to remove their stubborn and abounding difficulties in accepting it we really accommodate Christianity to heathen thought—in a word we simply explain Christianity away. This too is an evil which is by no means confined to missionaries. It may properly be called the deepest danger of pastoral life. Few of us escape it altogether. It is the root of the concessive habit of stating truth, which is the bane of all Christian society. It

is distressingly easy to fall into it, as a measure of charity—seeking to be all things to all men that we may gain the more. But what is it in effect but corrupting the truth? It is as if an army set to protect the frontier against an invading host, should suddenly wheel and place itself, with flags flying and bands playing, and drum majors in full regalia performing, in front of the opposing ranks, and proudly lead them over the land—evidently conquering because now leading! This concessive habit is in other words only an expedient by which we can make it seem as if we had gained others to our side, when we have really placed ourselves at their side. It saves appearances at the cost of realities. It is therefore as I say, only a less acute and obvious form of conversion from Christianity wherever it shows itself—among pastors or among missionaries. For it does show itself occasionally even among those select warriors of the cross, the missionaries. I have met more than one missionary from Mohammedan lands, for example, who had learned to state the doctrine of the Trinity, “so genially and so winningly,” (as they expressed it) that it roused little or no opposition in the Mohammedan mind. And when I heard how they stated it, I did not wonder; they had so stated it as to leave the idea of the Trinity out—much as Dr. James Morris Whiton, in his recent attempts to show how Unitarians and Trinitarians can unite on a common formula, certainly succeeds in providing an explanation of the Trinity to which no Unitarian should object. You may see his efforts in a recent paper in “The New World,” and in his little book called *Gloria Patri*. The trouble is you look in vain in the explanations for a Trinity.

Without pausing to illustrate this very common danger, let us glance next at another danger attending the missionary in his work, analogous to this, from its opposite side. The method of conversion by concession is really, at bottom, an attempt to deceive men into a profession of Christianity; to make them believe that Christianity is not

what it appears to be, and does not involve in its profession all that it seems; that it is much "easier to take" than men have been accustomed to think. Now there is another way of attempting to deceive men into professing Christianity which sometimes presents temptations to missionaries, especially those working among the simpler and less advanced races. We are accustomed to think of dubious miracles as the specialty of the more corrupt ages and localities of Romanism. It may behoove us to have a care, lest we fall victims to what may differ from appeals to dubious miracles by a very narrow ethical line indeed. There is a distinct temptation confronting the missionary at times to make use of his superior intelligence or superior acquirements to impress the ignorant with the divine character of his religion; a distinct temptation to over-reach his less well-informed brother men by an exhibition of the marvels which learning and science have put within his reach, as if these marvels were something more than proofs of advanced science, and were somewhat of the nature of signs from heaven of the justness of his claims and the validity of his apostleship; sometimes at least a willingness to permit the heathen to deceive themselves as to the purport of what to them are marvels. Take a passage like the following, from one of the noblest, purest, most Christ-like missionaries which the Church has yet produced. I should be far from criticising the motives or methods of such a man of God. I should not like to be understood as suggesting that the limit of the permissible were passed in this particular incident. But are they not at least so nearly approached that the incident may stand as a warning to us of how easy it may become, in somewhat like situations, to pass beyond the limits and attempt to deceive men into accepting the truth? I quote from one of the most thrilling narratives of missionary work our day has produced:

"But I must here record the story of the Sinking of the Well, which

broke the back of heathenism on Aniwa. Being a flat coral island with no hills to attract the clouds, rain is scarce there as compared with the adjoining mountainous islands; and even when it does fall heavily, with tropical profusion, it disappears . . . through the light soil and porous rock, and drains itself directly into the sea . . . At certain seasons the natives drank very unwholesome water. . . . My household felt sadly the want of fresh water. I prepared two large casks to be filled when the rain came. But when we attempted to do so at the water hole near the village, the natives forbade us, fearing that our large casks would carry all the water away, and leave none for them with their so much smaller cocoanut bottles. The public water-hole was on the ground of two Sacred Men, who claimed the power of emptying and filling it by rain at will. The superstitious natives gave them presents to bring the rain. If it came soon, they took all the credit for it. If not, they demanded larger gifts to satisfy their gods. Even our Aneityumese teachers said to me, when I protested that surely they could not believe such things:

"It is hard to know, Missi. The water does come and go quickly. If you paid them well, they might bring the rain and let us fill our casks!"

I told them that, as followers of Jehovah, we must despise all heathen mummeries, and trust in him and in the laws of his creation to help us.

Aniwa having, therefore, no permanent supply of fresh water, in spring, or stream, or lake, I resolved, by the help of God, to sink a well, near the Mission premises, hoping that a wisdom, higher than my own, would guide me to the source of some blessed spring. . . . One morning I said to the old Chief and his fellow Chief, both now earnestly inquiring about the religion of Jehovah and of Jesus:

"I am going to sink a deep well down into the earth, to see if our God will send us fresh water up from below."

They looked at me with astonishment [and spoke] in a sort of sympathy approaching pity. . . .

I started upon my hazardous job. . . . The old Chief and his best men . . . remonstrated with me very gravely . . . I toiled on from day to day, my heart almost sinking sometimes with the sinking of the well, till we reached a depth of about thirty feet. And the phrase, 'living water,' 'living water,' kept chiming through my soul like music from God, as I dug and hammered away. At this depth the earth and coral began to be soaked with damp. I felt that we were nearing water. My soul had a faith that God would open a spring for us; but side by side with this faith, was a strange terror that the water would be salt. . . . One evening I said to the old Chief:

"I think that Jehovah God will give us water to-morrow from that hole!"

The Chief said, 'No, Missi.' . . . I still answered, 'Come tomorrow. I hope and believe that Jehovah God will send you the rain

up through the earth.' At the moment I knew I was risking much, and probably incurring sorrowful consequences, had no water been given....

Next morning, I went down again at daybreak and sank a narrow hole in the centre about two feet deep. The perspiration broke over me with uncontrollable excitement, and I trembled through every limb, when the water rushed up and began to fill the hole. Muddy though it was, I eagerly tasted it, and the little 'tinny' dropped from my hand with sheer joy. . . . It was water! It was fresh water! It was living water from Jehovah's well. . . . The Chiefs had assembled with their men, near by. They waited on in eager expectancy. It was a rehearsal, in a small way, of the Israelites coming round, while Moses struck the rock and called for water. By and by, when I had praised the Lord, and my excitement was a little calmed, the mud being also greatly settled, I filled a jug which I had taken down empty in the sight of them all, and ascending to the top, called for them to come and see the rain which Jehovah God had given us through the well. They closed around me in haste and gazed on it in superstitious fear. The old Chief shook it to see if it would spill, and then touched it to see if it felt like water. At last he tasted it, and rolling it in his mouth with joy, for a moment, he swallowed it, and shouted, 'Rain! Rain! Yes it is rain! But how did you get it?' I repeated, 'Jehovah my God gave it out of his own earth in answer to our labors and prayers. Go and see it springing up for yourselves.' ¹

Graphically told, is it not? The scene is brought vividly before us. What I ask is, if you would have been, in such a situation, superior to the temptation—I do not say of announcing the well as a miracle from God—but of permitting those poor superstitious folk to take it for a miracle. But surely, surely, the proclaimers of the gospel of truth must not in even so slight a degree sink to the level of those medicine men, who, "if the rain comes, take all the credit for it."

Oddly enough in that stirring romance of missionary adventures which Mr. Rider Haggard has given us, he makes his missionary hero first catch the attention of the people by an incident precisely similar in its import with this which Dr. Paton describes. The Rev. Thomas Owen has given himself with entire faith and devotion to an exceedingly hazardous piece of missionary work. The chief med-

¹John G. Paton, &c. *An Autobiography*. Edited by his brother. Second part. London. 1890. pp. 176-8.

icine man of the tribe among which he is laboring has prepared for him a fatal trap; having administered a deadly poison to the king for which there is but one antidote, he contrives that all of Owen's credit and his life itself shall be staked upon his power to recover the monarch. Owen, meanwhile, has become possessed (in a supernatural way, as Mr. Haggard would have us think,) of the secret of the poison and its antidote, and has taken care to provide himself with the latter. Called to the king's side in the presence of all the people, he prepares the curing draught, and "this done, he clasped his hands, and, lifting his eyes to Heaven, he prayed aloud in the language of the Amasuka. 'O God,' he prayed, "upon whose business I am here, grant, I beseech Thee, that by Thy Grace power may be given to me to work this miracle in the face these people, to the end that I may win them to cease their iniquities, to believe Thee, the only true God, and to save their souls alive. Amen.'" So he administered the draught and reaped the natural effect.¹ Can we condemn the novelist for so representing the practices of missionaries, when missionaries so represent their own practices? But the oddest thing is yet to say. Mr. Rider Haggard feels the unworthiness of the part he has made his missionary to play. He does not betray consciousness of it here, indeed. But later in the story he makes him refuse to avail himself of a like transaction. "But I say that I will not use it," are the words that he puts in his mouth. "Are we witch-doctors, that we should take refuge in tricks? No, let faith be our shield; and if it fail us, then let us die."¹ It is strange to turn to Mr. Haggard for a lesson in missionary morals. But as we read his pages and blush to think that authentic missionary annals may justify him in attributing deceit of this grave kind to a missionary, we may rejoice that missionary faithfulness has also suggested to him that a good missionary would

¹The Wizard. By H. Rider Haggard. New York and London, 1896. P. 77.

¹Dilto. P. 119.

refuse such a temptation ; and in any event we may learn that missionaries must not be like the witch-doctors, and take refuge in tricks.

And is there not yet another form of moral danger to which the missionary may be exposed, suggested to us here—a danger lest in his zeal for propogating Christianity, he may be misled into the use of doubtful means of obtaining access to the heathen ? Those who are acquainted with heathen lands, or even those who have a tolerable knowledge of missionary history, will understand at once what an ever present temptation stands before the messenger of glad tidings to obtain an opportunity to make them known by some act of *finesse*, which may all too easily pass into an act of deceit. Sometimes the country is closed to the open proclamation of the Gospel, and the temptation arises to obtain access to its population under color of some other profession. One may at least go as teacher or physician, and while pretending to impart only secular learning, convey also that knowledge which is unto salvation ; while pretending to no more than heal the body, minister, also, to the diseases of the soul. There is no one of us, doubtless, who would contend that the messenger of Christ is bound by human law in matters of this kind ; it is for us, too, in this late day, to say with all boldness, “We must obey God rather than men.” (Acts 5:29). But we must see to it that we do obey God, and must not cast aside his great law of truth, in order to carry the truth to others. The point is not whether we shall boldly proclaim the Gospel in the face of all adverse force, or quietly propagate it in defiance of all adverse human enactments ; but the point is whether we shall teach it under color of doing something else, under an implied or even express promise not to teach it. A missionary, we will say, has long tried to gain entrance into a land closed to the Gospel ; an offer comes to him to take charge of a Royal University, we will say, with the express provision that if he takes charge of it

he obligates himself not to make his position a means of Christian propagandism. Ought he to accept such an offer? That is *prima facie* itself a serious question. How far does it involve an open renunciation of his Christian duty? But the point now is, if he does accept it, can he permit himself still to teach Christianity? A more subtle form of the same danger faces multitudes of missionaries. Take the case of Korea a few years ago:

"It should be premised here," says Mr. George W. Gilmore, in his bright work on "Korea From Its Capital" (Presbyterian Board. 1893. p. 294), "that every one of the ministers from the United States to the Court of Korea has construed the treaty between the two countries to mean that the work of teaching and preaching Christianity is not allowed. It provides that men may live in the capital for the purpose of studying the language, and it is under cover of this provision that missionaries are now resident in the country."

That is an ominous and disagreeable word: "Under cover of." And the narrative runs on to point out that the first Presbyterian missionary to Korea "was not known at first as a missionary," but "went ostensibly to practice his profession as a physician;" that his standing as a missionary was unknown even to the United States minister, under whom he served as physician to the American legation; that it was by his "shrewdness" and the "discretion" of his immediate successors that a beginning of Christian missions was made—and so on. I have no intention of passing a condemnation on these brethren. One would better, before doing such a thing as that, examine all the circumstances on the ground. But is there not an unpleasant flavor in the mouth as we read such an account? Do we not feel that it would require great discretion indeed—possibly more than you or I possess—to preserve our integrity as servants of the God of Truth, in such trying circumstances? No wonder that the narrator calls it "a hard position in which to be placed." Its hardness consists, however, not in the choice whether we will break the law of the land in order to preach Christianity, but whether we will keep the law of Christ in preaching it.

Take the situation in Japan. For traveling in the interior, passports have been necessary—to be secured from the central government.

"A very uncomfortable thing about these passports," writes the Rev. M. L. Gordon, M. D., in his "An American Missionary in Japan" (p. 88), "is that they are granted only 'for health or scientific purposes.' Because of this fact, some missionaries are unwilling to use them for evangelistic touring, and so confine themselves to the vicinity of the open ports."

All honor, we say, to such missionaries. A keen and high sense of honor is itself an evangelizing endowment. We condemn no one. But if you and I were there, might we not find ourselves in danger of "doing an evil that a good might come?" And may we not be sure that God will smile on those who seek to serve Him, though even to the apparent hurt of the cause they love?

I must bring these desultory remarks to a close. I have no intention to seek to mention all the dangers to which missionaries are exposed. It may even be truly said that missionaries are no more exposed to the dangers that I have mentioned than to others which are precisely opposite to them. A missionary may be so hard and dry in his mode of proclaiming the truth that so far from being in danger of letting go the distinctive principles of Christ, he is in danger of forgetting to place those principles within the reach of his hearers. He may be so very careful of his own personal integrity that he fails to enter open doors, and prevents the spread of true Christianity by his litigious persistence in pressing petty points of no moral value—"losing his life" by his own attempts to "save" it. But all this only the more emphasizes the multiplicity of the dangers amid which he walks, and shows us in increased clearness how circumspectly a missionary needs to walk if he is to adorn, as well as proclaim, the Gospel of the Grace of God. It also increases our admiration for our missionaries who, amid so many and such subtle dangers, do walk so circumspectly as to adorn the Gospel. We do not think we could do it.

But that they do it, even those least in sympathy with them seem forced to admit. I have lately read, for example, a somewhat flippant book which gives an account of the ordinary mode of life among the British residents in Calcutta, from the point of view of a woman of the world. In it a missionary appears. Here is the description of him :

"The missionary padre receives his slender stipend from the S. P. G., or from some obscure source in America. It is arranged upon a scale to promote self-denial, and it is very successful. He usually lives where the drains are thickest and the smells most unmanageable, and when we of the broad river and the great Maidan happen to hear of his address, we invariably ejaculate, 'What a frightfully long way off.' The ticca-gharry is not an expensive conveyance, but the missionary padre finds himself better commended by his conscience if he walks and pays the cost of his transportation in energy and vitality, which must be heavy in the hot weather and the rains. For the rest, he lives largely upon second-class beef and his ideals, though they don't keep very well either in this climate. . . . Those who are married are usually married to missionary ladies of similar size and complexion, laboring in the same cause. . . . The official padre's wife looks like any other memsahib ; the missionary padre's wife looks like the missionary padre. I believe that chaplains sometimes ask missionary padres to dinner 'quietly,' and always make a point of giving them plenty to eat. And I remember meeting a married pair of them. . . . It was in the hot weather and they spoke appreciatively of the punkah. They had no punkah, it seemed, either day or night ; but the little wife had been very clever and had made muslin bags for their heads and hands to keep off the mosquitoes while they were asleep. We couldn't ascertain that either of them had been really well since they came out, and they said they had simply made up their minds to have sickness in the house during the whole of the rains. . . . They knew little of the Red Road or the Eden Gardens, where the band plays in the evenings ; they talked of strange places—Khengua Pattoo's Lane—Coolestollah. [The wife] told us that her great difficulty in the zenanas lay in getting the ladies to talk. . . . and [the husband] had been down in the Sunderbunds, far down in the Sunderbunds, where the miasmas are thickest, and where he had slept every night for a week on a bench in the same small room with two baboos and the ague. . . . He was more emaciated than clever," etc. (The Simple Adventures of a Memsahib. By Sara Jeannette Duncan. New York. D. Appleton & Co. 1895. pp. 238).

Not an attractive picture, you will say ? That depends, however, on your point of view. From the world's point

of view it is a very unattractive picture—though we cannot help fancying that even the authoress intended it partly as a compliment to missionaries. From God's point of view I should think it would be very attractive—for after all what "is required in stewards is that a man be found faithful." (1 Cor. 4:27.) A caricature, no doubt it is, but a caricature which would not have been possible were not the average missionary both strenuous and faithful.

And bearing such a description of his ways in mind, perhaps we may say in conclusion, that the greatest danger to which the missionary is exposed is that, in the zeal for souls that burns in his bones like a fire, and in his yearning desire to reap the fruits of his labors, he may forget the weakness of the human frame and wear himself out in toils that are too abundant, or cast himself away through sicknesses that are avoidable. The conditions of life in most mission fields are so different from those to which the missionary is accustomed at home, that a serious strain upon his physical system is unavoidable. It will be well if he does not unduly increase the strain and thus unduly decrease his usefulness by assuming burdens which no flesh can bear. Here, too, the rule is applicable that our zeal for God requires tempering with knowledge. Not that the missionary should not hold himself ready to give his life, if need be, for the cause to which he has devoted it; for here, too, is it true that he who would save his life shall lose it, and he who would lose his life for Christ's sake shall gain it. But that he should never be ready to throw away so valuable a life as his, through impatience with the limitations of human powers. In this matter, too, let us listen to the traditional saying of our Lord, which Dr. Westcott has adopted as his motto in life: "Be ye good money-changers." Let the missionary set high store on his life and strength—barter with them, sell them dearly—see to it that when they go down under the accumulated labors that will fall upon

them, they bring a great price—the greatest price procurable—in souls. They have been given him not to be flung away as things of little value; they are his capital—let him put them out at long interest, that they may earn great gains to present the Householder when He comes and asks for an account of his stewardship.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

Princeton.

II. THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION AND CATECHISMS.

In every age men are confronted by the question, Is religion rational or ritual? Is it a matter of faith or of form? On one side of that question the Scripture of the Old and New Testaments takes its stand, and over against it is arrayed every other religion known to man. We need not stop to inquire whether this was the original attitude of all forms of faith beside the Jewish and the Christian, or whether in some instances it has been brought about through the perversion of their primitive character and intent. The fact is obvious that among the religious systems of the world to-day the Scripture alone maintains that religion is not ritual but rational, is not a matter of form but of faith. Character is more than conduct. Motive gives quality to action. Religion has its seat in the mind and heart, and the soul of religion is faith. Faith has two elements, belief, the faith of the mind; trust, the faith of the heart. Faith is not reason, but faith is rational. Scripture appeals to reason, must be received, interpreted and applied by reason. Truth must be apprehended by the understanding before it can touch the heart or shape the life. John Locke said truly that to decry reason in the interest of faith is to put out the eyes in order to look through a telescope. The wise man applies the glass of faith to the eye of reason. "Come, now, and let us reason together," is the word of the Old Testament; "Come and see" is the word of the New. The Bible is a plain book for plain men. "All things in Scripture," says the Confession (I. 7), "are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all; yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed and observed, for salvation, are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or

other, that not only the learned, but the unlearned, in the due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them." The Scripture has no hidden shrines, no veiled divinities, no mysteries but such as spring from the laws of our nature and the limitations of our powers. The truth lies open before us like the heavens, where no bounds are set to vision but those which the eye itself imposes. However it may be, then, with other systems, theology, creed, confession are the inevitable outgrowth of Scripture. A rational religion invites logical statement. Theology is related to the Word as science to the works of God. In the study of his works and of his Word alike it is the prerogative of reason, as Kepler said, to think God's thoughts after him. We cannot live out of doors in the realm of thought, and we fashion a creed as instinctively as we build a home.

Two hundred and fifty years ago the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church were framed, the Confession and the Catechisms, and they remain substantially unaltered to this day, not as a venerable relic, a historical monument, but as the living exponent of the faith of one of the largest bodies of Christians on the globe. It becomes us to inquire what are the qualities that have given them this permanence and vitality. Great revolutions have taken place in Church and State, the face of the world has been changed, yet these symbols of faith remain almost untouched by the finger of time and the progress of the age.

The most striking and important characteristic of the Confession is that it is Scriptural throughout. It proposes and endeavors to draw its material from the Word of God alone without intrusion of human philosophy or speculation. God reveals himself in many ways, but the truth conveyed in every other mode of revelation is comprehended and interpreted in his Word. The Scripture, therefore, is the sole and sufficient source from which our theology may be drawn. Nature and providence may confirm

and illustrate the truth of the Word ; they have nothing to add or to detract. The Confession is not perfect, it is not free from all taint of speculation ; but it is an honest, and in the main, successful attempt to set forth the teaching of the Scripture, and that alone. Even those who believe that the Westminster divines have often erred in their interpretation will yet rejoice that they have put such abundant honor upon the Word of God.

Moreover the Confession aims not only to expound in logical order the teaching of the Scripture, and that alone ; but to comprehend the whole range of Scripture truth, what man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man. Observe how clearly and comprehensively the great truths of the Word are marshalled, with what logical skill and completeness the system is wrought out and compacted. First, the Scripture is treated, the authoritative source from which our knowledge of God and his relation to man is derived. Then God is declared, as he has made himself known in his Word, Almighty Maker and Ruler of heaven and earth, subsisting in the form of the Trinity, three Persons in One Nature. Next is set forth his eternal decree, the program of the universe, of which all the events of time and eternity are the orderly unfolding, "Through the ages one increasing purpose runs." In the mighty sweep of that purpose all things are comprehended, to it all creatures are subservient, as it marches on in the strength of omnipotence to its eternal consummation. Then follow the works of creation and providence, in which God executes his decree. Man is introduced as the glory and crown of the creation, and the story of his origin, his fall, his punishment is told. The promise of salvation followed hard upon the sin, and the covenant of redemption, with the Son of God as the Redeemer, is unfolded. The part of God in the work of redemption is shown—effectual calling, which lays the foundation of man's hope not in himself but in God ; justification, adoption, sanctification. Then

man's part is declared, saving faith, repentance unto life, good works, perseverance, assurance. Then the new life thus described in its general character is treated in various particulars—the law of God, Christian liberty and liberty of conscience, religious worship and the Sabbath day, lawful oaths and vows, the civil magistrate, marriage and divorce, the Church, the communion of saints, the sacraments, church censures, Synods and Councils. Thus the Christian life is set forth first in its own nature, then as it is related to the law of the State, and as it is organized in the Church. And the survey is closed with the vision of the world to come, death, the resurrection, the judgment, life and death eternal. Thus the Confession essays to trace in broad outline the sweep of the divine decree from its birth in the counsels of eternity to its fulfillment in the unending triumph of the kingdom of God.

Observe again the breadth of the Confession. It is broad because it is Scriptural. It is constantly affirmed, indeed, that the Confession is harsh, narrow, illiberal. On the contrary, it may be shown that in most important respects the Confession exhibits a breadth of view and a spirit of charity which reflect the largeness of the Word of God.

(a) Its recognition and defense of the right of private judgment. "The authority of the Holy Scripture dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or Church, but wholly upon God." (I. 4.) "The only infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself." (I. 9.) "The Supreme Judge, by whom all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of Councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture." (I. 10.) "God alone is lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to his Word, or beside it, in matters of faith or worship. So that to believe such doc-

trines or to obey such commandments out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience ; and the requiring of an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also." (XX. 2.) Civil magistrates may not interfere in matters of faith, and all denominations of Christians should stand upon an equal footing before the law. (XXIII. 3.) The decrees of Synods and Councils are to be received with reverence and submission, if consonant to the Word of God. (XXX. 2.) "All Synods or Councils since the Apostles' time, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred ; therefore, they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both." (XXXI. 3.) To these broad assertions of Christian liberty the progress of two hundred and fifty years has little to add.

(b) Its conception of the visible Church. "The visible Church, which is also catholic or universal under the Gospel (not confined to one nation, as before under the law) consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children." (XXXV. 2.) No hard, exclusive, *jure divino* Presbyterianism is maintained. "We hold it to be expedient, and agreeable to Scripture and the practice of the primitive Christians, that the Church be governed by Congregational, Presbyterial and Synodical Assemblies. In full consistency with this belief, we embrace in the spirit of charity those Christians who differ from us in opinion, or in practice, on these subjects." (Form of Govt. VIII. 1.) The remains of Erastianism were erased when the Confession was brought across the sea, and the noble breadth and simplicity of this conception of the Church is one of the chief glories of our faith. It is easy to believe that the men who framed it cherished the hope of the reunion of Protestant Christendom. To our standards our practice is conformed, and in every man who accepts the gospel which Paul preached, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures ;

and that he was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures, we recognize a brother in the Lord.

(c) Its freedom from the polemic spirit. Creeds are generated by controversy. The Church is driven to define its position by the assaults of heresy, and the truth under God owes much to its enemies. Certainly the Westminster Confession is not devoid of the controversial temper. But error is refuted by the exhibition of truth. Heresy is overthrown, but no anathemas are launched against the heretic. To this rule there is a single unhappy exception, in the case of the Church and the Pope of Rome. Here the Confession is at fault, and has transgressed the principle of strict adherence to the Scripture to follow what is at best a doubtful interpretation of obscure passages of the Word. Apart from this the Confession is notably free from the polemic spirit. Contrast it in this regard with the so-called Athanasian creed, still in use in the services of the Church of England, with its fine-drawn definitions, its subtle distinctions, its labored attempt to compass the mystery of the Godhead, and its declaration that he who does not keep this faith whole and undefiled without doubt shall perish everlastingly; he that will be saved must think thus of the Trinity; "this is the Catholic faith; which, except a man believe truly and firmly, he cannot be saved."

It is worthy of special remark that the Confession contains no polemic against Arminianism, though the echoes of the Synod of Dort had not yet died away upon the troubled air. The truth, as the Westminster divines conceived it, was set forth with matchless clearness and precision, and left to bear its own witness. The kingdom of God is not promoted by the maledictions of the Church.

It is important to emphasize this aspect of our standards because they are often misrepresented. We are prone to magnify our differences, but the main value and highest glory of the Confession is not that it furnishes to one branch of the Christian Church an arsenal of controversial weapons,

but that it draws out and sets in order with masterly skill and completeness those great truths of Scripture which form the common faith of Christendom. For the larger part of the doctrinal contents of the Confession we hold in common with all branches of the Evangelical Church. Let us accustom ourselves to think of the Confession not merely as a barrier, but rather as a bond.

It becomes us to recognize this characteristic of our standards because there is no prospect that the Christian world will be united in the faith of Calvin. Centuries of conflict have brought the questions at issue between Calvinist and Arminian no nearer a decision. The battle has been fought in the cabinets of kings, in the halls of learning, with all the resources of scholarship. The strong arm of the civil power has been invoked. There are no reserves on either side ; there is no heavier artillery than that which is already engaged. Substantially all has been said that can be said on either side. The relative emphasis laid upon divine sovereignty and human freedom is largely determined by the inborn disposition of men, and the difference between Calvinist and Arminian is as deeply rooted in temperament as in theology. So long as both systems give birth to saintly and heroic souls, and bear fruit in holy living and good works, both will endure. Calvinism and Arminianism are not circles tangent at a single point, but circles described from a common centre, though they embrace different areas of truth. The relation between them ought to be one not of antagonism, nor even of an armed truce, but of cordial and brotherly alliance in the service of Jesus Christ.

This is not to say that the questions at issue are of no importance. They have an important bearing upon theology and life. Calvinism pursues at once the bolder and the more logical course. When propositions are submitted which appear contradictory, but which are both attested by sufficient evidence, it is the part of reason to accept

them both, even though we cannot reduce them to harmony. That is the attitude of Calvinism toward the doctrines of the sovereignty of God and the freedom of man. It can hardly be denied that upon the face of Scripture both appear, and that to eliminate either is, if not to do violence to the words of Scripture, at least to turn them from their natural and obvious meaning. There are three possible positions that may be assumed. 1. Fatalism. God's sovereignty denies man's freedom. Hyper-Calvinism approaches the faith of Islam. 2. Arminianism. Man's freedom abridges God's sovereignty. 3. Calvinism. God's purpose respects man's freedom, man's freedom fulfils God's purpose. God is sovereign, man is free. Without entering upon the vexed question of the nature and limits of the freedom of the human will, or rather of the human soul, of which the will is only a single faculty, it is sufficient for our purpose to observe that the Calvinist goes with the Arminian in carrying the freedom of man to the point of moral responsibility. It is further true, indeed, that Calvinism recognizes the freedom of man, emphasizes the sovereignty of God. That it does not undertake to reconcile these apparently discordant doctrines is a weakness, if such it be, that Calvinism must be content to share with the Word of God.

But while these questions are important, they are not vital either to religion or to theology, the science of religion. The essential truths of the Gospel are few and simple, and in them the Church of Christ must find its unity. The greater number of the branches into which the Church is divided can show no sufficient reason for existence. There are possible only a very few distinct forms of polity. All besides are only modifications of one or other of these original types. There are simply not enough points of doctrine or of polity to go round, unless we accept the mathematical definition of a point, as that which has no magnitude. Set the Confession over against any other evangeli-

cal creed, even those which diverge most widely from the system which it embodies, and the points of agreement are far more numerous and weighty than the points of difference. To the greater part of the teaching of our Confession the staunchest Arminian will respond with a hearty Amen.

Time will not suffer me to speak of the Catechisms, which present the same system of doctrine in the form of question and answer. The definitions which they furnish of such conceptions as God, sin, effectual calling, faith, repentance, justification, adoption, sanctification, sacrament, baptism, the Lord's Supper, prayer, are models of accuracy, clearness and precision. He who has mastered them is in possession of a theological equipment of the highest value. And it must be remarked that the catechetical method of instruction has been approved and employed by the wisest teachers of all time and of every people, and is commended by universal experience. To train our children in the Catechism is to set them in the way of clear thinking and holy living.

The Confession is not a polemic tractate. In spirit and intent it is not merely or mainly controversial. If that had been its character, it might long since have been remanded to that historical museum where so many pieces of theological ordinance are stored away, that have fought their battles, and are consigned to silence and oblivion. Because it is more than a controversial pamphlet, because it is a compact, logical, complete exposition of that system of doctrine which was taught by Calvin, by Augustine, by Paul, inwrought as we believe with the whole texture of Scripture truth, however it may be modified in detail, in its essential features it will remain unshaken while the world stands, to magnify the wisdom and the grace of God.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Baltimore, Md.

III. LANIER AS A POET.

Poetry in the South since the Civil War has been almost a neglected field of literature. Prose writers such as Joel Chandler Harris, George W. Cable, James Lane Allen, Richard Malcolm Johnston, Thomas Nelson Page and others of less note have flourished and seem to have absorbed the entire interest of the reading public. But of poetry there has been a dearth. Of the few poets who have warbled forth their songs only two or three have risen to anything like a conspicuous place in American literature.

Whether Poe's conviction that there was no equal chance for the native Southern poets be the true explanation of this fact or not, it would be idle here to discuss. The fact remains that since the Civil War there has been but one poet of renown in the South, and that poet was Sidney Lanier. Perhaps the ardent admirers of Timrod and of Paul Hamilton Hayne, "the poet laureate of the South," as his enthusiastic devotees, with more zeal than knowledge, are pleased to style him, would not permit this statement to pass unchallenged. Timrod's claim may be dismissed with the remark that he cannot properly be considered, as his premature death in 1867 closed his brief but promising career almost synchronously with the war. Of Hayne it may be said that he is not known outside of his own country and not very widely known even in America. It is significant to note here that when a few years ago Mr. Edmund Gosse, an eminent English critic and literateur, contributed to the *Forum* an essay upon the somewhat invidious question, "Has America produced a poet?" he made no mention whatsoever of Hayne (or of Timrod either, for the matter of that), but he did consider Lanier's claim to the distinction of being a poet.

It is the purpose of the present paper to consider Sidney Lanier as a poet.

Lanier was born at Macon, Georgia, on the third of February, 1842. From his parents he inherited his passion for music and poetry, for both on father's and mother's side the love of these two kindred arts dates so far back in the families as to amount to a traditional characteristic. So pronounced was Sidney's love for music that when only a child, his biographer tells us, "he learned to play almost without instruction, on every kind of instrument he could find ; and while yet a boy he played the flute, organ, piano, violin, guitar and banjo, especially devoting himself to the flute in deference to his father, who feared for him the powerful fascination of the violin. For it was the violin-voice that, above all others, commanded his soul. He has related that during his college days, it would sometimes so exalt him in rapture that presently he would sink from his solitary music-worship into a deep trance, thence to awaken, alone, on the floor of his room, sorely shaken in nerve." It is not, therefore, surprising that Lanier followed music as his profession in life, since his love for it even from childhood amounted to a passion. The effect, too, of his all-absorbing passion for music upon his poetry is quite pronounced. Whether he would have devoted himself wholly to music or to poetry, had he found some Maccenas to provide for his material wants, it would be impossible to say. Certain it is that his *res augusta domi* prevented the full fruition of his passionate love of either music or poetry, by degrading the products of his genius to the sordid level of their commercial value, in order to enable him to eke out a living for himself and his family. Alas, too often has nature imposed so severe a condition of existence upon her sons of genius.

Even in his college days he felt the drawing influence of the two kindred arts of music and poetry upon his soul ; and concerning his vocation in life he says in his college

note-book : "The point I wish to settle is merely, by what method shall I ascertain what I am fit for, as preliminary to ascertaining God's will with reference to me ; or what my inclinations are as preliminary to ascertaining what my capacities are ; that is, what I am fit for. I am more than all perplexed by this fact, that the prime inclination, that is, natural bent (which I have checked, though) of my nature is to music ; and for that I have the greatest talent ; indeed, not boasting, for God gave it me, I have an extraordinary musical talent and feel it within me plainly that I could rise as high as any composer. But I cannot bring myself to believe that I was intended for a musician, because it seems so small a business in comparison with other things which, it seems to me, I might do."

I think it was Lanier's weakness, if that is not too strong a word to use, that he could not definitely make up his mind whether he was intended for a musician or a poet. He felt both passions in his soul struggling for utterance. Or, as Stedman has beautifully expressed it, "in him the sister-spirits of Music and Poesy contended with a rivalry as strong as that between 'twin daughters of one race,' both loving and both worshipped by one whom death too soon removed while he strove to perfect their reconciliation." Had he been able to determine in his early life, once for all, that nature intended him for a musician, like Paganini, he might have moved vast audiences to rapturous delight by the soul-stirring music of his violin. But then we should have been deprived of much fine, graceful poetry which adorns and enriches American literature. On the other hand, if he had followed, untrammelled, his literary bent and poetic taste, he would probably have produced more copious and spontaneous verses and of a supernal beauty. In short, had he been less of a musician, he would probably have been more of a poet. Even as it was, he has left us much poetry that is destined to something more than a fugitive existence, yea to an immortality as endur-

ing as the republic of American letters, and has won for himself a place among the first poets of America. He is not, then, of that class of poets who, as Wordsworth said with keen poetic insight, "ne'er have penned their inspiration."

But Lanier was not permitted to devote himself, uninterrupted, to his chosen pursuits. From cultivating the Muse he was called by his duty to his country to enlist in the Confederate army, and with his company from his native Georgia, he was sent to do service, brave soldier that he was, upon the battle-scarred soil of Virginia. But the life of a soldier was not to his taste, just as it has not been to the taste of many another literary man from the days of the genial Horace down to the present. In "Tiger Lilies," a novel he wrote the year after the close of the war, he has given us a picture of his experiences in Point Lookout prison, where he was kept in close confinement for five months during the latter part of his career as a soldier. Even during his imprisonment he had with him his indispensable flute, which he had concealed under his sleeve when he entered the prison. On his release he made his way, on foot, back to his home in Georgia, only to be prostrated, upon his arrival, by a desperate illness, from which he recovered with shattered health. It was during the war that he felt the premonitions of that fell disease consumption, with which the rest of his life was a pathetic struggle, and to which, like the poet 'whose name was writ in water,' he was in the end to succumb.

To provide for the material needs of himself and his little family, he addressed himself successively to teaching and the practice of law. But neither of these professions, though they may have yielded him bread enough for his wife and babes, satisfied the poet-spirit in the man. His artistic nature was starving, and the keen pangs of that hunger were torturing his sensitive soul. It was during this period that he wrote to his friend, Bayard Taylor,

those pathetic lines, "I could never describe to you what a mere drought and famine my life has been. . . . Perhaps you know that, with us of the younger generation in the South, since the war, pretty much the whole of life has been merely not dying." He resolved to seek a more congenial atmosphere where his feeling for art might expand and develop. Accordingly, in December, 1873, he moved to Baltimore and procured for himself an engagement as first flute for the Peabody Symphony Concerts. It was several years after this that he was appointed lecturer on English literature in the Johns-Hopkins University.

"With his settlement in Baltimore," says Ward, in his memorial essay, "begins a story of as brave and sad a struggle as the history of genius records. On the one hand was the opportunity for study, and the full consciousness of power, and a will never subdued; and on the other a body wasting with consumption, that must be forced to task beyond its strength not merely to express the thoughts of beauty which strove for utterance, but from the necessity of providing bread for his babes."

To his father who desired him to return to Georgia and settle with him and share his income, the poet wrote: "My dear father, think how, for twenty years, through poverty, through pain, through weariness, through sickness, through the uncongenial atmosphere of a farcical college and of a bare army and then of an exacting business life, through all the discouragement of being wholly unacquainted with literary people and literary ways—I say, think how, in spite of all these depressing circumstances, and of a thousand more which I could enumerate, these two figures of music and poetry have steadily kept in my heart so that I could not banish them. Does it not seem to you as to me, that I begin to have the right to enroll myself among the devotees of these two sublime arts, after having followed them so long and so humbly, and through so much bitterness?"

But Lanier had faith in his mission; and it was this in-

domitable, never-failing faith in his own mission that inspired his heart amid all the sufferings he endured for the present and nerved that heart against the ominous future his frequently recurring hemorrhages boded. Under the inspiration of this implicit confidence in his mission he wrote to his wife, after one of his hemorrhages, "Were it not for some circumstances which make such a proposition seem absurd in the highest degree, I would think that I am shortly to die, and that my spirit hath been singing its swan-song before dissolution. All day my soul hath been cutting swiftly into the great space of the subtle, unspeakable deep, driven by wind after wind of heavenly melody." And again, to comfort his wife and dispel a lurking suspicion she entertained that he had, after all, perhaps made a mistake in devoting his life to literature, he wrote :

"Know, then, that disappointments were inevitable, and will still come until I have fought the battle which every great artist has had to fight since time began. This—dimly felt while I was doubtful of my own vocation and powers—is clear as the sun to me now that I *know*, through the fiercest tests of life, that I am in soul, and shall be in life and utterance, a great poet.

"Now this is written because I sit here in my room daily, and picture *thee* picturing *me* worn, and troubled, or disheartened ; and because I do not wish thee to think up any groundless sorrow in thy soul. Of course I have my keen sorrows, momentarily more keen than I would like any one to know ; but I thank God that in a knowledge of Him and of myself which cometh to me daily in fresh revelations, I have a steadfast firmament of blue, in which all clouds soon dissolve. I have wanted to say this several times of late, but it is not easy to bring one's self to talk so of one's self, even to one's dearer self.

"Have, then no fears nor anxieties in my behalf; look upon all my disappointments as mere witnesses that art has no enemy so unrelenting as cleverness, and as rough

weather that seasons timber. It is of little consequence whether *I* fail; the *I* in the matter is a small business: '*Que mon nom soit flettri, que la France soit libre !*' quoth Danton; which is to say, interpreted by my environment, Let my name perish—the poetry is good poetry and the music is good music, and beauty dieth not, and the heart that needs it will find it."

Here, then, we have Lanier's confession of his own conviction that he was a poet, nay a great poet—a conviction that grew with his years. Perhaps it is time for us to inquire, was Lanier a great poet? The unbiased answer to this question must, in my humble judgment, be in the negative if by a great poet is meant one who is entitled to rank with the world's great poets, such as Dante, Goethe, Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, Byron and Tennyson, to mention only moderns. But while he is not entitled to rank with these world-poets, so to say, nor even with such lesser lights as Shelley or Keats, he is yet a poet whose work has in it elements of permanency and will bear comparison with the best poetic product that America has produced. Let us, then, if we may, review his poetic output and examine more in detail its quality.

The first poem of Lanier which won for him the admiring attention of the reading public was "Corn," written in 1874. Most of his work prior to this time was not above mediocrity, and therefore hardly need be passed in review. It was the prestige that this poem gave its author that subsequently won for him the distinction of being invited to write the Centennial Cantata. (That poem, however, did not enhance his reputation.) The theme of "Corn" is, in its nature, prosaic enough; and yet the author invested this commonplace subject with a poetic air and coloring, weighing the respective claims of both corn and cotton upon the attention of the farmer and pointing out the disastrous results of speculation. Lanier could hardly resist the temptation which his theme offered of pointing a moral.

Here, as so frequently in his poems, like Wordsworth when not at his best, he lapses into didacticism, apparently oblivious of the fact that didacticism is a relentless foe to poetry of the first water. Lanier was not, however, the first to write upon such a theme as corn. The path had been blazed out before by Whittier. But it is to be said to Lanier's credit that he surpassed his predecessor in poetic conception and technical execution.

"Corn" was quickly followed by "The Symphony," a poem no less unique than beautiful, in which the author expresses through the musical instruments as speakers his own feelings and sentiments. Here he portrays, under the guise of a dialogue between the instruments, the deadening effect of the trade-spirit upon the human heart and affections and suggests as the remedy for the heartlessness of trade more love for humanity. Indeed, the key-note of the poem is love, which is struck by the violins in the very first couplet:

"O Trade! O Trade! would thou wert dead!
The Time needs heart—'tis tired of head."

Love is the specific for all the ills of trade. It is this point that reconciles the poor even to their contracted and narrow life, as they long for a broader, a fuller life. It is this that brings man in closer touch with nature and puts him also in harmony with nature's God. It is this that leads to purity, not only in woman but also in man, and beckons and allures both man and woman to a higher and nobler life. In a word, the poem is an attempt to put in graceful, poetic form the second great commandment of the Gospel, "Love thy neighbor as thyself;" and the musician-poet closes it with that beautiful line,

"Music is love in search of a word."

Lanier felt, and felt keenly, the sentiment he expressed in "The Symphony." In a letter to Judge Bleckley he says concerning the trade-spirit: "Trade has now had posses-

sion of the civilized world for four hundred years ; it controls all things, it interprets the Bible, it guides our national and almost all our individual life with its maxims ; and its oppressions upon the moral existence of man have come to be ten thousand times more grievous than the worst tyrannies of the feudal system ever were. Thus, in the reversal of time, it is now the *gentleman* who must rise and overthrow Trade. That chivalry which every man has, in some degree, in his heart ; which does not depend upon birth, but which is a revelation from God of justice, of fair dealing, of scorn of mean advantages ; which condemns the selling of stock which one *knows* is going to fall to a man who *believes* it is going to rise, as much as it would condemn any other form of rascality, or of injustice, or of meanness ; it is this which must in these latter days organize its insurrections and burn up every one of the cunning moral castles from which Trade sends out its forays upon the conscience of modern society."

In his "Song of the Chattahoochee," published in 1877, the poet showed his mastery of an art as beautiful as it is rare. The charming lilt and melody of this song place it second only to Tennyson's "Brook," and its music haunts the memory almost as powerfully as Poe's "Ululume." In the last stanza is seen an example of the poet's intense moral earnestness :

"But oh, not the hills of Habersham,
And oh, not the valleys of Hall
Avail : I am fain for to water the plain.
Downward the voices of Duty call—
Downward, to toil and be mixed with the main,
The dry fields burn, and the mills are to turn,
And a myriad flowers mortally yearn,
And the lordly main from beyond the plain
Calls over the hills of Habersham,
Calls through the valleys of Hall."

In the "Revenge of Hamish," published a year after the "Song of the Chattahoochee," Lanier essayed a new field of poetic art, that of the ballad ; and in this new venture he

achieved, by the vividness of the conception and the musical flow of the language, such high success as to challenge comparison with the very finest ballads in English literature. But it was in the "Marshes of Glynn" that he produced his most original poem, at least in conception. The theme itself is surely unpoetic enough—a dreary marsh such as one may see in Southern Georgia—and yet the poet, by his glowing imagination and sympathetic love of nature, has idealized it, and out of this vast dreary waste of water has built up an inspiring poem upon the illimitable greatness of God.

"As the marsh-hen secretly builds on the watery sod,
Behold I will build me a nest on the greatness of God :
I will fly in the greatness of God as the marsh-hen flies
In the freedom that fills all the space 'twixt the marsh and the skies,
By so many roots as the marsh-grass sends in the sod
I will heartily lay me ahold on the greatness of God :
Oh, like to the greatness of God is the greatness within
The range of the marshes, the liberal marshes of Glynn."

Another poem which is indebted for its inspiration to the same source as the "Marshes of Glynn" is "Sunrise," a wonderful poem if we consider the circumstances of its composition, written when the author's fever temperature registered one hundred and four degrees and he was nearing the end of his brief life. "Sunrise" shows to a still more astonishing extent even than the "Marshes of Glynn" the poet's mastery of the technical beauties of rhythm and his unflinching love of nature, which amounted almost to a passion. In the concluding stanza of this poem Lanier gives expression to his unswerving devotion to art :

"And ever my heart through the night shall with knowledge abide thee,
And ever by day shall my spirit, as one that hath tried thee,
Labor, at leisure, in art—till yonder beside thee
My soul shall float, friend Sun,
The day being done."

He saw that sun with a clear vision, undimmed by the mists and damps of his hard-cast life, when his day was done. And that sun to him was God, just as it was to

Turner, the great English landscape painter, who, as he lay dying and beheld the sun through the London mists, exclaimed, "The sun is God."

One of Lanier's most exquisitely beautiful and delicate poems is that to his wife's eyes, "My Springs." Indeed, there is scarcely a finer poem of its kind in the whole range of English literature. It is too long to quote in its entirety, and to give simply a selection would be to mutilate it. Another snatch of song, written in his early days, is the "Betrayal," which I will venture to quote :

"The sun has kissed the violet sea,
And burned the violet to a rose.
O Sea ! Would'st thou not better be
Mere violet still ? Who knows ? who knows ?
Well hides the violet in the wood ;
The dead leaf wrinkles her a hood,
And winter's ill is violet's good ;
But the bold glory of the rose,
It quickly comes and quickly goes—
Red petals whirling in white snows,
Ah, me !

"The sun has burnt the rose-red sea :
The rose is turned to ashes gray.
O Sea, O Sea, mightst thou but be
The violet thou hast been to-day !
The sun is brave, the sun is bright,
The sun is lord of love and light ;
But after him it cometh night.
Dim anguish of the lonesome dark !
Once a girl's body, stiff and stark,
Was laid in a tomb without a mark,
Ah, me !"

Lanier's poetry was inspired by the muse of Christendom. Not that it breathes an introspective or mystical air, which, as Heyne thought, tended to chill and ultimately to freeze the Homeric gods ; nor that it is what is technically called religious poetry, such as the work of Watts or Wesley. Lanier drew his inspiration from the New Testament ; his poetry teaches an evangel of love. His entire work is so shot through with this sentiment as to render selections for

illustration quite unnecessary. It furnishes the *motif* of his poem, "How Love Looked for Hell," and occurs in "Absence," where he says that love is the redeeming quality of life that makes it worth living.

"When life's all love, 'tis life ; aught else, 'tis naught."

Endowed with so noble a gift of heart, he ever strove to inculcate a broader and more catholic love and a larger tolerance on the part of Christians. Witness here his "Remonstrance." He has left us his own ennobling conception of Christ in the "Crystal." Nor was he content to preach this gospel of love simply. He also practiced it and lived it before others. It colored his very conception of beauty and art. Nay, he regarded love as inseparably linked with these. Probably no artist ever invested his calling with more sacredness than did he. Like the Hebrew seer of old, his soul was kindled to ecstatic enthusiasm by the "beauty of holiness ;" and he loved these words, his biographer tells us, and liked to reverse the phrase and speak of the "holiness of beauty." In his glowing admiration of this sentiment he reminds us of Milton and Ruskin. Lecturing before the students of the Johns-Hopkins University, he said :

"So far from dreading that your moral purpose will interfere with your beautiful creation, go forward in the clear conviction that unless you are suffused—soul and body, one might say—with that moral purpose which finds its largest expression in love ; that is, the love of all things in their proper relation ; unless you are suffused with this love, do not dare to meddle with beauty ; unless you are suffused with beauty, do not dare to meddle with love ; unless you are suffused with truth, do not dare to meddle with goodness ; in a word, unless you are suffused with truth, wisdom, goodness and love, abandon the hope that the ages will accept you as an artist."

After a careful review of Lanier's poetry the conviction is irresistible that he was intensely in earnest. He was no

'idle singer of an empty day,' to use Morris' phrase—a poet, by the way, with whose conception of the poetic mission Lanier had little sympathy. He looked upon the mission of a poet as sacred a thing as the office of an ancient Hebrew prophet. In answer to the question, What avails a poet? he replies:

"He beareth starry stuff about his wings
To pollen thee and sting thee fertile."

It was no doubt the man's intense earnestness of purpose that led Stedman to tax him with magnifying his office as poet. But he took equally as serious a view of the life of an artist. In the intensity of the moral purpose of his message to mankind he reminds us of the nature-intoxicated Lucretius, whom he studied and ardently admired, or better still, perhaps, of the ancient Hebrew prophet, Isaiah. For, as Callaway has said, Lanier was something of a Hebrew in his love of righteousness and something of a Hellene in his love of beauty.

Such, then, was Lanier the poet. Not a great poet, assuredly, in the sense that any poem of his is entitled to rank with that class of literature which Goethe called "*welt litteratur*," and yet a poet who interpreted life truly as far as he did interpret it, as far as his range extended. He possessed some of the elements of a great poet. He had a love of music as passionate as Milton's. But his genius, alas! was too much trammelled by the sad circumstances of his outward life, and this prevented him from becoming a great poet in utterance. Nevertheless, he is entitled to be classed with the very first American poets and is eminently worthy of a permanent place in the heart and affection of the American people.

EDWIN W. BOWEN.

Ashland, Va.

IV. "THE BOOK OF THE TWELVE PROPHETS, COMMONLY CALLED THE MINOR :"¹ CONSIDERED AS A TYPE.

Notices of this book seem to have been slow in finding their way to the public. The very complete bibliography provided in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature* mentions the book itself, but that is all. This looks as if the usually careful compiler of that bibliography had not met with any formal and extended criticisms of Dr. Smith's book. Certainly no such criticisms have fallen under the eye of the present writer. Indeed, I can, at the moment, recall but two notices of the book. One of these appeared in the *Expository Times*, the other in the *Christian Observer*. The former was sufficiently appreciative, but not judicious or discriminating. The latter was judicious, but not specially appreciative. For lack of space neither was at all adequate to the real merits, and still less to the real importance of the book. Of its merits I shall have occasion to speak later. Apart from all other considerations, its importance lies in the fact that from its title page to its last paragraph the book is typical. It reflects, as in a mirror, all the leading characteristics, the excellencies, and, one must add, the defects also of the school to which its author belongs.

The typical character of the book reveals itself in its very title. Let the reader refer to it again. He will find that it is not called by any such staid name as "A Commentary on the Minor Prophets." It is not a Com-

¹THE BOOK OF THE TWELVE PROPHETS, COMMONLY CALLED THE MINOR. By George Adam Smith, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. IN TWO VOLUMES, Vol. II. Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, Haggai, Zechariah, i.-viii., "Malachi," Joel, "Zechariah," ix.-xiv., and Jonah, with Historical and Critical Introductions. .

mentary. It is not called, "An Exposition of the Minor Prophets." And, notwithstanding the fact that it is one of the series known as the "Expositor's Bible," it is not an exposition. The title reads, "The Book of the Twelve Prophets, Commonly Called the Minor," (here follow the names of such of the Minor Prophets as are treated in this volume) "with Historical and Critical Introductions." Now this title is not only sufficiently unconventional to have a literary flavor and individuality of its own, but it has an additional charm, viz. : it conforms strictly to reality. And, just here, it may not be amiss to add that, while Dr. Smith has succeeded in being unconventional throughout, sometimes even laboriously so, he has not been equally successful in imparting to all of his statements that peculiar charm that comes only from being conformed to reality. In his title, however, the combination of these two qualities, freshness and reality, is almost perfect and altogether happy. If one will be at the pains to read the title, he will have only himself to blame, if, on reading the book, he feels defrauded or disappointed. It contains comments, grammatical and otherwise, and many of them of an illuminating character ; it contains expositions, and some very fine ones ; but, as already stated, it is neither commentary nor exposition. It is for the most part a series of translations prefaced by historical and critical introductions. Dr. Smith's title then could hardly have been improved upon.

The freshness and force which characterize the title characterize the book. They characterize both its literary form and its thought. Dr. Smith will put more thought upon the wording of a phrase than many writers will put upon that of a whole paragraph. He will put more thought into a phrase than some will put into many paragraphs. The result justifies his expenditure of energy. Men will read what he writes. And as they read they cannot but become aware that they have come into contact with an automobile

mind. They perceive unmistakable evidences of a real mind, really wrestling with a real problem. They may sometimes feel that the processes of this mind are erratic, and that the positions to which these processes lead are worse than erratic, but, if they think at all, they are compelled to experience a certain sympathy with and admiration for the wrestling mind as it addresses itself with skill and energy to the mastery of its problem. Dr. Smith is no mere manipulator of other men's thoughts. He thinks. Everywhere his thought shows that it has been forged at his own furnace and stamped with his own image and superscription. And because he does think, his readers will be apt to forgive him much—far too much. Carried forward upon the full, free-flowing tide of his learning, charmed by the chaste beauty and vigor of his style, mastered by the energy of his mental action, only too many of his readers will be apt to overlook the preposterousness of certain of his pre-suppositions, the perversity of his logic, the impossibility of his methods and the inconcinnities which mar his conclusions.

I call attention to these points of excellence in Dr. Smith's book for the special benefit of my younger brethren. They have golden opportunities to do valiant service for the truth. Let them remember that it was of the sword of Goliath, the Philistine, that David said, "There is none like that; give it me."

It is no mean compliment to the school to which Dr. Smith belongs to say that, in its literary merits, his book is typical.

In what has been said of the title I have already indicated that for reasons satisfactory to himself Dr. Smith has largely delegated to others the task of expounding the prophecies that fall within the compass of this volume, and has devoted himself to the problems of criticism and of the historical development of prophecy which they present. Such a procedure, however, is sufficiently remarkable to

demand something of the nature of explanation or justification. And here it will be only fair to permit Dr. Smith to speak for himself. He says : "The necessity of including in one volume so many prophets, scattered over more than three centuries, and each of them requiring a separate introduction, has reduced the space available for a practical application of their teaching to modern life. But this is the less to be regretted, that the contents of the nine books before us are not so applicable to our own day as we have found their greater predecessors to be. On the other hand, however, they form a more varied introduction to Old Testament criticism, while, by the long range of time which they cover, and the many stages of religion to which they belong, they afford a wider view of the development of prophecy."

Speaking of the first of these points Dr. Smith says : "To Old Testament criticism these books furnish valuable introduction—some of them, like Obadiah, Joel and 'Zechariah,' ix.-xiv., by the great variety of opinion that has prevailed as to their dates or their relation to the other prophets with whom they have passages in common ; some, like Zechariah and 'Malachi,' by their relation to the Law, in the light of modern theories of the origin of the latter; and some, like Joel and Jonah, by the question whether we are to regard them as history, or as allegories of history, or as Apocalypse."

On the second of the two points mentioned above, he says : "But the critical and textual value of our nine books is far exceeded by the historical. Each exhibits a development of prophecy of the greatest value. From this point of view, indeed, the volume might be entitled, 'The Passing of the Prophet.' For throughout our nine books we see the spirit and style of the classic prophecy of Israel gradually dissolved into other forms of religious thought and feeling. The clear start from the facts of the prophet's day, the ancient truths about Jehovah and Israel, and the

direct appeal to the prophet's contemporaries, are not always given, or when given are mingled, colored and warped by other religious interests, both present and future, which are even powerful enough to shake the ethical absolutism of the older prophets." But I cannot quote farther.

Whether or not Dr. Smith has justified himself in substituting criticism of the prophets for expository comments, and that in a book published and sold under the title of "The Expositor's Bible," is a question about which I feel little interest or concern. The fact that he does make such substitution of criticism for expository comment is significant. Here again we have the characteristic of the entire school to which Dr. Smith belongs. Take, for instance, the series known as "The International Commentary," and it will be found that, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, a proportionately small space is taken up in making plain what the Biblical author has said. Page after page is devoted to elaborating some theory of the so-called commentator in reference to double, triple, quadruple or quintuple authorship; or in showing up some absurdity or incongruity in the Biblical writer which the so-called commentator has, I dislike exceedingly to say it, himself devised.

In this connection, I may be permitted to add two remarks. The first is, that, when properly employed, there can be no exception taken to the validity of the methods and principles of historical criticism. With these, in the abstract, conservatives have no contention. It may fall in very well with the excellent opinions which "we moderns" entertain of ourselves and our achievements to represent the methods and principles of historical criticism as a recent discovery. Such boasts, however, must make the Muse of History blush. For she knows that there is merely enough truth in them to mislead the careless. The fact is that all the legitimate processes of the higher criticism, like the processes of logic, have their basis in the

very constitution of our minds. Their employment, to some degree or other, is scarcely optional. They come into play *sua sponte*, when the mind is confronted with the problems of higher criticism. What "we moderns" have done, and it is no mean service, is to give definite statement to these principles and methods; to bring them into formal relation one to another; and to apply them with a fuller consciousness of the fact that we are applying them, and so with greater chances of applying them consistently and successfully. Further, it ought not to be forgotten that these methods and principles are not the property of any one school. Nor does the use of them necessarily guarantee the correctness of the results reached. One's conclusion may be formally sound and yet his ratiocination as a whole fearfully rotten. In order to sound conclusions, sound methods and principles must be sanely used. Much, however, that in our day calls itself "historical criticism" is the very insanity of fancy prostituted to furnish plausible premises for foregone conclusions.

The other remark that ought to be made in order to prevent misconception is simply this: No language is too strong to express my appreciation of the laborious patience of the minute investigation instituted by writers, like Dr. Smith, in order to secure scientific accuracy in their results. They esteem no toil too great, no scrutiny too searching, no detail of form, phrase or thought, too minute to demand their consideration, if only they can get clearly before them all the factors that enter into the complex problem with which they undertake to deal. Nor can too great admiration be expressed for the amplitude of the learning which they bring to bear upon these problems. The evidence of such learning meets us on almost every page of Dr. Smith's book. And here lies the secret of the confidence which the general public seems disposed to repose in these men, and the homage it accords them. However it may hold in the forum of reason, or in that of conscience, no indictment

framed against them is likely to hold at the bar of the general public except as it is drawn by those who show themselves their peers in the respects I have indicated. Hence the folly and sin of the church, if she fails to raise up for God a body of men, not only of competent but of commanding scholarship. Such scholarship was never more demanded of her ministry than it is to-day.

Passing by other features of Dr. Smith's book which are typical, the remainder of this paper must be devoted to a somewhat fuller illustration of a single such feature. I refer to the tone and attitude which Dr. Smith assumes towards the Scripture writings and writers. The practical importance of this point must be obvious to all. The question has often been asked, What will be the effect upon the authority of Scripture, should the principles of Dr. Smith's school prevail? Dr. Smith's book furnishes the answer. And this answer, if less reassuring, seems more conclusive and convincing than some that have been given by the advocates of that school. Canon Cheyne, for instance, has written a volume entitled, "Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism." In it, he has undertaken to show that the legitimate result of the critical findings of his school is to increase our reverence for Scripture, and its value for edification. Dr. Driver has also given very comfortable assurances along the same line. But a greater than either has said, "By their fruits ye shall know them." (Would it be considered ungracious, should I recall the fact that he also said, "Beware of false prophets which come unto you in sheep's clothing?") I propose making a practical application of this test to the case in hand. In other words, I propose exhibiting in Dr. Smith's own words the effects of the principles of his school in his his own case. Surely this is fair. If these principles could be safe and wholesome in the hands of anyone, then, I may frankly say, I would have expected them to be found so in the case of Dr. Smith. Never did any reader come to

the perusal of a book with kindlier sentiments of confidence and regard for its author than were brought by the present writer to the perusal of Dr. Smith's book. And if I have been disappointed, I am compelled to believe that the fault is with Dr. Smith's critical principles rather than with Dr. Smith himself. But be that as it may, the fact is, that in this particular, as in others, Dr. Smith is a type. And it is fair to add that he is an exponent of the best element in his school.

What then is his tone, and what his attitude towards the Scripture writings and writers? The following quotations will sufficiently show. Let us begin, so to speak, with the minima. Here is what Dr. Smith has to say in regard to the style of Zechariah—he is speaking of the Visions—"Here the style is involved and redundant—the formulas 'thus saith' and 'saying' are repeated to weariness." Dr. Smith admits that some of the defects in style to which he has referred may be traceable to corruptions of the text. But he adds, "There must of course have been a certain amount of redundancy in the original to provoke such aggravations of it, and of obscurity or tortuousness of style to cause them to be deemed necessary." He is careful, however, to make this excuse for the prophet, "Of course the involved and and misty subjects of the latter (that is the Visions) naturally forced upon the description of them a laboriousness of art to which there was no provocation in directly exhorting the people to a pure life." Again, in another place, he refers to the "strained art and obscure truths of the Visions." That Dr. Smith cannot wholly excuse the prophet, however, appears from the fact that after having made every allowance possible he feels constrained to say, "The problem, therefore, remains—how one who had gift of speech, so straight and clear, came to torture and tangle his style."

Dr. Smith adopts the same tone in speaking of the style of Haggai. He says, "The sneers of modern writers have

not been spared upon a style that is crabbed and jejune, and they have esteemed this to be a collapse of the prophetic spirit." Then follows the usual generous partial apology. It concludes as follows, "What God's people themselves could do for themselves—that was what needed telling at the moment; and if Haggai told it with a meagre and starved style, this also was in harmony with the occasion. One does not expect it otherwise when hungry men speak to each other of their duty." I cite these passages not because of any special importance that attaches to the matter of style, looked at in itself, but partly because they exhibit the force and finish of the style of which Dr. Smith is himself master, and partly because they will prepare the reader for what is to follow. They notify us that Dr. Smith, while disposed to deal generously with Scripture writers, can nevertheless, when occasion demands, deal with them with the utmost, most unflinching, unreserved faithfulness. Whether at times both his generosity and his severity are not overdone, even wholly misplaced, will of course be a question by itself. It is, however, a question upon which we need not stop. We are concerned rather with ascertaining and setting forth what are Dr. Smith's tone and attitude towards the Scripture writers, rather than with determining whether or not these are what they should be.

Let us pass on to notice Dr. Smith's estimate of the mental grasp of certain of the prophets. Speaking of prophecy during the Persian period, he says: "We miss, too, the clear outlook of the earlier prophets upon the history of the world, and their calm rational grasp of its forces. The world is still seen, and even to further distance than before. The people abate no whit of their ideal to be the teachers of mankind. But it is all through another medium. The lurid air of Apocalypse envelopes the future, and in their weakness to grapple either politically or philosophically with the problems which history offers, the prophets

resort to the expectation of physical catastrophes and of the intervention of supernatural armies. Such an atmosphere is not the native air of prophecy, and prophecy yields its supreme office in Israel to other forms of religious development. On one side the ecclesiastic comes to the front—the legalist, the organizer of ritual, the priest; on the other, the teacher, the moralist, the thinker and the speculator. At the same time personal religion is perhaps more deeply cultivated than at any other stage of the people's history." I hope that I shall be pardoned for adding that last sentence to my quotation. Of course it is not strictly relevant to the main purpose for which the quotation is made. It will, however, at least serve to show that Dr. Smith is dimly conscious of a problem which his school have conjured up for themselves, but with which they have made no serious effort to grapple. I refer to the fact that they would have us believe that from the same religious fountain there were going forth at one and the same time sweet waters and bitter. They are shut up to maintaining that the spent religious forces of the nation were at one and the same time going to seed in the ritualism and formalism of the Law (Dr. Smith himself pays this venerable relic of the religious past the graceful tribute of spelling it with a capital—"Law"), and striking root downward and bearing fruit upward in the splendid spirituality of the Psalms. But, like Dr. Smith, I can only glance at this interesting problem and pass it by. Our present business is with other elements in Dr. Smith's vivid, if somewhat startling and uncompromising portrait of prophecy during this critical period of Israel's history. Let the reader run his eye over it again. If he is in the habit of thinking at all he will be apt to find that it breeds many questions in his mind. I cannot go into them, nor even glance at them. I shall not call into question his "lurid" description of Apocalypse, nor ask by what authority Dr. Smith characterizes God's accredited messengers in the

way he does. I shall not ask what he does with Apocalypse in Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. In reference to all such matters, it is, perhaps, sufficient simply to remind one's self that to the "*sic volo, sic jubeo*" type of criticism "nothing is impossible." It is a law unto itself. What I do desire to do is simply to arrest attention upon the fact that the prophets of this period, if they were men of ordinary self-respect, could not but feel—mortified, shall I say? or indignant, at the portrait which this gifted literary artist has drawn of them. Happily, the prophets are long dead; and those long dead, of course, have no sensibilities to be wounded. Hence, doubtless, it is that criticism feels that there is no occasion for mincing her words when speaking of them. It does not fall within the province of this paper to inquire whether criticism has any need to consider that the God who commissioned these prophets, and spoke by them is still the living God, and so may be a factor worth reckoning with. The practical question is, What is likely to be the effect of this sort of "criticism" upon the living, the men and women of to-day, who are here with the problem of their own destiny actually upon their hands, and who have been inclined to look to the "more sure word of prophecy" for guidance and comfort? Let us look at Dr. Smith's account of the matter again. Here it is, very simple and intelligible—mental impotence confronted with the dark problems of history brought forth Apocalypse; and Apocalypse, that is revelation, revealed—mental impotence. Now let this scholarly conception of Dr. Smith penetrate the thick heads and permeate the thinking of the slow brains of us ordinary Anglo-Saxons; let us once become firmly seized of the idea that the darkness that characterizes Apocalypse does not truly represent or represent at all the clouds and darkness which serve at one and the same time to herald the coming of Jehovah and to hide his movements; let us become fully convinced that this darkness is occasioned by the dust which has been cast up by

discomforted prophecy to hide its impotence—I say, let this idea once become firmly lodged in men's minds and what will be its effect upon their reverence for Scripture? We Anglo-Saxons have our faults and our follies, but, so far as my observation goes, homage for exposed, impudent impotence masquerading in the terrors of deity has not been one of them. Dr. Smith may, indeed, continue to write prophecy with a capital "P," and so express his personal reverence for departed greatness, but will that be sufficient to inspire a similar reverence in others?

Having glanced at Dr. Smith's conception of Apocalypse, and gotten his view of the mental measure, and the methods of the prophets of the Persian period, let us next hear what he has to say of other prophets and their prophecies. "Criticism" has made us acquainted with a prophet nowhere explicitly mentioned in Scripture—I refer to him who is commonly known as the "Second Isaiah." It has said many very gracious things of him. Dr. Driver has assured us that he uttered genuine predictions, real disclosures of what would be the course of events in the future; not in the distant future, to be sure, but still sufficiently distant to give us all the assurance that we need that the prophet spoke from the mouth of God.

It sounds a little strange, therefore, and not wholly encouraging to hear Dr. Smith say, "We must remember that Haggai and Zechariah were addressing a people to whom (whatever view we take of the transactions under Cyrus) the favor of Cyrus had been one vast disillusion in the light of the predictions of the Second Isaiah." (219.)

From this it would appear that the "Second Isaiah" of "Criticism" was so unfortunate as to awaken expectations that were not to be realized in the sphere of history. I do not mean, of course, merely that he was misinterpreted, nor does Dr. Smith. The latter would doubtless scorn such a subterfuge. I mean that, according to Dr. Smith, those

who understood his words best, and trusted to them most implicitly fared worst. Those who walked in the light of his promises, in the end awoke to the realization of the bitter truth that they had been following up an *ignis fatuus*.

And what was true of the "Second Isaiah" was true, according to Dr. Smith, of Haggai. We read in the latter, "And the word of Jehovah came a second time to Haggai on the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month, saying: Speak to Zerubbabel, Satrap of Judah, saying: I am about to shake the heavens and the earth, and I will overturn the thrones of kingdoms, and will shatter the power of the kingdoms of the Gentiles, and will overturn chariots and their riders, and horses and their riders will come down every man by the sword of his brother. In that day—oracle of Jehovah of Hosts—I will take Zerubbabel, the son of She'alti'el, My servant—oracle of Jehovah—and will make him like a signet ring; for thee have I chosen—oracle of Jehovah of Hosts."

Now upon these words Dr. Smith has the following interesting series of comments: "The wars and mutual destructions of the Gentiles of which Haggai speaks, are doubtless those revolts of races and provinces, which threatened to disrupt the Persian Empire upon the accession of Darius, 521. In four years Darius quelled them all and reorganized his empire before the Jews finished their Temple. Like all the Syrian governors, Zerubbabel remained his poor lieutenant and submissive tributary. History rolled westward into Europe. The signet-ring of Jehovah was not acknowledged by the world—does not even seem to have challenged its briefest attention. But Haggai had at least succeeded in asserting the Messianic hope of Israel, always baffled, never quenched, in this reopening of her life. He had delivered the ancient heritage of Israel to the care of the new Judaism."

I ask the reader to give both the prophecy and Dr. Smith's comment his most thoughtful attention. In regard

to the former, let him ask himself whether the prophet could have spoken with greater authority or with greater assurance? Would it have been possible for him to give in words a more vivid impression of his own conviction that he was speaking directly from the mouth of God? Could he, if he had tried, more fully have committed that God, for whom he professed to speak, to the effecting of the event predicted? And now let him ask himself whether the prophet who spoke these words could read Dr. Smith's comment without, I will not say chagrin and profound mortification, but without resentment? And why with resentment? Surely, not merely because, as a critic, Dr. Smith has felt obliged to tell the truth regardless of whose feelings may be wounded; nor merely because Dr. Smith has been pleased to assume that the words of the prophet will bear no other interpretation than one that brings them into direct and palpable conflict with the facts of history. I think that the prophet might possibly have read with a grim smile the blunt words of which the Scotch Professor makes use a little further on: "Four months had elapsed since Haggai promised that in a little while God would shake the world. But the world was not shaken." But I cannot avoid the feeling that, if the prophet possessed the slightest particle of self-respect, his indignation would have flamed out hot as he read these fine sentences—and they are very fine—in which Dr. Smith is at pains to attempt elaborately to prove that his prophecy—despite its thrice repeated "oracle of Jehovah"—was a miserable and even ridiculous fiasco.

Some one, however, may insist that while the Scotch Professor has been possibly unnecessarily elaborate in making obvious the untowardness of the prophet's utterance in this particular instance, his offence after all amounts only to a little over-indulgence in fine writing. I am aware, of course, of the fact that by his ordination vows, as well as by his occupancy of a chair in one of the Theological

Seminaries of the Free Church, Dr. Smith is committed to the position that the book of Haggai, including this oracle, is a part of the Word of God written. I am aware that, in the paragraph immediately following the one above quoted, Dr. Smith undertakes to defend Haggai against some who are disposed "to depress his value as a prophet almost to a vanishing point." Hence should Dr. Smith claim that these facts are of themselves sufficient evidence that he does entertain a due respect for the prophet, I trust that I should be the last to avail myself of his own critical methods to impeach his veracity; though anyone at all acquainted with those methods can easily see how this could be done, not only with poetic justice, but without any of the violence that characterizes Dr. Smith's application of the same methods to a writer, like the author of the book of Ezra. Admitting, then, that Dr. Smith does, doubtless, believe himself to have some sort of respect, such as it is, for Haggai, I should feel amply warranted in insisting that the manner in which he has expressed it is not at all calculated to inspire a similar sentiment in others. To stultify the prophet, and prove that the "Word of Jehovah" in his lips was but an empty phrase synonymous with the desire, and as the event proved the delusion of his own heart may not in the least interfere with Dr. Smith's reverence for the "Word of Jehovah," or his respect for the prophet who uttered it; but certainly if the above be a just exposition of the "Word of Jehovah" by Haggai, then, many will feel that they had just as well go to, let us say, Dr. Smith himself, or any of the "prophets" of his school for the "Word of Jehovah" as to Isaiah, or the "Second Isaiah," or Haggai. And he may feel quite sure that, if ever things should come to such a pass, at least one of the predictions of the "Second Zechariah" will not lack fulfillment: "And it shall come to pass, if any man prophecy again, then shall his father and mother who begat him say to him, Thou shalt not live, for thou speakest falsehood in the name of Jehovah; and his

father and his mother shall stab him for his prophecy. And it shall be in that day that the prophets shall be ashamed of their visions when they prophecy, and they shall not wear the leather cloak in order to lie." But I must pass on.

Without stopping to comment upon them individually, I shall next group together several statements from the Glasgow Professor which will throw light upon an important aspect of the matter under consideration. I mean the tone which Dr. Smith permits himself to assume towards the writers of Scripture.

Speaking of Nahum, he says, "Such is the sheer religion of the Proem to the Book of Nahum—thoroughly Oriental in its sense of God's method and resources of destruction; very Jewish, and very natural to that age of Jewish history, in the bursting of its long pent hopes of revenge. We of the West might express these hopes differently. We should not attribute so much personal passion to the Avenger. With our keener sense of law, we should emphasize the slowness of the process, and select for its illustration the forces of decay rather than those of sudden ruin. But we must remember the crashing times in which the Jews lived." (92).

Again speaking of Obadiah he indulges in this vein, "Brave, hot heart! It shall be as thou sayest; it shall be for a brief season. But in exile thy people and thou have first to learn many more things about the heathen than you can now feel. Mix with them on that far-off coast, from which thou criest. Learn what the world is, and that more beautiful and more possible than the narrow rule which thou hast promised to Israel over her neighbors shall be that world-wide service of man, of which, in fifty years, all the best of thy people shall be dreaming." (183).

Commenting upon Haggai's opening oracle, he says, "For ourselves, Haggai's appeal to the barren seasons and

poverty of the people as a proof of God's anger with their selfishness, must raise questions." (239).

Referring to Zechariah xiv, 17ff, he expresses himself thus, "But such a punishment for such a neglect shows how completely prophecy has become subject to the Law. One is tempted to think what Amos, or Jeremiah, or even 'Malachi' would have thought of this. Verily all the writers of the prophetic books did not stand upon the same level." (489).

This last, though not quite up to Dr. Smith's high grade of literary excellence, is in its way unsurpassed by anything in his book. It relieves the tension on the feelings caused by some of Dr. Smith's preceding pronouncements, and provokes a smile, not only because of the naive way in which it reveals what Dr. Smith thinks of Zechariah, but because it compels us to consider what Zechariah, or "even 'Malachi'" would think of Dr. Smith. One hardly knows which to admire more in the preceding excerpts, Dr. Smith's frank expression of appreciation of whatever of excellence he may have discerned "even in 'Malachi'"; the steadiness and steadfastness with which he asserts and maintains his own critical independence; or the very delicate but thorough way in which he performs the difficult and disagreeable task of preventing his readers from suffering damage from the mistaken notions of the prophets. And yet, much as I admire the brilliance of the Glasgow Professor, I can but question whether he is quite wise to bring himself into such painfully pointed contrast even with "Malachi." For should the poor confused people of God ever find themselves compelled to forsake "Malachi" *et id omne genus*, and take up the distressed cry, "Lord, to whom shall we go?" I can but question whether a single voice from heaven or upon the earth would be heard to reply: "To George Adam Smith."

I come next to consider a yet more important element in the prophetic writings, as it appears in the light of Dr.

Smith's criticism. I refer to the ethical temper of the prophets and the ethical content of their productions. The reader is of course cognizant of the fact that "Criticism" has assured us that even after the Scriptures, viewed as histories, have been relegated by it to the waste basket, the world will take them from there for the sake of the "grand religious stories" which they unquestionably contain. Hence it is the more discouraging to hear Dr. Smith say :

"With Nahum and Obadaiah the ethical is entirely missed in the presence of the claims—and we cannot deny that they are natural claims—of the long-suffering nation's hour of revenge upon her heathen tyrants."

And again :

"In the Greek period, the oracles now numbered from the ninth to the fourteenth chapters of the Book of Zechariah repeat to aggravation the exulting revenge of Nahum and Obadiah, without the strong style or the hold upon history which the former exhibits, and show us prophecy still further enwrapped in apocalypse."

Nor is there much to encourage in such a portrait as this :

"For this (i. e. the punishments of "the incorrigible people of Jehovah") Nahum has no thought. His heart, for all its bigness, holds room only for the bitter memories, the baffled hopes and the unappeased hatreds of a hundred years. . . . Nahum's book is one great At Last !" (90).

"And, therefore, while Nahum is a worse prophet than Zephaniah, with less conscience and less insight, he is a greater poet, pouring fourth the exultation of a people long enslaved, who see their tyrant ready for destruction." (91).

And quite unique, at least in Anglo-Saxon religious literature is the following :

"About 1030 David, about 130 the Hasmoneans, were equally at war with Edom ; and few are the prophets between those distant dates who do not cry for vengeance

against him or exult in his overthrow. The Book of Obadiah is singular in this, that it contains nothing else than such feelings and such cries. It brings no spiritual message. It speaks no word of sin, or of righteousness, or of mercy, but only doom upon Edom in bitter resentment at his cruelties and in exultation that, as he has helped to disinherit Israel, Israel shall disinherit him. Such a book among the prophets surprises us. It seems but a dark surge staining the stream of revelation, as if to exhibit through what a muddy channel these sacred waters have been poured upon the world. Is the book only an outbreak of Israel's selfish patriotism? This is the question we have to discuss in the present chapter." (178).

"It is, therefore, no mere passion for revenge, which inspires the few hot verses of Obadiah. No doubt, bitter memories rankle in his heart. He eagerly repeats the voices of a day when Israel matched Edom in cruelty and was cruel for the sake of gold, when Judah's kings coveted Esau's treasures and were foiled. No doubt there is exultation in the news he hears, that these treasures have been rifled by others; that all the cleverness of this proud people has not availed against its treacherous allies; and that it has been sent packing to its border. But beneath such savage tempers there beats a heart which has fought and suffered for the highest things, and now in its martyrdom sees them baffled and mocked by a people without vision and without feeling. Justice, mercy and truth; the education of humanity in the law of God, the establishment of His will upon earth—these things, it is true, are not mentioned in the book of Obadiah, but it is for the sake of some dim instinct of them that its wrath is poured upon those foes whose treachery and malice seek to make them impossible by destroying the one people on earth who then believed them and lived for them." (182, 3).

Let the reader remember that this last is designed by Dr. Smith to be a defense of the prophet. He follows it up

with the feeling apostrophe, "Brave, hot heart!" which we have already read. Now let us imagine the prophet Obadiah coming across it with this title, "*Apologia Pro Vita Prophetæ Abdiæ*," and ask ourselves what would probably be the prophet's feelings. These feelings would of course be no criteria as to the justice of Dr. Smith's portrait, but they will, at least, serve to bring before us the effect that the prophet would expect it to have upon his reputation wherever it found acceptance as true to life. His only consolation would be that beneath his "savage tempers," and the "dark surge" with which he stained "the sacred waters of revelation," Dr. Smith has confessed that even he could discern "some dim instinct" of the fact that, in the prophet's mind, Israel somehow stood for "Justice, mercy and truth, the education of humanity in the law of God, and the establishment of His will upon earth." I fear, however, that to many of us moderns Dr. Smith will appear to have gone beyond the bounds of a wise magnanimity in finding in this "dim instinct" a palliation, if not a justification, of the prophet in emptying upon Edom the full viols of his poisonous, personal hate.

I come now to the last point to be considered in this paper. I refer to the cavalier way in which Dr. Smith brings into suspicion, or brushes aside the veracity of the statements made by one and another of the Scripture writers. The position of critical independence which he assumes towards the statements of the Book of Kings, and the critical freedom that he employs in referring to them appears in the following passages :

"Jerusalem was delivered in 701, and the Assyrians kept away from Palestine for twenty-three years. Judah had peace, and Hezekiah was free to devote his latter days to the work of purifying the worship of his people. What he exactly achieved is uncertain. The historian imputes to him the removal of the high places, the destruction of the Maceboth and Asheras and of the brazen serpent. (5.)

"The Book of Deuteronomy forms a problem by itself. The legislation which composes the bulk of it appears to have been found among the Temple archives at the end of our period and presented to Josiah as an old and forgotten work. There is no reason to charge with fraud those who made the presentation by affirming that they really invented the book. They were priests of Jerusalem, but the book was written by members of the prophetic party, and ostensibly in the interests of the priests of the country." (10.)

What Hezekiah really did, in the present state of his information, Dr. Smith does not care positively to say. He deems it sufficient and safest to indicate that "the historian *imputes*" certain changes to him. And so as to the real purpose of the members of "the prophetic party" in writing Deuteronomy, Dr. Smith leaves it to his readers to surmise, if they can, what this purpose was. He contents himself by throwing out, as it were, a note of warning, to the effect that it was written "*ostensibly* in the interests of the country priests," that is, the country priests as opposed to the priests of Jerusalem.

Those at all familiar with the trend of current criticism will be prepared for Dr. Smith's critical reserve in reference to the Chronicler. It comes out not obscurely in such language as this :

"What grounds the Chronicler had for such a statement are quite unknown to us. He introduces Manasseh's captivity as the consequence of idolatry, and asserts that on his restoration Manasseh abolished in Judah all worship save that of Jehovah, but if this happened (and the Book of Kings has no trace of it) it was without result." (11.)

His estimate of the historicity of portions of the matter found in Ezra may be gathered from the following : "This last assertion, which of course was false, may have been due either to a misunderstanding of the Jewish elders by the reporting Satrap, or else to the Jews themselves, anxious to make their case as strong as possible. The

latter is a more probable alternative." No one, I think, should object to a spade's being called a spade. Hence it would be mere squeamishness to stumble at Dr. Smith's word "false," seeing that the "assertion" to which it is applied is unquestionably false. But I must confess that I cannot regard it as generous in Dr. Smith first gratuitously to construct the words of the record into a falsehood, and then gratuitously to put this falsehood into the mouths of the elders of the Jews. It will be observed that his reasoning is something like this: "This statement, as I have now found it, may very well be a deliberate falsehood, rather than a mere misunderstanding, hence it is, under all the circumstances, probable that it is a falsehood." It was this sort of "judicial" impartiality which gave to the "bloody Jeffries" his great distinction among Jurists. If such criticism does not secure for Dr. Smith a similar distinction among critics, it will only be because it is his misfortune to be exercising his function at a time when this style of criticism, so far from being exceptional, is quite the rule.

The following will be found to be in the same vein: "On these grounds, therefore, we must hold that the attempt to discredit the tradition of an important return of exiles under Cyrus has not been successful; that such a return remains the more probable solution of an obscure and difficult problem, and that therefore the Jews who with Zerubbabel and Joshua are represented in Haggai and Zechariah as building the Temple in the second year of Darius, 520, had come up from Babylon about 537. *Such a conclusion, of course, need not commit us to the various data offered by the Chronicler in his story of the Return, such as the Edict of Cyrus, nor to all his details.* (The italics are mine.)

It will be observed here that Dr. Smith distinctly refuses to commit himself to "the various data offered by the Chronicler in his story of the Return, such as the Edict of Cyrus," and "to all of his details." Of course every man's

first duty is to his own reputation. Hence no one can blame a person occupying Professor Smith's high position for having a care how he lends the influence of his name to loose and unhistorical statements from whatever source they may proceed—even though that source be the author of one of the books of the Bible. And yet, it must be obvious to all that just in proportion as Dr. Smith gains credit for discrimination by this off-hand, matter of course disclaimer, just in that proportion must the credit of the *Chronicler* suffer. It is much to be regretted that Dr. Smith felt compelled to assume such a position. It looks like a claim either to superior information or to superior morals. Of course, if Dr. Smith has detected the *Chronicler* in falsifying the truth of history, then he is rather to be praised than blamed for having had the love of truth that inclined him to investigate the case, the candor that enabled him to admit the weight of the evidence, and the courage that sustained him in announcing his conclusion. But, even then, it would have added immeasurably to the moral weight of his judgment could Professor Smith have seen his way clear to surrender a commission that requires him to teach that the Book of Chronicles is the Word of God, to say nothing of the stipend that is usually supposed to attach to the faithful discharge of this commission. The Scotch Professor can hardly be ignorant of the fact that when one appears in court to discredit the statements of even the humblest of his fellow-citizens, it is of prime importance to the full effect of his testimony that the jury should have no grounds to suspect that his own mind is at all beclouded as to the binding obligation of an oath.

This, however, is only one aspect of the case. There is another which even a man of Professor Smith's courage would have done well to consider, if for no other reason, at least out of regard for the interests of the truth, which he holds so dear, though it has cost him so little. The consideration referred to connects itself with the phrase "of

course" which falls so lightly and easily from the Glasgow Professor's pen. It is possible to conceive of a really loyal son whose love of truth would enable him, rising superior to all merely natural, filial instincts, sorrowfully but faithfully and unflinchingly to sift the evidence that was to impeach the chastity of the mother that nurtured him at her breasts, and whose courageous candor would enable him to admit its weight even though it broke his heart. But a son who had been pursuing such investigations, and who, moved by the love of truth, meditated giving his conclusions to the public, would act in a very ill-advised manner should he do it in any such terms as these: "That my honored mother was a woman of substantial chastity, I am prepared to maintain against all gainsayers, though, of course, she had her occasional lapses and liaisons." For, as is only too obvious, the brutal callousness of such an "of course" would be more damning to the fair name of the son than of the mother—even though she were an harlot.

Such, then, is the attitude and such the tone which Dr. Smith, a Professor, be it observed, in the Free Church College, Glasgow, permits himself, and is permitted by his ecclesiastical superiors to assume towards the Scripture writers and writings. He does not hesitate, as we have seen, to describe the prophets of the entire Persian period as a set of mental incompetents, but with enough of a certain immoral shrewdness to attempt to hide their incapacity by enveloping the future in what he is pleased to characterize as "the lurid air of Apocalypse." He does not hesitate to picture Isaiah, Haggai, and others of the prophets as using the solemn formula, "oracle of Jehovah" as a means of securing currency and credit for what were in reality oracles out of the desire and delusion, if not the positive and impudent deceit of their own hearts. While crediting Obadiah, and others of the prophets, with "some dim instinct" of the fact that somehow or somehow his people were no less than the hinge of destiny, he does not hesitate to make

it appear that the real inspiration under which the language of his "oracle of Jehovah" was framed was that of a bitter personal hate, and—last, lowest, bitterest depth of the prophet's humiliation—he does not hesitate to apostrophize him, to applaude him, "damning with faint praise," and ostentatiously to patronize him, making even for his book a place in these goodly "oracles of God." He does not hesitate gratuitously to impugn the veracity of Scripture persons, and to bring the taint of an unjust suspicion upon the veracity of the Scripture writers themselves.

It is not my purpose to indulge in any useless lamentations over this state of things. I have no unavailing protest to make against handling God's holy Word with profane hands. The Master whom we serve, when told on a certain occasion that the Pharisees were criticising his words, experienced no spasm of weak fear, but said with a certain dignified and properly understood, even awful composure: "Let them alone. They be blind leaders of the blind." And again, when these same Pharisees had asked with incredulous contempt: "Are we also blind?" answered: "If ye were blind, ye would have no sin; but now ye say: We see; your sin remaineth." We cannot do more wisely than to note these words of our Master and shape by them our attitude towards those who professing to be "critics," that is, judges, of the written Word, shape their procedure by precedents borrowed from the Courts of Caiaphas, Herod and Pontius Pilate—judges, who, having a case to prove, wisely manipulated some evidence, and manufactured more, and who between them managed to heap upon the Incarnate Word the incongruous indignities, if indignities can be incongruous, of undisguised rejection of his claims, mock reverence for his claims, and misplaced condescension towards the real excellencies of his much misunderstood and misrepresented character, which condescending, weak defense availed as little to deliver Christ from the malice of his enemies as it has availed to deliver

him who uttered it from the condemnation and contempt of posterity.

I say again that I have neither complaint nor protest to make against these "reverent Christian scholars" who now stand to the front. I note their procedure, by which is meant their manner of applying certain methods and principles to concrete cases, merely to say that intelligent students of God's Word, who are able to restrain a certain righteous, fiery indignation and push through a volume like this, will find themselves repaid by laying it down with a deeper sense of the reality of Scripture persons and their experiences, and with a livelier sense also of the preciousness of Scripture, and—of the long-suffering of God.

Columbia, S. C.

W. M. MCPHEETERS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

R. C. REED.

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

[Inaugural Address. Columbia Seminary.]

¹VI. THE ATTITUDE OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, SOUTH, TOWARD MODERN "REGENERATED" THEOLOGY.

In the year 1810, Frederick William III, of Prussia, founded the University of Berlin. Whether the King had been influenced by his political troubles and reverses, or had been subdued by the sorrowful death of the universally beloved Queen, which occurred that year, it is certain that he had come to the conclusion that if a government would permanently prosper it must have its foundation, not merely in military power, but in the intellectual, moral, and religious culture of its people. The old University of Leipsic, established in 1409, had just passed its four hundredth anniversary; the University of Bonn, founded by the Maximilian Frederick, had not yet attained its quarter of a century mile-post, and was to be greatly enlarged by Frederick William III. in 1818. The new University of Berlin at once took its stand prominently along side its older competitors, the youngest, freshest, and, in some respects, the strongest of the three. Into it swept the waters of philosophical and religious thought which had their springs in writers of the centuries of the past, especially of the preceeding two hundred years; out of it emerged the streams, bold but by no means clear, which to this day are mingling with the Revelation of God, with

¹The article embodies the substance of an address delivered before the Alumni Association of Columbia Theological Seminary, who adopted the following resolution: "Having heard with sincere pleasure the able, instructive and entertaining address of the Rev. Dr. Eugene Daniel, 'Resolved, That we hereby express to Dr. Daniel our high appreciation of and sincere thanks for this timely address, and that we request him to furnish a copy of the same to the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY for publication.'" The address was delivered before it was written. It is given for substance.

obscuring and contaminating power. The University of Berlin became at once a reservoir and a fountain. As preliminary to the matter of this article, it will be interesting to recall to memory some of the writers whose thoughts this university has attracted; and then, some whose peculiar views it has originated, developed and sent forth into the Theological world of the nineteenth century. This simple process will give conclusive suggestion as to the origin of that which Professor Dorner has called "Regenerated" Theology.

I. INTRODUCTORY.

For the purpose of this article, our preliminary survey need extend no further backward than to the fourth decade of the seventeenth century.

In the year 1632, at Amsterdam, began a life which was to have the brief duration of only forty-five years, the influence of which will probably live as long as thought lives. Spinoza was a Jew. His people excommunicated and anathematized him. Poor, he polished lenses and wrote books. Exiled from Amsterdam, he fled to The Hague, studied on and wrote on, until he became so eminent that he had the honor of declining the Professorship of Philosophy at Heidelberg. His study was to him the world, and he gave time, health and possible wealth, for the privacy of his chamber and the luxury of uninterrupted, severe thought. As a Jew, his philosophical speculation could not but move in the atmosphere of Traditional Revelation. Spinoza could not write philosophy and fail to write of religion. He wrote both and joined them in wedlock.

There were three things in Spinoza's system which took mighty sweep.

First, he made religion to be essentially feeling, the love of God; while doctrines belong to Philosophy. Second, he held that the facts of the Bible are highly colored by its writers and that it is of first importance to distinguish

between the fact and its coloring ; or, as the modern critic develops the thought, that the Bible must be read with great "discrimination." Third, the heart and soul of Spinoza's Philosophical and Religious System was Pantheism. Of course it is not affirmed that this most fascinating of all erroneous forms of belief found in Spinoza an originator. It is more than probable that Pantheism in one or another of its Protean shapes, arises spontaneously in the human soul, the shadowy distortion of truths made ghosts by sin and sin's darkening of the understanding; entering into every false religion on the globe. Even within the Christian Church, the plausible error found unmistakable expression in Scotus Erigena as early as the ninth century. But whilst all this is true, it is certain that Spinoza's mystical mind and patiently-brooding thought gave to Pantheism its widest and most powerful exhibition. With these three things in his hand, namely: (1) Feeling in Religion; (2) A Bible of Suspected Historicity, and (3) Pantheism, Spinoza will one day knock at the door of the University of Berlin. We shall see who will bid him enter.

Meanwhile, passing over a period of nearly fifty years from the death of Spinoza, we find ourselves at the birth-date of another philosopher whose genius and learning have left their impress upon nearly all the systems of the succeeding years. This was "the Sage of Konigsberg."

Immanuel Kant was born in 1724. It is said that during his long life of nearly eighty years, he never travelled farther than forty miles from his native city of Konigsberg. His father of Scotch descent and his mother German, he inherited the strict morality of the former and the simple frugality and thrift of the latter. Of slight and frail physique, one shoulder carried higher than the other, he stood while lecturing in the University of Konigsberg as one transfixed, his gaze fastened upon some one student, and his utterance sometimes, especially when discoursing of the sublimity of the "Categorical Imperative," vehement

and inspired. The "Critique of Pure Reason" was published in 1781; that of the "Practical Reason," in 1788. The literary atmosphere was then full of skeptical poison. Berkeley had published in 1710 his "Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge." Hume's "Natural History of Religion" had been issued in 1757. Gibbon had sent the first volume of his "Decline and Fall" to Hume about the year 1776. Voltaire had spent the years between 1750 and 1753 in Berlin, enjoying royal favor as the companion of the King. Paine's "Age of Reason" was to come forth in 1795. Kant wrote avowedly under the stimulus of a keen desire to confute the fallacies of Hume. It is well known that his "Pure Reason" but intensified the alarm it was intended to allay. The "Practical Reason" in large measure restored the confidence which Rationalistic negation had so much weakened. But from first to last, Christianity to Kant was but a system of transcendental moralism. Out of inborn faith in Duty, sprang faith in God, by whom devotion to duty must be rewarded. Original sin was accounted for by the hypothesis of an anti-mundane existence. The sole punishment of sin is that of its natural consequences. To be saved, we must undergo a "total revolution" which, however, need not be the fruit of any supernatural grace. Christ in his person symbolizes a reconciliation between man and God, effected through repentance, and Christ, in the Scriptures, represents "the agony of repentance."

Out of all this speculation of Kant, three things may be noted and borne in mind: (1) His contention that the essence of the Christian religion lies in rationalistic moralism; (2) his vague and peculiar allegorizing about Christ as being "the agony of repentance;" (3) his Soteriology, found in a reconciliation, of which penitence is the sole and exclusive basis. These things we shall meet, with modification, at another stage of this discussion.

Kant died just six years before the University of Berlin

was opened. But his philosophy had already been expounded in that city, and all the leading minds of Germany were acknowledging its power. No writer, either of metaphysics or of ethics, or of theology, can afford to ignore Immanuel Kant.

One of Kant's personal acquaintances and devoted adherents was Fichte, who died in Berlin in 1814. As is so often the case, the disciple went beyond the master, for Fichte pushed some of Kant's principles to extreme results. Says Dr. Noah Porter :

"Fichte accepted literally the principle of Kant that the forces of the concept are the products of the understanding, and applied it with logical rigor to its appropriate consequences, viz.: that *all the so-called forms of knowledge*, as contrasted with its matter, are furnished by the mind's own creative activity. * * Fichte would make the individual dependent upon the concept, at least for its form. Upon this theory the whole question respecting the relation of the concept to the individual object becomes entirely changed. Individual objects are themselves individualized concepts. Real things are the creations of the mind. The concept itself becomes an entity," etc.

Another writer describes the salient feature of Fichte's philosophy as follows :

"What Fichte attempts to prove is simply this : that between objects as they appear to human conception and as they actually are, there is no real difference since the forms of human cognition are identical with the action of the absolute intellect : that objects are the limit set by the absolute within itself in order to arrive at self-consciousness : that the absolute is at the same time subject and object, the ideal and the real. Reduced to plainer language all this would mean that God (the absolute subject, the great active and creative 'I') and nature (the 'Not I,' the aggregate of objects) are united in a similar manner as soul and body ; that the absolute intellect pervades all and

everything, and that the human mind is an integral part of the absolute intellect."

These quotations will show that Fichte, in the development of the thought of the time, should have no mean position. In him the theories of Spinoza and of Kant plainly converge and unite. The result is a sort of rationalistic and mystical pantheism.

It needs only to be added that Fichte was made professor in the University of Berlin immediately upon its establishment in 1810.

The next potent personality to be noticed in these introductory references is Schelling, who was born in 1775 and lived until 1854. Before this man was twenty years old, whilst he was yet a student at Tübingen, his power of thought began to attract the attention of learned men. His earlier writings established for him a reputation for mystical pantheism, which his subsequent modifications of them failed to remove. Not dwelling upon these, nor pausing to call more than passing attention to his well-known doctrines of indifference and identity, of immediate and intuitive cognition of the absolute, it is more important to fix in memory that in Schelling begins to emerge that doctrine of Christ which his contemporaries and successors are to modify, partially reject, and yet largely develop. If Principal Fairbairn properly presents Schelling, the similarity of the views of that philosopher to the teaching of many modern theologians is too striking to escape attention:

"The eternal Son of God, born from the essence of the Father of all things, is the finite itself as it exists in the eternal intuition of God, appearing as a suffering God, subjected to the fatalities of time; and this God, in the moment of his appearance in Christ, ends the world of finitude and opens that of infinitude, or of the dominion of the Spirit. The universalism of this truth is confirmed by the presence of the idea in religions before and without the

Christian, yet in forms that may be termed immanent as really present though imperfectly realized and prophetic, as looking towards a more perfect realization. And as universal, it is eternal, and so independent of all questions as to whether certain books be genuine or spurious, or certain histories are real or imagined. Christianity, as speculative and transcendental, must never be confounded with a series of empirical facts."

That sounds familiar! And the following also:

"The Spirit has its Iliad, its tale of struggle with brutal and natural forces, and then its Odyssey, when out of its painful wanderings, it returns to the Infinite. This is accomplished by a double act: on the one side, of revelation—God shows his heart, which is love; on the other side, of discovery—man sees it and surrenders freely his particular to the universal will. But in order to this, a Mediator in human form is necessary, 'For only the personal can heal the personal, and God must become man in order that man may come again to God.' He becomes man in the Archetypal Divine Man, who as in the beginning with God, is by his nature the highest peak or apex of the Divine Revelation. By this man, nature is transfigured to Spirit and God becomes a personal and intelligent Being. But who is this archetypal man? It can only be Christ but Christ conceived not as an individual, but as universal, ideal man; what is true only of collective humanity cannot be limited to the historical individual, though without this individual, the truth could not have come to be known. To conceive and embrace the ideal principle is to be incorporated with Christ, to be of his community, realizing his unity of nature and Spirit, participant, as it were, in his incarnation. His history thus ceases to be single and empirical, and becomes universal, the history of a Divine Spirit so incorporating itself with humanity as to organize it into a great body whose head is Christ. History conceived from this point becomes in con-

sequence of Christ, as it were, *the progressive incarnation of God.*" (Italics mine.)

Let the reader study this quotation. If in it Professor Fairbairn accurately sets forth the views of Schelling, it is very plain that this philosopher stands amongst the first who have "regenerated" the new Theology. Schelling was a Professor in the University of Berlin with royal favor and with renown in 1841, having written his "Philosophy and Religion" in 1804.

As in the case of Schelling, so in respect to Hegel, it is unnecessary that these passing references should dwell at all upon that which is best known as fundamental in his system—his Pantheism. The difference between Spinoza and Hegel is one of particulars. Spinoza made prominent one substance, with its two attributes of extension and thought, out of which, respectively, grew materialistic and intellectual Pantheism. Hegel made prominent this one substance as subject, and gave us a Pantheism more definitely spiritualized. But Pantheism was the basis of the philosophy of both. And with this so generally known, we may with Hegel, as with Schelling, pass to a specific development of Pantheism bearing directly upon the Christian religion.

Hegel put emphasis upon the theory that God, in order to self-consciousness, must objectify himself; must be externally sinking his infinite in the finite, and then returning into himself again, as in an endless process. Out of this grew Hegel's thought of the Incarnation thus described by Dorner :

"Hegel, like Schelling, recognizes the idea of the Divine incarnation as the central point of Christianity; but this incarnation is conceived as an eternal incarnation, so that, as an eternal occurrence and occurring, it nevertheless expresses nothing but the eternal metaphysical relation between God and humanity, which is conceived as a unity of essence; only that *there exists a difference in the stages*

of the consciousness of this ever-existing and eternally similar unity of essence in God and man. With the historic side of Christianity and with the Person of Christ himself, this whole standpoint so endeavors to square accounts that it strives to trace lines of connection between the empire of eternal truths and the historic Christ, *in order to unite the two somehow in our consciousness or faith.* (Italics mine.) * * * His is the first man in whom the consciousness has arisen of the actually existent unity of essence between God and man, and at the same time the consciousness of Divine relationship or Sonship, unmistakably combined with a power which kindles the same consciousness in humanity, and awakens within it *consciousness of its real nature.*" (Italics mine).

This, according to Dorner, is Hegel, and the Later Pantheistic Soteriology. Hegel was in the University of Berlin, first for eleven years as Professor of Philosophy and for two years as Rector of the University. He died suddenly of cholera in 1831.

Spinoza, Kant, Schelling and Hegel (not to mention Jacobi) have thus poured into the young university the streams of mingled Pantheism, Rationalism, Moralism, Transcendentalism, and Mysticism.

Let us next treat this reservoir as a fountain of Theological Doctrine. What teachers and what teaching has it sent forth?

Obviously, a beginning must be made with the first Professor of Theology that the University ever knew. This was Schleiermacher.

It is no part of the purpose of this paper to disparage the greatness of this wonderful man. His varied talents were tried in many directions, and failed in none. Born the son of a Reformed minister (a chaplain), at fifteen years of age he was placed in a Moravian school; at seventeen, in a Moravian college, and at nineteen he entered the University of Halle, where he completed a two

years' course. His twenty-first year found him with no fixed religious opinions; but at twenty-six he took orders, and at twenty-eight he became chaplain of the Charity Hospital in Berlin, serving in that position for six years. At the age of thirty-six, he became Professor of Philosophy and Theology in the University of Halle; and at forty-two we find him pastor of Trinity church and Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. Both these positions he continued to hold until his death, twenty-four years afterward.

At an early age, Schleiermacher studied, unto thorough assimilation, Spinoza, Kant and Fichte. He absorbed Plato whom he translated so well as to acquire for himself an extensive reputation as a master of Greek. He attached himself to what was called the Romantic School of Poetry.

Slight in form, stooping and even hump-backed, his eye was magnetic, his countenance was noble and full of intellectuality and benignity, and his movements were quick, as his manner was polished and winning. His power as a writer is said to have been even surpassed by his fluency and eloquence as a speaker. There must have been in him much that was lovable as to personal character and devout as to Christian spirit. Dr. Charles Hodge writes of him :

"When in Berlin the writer often attended Schleiermacher's church. The hymns to be sung were printed on slips of paper and distributed at the doors. They were always evangelical and spiritual in an eminent degree, filled with praise and gratitude to our Redeemer. Tholuck said that Schleiermacher, when sitting in the evening would often say: 'Hush, children, let us sing a hymn of praise to Christ.'"

This man, so superbly educated, so lovable in personality, so devout in his "passion for Christ," is now in the very center of philosophical speculations. Deism and atheism and all the fine-spun theories and sophistries of

the opening nineteenth century crowd around the chair of the Professor of Theology in this most conspicuous and potent place in all Germany. What shall be his message to a waiting world in the hour of its great spiritual birth-throes? Others have spoken as philosophers. What shall Schleiermacher speak as a theological interpreter of the Revelation of God?

The sad fact is that this man, with this splendid opportunity, yielded at once to rationalistic assaults upon the Bible. He refused to demand for that Book recognition as the inspired Word of God. The line was sharply drawn between human speculation and the Scriptures. Schleiermacher consented that the Scriptures had gone down.

Next, groping for an extra-Scriptural revelation, our theologian accepted one furnished him by the speculations of Idealism which he had so thoroughly absorbed. This revelation was human consciousness in general, but, specifically, Christian consciousness.

Schleiermacher did not reason to God from the contents of consciousness as to the intellect. Religion, to him, had nothing to do with doctrine. Nor did he follow Kant in emphasizing the moral consciousness as demanding that there must be a God. For Schleiermacher, religion was a matter of feeling—the universally conscious feeling of dependence upon God. "It was the immediate consciousness of the being of everything finite in the infinite, and through the infinite; of everything temporal in the eternal and through the eternal: it was to feel amid all action and suffering our very life as life only as it was in and through God." This feeling was both personal and collective; and so there was a personal consciousness and a collective consciousness.

Specifically, Christianity in all necessary aspects was not a Bible, not a doctrine, not a cultus, but a life, attested to by a specific consciousness of which Christ's consciousness was the archetype and God the Creator. In religion, the

all-important thing is the Christian consciousness. In the Saviour, the all-important matter is not what he has done, but what he is. The life infused into men by a creative act as to Christ develops itself by a natural process "which is to end in the full actualization of the Divine life in the form of humanity."

This is sufficient to show (1) that Schleiermacher's Theology, while earnestly seeking originality, is largely composite, the Theologian breathing unconsciously the very vital air of Spinoza, Kant, Fichte and Schelling; (2) that here is a source sufficiently large and full and bold to send out many streams of the "Regenerated" Theology.

It may seem not gracious, in any tracing of the literary development of the Regenerated Theology, to assign any prominent place to David Friedrich Strauss. The simple fact is, however, that one, at least, of the very ablest advocates of this Theology has given him such a position. This is Principal Fairbairn. This able author of "Christ in Modern Theology," whilst not approving Strauss in general, acknowledges to some extent his contribution to the new Theology.

And the debt to Strauss is far larger than even Principal Fairbairn would be disposed to admit. Through him, Berlin began to pour forth the waters of "Criticism."

It must not be forgotten that Strauss commenced life as a theologian. He was, in fact, educated at Tübingen. When scarcely twenty-three years of age, he went to Berlin to sit at the feet of Hegel and Schleiermacher. Soon afterward Hegel died, but not without giving an impress and impulse to the keen young student which developed into the lectures in the Hegelian Philosophy, afterward delivered in the University of Tübingen. But whether Strauss owed more to Hegel or to Schleiermacher may be questioned. The lectures of the latter aroused an interest and a semi-opposing activity which found result in "The Life of Jesus."

All things considered, one cannot be surprised that Strauss treated the Bible with so little respect. Had not the Masters of Philosophy done it? Had not the most able and prominent theologian admitted that he found little use for it? Had not the cry been "Back to Christ," but, not through the Word? "To Christ," indeed, but through a pantheistic philosophy, through an almost Deified, immanent Christ-consciousness: a mystical life-force, an energizing incarnation. It is a positive relief to find at last that somebody has some use for at least some part of the Bible.

The method of Strauss was simple and direct. Like those who had gone before him, he took the liberty of excogitating his own plan. Substantially, there were but four steps: 1. Frame a hypothesis. 2. Adapt the Bible to it. 3. Annihilate all the Bible that cannot be adapted. 4. Use as your weapon radical, destructive criticism.

Unconsciously, it may be, but not the less certainly, the general progress of the higher criticism has been along those four steps. The hypotheses may not be the same in all cases. The methods of adaptation or of destruction may be diversified. The extent and freedom of the critical spirit may differ in different writers. But the four steps indicated are solidly built into the fabric of the higher criticism, and the regenerated theology is a compound of the philosophy of Spinoza, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, the theology of Schleiermacher and the essential principles of the destructive criticism of Strauss.

Other writers to be embraced in these literary references are so near to us that they may be dismissed with brief but significant mention in a single paragraph.

Baur was an admirer first of Schleiermacher and then of Hegel. His relation to Strauss was at one time that of teacher to pupil. His theory as father of the Tübingen school is known to all. Dr. Charles Hodge studied at Berlin when he was about thirty years of age. He had

then served in the Seminary at Princeton as instructor for two years and as professor for four years. His theological grounding was already complete. He met error only to give it the strong refutation found in his superb systematic theology. Principal Fairbairn, of Mansfield (Congregational) College at Oxford, Gifford Lecturer in the University of Aberdeen and Late Muir Lecturer in the University of Edinburgh, was also a student in the University of Berlin. His "Studies in the Philosophy of Religion and History" was published in 1876. His "Christ in Modern Theology," issued in 1890, will be treated in this article as the most thorough and articulate statement of the new theology that this school has produced within the writer's knowledge. Fairbairn's influence upon Bruce is apparent in Bruce's Apologetics. Professor Charles A. Briggs and Dr. Henry J. Van Dyke were both students at Berlin, each at the age of about twenty-five. References to the writings of Dr. Van Dyke will be made further in this article.

With the aid of these writers, let us now see if we can determine what the "Regenerated" Theology is.

II. THE REGENERATED THEOLOGY.

The term "Regenerated," as applied to Theology, is Dorner's. Dr. Hodge says that Dorner uses it in such a connection as to show that he means that Theology has been regenerated by Schelling, Hegel and Schleiermacher. Its broad distinctiveness is found in its claim that it is Christo-Centric. With great insistence, its advocates tell us that everything must be tested and determined by the consciousness of Christ. To the very natural question, as to how the Christ-consciousness is to be ascertained, the reply is vague and confused. It seems to be settled that the sayings of Christ are to be regarded as of paramount authority; yet, as to the genuineness even of these as reported in the Gospels, there is room for large difference of opinion and for the exercise of much critical discrim-

ination ; for, as Professor Bruce candidly tells us, modern scholarship has pretty generally settled that some of the Evangelists marvelously "idealize" and very "freely report" the sayings of Christ. This necessarily leaves us in a state of confusion and indecision as to what the "mind of the Master" really is. If we ask, where can the Christ-consciousness be found ? we are told, in the Christ-teaching. If we ask, how can the teaching be tested ? the reply is, by its fidelity to the Christ-consciousness. And so we seem to go round the circle.

Upon one thing, however, there is essential agreement, namely : that if genuine, the teaching of Christ is of far greater value and authority than any that the Holy Ghost may give us through any of the inspired writers of the Bible. The extent to which this comparison is made and this disparagement carried is simply shocking. Professor Fairbairn says :

"One thing is now beginning to stand out with a perfectly new distinctness, viz., the degree in which the mind of the Master transcends the minds of the disciples ; not the way they develop his teaching, but how they fail to do it ; the elements they miss, or ignore, forget, or do not see."

The apostles are represented as exhibiting a "falling off ;" as having a "more outward, less intimate," conception of God ; of "having lost, also, in some measure at least, the idea of the kingdom with all it implies to the human brotherhood, which expresses the Divine Sonship."

Similarly, in his Apologetics, writes Dr. Bruce : "It is the business of Theology to determine the affinities between the Galilean and the Pauline Gospel, but it is the privilege of religious faith to enter into life by the door which Jesus has opened, without stopping to try whether Paul's key fits the lock. The words of Jesus are words of eternal life, and no truth not spoken by him can be essential to salvation, however upbuilding to faith. His teaching contains in the smallest measure a local and temporary element."

And so Dr. Van Dyke: "How often Jesus quoted from the Old Testament to show that it was already old and insufficient: that its forms of spirit and rules of conduct were like the husk of the seed which must be shattered by the emergence of the living germ."

But Dr. Watson (Ian Maclaren) is "very bold." He calls the destruction of the Canaanites at God's command a "massacre." He says that the "Ten Words are only eclipsed by the Law of Love." He compares the words of Jesus with the writings of St. Paul and says "it must surely strike any one that the Apostle is less than his Master: that Paul's style is at times overwrought by feeling; that his illustrations are forced; that his doctrine is often Rabbinical rather than Christian, his ascetical treatment of certain subjects somewhat wanting in sweetness."

But now, with nearly all the Bible closed against us, except the sayings of Christ, and many of these sayings under dispute and doubt, we ask these modern writers to tell us: what is the Theology that this consciousness of Christ, so dubiously discovered, has so clearly revealed to them?

1. What does the Regenerated Theology teach as to the Bible?

How confused is the reply! Schelling, Hegel and Schleiermacher who, according to Dorner, are the fathers of the regeneration, say that the Bible is wholly unnecessary. Philosophy or a Christian consciousness, a collective religious experience, can give us all we need. Wherefore then serveth the Bible? But the Higher Criticism modifies this sweeping all-destructiveness. It is error to hold that all the Bible must go. It is equal mistake to claim that all the Bible may stay. "Inspiration" is a term of very broad significance. Inspired men, in greater or less degree, may be found wherever the "immanent" "God-human" Christ may be found, everywhere, at sundry times.

As to the Books of the Old Testament, Jesus gave them

no comprehensive and authoritative approval as God's Word. He denounced some of them with vigor. The whole Levitical code was to him detestable Rabbinical Pharisaism. As Professor Bruce puts the matter, Jesus taught us to read the Old Testament with "discrimination"—that is, with suspicion, ending often in rejection. Dörner teaches that the Bible is historically accurate only in so far as may be necessary to protect the essential revelation, the writer being liable to error in minor matters of fact. Professor Marcus Dods, of the Free Church College in Edinburgh, in the first chapter of his work on Genesis, takes even more freedom. Professor George Adam Smith, of the Free Church College, Glasgow, in his delightful and in many respects most instructive and suggestive work in *Isaiah*—a work written in fine style and with fascinating interest—tells us in no uncertain way what he and his school believe as to Prophetical inspiration. He says :

"To *Isaiah*, inspiration was neither more nor less than the possession of certain strong moral and religious convictions, which he felt he owed to the Spirit of God, and according to which he interpreted, and even dared foretell the history of his people, and of the world," * * "*Isaiah* prophesied and predicted all he did from loyalty to two simple truths, which he tells us he received from God himself: that sin must be punished and that the people of God must be saved. This simple faith, acting along with a wonderful knowledge of human nature and ceaseless vigilance of affairs, constituted inspiration for *Isaiah*. * * *Judah* shall be punished, *Israel* shall continue to exist. These were the certainties deduced from the laws. But for the exact conditions and forms, both of the punishment and of its relief, the prophets depended upon their knowledge of the world, of which, as these pages testify, they were the keenest and largest hearted observers that ever appeared."

These modern Theologians are thus shown to have for the Bible an exceedingly attenuated inspiration. Their

canonicity is entirely unsettled. The results of Radical Criticism are accepted with more or less general consent as the returns from the latest discoveries are made. Their Bible is appropriately in polychromic printing, its historicity doubted, its ethical integrity openly impugned by themselves; the very method by which its alleged composite authorship has been produced is admitted to be the product of men and times and processes of crude morality." It is simple justice to say that the Regenerated Theology has no definite Bible at all. The whole relation of the unsystematic system to the Scriptures is an illustration of the law which Dr. Van Dyke lays down for Theological guidance: "Definition is dangerous."

2. What does the Regenerated Theology teach as to God? The answer to this question must lead us to uncover that which is urged as the regulative principle of the whole system. This, as is well known, is the Divine Fatherhood. However slightly Professor Watts may speak of Professor Fairbairn's elaboration of this theory, it is certain that the book, "Christ in Modern Theology," is written with subtle and fascinating power, and is an able and well wrought presentation of the doctrine under consideration.

The strength of the whole theory lies in a plausible and forceful speculation as to the God-head. The consciousness of Christ shows us Fatherhood and Sonship in the God-head, and the Fatherhood of God has a far higher and more comprehensive meaning than that God is the Father of the human race. Let us follow Professor Fairbairn in the earliest points of his discussion.

First a distinction is made between God and God-head. "God is Deity conceived in relation, over against the universe; * * but the God-head is Deity conceived according to his own nature, as he is from and within himself." The doctrine of the God-head must be revealed. When revealed, it can be made the basis of a doctrine of God.

This Revelation comes through the consciousness of Christ. This shows us Fatherhood and Sonship as eternal and essential in the God-head. "Fatherhood is the essence of God, therefore Sonship is the same ; and both are realized in the only forms and under the only conditions possible where God is concerned—outside or above the categories of time and space, where all distinctions of here and there, before and after, alike cease."

Again, Christ becomes the son of man because he is the Son of God. "The filial relation to man is the temporal form of the eternal relation to God." As the ideal son of man, Christ embodies humanity, which has existed before the mind and heart of God as Son from all eternity. God is thus conditioned in his own Being. It is of his essence to be related and to be conditioned by Fatherhood and Sonship. Hence, it is of his essence to love and to create and provide for sons whom he can love, and who can love him. God does not love because he creates ; he creates because he loves. This love is a "passion to create happiness, active and exercised." It presupposes a moral being for its object. Nature is but God's instrument, a medium between the Father and his sons. His delight is in his children. His good-will as the eternal Father had no beginning, and will have no end.

Thus in the new Theology, God's Fatherhood and Love are everything. The Divine sovereignty is not judicial or regal but patriarchal. Divine justice is never retributive or vindictory but always remedial and disciplinary and reformatory. God's attributes of omnipotence and omniscience and omnipresence are so far secondary that in the Incarnate Son they may be temporarily laid aside. Divine holiness is but another name for Fatherly love. In the new terminology, the omnipresence of God becomes the Divine immanence. The universal and necessary Fatherhood sweeps the whole field of Divine and human being. Says Dr. Watson :

"With this single word, 'Father,' Jesus instantly defines the relation of man to God, and illuminates Theology. He transfers the Divine idea from the schools, where they discuss the sovereignty of God, to the hearth, where the little children say 'Our Father' with understanding. * * What an astounding *gaucherie* it has been to state the intimate relation between God and the soul in the language of criminal law, with bars, prisoners, sentences. * * Take it at the highest it was the spirit of Moses."

3. We next pass to an exhibition of some of the peculiar features of this Theology as it respects Christology.

The doctrine of the incarnation as held by this school is almost paramount. It is entirely probable that many amongst us have failed to note the significance of certain constantly recurring phrases, such as "A Personal Christ," the "Historic Christ," "*the* Christ." It is not difficult, however, to make this significance manifest.

According to Schleiermacher, the personal Christ was immanent as a life-force in the Church and in the world. This did not mean the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, but of the Christ in his own proper personality. And after Schleiermacher, almost every writer of the new Theology has insisted that the incarnation is, as Dr. Watson says, "not an expedient, but a consummation." The redemptive power resides distinctly in the personality. Almost the whole saving virtue is made to stand in "the human life of God." Christ is the ideal man in whom the idea of humanity is realized, and yet Christ is God because man is one of God's existence-forms. In Christ the God-consciousness is complete and men are made in Christ in such a way that his consciousness becomes their consciousness, and they become God-manifest in the flesh. This "human life of God" is the vitalizing and organizing principal of the Church.

That Dr. Van Dyke approximates this mystical view of the incarnation must be evident to all who will read his

chapter on the Human Life of God. His doctrine of the Kenosis represents the Eternal Logos as divesting himself of his essential fulness that he may as God be less than God while living a human life. In the view of the author of "The Gospel for an Age of Doubt," almost any theory as to the "Method of the Divine humiliation" will suffice, so the end of the actual lowering of the essential Divinity of Christ is attained. It is a matter of indifference whether one hold that the Eternal Word entered into life without omniscience, or omnipotence, or omnipresence; or that having been born under deprivation of his Divine mode of being, he received more and more of conscious Divinity; whether we agree with Muller or Godet or Gore or Fairbairn or Crosby, "Life is now the regnant idea: personality its most potent expressiou. It is in the facts of life * * that we must seek our comparisons for the Incarnation and the very search will bring us face to face with the conviction that life in all its manifestations transcends analysis without ceasing to be the object of knowledge."

All this, if it means anything definite, in a book in which it is distinctly stated that "definitions are dangerous," simply means what Schleiermacher meant; that the Incarnate Christ is a life-force in process of development, but how we cannot tell. After all this vagueness as to the matter and manner of the Incarnation would not a little sober and sound "definition" be stripped of its tenor, and might we not hear, well pleased, the old Shorter Catechism ring out:

"Christ the eternal Son of God, became man by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul, being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and born of her, yet without sin; and thus He was, and continueth to be, God and man, in two distinct natures, and one person, forever."

4. Passing from the Incarnation, we next glance at the new Soteriology. The fundamental matter here is sin. What are we to think of it?

The new Theology does not view sin so much as an attitude towards law. The sovereign and inimitable righteousness of God and the infinite divine holiness are studiously not made prominent. The scriptures bearing upon God's relation to man as moral governor are ignored, or interpreted unnaturally, or altogether rejected. Even the "Ten Words" are disparaged, as by Dr. Watson, and the whole Levitical code is despised, as by Dr. Bruce, with a sigh over the luckless day when Ezra came back from the exile with a Rabbinical law in his hand. Sin is to be described in the terms of Fatherhood and Sonship. The nearest approach to a definition is given by Dr. Fairbairn :

"Sin is the reign of unfilial feeling in the heart that was made for filial love; and where this reigns, the created Sonship can never fulfil its end or the creative Fatherhood be satisfied with its unrealized ideal."

As the very impulse to create souls sprang from the Father's loving delight in Fatherhood and Sonship, to fail to be a son consciously in communion with the Father is "to deny to the creator the beatitude he was created expressly to give." And this is the essence of sin.

The term "Collective Sin," or "Common Sin," is preferred to "Original Sin." The race is a family, and as such is a unit, and its constituents are in a relation of "solidarity." The Collective Sin should never be thought of out of its relation to the "Collective Righteousness." The "tendencies" common to us all are "defects of nature, yet for them no man is condemned."

"This law of solidarity finds its supreme illustrations in the sphere of religion: *here creative personalities exercise their mightiest lordship.* (Italics mine). The names that in Theology embody good and evil for the race are Adam and Christ: through the one sin comes to be, through the other, righteousness. They are, because opposites, complementary and correlative." From this it is argued that the race was constituted both in Adam and in Christ, all

the subjects of the common sin share in the good as well as in the evil. Personal guilt is developed only by actual transgression. And as the essence of personal sin is a failure to have, consciously, God as our Father, and to recognize ourselves as his sons, Salvation consists in awakening our dormant consciousness of the filial relation. Such seems to be this peculiar theory. It smacks decidedly of Schleiermacher.

To the end that we may become conscious of the Divine Fatherhood, the Incarnation is held up as "a communication." The stress is constantly laid upon "the Personal Christ." The "Human Life of God" is viewed as a force, full of creative and energizing power. The mode of its working is so vaguely described as to perplex and bewilder us. Sometimes it seems to proceed by mere exemplification, as if the Personal Christ saves us by being our model, sometimes by teaching, as if the salvation is to come through the moral and philanthropic precepts of Jesus, in the Sermon on the Mount, out of which Watson would evolve his boasted creed ; sometimes by mystical contact, a sweet friendship with the Personal Jesus : but always it is the Incarnation which is the force, the saving power, the consummation. The Cross is a form of "culture."

And let it be emphasized : this prominence given to the Personality of Christ is designedly in distinction from his official work, and inclusive of it only in the faintest way, if at all. This is explicitly avowed by Dr. Fairbairn in the following words :

"It is also characteristic that the determinative idea in the system which he (Paul) elaborated with so much dialectical passion, comes from the Personality of Jesus, *and not from the Messianic office.* (Italics mine). That idea was his filial relation, his Divine Sonship. What to him was the primary fact in the consciousness of Jesus became the constitutive factor of his own thought."

In the light of this quotation, it is obvious to what all

this insistence upon the Personality of Jesus in tending. Its full development is seen in the new Soteriology as to Christ's death.

If there is one thing which the new Theology seems to view with aversion even unto detestation it is the essential idea involved in expiatory sacrifice and in a satisfaction-rendering priesthood. Wherever sacrifice is referred to, it is spoken of simply in its sense of self-denial. The parts of the Bible which speak of justice as demanding satisfaction, and of Priesthood rendering it, are treated as if they were suspected of poison. An atonement made to satisfy Divine justice is spoken of as "Juridical," and every Scripture which proclaims that Christ's blood must be shed in satisfaction for human guilt, is either perverted, or, like the Levitical code, treated as a blundering and pernicious mistake. The death of Christ is held up as a mere illustration, an exhibition of the "passible" Father who makes the real sacrifice in order to show how unhappy he is because his children will not love him. Jesus died for us, not vicariously, but sympathetically: taking our place and standing in our stead, not really, but by a vividness of imagination, a conceptualistic imposition upon himself. The strongest presentation of this sympathetic theory of the atonement is made by Professor Dörner:

"In such deep compassion and sympathy, he feels their sin and guilt more than his own suffering. Nay, sorrow for them, this sympathy with not merely their wretchedness, but for their guilt and penal desert is, through his self forgetting devotion, his deepest suffering, the heart of that suffering." * * "He enters into this condemnation of theirs in feeling, sorrowfully acknowledging it to be just in his deepest soul, and so far subjecting himself to the Divine condemnation which he recognizes." * * "He is, therefore, a High Priest in sympathy."

From all this it is perfectly plain that the passion of Christ is viewed as a culmination of the Incarnation; and

that its effect upon us is moral and subjective, as its aspect toward God is that of a climax to the Kenosis, the "self-beggary" of the passible God-head.

5. The new Theology has no settled view as to the doctrine of endless punishment. Professor Bruce says that the Christ consciousness represents Christianity as optimistic for time and eternity and that the Christian apologist is not called upon to dogmatize as to the final destiny of the unsaved.

But it cannot be denied that the general tendency of the modern Theology is toward Restorationism. It is held to be inconsistent that infinite Fatherhood should fall short of an everlasting struggle against a severance or destruction of the filial relation.

Schleiermacher's position, as Dr. Shedd shows, practically amounts to saying that "hell is abolished by becoming used to it and that remorse is of the nature of virtue" which must ultimately relieve. Dorner concludes that the whole matter is involved in unfathomable mystery but hints at possible annihilation or an entire change into some other form of being. Dr. Fairbairn holds that if "at any point of space or moment of eternity God were to say certain sinners must, in order to vindictive and exemplary punishment, remain sinners forever," then he would, as it were, "concede a recognized place and function for sin." His conclusion is that if evil never ceases, the conflict of righteousness with sin "must go on forever." The very necessity that Regal Paternity should be merciless to sin "prevents penalty ever becoming merely retributive or retaliatory." And as the new Theology's hope is very long, so it is exceedingly broad.

Says Dr. Watson :

"It is surely a narrow mind and more—a narrow heart—that would belittle the noble sayings that fell from the lips of outside saints or discredit the virtues of their character. Is it not more respectful to God, the Father of mankind,

and more in keeping with the teachings of the Son of Man, to believe that everywhere and in all ages can be found not only the prophecies and broken gleams, but also the very Kingdom," such as Mogul Emperor Akbar, "Moslem Saints," Marcus Aurelius, and those whose "fine charity" is embodied in the legends of Abou-Ben-Adhem and the renunciation of Buddha.

III. THE ATTITUDE OF OUR CHURCH TOWARD THE MODERN THEOLOGY.

1. Our attitude is not one of ignorance. Of course the large proportion of our ministers cannot be regarded as making the new Theology a matter of special study. Our pulpits are kept free from the speculations of philosophy and the advanced notions of Higher Critics. This is as it should be. But it is also true that many of our ministers have a very definite conception of what the new Theology is. The books of these writers who belong to this school are not unfrequently found in the libraries of our pastors, and much in them is appreciated for general suggestiveness. And then, our religious papers are conducted by men of active minds, who know what the Theological world is doing. Our *Outlook* and QUARTERLY are not wanting in information as to developments in this line of thought, our Professors in our Theological Seminaries are abreast of the age, and the personal contact of our ministers with the Theological institutions abroad is not inconsiderable.

2. The attitude is not one of indifference. We comprehend that it would be unwise to let these movements awaken in us no interest. We know that far more is involved in these discussions than could be included in any agitations affecting only our denomination. These matters belong, not merely to Calvinism, but to the universal Christian faith. Questions affecting the Being of God, the Incarnation and Redemptive work of Christ, the integrity and trustworthi-

ness of the Bible, the Plan of Salvation, and the issues of eternal destiny, belong to every church in the world. We carry our share of interest in these vital matters.

3. This attitude is not one of arrogant intolerance or of uncharitable malice. With us, legitimate freedom of thought and of speech is fundamental. The church does not permit disapproved teaching in her name and by her authority; she makes no effort to prohibit any man from teaching in his own name, or by authority of his own church, whatever he believes to be the truth. The Christian loveliness of many who belong to this school of theological thought we fully appreciate; and whatever they have written that seems to us uplifting and true, we heartily enjoy. That there is much of this, we fully admit.

4. This attitude is not one of opposition to sanctified scholarship. The Southern Presbyterian Church has always upheld the standard of ministerial qualification and has always demanded that her teachers shall be able to teach others also. Criticism within proper limits is not interdicted. This by no means prevents us from being aware that critics, like ourselves, are not infallible.

5. This attitude is not one of stolid narrowness. It is true, we seriously object to much that is often implied in the word "broad." But we most highly value genuine catholicity. For this reason, we are slow to part company with our dead who died in the old faith: with the best element in the old Catholic Church; with the Reformers; with the creeds of Christendom; with our dear old Westminster Confession. The Bible is so good for us that we feel that we want it as broad and as long as we can keep it.

6. The attitude of our Church toward the Regenerated Theology is that of thoughtful, intelligent, positive, and, I believe, unanimous, rejection and antagonism. To a concise exhibition of the grounds of this opposition, attention is next invited.

1. The consciousness of Christ, as ascertained by the new Theology, is too narrow and too uncertain to serve as a basis of theological construction. There is not a shadow of evidence that the Revelation through the Bible should be thus limited. To refuse to hear God's Word through Paul out of alleged reverence for Christ, is but to imagine a conflict between the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity; or, since Christ was full of the Spirit that inspired Paul, to make the Spirit antagonize himself. The Bible to us must ever be not only the Word actually uttered by Christ, but also the Word which the Holy Ghost teacheth, by whomsoever uttered. To determine what this inspired word is, we are steadfast in maintaining, that the old commonsense way is the true way. The genuineness and authenticity of the Bible must be examined. Its testimony for itself must be heard and the value of that testimony weighed by the rules of evidence. Above all, the organic unity of the Scriptures the excellency of their matter, their fitness to be food for the soul, their efficacy in producing noble lives, their power to sustain in sorrow and in death, and their faithfulness in guiding to heaven, all must be considered. And having intelligently done this, we deny that the Bible is to be limited to the sayings of Christ, many even of these being disputed.

2. But now coming to the actual teaching of Jesus, we differ most widely with our honored brethren as to the content of the mind of the Master. This difference emerges at every point along the whole line of investigation.

(1). When we ask Christ about the Bible, he does not say what these brethren represent him as saying. It is not a fact that he disparaged or condemned any part of the Old Testament. Christ honored the Bible as his Bible. He referred to it under its well-known divisions. He encouraged the people to search these Scriptures. He quoted them when living, when suffering, when dying. He cleared

their enactments of Pharisaic glosses, and reaffirmed them in their true meaning, correcting the traditional abuse and giving anew the genuine law.

Even Wendt, who denies the Pre-existence of Christ—substantially a Unitarian, but significantly in great favor with this school—admits without hesitation that the common impressions of the Jewish people concerning the Scriptures in Christ's time, were Christ's own impressions and belief, and boldly says that neither they nor he knew what they were talking about. Is it not astonishing that such high praise, with no warning, can be given to such a work as Wendt's "Teaching of Jesus," and this by Professors in chairs of Theology! These brethren, too, seem strangely silent as to what Christ had to say respecting the Revelation in the New Testament. Did the promises in the upper room amount to nothing as exhibiting the mind of the Master? Is it true that a Juridical, Rabbinical, ascetic celibate of a St. Paul could have so disastrously misled the Church after Christ had said: "He will guide you into all truth." "He will bring all things to your remembrance." With the Holy Ghost thus promised for this specific purpose, could John have "idealized" and suffered in his writing from "personal idiosyncrasy," from "environment," so that the verisimilitude of Christ's sayings flickers in ghostly uncertainty on the borders of belief and doubt, of truth and error? "We have not so learned Christ" or heard his testimony to the Bible, just as it was, as it was to be, and as it is. We are firmly persuaded with Dr. Storrs that this Jesus lays a hand of approval upon each of the Testaments, standing midway between the two, "predicted of the one, attested of the other, and the sure Witness of both."

(2) Again: when we go to Christ and ask him "what is God?" His reply seems to us far broader than is represented. At Samaria's well, he said "God is a Spirit" to be worshipped in spirit and truth. He made God the "Lord of

Heaven and earth," the awful Revealer, Concealer, Disposer. His favorite phrase was "the Kingdom of God," found on his lips not less than thirty or forty times in the Gospels. He put naked Divine condemnation over against human hypocrisy; and if against this, why not against other sin? It is true, he called God his Father, for so he was. It is true, also, that he taught that God is a Providential Father to men as men, and a Gracious Father to Christians. These truths are not denied. Why should they be? But, on the other hand, it is not true that God to Christ was Father and nothing besides. God to Christ was just what he is to himself and to all, and that is—God!

When we write our equation with God as its first member, the only appropriate second member is just God. "I am that I am." The universal, all-transfusing, all-surrounding element of God's Being was the same in Christ's conception as in all the Scriptures: and that was and is his awful Holiness. This gives character to every personality in the Godhead, to every relation and condition amongst the Persons, to every attribute in God, and to every act of God. It pervades the Divine essence. It glorifies every thought, feeling, and volition. The Father is the "Holy Father." The Son is the "Holy Child." The Spirit is the "Holy Ghost." If we may with any degree of propriety speak of anything as conditioning God in every conceivable relationship, attribute, affection, in his law, in his Gospel, in his Word, in his works, for all time and for all eternity, it is that of which the Cherubim chanted as they flew through the temple, covering face and feet, and crying so that the very posts on the threshold trembled: "Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of Hosts." God's own awful oath is made upon his own Being *and Holiness*.

(3) In the next place, we cannot admit the new Theology's doctrine of the Incarnation to be an unfolding of the consciousness of Christ. Our primary reason is that it is no definite doctrine for us to accept. It may safely be pro-

nounced as not even clearly conceivable, and it is sure that no lucid expression of it has ever been made in human speech. Such a phrase as "the human life of God" simply obscures thought. If the Incarnation in Christ's representation of it is the "consummation" of Revelation, and apparently of all saving force and life, right here the thought should be the clearest, so that a man running might read it.

But here everything is in a bewildering, Pantheistic, Kenoistic mist and shadow simply impenetrable. These writers are wont to dwell upon the "simplicity" of Christ's teaching, with "silver iterance." Can any mortal discover the faintest trace of this characteristic in this mysticism? Now it is admitted that the Incarnation is mysterious. But the ordinary doctrine of it can be expressed in intelligible terms. Dr. Charles Hodge can be understood. So can the Shorter Catechism. The fact is a mystery, but the revelation of it is plain. Christ has two natures in one personality. Whatever can be affirmed of either nature can be affirmed of the person. The mystery here is in the thing; but there is not fatal obscurity in the expression of it. What Christ taught, we can easily know. He said, "I and my Father are one." "Before Abraham was, I am." "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father"; and again, "The son of man hath not where to lay his head." "I thirst." "This is my body." We can know what all this means. It means that Christ was God; that Christ was man; and there was just one Christ. This personality was unique. The fact that Christ was man, did not operate to take the human race unto Deity; or that he was God, to make God Pantheistically immanent in humanity. Christ's teaching is clear. But is Schleiermacher's? Is Dorner's? Can we find anywhere in Christ's teaching any warrant for Dorner's theory that when he was born as man, his Divinity as Logos was dormant or absent; that more and more of it was poured into him as he grew; that at last the human soul, receiving more and more of God's perfections, be-

come completely Divine? Did Christ reveal to Principal Fairbairn through his sayings, or by any other instrumentality, that when his Divinity underwent the Kenosis, the external or physical attributes of Deity, as Fairbairn calls them, such as omniscience, omnipresence and omnipotence, were "veiled," or "restrained" by his moral attributes, resulting in "the limitation of God by the God-head." Remember, all this comes from men who are shouting "Back to Christ;" to Christ's simplicity. Where in Christ's consciousness did Dr. Fairbairn find authority for these following sentences occurring in his discussion of the Incarnation: "Schelling's Absolute Identity and Hegel's Absolute Idealism meant the same thing; and it has passed into current thought, philosophical and religious, as the Doctrine of the Divine immanence" * * God is, as it were, the eternal possibility of being incarnated; man, the permanent (why did he not say eternal?) capability of incarnation?" Now, in all seriousness, the only possible ground on which this speculation might be offered as a Revelation through the Christ-Consciousness would be, that, through some racial union, Christ's consciousness was Schelling's and Hegel's consciousness!

(4). Passing now from the Incarnation, we next remark that this Union of Speculative Philosophy and Straussian Criticism, two relatives of blood kin, is seen to yield its most unhealthy offspring when we come to view its Soteriology. It vitiates the cardinal Gospel truth that is the heart of the Scriptural plan of Salvation.

Priesthood is regnant in all religious history. The soul of man, conscious of sin, echoes God's call for expiatory sacrifice, universally and everlastingly. Scientific speculation through John Fiske may sport with this deep deliverance of human consciousness as the product of ignorance and fear in the human mind not yet sufficiently revolutionized to cast off the fetters of superstitious dread and awe of the uncomprehended forces of destructive nature. But the

dominant fact of history, which is sin, gives concurrent testimony along with the dominant fact of religious consciousness as expressed in all worship through all time, and absolutely martyrizs the human race for the truth that guilt is universal and demands a priesthood with a sacrifice that shall satisfy the holiness of God. All the legions of the new Theology are hurled in avowed and most bitter assault upon the vicarious priestly offering of Jesus Christ as satisfaction to God's Justice, which is simply God's Holiness in relative expression and operation. Principal Fairbairn having quoted "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law," most strongly says:

"Certainly ; but this was the law which the Jew loved, and which was thus forever abolished, not the universal law of God. He became 'a curse for us ;' certainly, but under the same law, for by it he was 'hanged upon a tree.' But the law that thus judged him condemned itself: by cursing him it became accursed. His death was not the vindication, but the condemnation of the law. And this is the characteristic attitude of the New Testament writers."

Amazing exegesis ! That law which the Apostle was writing about was older than Abraham, whose obedience to it, the Apostle expressly says, could not justify.

In this opposition to a sacrifice that satisfies justice is imbedded inveterate bitterness against the whole Levitical code. Says Bruce:

"Judaism (Leviticalism) cured that ["moral religious license"] by hedging the people in on every side by positive law, and the evil now to be apprehended was that the cure would breed a new and worse disease—dead, rotten-hearted legalism. It might even be affirmed with a measure of truth that the sinister reign of legalism began the day that Ezra appeared on Jewish soil, with the law in his hand."

Dr. Watson speaks of "The Culture of the Cross." He says that "Jesus did not describe his cross as a satisfaction to God." "He always spoke of it as a regeneration of

man." "The Gospels do not represent the cross as a judicial transaction between Jesus and God, on which he throws not the slightest light, but as a new force which Jesus has introduced into life." "The cross may be made into a doctrine, it was prepared by Jesus as a discipline." Dr. Van Dyke makes "the whole value of the atonement," in its "reconciling influence on the heart of man," and in its "exhibition of the heart of God," "depend on the actuality of the Incarnation." And so we are ever brought back to the dominant Soteriology of this whole School. The "Gospel for an Age of Doubt" has, as its distinctive element, "a Person." Fairbairn boldly adds in words what is involved in the teaching of all the others, "*and not the Messianic office.*" Whereas Paul said: "We preach Jesus Christ and him crucified," these Theologians would say: "We preach Jesus Christ" and "a life-force;" "culture;" salvation through a natural process of personal magnetism or a development of a race-incarnation.

This superficial combination of rationalism and sentimental mysticism can never supplant the sublime and common-sense truth as to the Priesthood of Jesus Christ. Beside Thornwell's magnificent sermon, it is simply puerile. Every solitary utterance of Jesus condemns it. "Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man and *drink his blood*, there is no life in you." The agony of Gethsemane, with the shuddering horror of its bitter cup, its sorrowfulness unto death, rebukes these theories in awfulness of spoken and unutterable woe. The "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me," shows that the "final idea of God" according to Christ, is God and nothing less. To God, as God, Jesus offers himself on the cross in a sublimity of worship that rocked the earth, darkened the heavens, rent the temple's vail, startled the dead and amazed the living in earth and heaven. The specific form of this worship was sacrifice. And the innermost heart of sacrifice as worship is, not merely scenic exhibition, not conceptualistic substitution by sympathy

working through phantasy, not disciplining exemplification, not a force-furnishing Kenosis; but expiatory satisfaction for guilt by the vicarious suffering of the substitute for the principal, the former, standing in the very law-place of the latter and bearing the suffering as just penalty: the whole transaction a voluntary homage to the majesty of law, to the inimitability of righteousness, to the Holiness of God, and to the amazing grace which provides in God's Son the willing victim, the adoring Priest, and the sanctifying Altar to be sworn by in covenant forever.

This is the Soteriological foundation of human hope as revealed in the Bible, from beginning to end. There is one God and one Mediator * * who "gave himself a ransom for all." He bore our sins. Our iniquity was laid upon him. God made his soul an offering for sin. He died for us, the just for the unjust. Though an Eternal Spirit he offered himself without spot to God. He is the Propitiation for our sins. Abel's Lamb, Abraham's Lamb, Isaiah's Lamb, John the Baptist's Lamb, Calvary's Lamb; through all time and though all eternity, the redeemed of his blood must behold him as the Lamb in the midst of the Throne, and must cry: "*Thou hast redeemed us by thy blood.*" Touch that truth and, as we see the matter, you have put the coldness of ice through the Gospel's heart. This is the "Gospel for an Age of Doubt." And our time is ominously warning that the less of this very Gospel there be, the wider and deeper, darker and deadlier, will be the doubt. The Sampson that tugs at these pillars which uphold the temple at the place where mercy and holiness meet, may pull down the edifice upon those he deems his theological foes; but deepest under the ruin will be his own theological self.

(5). Finally: the "Regenerated" Eschatology seems to us full of perilous uncertainty. In the minds of many of the writers there appears to be no eschatological conclusion at all. To affirm that death ends probation and fixes the

state eternally, their theologians will not: to deny absolutely, they cannot. Would it not have been wiser and safer to be silent?

But here very bold speculation rushes in where angels fear to tread. The Fatherhood of God is represented as so possessed of love as to make it impossible to say that any moral chasm between God and the soul can be a "great gulf fixed." Now, between God and his child by grace, justified, adopted, born of the Spirit, there is a bond that neither death nor life can destroy. Forever blessed be his Name!

But can this be affirmed with any degree of confidence of that creative and providential Fatherhood which the fall and sin have so awfully transformed as to justify the loving Christ in saying to sinful men, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do?" "*If* God were your Father, ye would love me." Whose son did Jesus say Judas was? "The son of perdition." And what did Jesus say was his fate? "Lost!" What is the fearful import of a Divine utterance to the effect that "it had been better that he had never been born?" What did Christ mean by a loss of soul whose descriptive adjunct was "cast away?" By a "fire that is not quenched?" By "where the worm dieth not?" By "depart from me?" By "and the door was shut?" By "whither I go ye can not come?" By "it shall not be forgiven to him, neither in this world nor in the world to come?" By an everlastingness binding heaven and hell in an equal duration? The only conceivable way of breaking the force of these "Logia" is by applying, to each and all the quotations, the peremptory short-cut so often used by Wendt: "Clearly a gloss of the redacting Evangelist."

Christ says enough to warn us away from these speculations based upon personal relationships. He tells us of a relation closer than human fatherhood; for whose sacredness a man may forsake his father and mother and cleave to his

wife, and they be one. But between these two Jesus says that sin may dig a pit that in Christ's own judgment either party might be right in never attempting to cross. And that chasm might be, in depth and breadth, in exact proportion to the purity of the character or the intensity of the love in the party sinned against—the very purity of the love and the very love of purity burying the old relationship in a grave of moral ruin beyond possibility of resurrection; as when the noble Arthur, in knightly chastity, yearned over the golden haired queen saying: "Let no man dream I love thee not," but under a moral necessity rode away from her forever. I do not offer this as argument. It is offered as an illustration of a truth that obtains on earth and may obtain in heaven. And it is that (as amongst relationships) no man on earth can speculatively judge *how far sin may go in the awful work of moral divulsion*. If as dynamite, it can shatter the union that typifies Christ and his church; if as moral and spiritual earthquake, it can open a bottomless pit between God and some of his earliest sons, the angels who kept not their first estate, wiser will it be for us to cling to the faithful, the severe, but the loving and the true words of Christ, and dismiss all speculation as to what, *a priori*, so fearful an element in the moral universe cannot do. And with this, we bring the discussion to an end.

CONCLUDING INFERENCE.

If the foregoing pages have truthfully shown the literary origin of the Regenerated Theology, its composite form, its main characteristics and the real attitude toward it of the Presbyterian Church, South, then the discussion yields one inevitable inference: it could never advance the welfare of our Church, or the interests of peaceful Christian communion, for that Church to put herself in a position of responsibility for doctrines which, while she must disapprove, she would be powerless to control. If it should appear that her inner spirit toward the Regenerated

Theology is unique, her outward organism must be conformed and adapted to her real inward convictions.

That these "progressive" views are progressing, must be admitted. In consistently denouncing Systematic Theology, the Progressionists jointly in Europe and America are bending every energy and exhausting every resource of scholarship to build up a Systematic Theology! A Polychrome Bible, an Expositor's Bible, an International Critical Commentary, an Exhaustive Bible Dictionary, an International and Inter-Confessional Theological Library, all are in process of development under a motto set forth in the first sentence in the "Editor's Preface," to-wit: "Theology has made great and rapid advances in recent years." The prevalence of these views over Germany is well known. Their extensive existence in England under Canon Driver's scholarly influence is fully recognized. In Scotland, their advancement has been steady since the Free Church in 1881 pronounced that it was "neither safe nor advantageous" that Professor Robertson Smith should teach in the College of Aberdeen. In 1882 Professor Bruce's "End of Revelation" came up on complaint in the General Assembly. Principal Rainy moved that no action was necessary or expedient, and the motion was adopted.

Again in 1890, the teachings both of Professor Dods and Professor Bruce arose for consideration in the Assembly. That body "recognized the existence of causes for profound anxiety" in Professor Dod's writings but not for instituting process, and then adopted a paper elaborately affirming *its own* orthodoxy, which had not been called in question. About the same thing was done with regard to the teaching of Professor Bruce; only, the criticism was somewhat more severe and the warning a little more positive. This amounted to saying to these teachers: You are not sound but *we* are, and you can go on teaching in our name. And they went on.

In 1891, overtures asking for more definite expression

concerning both these Professors come up to the Assembly. The reply was that the Assembly did not deem it necessary to take any further action in reference to the matters referred to in the overtures.

In 1893 the Rev. Walter C. Smith, of Edinburgh, Moderator of the Free Church Assembly, in his address closing the sessions, said that the "Method of scientific criticism had already got a footing in the Church and had established a right to be there without injury to their belief in Christ or to their reliance in the sacred records."

In 1895, Dr. Drummond was reported to the Assembly. No action was deemed necessary, Principal Rainy declaring that ministers and elders were not equipped for the scientific questions raised and liberty must be allowed. And so, we suppose, endeth the chapter. Results: one teacher was silenced; two were admonished, but not silenced; the last was not admonished: and then came "liberty." But the Assembly had saved its own orthodoxy by declaring for itself that it believed what nobody had said it did not believe, and what its most prominent teachers in its Theological Colleges say is not true.

It is not my purpose to suggest a parallel to this history of ineffectual opposition farther than as an American Presbyterian possibility. The analogy in the course of proceedings as thus far advanced is striking. This article will close with no prophecy, but with a palpable fact. Whatever arguments of the past have held the Presbyterian Church in the South to her distinct organic existence, all of which remain in undiminished vigor, the overwhelming consideration to-day is fully expressed in the words that one of our prominent ministers, who has studied in seminaries, both at home and abroad, gave utterance to when he wrote: "Point strongly the moral that our church should bide as she is, for her doctrinal life may be at stake."

EUGENE DANIEL.

Raleigh, N. C.

VII. THE FIRST PRESBYTERY.

I. The first Presbytery which met in America convened in the early part of the year 1705, in the village of Philadelphia, in the colony of William Penn. It is true that four years before this date William Penn had dignified the settlement with the title of city, at which time its population all told, would not number as many people as ordinarily congregate at this day in a frontier village to attend a popular circus. The reader will understand that the craze for calling every railroad crossing and every cross-road settlement a city is not a modern craze. All our boasted civilization and modern progress has made but little advance along this line. The quaint and dignified old Quaker with his religious sanctity and court intrigues, moved the previous question on modern civilization, and in 1701, before there were any railroads, signed a charter and made his little settlement on the Delaware river at the mouth of the Schuylskill, a city. Nevertheless, it was a village of log houses and shanties squatted in the fork of the two rivers and barely reaching down to the water's edge of either. In this village and in a "log meeting house" the first court of the Presbyterian Church in America opened up business for the spread of the Gospel and the evangelization of the new world along the line of the Scripture form of Church government, which is that of Presbytery.

This Presbytery had no legal standing, no distinctive or descriptive title, no corporate life, although it claimed to have a constitution, which was never printed, or if so, no copy has ever come down to us. It was simply a Presbytery. It met annually in the city of Philadelphia till the organization of a Synod, with the exception of two meetings, which were held in New Castle. The exact date 1705

is a presumption. But it goes without contradiction, and is strengthened by the fact that the first accessible records upon which the presumption is based, bear date 1706, with strong indication of and allusions to, a previous meeting, which had assigned certain parts of trial to a candidate for the ministry. The first and second pages, missing the third page, open: "*De regimine ecclesiæ*—which being heard was approved of and continued." The record proceeds: "He gave in also his *thesis* to be considered of against the next *sederunt*." The next *sederunt*, 2d, 10brs. 27. "*Post preces sederunt*, Mr. Francis McKemmie Moderator, Messrs. Jedediah Andrews and John Hampton ministers." The latin quotations here are literal as they stand in the records, and may without any breach of propriety be pronounced as the fathers pronounced them, after the English method, by which the reader will be able to trace the signification by the sound of the words and understand that *sederunt* of the primitive American Presbytery corresponds to the sittings of the Presbytery of modern times.

"Mr. John Boyd performed the other parts of his trial, viz: preached a popular sermon on John 1: 12, defended his thesis, gave satisfaction as to his skill in the languages and answered to extemporary questions, all of which were approved of and sustained." It was further "appointed that his ordination be on the next Lord's day, the 29th, which was accordingly performed in the public meeting house of this place before a numerous assembly. The next day he had a certificate of ordination."

From these records it appears that Mr. John Boyd was the first minister licensed and ordained by the Presbyterian Church in America. His licensure and ordination took place at the same meeting of Presbytery. But it was no hurried up affair. No extraordinary case. His examination appears to have been thorough, full and exact. Mr. Boyd was assigned to service on several committees, and to "supply Woodbridge every third Sabbath if the people

desired it." He was finally settled in Freehold, N. J. The records of the year 1709 have this entry: "The Rev. Mr. Boyd being dead, what relates to him ceases." This is the first death mentioned in the record. There is no memorial page set apart; no committee appointed to draft and bring in a minute—just simply one entry, terse and significant as any we find in the Old Testament concerning the patriarchs. There is no mention in the records concerning the death of Rev. Francis Makemie, the first moderator. But in a letter addressed by the Presbytery, in May 1709, to Sir Edward Harrison, at London, we read: "The negotiations begun and encouraged by a friend in the time when our worthy friend, Mr. Makemie, (now deceased) was with you for evangelizing these colonies was a beginning exceedingly acceptable to a multitude of people, and was likely to be of great service if continued, which makes us much grieved that so valuable a design was so soon after its beginning laid aside." The point of the "much grieved" here is not that Mr. Makemie is "now deceased," but that the enterprise of evangelizing the colonies was so soon cut off.

The youngest, first licensed, first ordained is "dead." The oldest first moderator, most able, distinguished and efficient is "deceased," and the mention of the last fact placed in brackets.

Although but three names appear on the pages of the records as present at the first recorded meeting, their number very soon increased to seven, as appears from the sixth page of the "Preliminary Sketch" of the Presbyterian Church, published by the board of publication in 1841. Their names are Francis Makemie, John Hampton, George McNish and Samuel Davis. These were all emigrated from Ireland and exercised their ministerial gifts on the Eastern shore of Maryland. In addition to these Nathaniel Taylor, a Scotchman, settled in Marlborough; John Wilson, likewise a Scotchman, settled in New Castle; and Mr. Jeddiah Andrews, a Boston Yankee, settled in Philadelphia, completed the seven.

The same dissatisfaction which prevails to-day about church conveniences and the multiplicity of preaching places cropped out very early in the history of Presbyterianism in America. To-day almost every little town which is incorporated into a city with charter privileges, has those in it who want to divide that element, which might if properly managed, make one strong Presbyterian Church, into two or three feeble bands calling themselves by pompous titles. They go begging all through the community for money to help them on in their disintegrating work—starving out two or three good preachers by their divisive actions when by combined effort they might give one man a decent support and make themselves felt a power for good in the community. Before this Presbytery had held its third meeting two counter petitions came before the body. The record runs after this fashion: "This day was read before the Presbytery a letter sent by the people of and about White Clay Creek, in New Castle County, importing their desire and petition to the Presbytery to have the ordinances of the gospel administered with more convenience and nearness to the place of their abode for the greater advantage and ease to their several families, promising with all due encouragement the minister that shall be thus appointed to supply them." Over against this on the same page and the same day we read, "This day was also read a letter from several persons in the town of New Castle wherein they crave that the people of White Clay Creek may not be suffered to set up a meeting house in the country, that their meeting house and congregation in New Castle may not be damaged by this rupture of their fellow members of White Clay Creek." After due deliberation the Presbytery took the following action: "Ordered that the people of New Castle and the country shall not be divided by setting up two separate meetings." This action was preeminently wise, and the wording is perfect—it is inhibitory, the right of rule and

authority is asserted. The Presbytery exercised that Episcopal function which belongs to and is inherent in the body. The end for which the action was taken is clearly set out : "Shall not be divided." That is generally the effect produced, it divides the Presbyterian Church in any and every community where it is attempted, however loud the protestations may be to the contrary. Any one who has ever been on the ground knows that the distance between White Clay Creek and New Castle is so short that an active and energetic boy could, in the summer time, have left home after an early breakfast, on Sunday morning, gone down to the creek, with good tackle and the right sort of bait, and caught a fine mess of fish and got back home before his mother could have returned from the meeting house where she had gone to hear Mr. John Wilson preach his sermons by order of Presbytery. Or that same mother could have sat on her front porch, any quiet summer evening during the week, and heard distinctly the deep bass notes of the green-headed bull frogs which in those days infested the waters of White Clay Creek. Still at that early day with bad roads and inconvenience of travel, and many other considerations there might have been found some plausible excuse for wanting two meeting houses in sight and sound of each other. But in this day with all sorts of conveyance from the "fly" to the "trap" or the "spider" and the "drag" for fashionable Christians, with the street cars for those in more modern circumstances, bicycles for the young folks and stick horses for the children, there is absolutely no real and necessary demand for dividing the congregations by setting up separate meeting houses in so many of our large towns and smaller cities.

Our Presbyteries should follow the policy thus laid down by our fathers and assert their authority in unifying the strength of the church and consolidating its forces. No movement in any town or city should be encouraged, much less aided by the "committee of Home Missions," until it can be shown that a church is strong enough numerically and

financially to support itself, and also aid the out-going colony with substantial help. Then let them multiply as fast as these conditions will justify the multiplication, but not any faster. Otherwise the cause is injured, notwithstanding the talk about a mission in every ward, and a little church in every bailiwick. The real need and most pressing demand of to-day is for the grouping of weak churches in the smaller towns and country places and putting one minister over a number of them, that all may have the benefits of the gospel ordinances once a month, or oftener. Or, sending the man who wants to plant churches to the frontier and destitute parts where there is no preaching at all, and thus build for God and the church.

"The Home Mission Committee" should not be asked, by any Presbytery, to take the money given by the church for "Home Missions" to start, or maintain, any and every feeble little effort which may be attempted in towns or small cities where already the means of grace are found in a church organized and a pastor settled. It is the part of wisdom and prudence, as well as a duty, to take care of the country churches and destitute places. And when we remember that the larger cities are drawing from the country to keep up, and increase, their growing and business population we can readily understand that the most economical and best use which can be made of the men and the money is to put both in the smaller towns where we have no churches, and from which our cities are making constant drafts.

Another matter arrested the attention of this first Presbytery and received that prompt action which should characterize every church court under similar circumstances. Upon information that David Evan, a lay person, had taken upon himself to publicly teach or preach among the Welch settlements, in what was then called the "Great Valley," in Chester county, the Presbytery proceeded to take up the matter and issue it in the following words: "It was unanimously agreed that the said David Evan had done very ill

and irregularly in thus invading the work of the ministry, and was thereupon censured." The record does not show whether Mr. David Evan had been teaching a singing school, and being popular with the young ladies and their mothers, was thus fitted for and called to the independent work of the ministry. Nor does it carry any recorded evidence that he was a commercial traveler, and knew the ways of the traveling men, and boys about town, and had that special qualification and call to the ministry, or that he was a reformed gambler and drunkard, and for that reason the very man of all others for the place. The presumption is rather the other way, for there is no evidence that Mr. Evan became obstreperous and sneered at the authority of the courts of the Lord's house, and rushed frantically into the ministry as a great lay evangelist. Nor did he tramp about over the country with a little reed organ and a dapper little side-whiskered singer, invading the churches and forcing pastors to tolerate and approve him and his methods under an implied threat that if they offered any opposition he would get a rickety old tent, or rent a dingy old hall, and begin at once dividing their congregations and unsettling their pastorates.

Having unanimously agreed that Mr. Evan had done "very ill," and further having "censured him" for doing so, it was finally "Agreed, that the most proper method of advancing David Evan in necessary literature to prepare him for the work of the ministry, is that he lay aside all other business for twelve months and apply himself closely to learning and study, under the direction of Mr. Andrews, with the assistance of Mr. Wilson and Mr. Anderson, and that it be left to the discretion of these said ministers when to put Mr. Evan on trial and license him publicly to teach or preach." Here is the first instance on record of the Presbyterian Church in America appointing a commission with authority to license a candidate to preach. This commission consisted of three ministers but no ruling. Here is the first instance of the

Presbyterian Church in America recommending that a candidate for the ministry study for a given period of time "under some approved divine." Both of these principles had since been embodied in the organic law of our church. To all of the action the people of the "Great Valley" and Mr. David Evan submitted themselves in the fear of the Lord, feeling that the Presbytery had the authority to act in the premises. In the subsequent record we read: "A unanimous call from the people of West Tract to Mr. David Evan being presented to us and approved, we offered it to him which he accepted, whereupon it was appointed as follows, viz.: Messrs. Jeddiah Andrews, Jones, Anderson, Gillispie and Wortherspoon solemnly ordain him to the work and office of the ministry after having been satisfied with his ministerial abilities in any pieces of trial they should think fit to appoint him." There was no ruling elder there. The high estimate set by these fathers upon the value and efficiency of the Church courts may be more clearly seen and better understood by a few extracts from the records:

"Ordered that no members of this Presbytery upon any whatsoever pretence, do depart or leave the Presbytery without the meeting be broke up, or at least leave be asked and had from the Presbytery." (Page 16.) Again: "This day a letter by Mr. Samuel Davis was presented to them, it being moved by one of the members that the letter might be read it was accordingly read, and Mr. Davis his reasons for excusing his absence from this and the preceeding meeting were *not* sustained by the Presbytery." The "not" was italized. It was further "Ordered, that a letter be written and sent to Mr. Samuel Davis, in the name of the Presbytery, by Master John Watson, requiring him to be present at our next meeting in this place." (Page 1.) In the case of Mr. Hehry: "His letter to excuse his not coming to Presbytery read, and his excuse sustained. *Ordered*, that the Moderator write to him and signify that his excuse was

sustained with difficulty." (Records, page 21.) "In the case of Mr. Morgan and Mr. Van Vleck, who were absent and no excuse given or sent: Ordered, that Mr. Andrews write to them and *reprehend* them for their absence." (Records, page 21.) There was little disposition to accept any excuse or sustain any reason offered by any delinquent. "Mr. Andrews was defective in not delivering his Presbyterial exercise and was censured for his defect and appointed to deliver it next meeting." (Records, page 22.) "Mr. George McNish not having his Presbyterial exercise ready and excusing himself on account of sickness for a month past was blamed for not preparing it sooner, and ordered to prepare and deliver it by the next Presbytery." Records, page 32.) "Mr. Evan's absence from Mr. Con's ordination was ill taken by the Presbytery." (Record, page 44.) Mr. Robert Wortherspoon having been appointed to prepare a Presbyterial exercise, and not having complied, it was ordered "that the Moderator should Presbyterially admonishing him to be more careful for time coming, which was accordingly done." (Record, page 44.)

This Presbytery early established a rule for defraying the expenses of representatives to the meetings of the same, which principle has since been embodied in the organic law of our Church. "Mr. Henry, representative of the congregation, being absent, and his reason for not coming being inquired into, he said the present condition of his people made it necessary that there should be a particular collection made by the congregation for defraying the charges of the representative to the Presbytery and it was allowed that there should." This became the rule in the subsequent meeting of Presbytery.

The question of settled pastors and the payment of the salary promised, received the attention of the Presbytery as will be indicated by some facts in the record. The people of Snow Hill sent their representative to Presbytery asking the permission and concurrence of that body in presenting

a call to Mr. John Hampton to become their pastor which was agreed to and Mr. Hampton was settled as their proper and permanent minister and pastor. At a subsequent meeting of Presbytery we find this significant entry: "Ordered by Presbytery that there be a letter sent to the people of Snow Hill requiring their faithful care in collecting the tobacco promised by subscription to Mr. Hampton." (Records, page 11.) Another entry during that same session of Presbytery reads in these words: "Ordered that Mr. Taylor write to the people of Monikin and Wycomico exciting them to the duty to pay what they promise to Mr. McNish." (Records, page 13.) At a subsequent meeting of Presbytery the following action was had: "Ordered that the ministers and elders come prepared for the future to give a true and impartial account how matters are mutually betwix them both in regard to spirituals and temporals." (Records, page 18.) Four years after this it was enacted by Presbytery that "For the better establishment and settling of congregations it was ordered and appointed that in every congregation there be a sufficient number of assistants chosen to aid the minister in the management of congregational affairs and that there be a book of records to this effect and that the same be annually brought here to be revised by the Presbytery." (Records, page 37.) Just what particular status these "assistants" occupied in relation to the elders and deacons is not known, for in that particular the records do not say. And whether that "book" was sent up as a part of the session is not known. Sometime before this action was taken we find that, "Inquiry was made of the several ministers touching the state of their congregation and of themselves with relation thereto; and also of the several elders not only of the measures taken to support the ministry but of the life, conversation and doctrine of their several ministers, and report was given to satisfaction for this time." (Records, page 22.) This evidently corresponded to what is now called, in many

of our Presbyteries, a free conversation on the state of religion within their bounds. It was also, "Agreed that none should be allowed to vote for the calling of a minister but those that shall contribute for the maintainance of him and that the major vote of those shall be determinative." (Records, page 24.)

II. Two cases of discipline engaged the attention of the fathers of this first Presbytery. The one pertained to the church at Woodbridge, the early beginning of which appears to be wrapped in considerable mystery for the records are not clear on that particular point. Indications point to the fact that four congregational ministers in Connecticut, viz., Davenport, Webb, Shove and Buckenham, co-operating with Dr. Cotton Mather, of Boston, had been instrumental, through the agency of Jediah Anfreus, in settling over the people in Woodbridge a Rev. Nathiel Wade, himself perhaps from Boston. Whether there was any suspicion of Mr. Wade on applying to Presbytery for admission, or whether it was that rigid supervision which the Presbytery felt itself called upon to exercise in all matters, we cannot tell. But from the time of the application of Mr. Wade for his reception there appears to have been an apprehension that all would not go well. We read, "The Rev. Mr. Nathiel Wade made application to the Presbytery to be admitted a member thereof, upon which we deliberately debated and made a narrow scrutiny into matters as they appeared to us, and found by his certificate that his ordination was good and valid according to Scripture rules, and also a call and subscription even from some of yourselves (Woodbridge Church) with several other recommendations from persons whose integrity we could not suspect. And nothing appearing to his disadvantage, sufficiently attested, we judge it unjust to deny his desire which seemed to us to flow from sincere intentions of being more useful and doing greater good, he having freely and fully submitted himself to the judgment and discipline of

the Church, according to Presbytery." But Mr. Wade appears to have been one of those impulsive individuals whose emotional nature, governed almost entirely by the circumstances surrounding him, frequently got the better of his judgment. So his statements at different times, and sundry places, contradicted each other, and the actual facts in the case, by a big majority. When Mr. Wade was at the meeting of Presbytery he was a Presbyterian, "and with tears in his eyes and uplifted hand," declared himself ready to abide the action of Presbytery and "submitted himself willingly to its constitution," saying, "that he by the consent of the Presbytery would cheerfully demit and resign up all pastoral relation to the whole people of Woodbridge." But on returning home from Presbytery there was a reaction and he again became a Congregationalist, and told "the people, with ostentation, that he was more firmly fixed than he was ever before" in his pastoral relation, which Presbytery had dissolved. This action upon his part the fathers of this first Presbytery called "fallaciously and falsely pretending." When Mr. Wade thus kicked out of the traces, and began to buck in good fashion style against Presbyterian power and influence, the Presbytery stripped off his ministerial harness, divested him of his pastoral relation, and hastened to write a letter to Dr. Cotton Mather notifying him of what they had done, and asking that he use his influence in quieting the disturbance between this obstreperous divine and the good people of Woodbridge.

Coming from a less grave and dignified body, this letter might be construed as sarcastic irony. For they stated in very plain terms that they were aware of the fact that Mr. Wade had recently been to Boston consulting with Dr. Cotton Mather, and had returned with a letter giving encouragement to the divisive element. We have no information as to whether this ancient and eminent mind-reader and interpreter of satanic purposes in the brains of foolish and

superstitious old women, and silly and credulous young girls ever responded to this letter, or exerted himself, to any great extent, to passify matters in this triangler conflict. But we have a shrend suspicion that if the old fellow had delivered himself it would have been to the effect that all parties had been "bewitched" by Satan in his "most nefarious" efforts to prevent the planting of congregational principles in the courts of the Presbyterian Church.

The other case of discipline was that of the Rev. Paulus Van Vleck, a Holland Dutchman, well up on the doctrines of the Synod of Dort, and sound on the Heidleburg Catechism. The charge against him, therefore, was not that of heresy in doctrine or insubordination to the Presbytery in the matter of government. It was a charge of immorality in life and conduct. The Rev. Paulus Van Vleck was suspected of having two living wives at one and the same time—one spouse left behind him in Holland, and one, as a living reality and present witness, here in America. The charge was at first that of bigamy, to which was afterward added that "of lying also." As the investigation proceeded a suspicion arose and grew that the Rev. Paulus Van Vleck had "committed some forgeries." In this way "common fame" volunteered her services to the prosecution, and helped on with the conviction. Her specification under the general indictment was, "that there was a letter at New York from the said Mr. Van Vleck's mother that contradicted those which he had produced."

Mr. Van Vleck was somewhat handicapped from the very start, for the issue was not joined upon the common law principle, that if not proven guilty, the accused must go free, but rather upon the condition, that, one side or the other had to make out the case, and if the prosecution could not prove guilt, the accused must be able to establish his innocence. And such was the verdict in this grave matter of bigamy, falsehood and forgery. The case was first brought to the attention of Presbytery when the character of its

ministers and people, was being looked into, the Presbytery having established "The order for inquiring into the mutual condition of ministers and people." The cause pending, it was concluded that, "After the Presbytery had examined the several evidences brought in relation to the crime of bigamy, alleged against Mr. Paulus Van Vleck, as also the exceptions offered by the said Van Vleck against the evidence and in vindication of himself, the Presbytery not finding the evidence clear and positive enough to prove the crime against him, and yet Mr. Van Vleck's vindication not sufficient to take off the scandal wholly, do therefore, till such time as Rev. Van Vleck brings satisfactory proof of his first wife's death, for the honor of the gospel, advise that he do not officiate as a minister of the gospel. To which he does willingly agree."

It was upon the whole "ordered that a letter be writ to the people to whom Mr. Van Vleck did use to preach" which being done, "by the moderator, (Jeddiah Andrews) and Mr. Hampton;" a postscript is added in these words: "The reason of this advice for his not preaching was this, that the Presbytery could not find proof clear and positive enough to prove the crime against him, yet Mr. Van Vleck's vindication did not appear sufficient."

The case was reopened when Mr. Van Vleck brought in certain papers immediately after the breaking up of Presbytery to clear himself of the crime charged upon him. No order was made to examine the validity of these papers, but they were referred to a commission consisting of Andrews, McNish, and Hampton, who after examining the validity of the papers, adjudged "that he was guilty." And Mr. Van Vleck being absent and nothing appearing for his vindication, it was adjudged that his suspension should continue, and the judgment was made final.

Such was the solemn, grave, and conscientious judgment of the court of Christ's house, the first Presbytery set up in America. And if the reader is ready to raise both hands

and hold his breath in amazement, we can tell him that this case has been paralleled many a time since that day in the Presbyterian Church courts by Christian gentlemen sitting as judges and acting on their consciences. Several of which we have in mind, but do not care to specify, because that is no part of the object for which this article was written.

III. The dignity, consequence and importance of the Ruling Elder in the courts of the church since that day has increased in about the same proportion that the attendance of these officers upon the courts has diminished. We fail to find in the records that the Ruling Elder was considered an essential part of Presbytery. The appointment of committees and commissions, the organization of churches, the instalation of ministers and the dissolution of pastoral relation were all effected without the presence of the ruling elder. The Presbytery of 1706 at Philadelphia, and in 1713 at New Castle, were open, transacted all business, and "broke up without the presence of a single ruling elder. Therefore, it is evident, that the ruling elder was not considered an essential factor in the make up of a Presbytery. In 1716 the question was gravely put and voted upon whether an elder "should act here as a representative, notwithstanding the minister's absence." And yet accepting the two instances mentioned, the ruling elders attended the annual meetings in such numbers that a very large majority of the churches were represented by ruling elders in each meeting. As the Presbyterian Church in America formed no distinctive constitution for either its guidance or government till 1787, the presumption is that this first Presbytery was governed in a general way only by the form of government set on foot by the Westminster Assembly. In the debates of that Assembly it was decided that "the office of ruling elder was of divine institution." "But, it remained to define in what this office consisted, and this gave rise to another and very animated debate, and after a very learned and animated discussion, the opinion of the Assembly being

nearly balanced, was laid aside for a time without any definite conclusion." (Hetherington, pages 142-143.) The ruling elder has been buffeted about a good deal by his friends in trying to give him a locus and a status in the church courts. There is no difficulty and all are agreed, on the point, that the ruling elders are the immediate representatives of the people, and chosen by them, that, in conjunction with the pastor or ministers, they may exercise government and discipline, and take the over-sight of the spiritual interest of the particular church which elects them and in which they are ordained to exercise the functions of the office. But when we get above the session and the particular congregation, the atmosphere begins to get a little hazy. The teaching elders who are to "labor in the word and doctrine," possess an office which is declared to be "the first in the church for dignity and usefulness." They take their place in the courts of the church above the session, by virtue of their ordination, to exercise functions which are inherent in the office to which they are set apart by ordination. And these are double, or two fold. The Presbyterian system makes a bold cut across every teaching elder and divides him into a teacher and a ruler. But the system makes no such cut across the ruling elder. He takes his place in the courts of the church, above the session, not by virtue of his ordination alone but by appointment, also, as a representative chosen by the members of another court. And with many the question is still an open one, whether he represents the session, which appoints him, or the congregation which does not appoint him. But, however that may be, he is never and nowhere a teacher as well as a ruler. Therefore, by the genius of the system, whatever may be the declarations of the Book of Church Order, he cannot possess the "same authority in the courts of the church as the minister of the word." He cannot teach there, or anywhere else, as an elder. The power to rule comes by virtue of ordination, but it does not go beyond that, with the ruling elder, he is not ordained to teach.

The courts of the church are not only bodies which have the power to rule, but they have additional powers to interpret and to teach. The last two belong alone to the teaching elder and cannot by him be relegated to any one, neither can they be usurped by any. Here the equation is broken on the one side. The constitution of the church is incoherent and very much tangled up at this point. It claims that the ruling elder possesses "the same authority in the courts of the church as a minister of the word." Yet, in the same clause in which this sweeping declaration is made we find a proviso: That "any official duty devolving upon him (the ruling elder) the performance of which requires the functions pertaining only to the teaching elder, shall be remitted by him for its execution to such minister of the word, being a member of the court, as he may select." (Form Gov. ch. IV. sec. 2-43.) This *proviso*, which was intended to cover the abuse of the principle in making a ruling elder a Moderator, has done much violence to the whole system. For the very genius of the Presbyterian system of courts requires that he who presides over these courts shall have power to exercise the functions of expounding and teaching that law which is to guide their actions and deliberations. For the interpretation of the law is as much a teaching function as the expounding of the Gospel in preaching an opening sermon. In assuming that the ruling elder can do the one, and making provision for an escape from doing the other, is an abuse of the principle and a flagrant violation of the logic of the system. Another hitch comes when the constitution defines what shall constitute a quorum of Presbytery. "Any three ministers belonging to the Presbytery with at least one ruling elder being met at the time and place shall be a quorum competent to proceed to business." (Form, Gov. ch. V. Sec. IV.-74.)

The office of the teaching elder is declared to be "the first in the Church both for dignity and usefulness." Dignity

means elevation of rank—a degree of excellence. But one ruling elder, whose office must be of a lower degree, if the teaching elder is of the first degree, possesses, within himself, the authority in the courts of the Church to upset, and knock out, three degrees of first-class dignity with one degree of second-class dignity. Here the equation is broken on the other side. It may be that right here we have a constitutional explanation of a fact which has so much perplexed and worried the Church in the last few years—why so few ruling elders attend upon the meetings of the higher courts of the Church—as one is to three, so are a very few ruling elders to a great many ministers of the Word. To secure a renewal of attendance, upon the part of this delinquent class, the Church began to cajole, and coax, and coddle, and wheedle, with many promises not warranted by the genius of the Presbyterian system. Knowing that man loves a “little brief authority,” and not forgetting the American’s propensity for office, many overtures were sent up, profound arguments, beat out in long and heavy newspapers and review articles, were set on foot and the thing was accomplished. The mountain labored and the mouse came forth. It was actually engrafted into the organic law of the Church that a ruling elder could, would, and should, be elected Moderator, notwithstanding it is an office many of whose functions he cannot perform.

We have experimented one time in making a very excellent ruling elder and Christian gentleman Moderator of the General Assembly. To be consistent, we ought not to stop with that one experiment. Some time in the future we ought to try it again. It may be that some over sensitive, or over nervous, brother would be shocked at seeing matters go in the courts of the Lord’s house as they might go in a court of common pleas, or legislative hall, or political convention, as the ruling elder chosen might be an eminent civil judge or distinguished legislator, or a successful manipulator of State conventions, each governing by

the rules which prevail in the province of his chosen field of action. Having made it lawful is the Church now reaching the conviction that it is not expedient ?

It will not be many years before the Church will be forced either to abandon the very genius of the Presbyterian system or to re-write the Book of Church Order. For about every change, or amendment, made since the book was first adopted in 1879, differentiates it from the genius of the Presbyterian system.

At first (1561) the Church of Scotland put the deacon and the ruling elder on the same footing. "The affairs of each congregation were managed by the ministers, elders and deacons who constituted the kirk session." (Hethington Church, Scotland, page 551.) So the deacon, no more nor less, than the elder, was a part of the session. The second Book of Discipline (1578) divided the whole polity of the Church into three divisions—doctrine, discipline, distribution—according to this arrangement there arose a three-fold sort of officer bearer in the Church—minister, ruling elder, deacon—all these were "call it beane generall waird ministers of the kirk." The deacon held his office in the session on an equal footing with the ruling elder, until 1645, when the Church of Scotland adopted the Westminster Form of Government. It was this Westminster Astemby which cut the deacon loose from his place in the session. This Westminster Assembly settled for the Church the fact that the "office of ruling elder was of divine institution." But "it remained to define in what that office consisted." That question was never settled by that Assembly. And it remains to this day an unsettled question.

IV. In addition to the record books of the Presbytery it was (1709) "Ordered, That every letter sent by Presbytery be inserted in a book appointed by the Presbytery for that purpose and this be done by Mr. Andrews." From this letter book we get a great many valuable facts and much

general information which would otherwise be entirely lost. We get an insight, through some of these letters, into the difficulties with which these fathers had to contend. And we also learn that they wrote and talked in a tone much more authoritative and consequential than might, with perfect safety to the Church, be indulged in at this day. We submit a few samples of the ore to give our readers some idea of the quality and grade of the metal." The Christian people of New Castle had tangled matters up between themselves and their pastor until there was a "misunderstanding" which had gradually spread to the congregation in the country. For the reader must know that the congregation in the country, like the minister in the town, were Irish in the quality and tone of their piety as well as their national temperament. And learning that there was something like a "row" in the church in town there is nothing more natural than that they should "jist go down and take a leetle bit of a hand in it." Matters pretty rapidly reached that point where Presbytery had to intervene. The letter began, "Out of a Christian compassion that we have towards you, we can but commiserate your present circumstances, and are heartily sorry for the misunderstanding that is between you and Mr. Wilson; as also for the difference that is between you and our Christian friends in the country. We would be glad to fall upon a healing method to remedy these unhappy divisions. And gentlemen, you may be assured that whatever (in duty) lies within the compass of our power shall not be wanting; but after second thought, and a due sense of your condition, we fear that such changes as are set on foot among you in the present circumstances concerning a minister may prove detrimental to you and our common interest; especially when we take notice that nothing particular has been offered to us by you concerning our brother Wilson why he may not continue in his present charge and function toward you as formerly. A general

dissatisfaction is the principle (it seems) which is presented both in your letter to us and by your, and our friend, Mr. Janvier." After a few more sentences about another minister whose name is mentioned and who appears to have been too shrewd a man to want a church which would fall out with its pastor without being able to give any better reason than "a general dissatisfaction;" the letter concludes after this fashion: "And therefore we entreat, nay require, you in the Lord to concur with us." This settled the matter and Mr. Wilson continued to serve the church as its pastor. There appears to have been a kind of pious fuss at Woodbridge, in which almost all, if not all, the members felt it to be their Christian duty to engage. The matter finally came before Presbytery. That body wrote a letter to the congregation from which we make the following extracts: "Upon the whole matter and after our serious reflections thereon we cannot but with grief tell you that we fear there has been fault on all hands and that the most innocent have reason for self-condemnation; how much others then that have been the unhappy causes, fomenters and promoters of such unchristian distraction and animosities. Woe unto them by whom offenses come. Having mentioned this we cannot pass on till in the bowels of Christ we beseech and request you to look back and repent, to love and unite, in the true fear of God and the interest of his Kingdom for the future."

From these extracts the reader will understand that the fathers of this first Presbytery were not disposed to indulge in blandishments or pious taffy in dealing with recalcitrant churches and their obstreperous members.

In 1709 the Presbytery of Dublin addressed a letter to this Presbytery through the courtesy of Mr. Alexander Sinclair, a member of the Presbytery of Dublin directed to Mr. John Henry, a member of this Presbytery, expressing a desire that "a correspondent may be settled and continued from time to time." The request was also made that

"an account of the ecclesiastical affairs with a promise of all assistance they could afford or procure by interest of others." From this correspondence we gather the following which may best be stated in the language of the letter : "As to the state of the church our interest truly is very weak and we cannot relate this matter without sorrow of heart, since it is too much owing to the neglect of ministers at home. Our late Rev. Brother Francis Makemie prevailed with some ministers of London to undertake the support of two itinerants for the space of two years and after that time to send two more upon the same conditions allowing the former after that time to settle which if accomplished had proved of more than creditable advantage to these parts considering how far scattered most of the inhabitants be. But alas, they drew back their hands and we have reason to lament their deficiency, Had our friends at home been equally watchful and diligent as the Episcopalian Society at London, our interest in most foreign plantations probably might have carried the balance. In all Virginia there is but one small congregation at Elizabeth River, and some few families favoring our way in Rappahannock and York. In Maryland only four ; in Pennsylvania five and in the Jerseys two, which bounds, with some places of New York, make up all the bounds we have any members from, and at present some of these are vacant."

This letter indicates that the spirit of mission work was alive in the heart of these Irish Presbyterians and that they had the keenest appreciation of the work in the foreign field, for at that day America and her plantations were six times or more as far away (in point of time) from Dublin as China, Japan or Corea are from America today. Let the reader think for a little space. The letter was written in Dublin in November, 1709, and answered by Presbytery in a letter written September, 1710. Such was the tardiness with which correspondence was carried on nearly two

hundred years ago. These fathers had what we believe was the true idea of the work required to build up our Church in that day and equally so now if the Church could only see it. It might be called the Francis Makemie idea of home mission work, itinerating for the space of two years and after that to settle. If each Presbytery would require every licentiate to itinerate for two years before settling, their support being furnished by Presbytery, every county in every Presbytery would have Presbyterian churches, and settled pastors would be more numerous and more permanent. But this is not the time or place to discuss that matter. A similar correspondence was opened with the synod of Glasgow brought about by a letter from the Rev. James Brown of the synod to "some good friends" intimating that the synod was willing. The letter of the Presbytery to the synod bears date September, 1710. Among other things the letter says: "We are thankful that by the Divine Providence our endeavors and poor essays have not been altogether in vain. The number of our ministers from the respective providences is ten in all, three from Maryland, five from Pennsylvania and two from East Jersey." After setting forth the desolate condition of sundry vacant places the letter proceeds: "May it therefore please the pious and Reverend Synod in compassion to desolate souls in America perishing for want of vision to send over one or more ministers and support them for longer or shorter time. We further represent that according to the best of our judgment that forty pounds sterling, paid in Scotland to be transmitted in goods, will be a competency for the support of each minister you send, provided that of your pious and Christian benevolence you suitably fit them out."

Correspondence was likewise opened up and set on foot with certain ministers in London who expressed the greatest interest and took the deepest concern in planting the Gospel in these "American plantations." Among the most

conspicuous and prominent of these was the Rev. Thomas Reynolds, of London. Mr. Reynolds' letter bore date December 24, 1712. After promising to advance thirty pounds for the support of one or more ministers, the letter closes in these words: "I desire to hear from you as soon as may be, and would be glad to be an instrument of disappointing any that encourage no expectation from us." The answer to this letter bore date September 17, 1713. From these extracts it will appear that from Ireland, England and Scotland, the spirit of Foreign Missions was alive in the bosom of the Presbyterian Church. The Presbyterians of the kingdom of Great Britain were laying the foundations and building the Church for Christ, in the distant American colonies, more than a hundred years before Alexander Duff sailed for India, or Adoniram Judson "embarked from Salem for Calcutta;" and almost a century before William Carey, with his family, set sail for Bengal. This last meeting of this unique, original, and first Presbytery in America, was held in New Castle, in September, 1716. Provisions were there and then made for the organization of the Synod of Philadelphia. The order runs in these words, "It having pleased the Divine Providence so to increase our numbers, as that, after much deliberation, we judge it may be more serviceable to the interest of religion to divide ourselves into subordinate meetings, or Presbyteries, constituting one annually as a Synod, to meet at Philadelphia, or elsewhere, to consist of all the members of each subordinate Presbytery for this year at least; therefore, it is agreed by the Presbytery, after serious deliberation, that the first subordinate meeting, or Presbytery, to meet at Philadelphia, or elsewhere, as they shall see fit, do consist of the following men: Powell, Orr, Bradner and Morgan."

This "first subordinate meeting of Presbytery" was and is the Presbytery of Philadelphia from that day on to the present time. Like provision was made for a second and a third, with recommendations for the organization or erection

of a fourth, on Long Island. The time of the meeting of these Presbyteries was "left to their own discretion." It was "ordered that a book be kept by each of the said Presbyteries containing a record of their proceedings and that the said book be brought every year to our anniversary Synod to be revised." The record goes on to say, "Our next meeting being appointed as Synod, it is ordered that the present Moderator open the same by preaching; and that the Moderator of the last Synod open the next by preaching always for the time coming, upon the first Tuesday of our meeting, at 10 o'clock."

There is no record that this original Presbytery was ever opened or closed with prayer during the whole period of its separate and independent existence.

R. K. SMOOT.

Austin, Texas.

I. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

BEHIND THE PARDAH. The story of C. E. Z. M. S. Work in India. *By Irene H. Barnes.* With Preface by T. A. Gurney, M. A. Illustrated by J. D. Mackenzie and Percy R. Craft. New York.: T. Y. Crowell & Co. 1897. 16mo. Pp. 264.

A thoroughly entertaining, instructive and useful piece of missionary literature. Probably the best exhibition of what woman has done and can do for woman that has been given to the public. We may adopt the language of Rev. Mr. Gurney, in the preface: "It gives glimpses of the inner life of Indian women which, for picturesqueness of detail, vividness of description, and dramatic power, would be hard to surpass. And, throughout, the style is so easy and conversational that the mind never feels wearied. It may, therefore, be cordially commended not only to missionary circles, where it will be invaluable, but also to genuine readers who desire to know something of Indian life and folklore."

We may explain the title by saying that the "Pardah" is the veil that shuts off the females of the Zenana from the rest of the house, and from the sight of all strange men. The Church of England Zenana Missionary Society has been carrying on distinct and ever growing work since 1881. They have done a work vast and wonderful in itself, that cannot be estimated by any human standard. This book it well calculated to give a clear conception of the work, its difficulties, successes, needs, possibilities and manifold activities. The workers are continually introduced to describe their experiences and observations for themselves.

The introduction gives us some account of the great organization that is doing this work. Then follows "a glance at the land," a condensed view of India, its peoples, customs, religions. Then we are taken behind this pardah and permitted to see the condition—pitiable enough!—of the female inmates of the Hindo, Parsi and Moslem establishments. The hapless lot, the "ways and woes," of Indian girlhood next occupies attention, the full consideration that it demands. The authoress then portrays the "first experiences" of the Zenana Missionary. She devotes two chapters to the important matter of village missions. Discussing native helpers, many of them by name, and enforcing the plea "India's girls for Christ," she passes to the consideration of that desperately wretched host of 23,000,000 of widows in India. The simple narrative is enough to stir the most callous. So unhappy is their lot that they do not always regard the abolition of the Suttée as a mercy. That was the short anguish of death by fire. Now it is a lifelong torment, unless indeed the woman suicides or abandons herself to a life of shame. Six hundred thousand of these widows are under nineteen, many thousands are under ten, and thousands under four.

Two chapters are given to "our suffering sisters behind the pardah,"

depicting further the sad condition of the Hindu women ; and the last chapter is devoted to "the daughters of Islam," showing the equally deplorable condition of the Mohammedan women. An Appendix of 28 pages gives a succinct history of the work of the C. E. Z. M. S., year by year, from 1881 to 1897. A sensible feature, not usually found in missionary books, is a full index.

The illustrations, some of them half-tone, are mostly good. The mechanical execution up to the mark. The author uses too many abbreviations, such as "T. Y. E." and "Z. B. M. M.," that do not explain themselves, and, therefore, puzzle the thinking reader. But that is a small blemish.

D. J. BRIMM.

Columbia, S. C.

ROBERT WHITAKER MCALL, FOUNDER OF THE MCALL MISSION, PARIS.

A Fragment by Himself ; a Souvenir by his Wife. With Portraits, Fac-similes and Illustrations. London: The Religious Tract Society. 1896. Cr. 8 vo, pp. 252.

Dr. McAll was one of the great Field-Marshalls of the Church Militant. He has been recognized on all hands as one of the colossal figures of this century, to be ranked with Livingstone, Hudson Taylor, Paton, Moody, Miller, and others who have originated and had the boldness and faith to project and execute, in spite of all obstacles, wonderful works for the salvation of men and upbuilding of God's Kingdom. When he died in 1893, three of earth's greatest nations mourned. Here is Dr. Boardman's somewhat remarkable characterization of him, as given in the Appendix of the volume before us: "Dr. McAll was an islander, but not an insular ; a Protestant, but not a propagandist ; a Catholic, but not a Romanist ; a Congregationalist, but not a denominationalist ; a missionary, but not a proselytizer ; a preacher, but not a doctrinaire ; a reformer, but not an iconoclast ; a philanthropist, but not a sentimentalist ; an enthusiast, but not a visionary ; a commander, but not an autocrat ; a practic, but not a pragmatist ; an opportunist, but not a time-server ; a conciliator, but not a compromiser ; a tactician, but not a manœuverer ; an achiever, but not a boaster : in brief, a Christian Nehemiah, rebuilding the Jerusalem of the Huguenots, and sending forth his lieutenants through the Judea of France, to reconvert it to the true Messiah."

Such is the man that the attempt is made to portray in this volume ; a great subject for an able biographical artist, certainly. Knowing this to start with and realizing it continually, as we read, the wonder ever grows that the work has been so imperfectly done. We are loath to say this ; we do hope, for the sake of the great subject of the memoir, for the sake of the great cause set forth, for the sake of the widow who pieced together the fragments and glimpses that compose the volume, that the work will have a wide circulation. But we are compelled in honesty to say that the work has been badly done. And we can scarcely divine the reason why. There was certainly no lack of material ; much

is here and it is said to be only a selection. There is certainly abounding love and admiration ; there was no need of excessive diffidence. We will do the compiler the justice to say that she disclaims any attempt to write a biography ; but this is just where she made the prime mistake. Why did she not, when she had this great obligation laid upon her ? If she really felt incompetent she should have declined and left it to abler hands. As a matter of fact, we believe the fair sex has furnished no approach to Boswell in the field of biography. Various explanations of this might be given, but we will not attempt to discuss this matter, further than to say that the explanation must lie near to that which accounts for no woman's having ever produced a great epic.

Among the points to be criticised, we note, first, the absence of objective delineation. There is a great number of picture-fragments of various shapes, sizes and colors, and the reader is left largely to his own acuteness in forming the pictures. Fragments that stand in consecutive order, sometimes without even a word of connection, frequently puzzle us to determine their relation to each other. This leads, in the second place, to lack of steady forward movement. We swing forward and backward in dates, sometimes, in a very confusing fashion ; harmony all gone, amid the jangling discord we lose the strain and are bewildered for a time—like listening to a Liszt Melody, so-called. Then, the ends of the threads also appear in the embroidery, at times, as when extracts are given from Dr. McAll's diary, mere jottings, *dissecta membra*, of no more meaning or interest than are the quotations in a commercial report, to a society belle.

Another matter for criticism is the amount of French employed. French words, phrases, sentences, letters, poems really abound. The Menu is none the more appetizing because of all this French. It makes no difference whether the reviewer was bothered by it or not ; we are sure that nine-tenths of those who would wish to read of Dr. McAll's life and work would be considerably bothered by the French. The proof-reading of the book is not good. We will not specify all. Several dates are made wrong thereby. Take this as an example of punctuation : "a wonderful copy for so young a child of an altar-tomb with recumbent figure." A child of an altar-tomb with recumbent figure is liable to do something wonderful. Perhaps the reader would like to practice himself a little on this sentence, also : "Whilst leaving the Hibel-road station, a short three minutes in the Manchester train shows us Prestbury, the mother-church of Macclesfield, with lych-gate, and the quiet village on the left bank of the little Bollin, making its unobtrusive way to the Mersey."

We refrain from further criticism. We wish that every one might be familiar with the life and work—especially that from 1871 to 1893, in Paris—of this great evangelistic hero. We only wish that Dr. George Smith would write the narrative.

Paper, type, binding and illustrations are good.
Columbia, S. C.

D. J. BRIMM.

MISSIONS AND POLITICS IN ASIA. Studies of the Spirit of the Eastern Peoples, the Present Making of History in Asia, and the Part Therein of Christian Missions. *By Robert E. Speer*, Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1898, 16 mo. Pp. 271. \$1.00.

Good and useful, thoughtful and suggestive, instructive and inspiring books on missionary themes are continually coming from the press. This is to be considered one of the peculiar blessings of our age. Most of the books issued in this field are useful or valuable or interesting from one point of view or another. The man who reads all these and whose duty it is to pronounce on them for the benefit of the public, determined always to be fair to the author and honest with the expectant reader, at the same time, needs to be supplied with an abundance of descriptive adjectives, shading almost insensibly in meaning from "fairly good" to "superb," "brilliant," "absorbing," etc., etc. We feel this more and more in writing notices or reviews and in reading those prepared by others. We often wish that the whole guild of us might adopt some system of grading or some graduated nomenclature that would enable us to put the matter down with scientific or at least commercial exactness.

To illustrate by the book under consideration: After having notified the reader that this volume contains the "Students' Lectures on Missions," five in number, delivered at Princeton in 1898, by one whom all that know much of Foreign Missions recognize as eminently competent to deliver something worth listening to or to publish something well worth reading, we might consider the fitness of the title to convey an impression of the contents, and decide that, though somewhat puzzling at first, it is in fact apt, and so we describe it as A 1. The sub-title gives the idea of the lectures a little more fully. The author acquired part of his fitness for handling this attractive subject, by an extended tour through the countries treated—Persia, Southern Asia (Turkey, Arabia and India), China, Japan and Korea, and a part by the study of the works of competent authorities. And so, secondly, we may describe the matter as "excellent." We are not too modest, while robed in our critic's ermine, to take issue with points made by the author, if we had seen any to take issue with, but we did not.

Thirdly, as to literary style, we would grade the "production" at about 90 per cent. The style is undoubtedly good and natural, but style is a somewhat variable, fluid thing, that is, according to our rigid system of marking, hard to reach perfection in, and so 90 is a *magna cum laude* mark. It leaves some room for brilliance. In the volume here considered there would be greater purity and withal perspicuity, by the less frequent omission of a narrative "that," and certainly there is no defense for the omission of a relative "that," in one case.

We commend the volume to students of present-day problems in missions, as a helpful work. The mechanical execution is up to the usual standard of neatness and durability maintained by the Revell Company.

Now that we have praised sufficiently, let us bring out the ferule a little. This book is one that a student will want to keep and refer to occasionally. In this day, when we have to read so many books and so much else, we can rarely take time to re-read a book, still less to give it a third or fourth perusal. There are few of us that can fix everything in a book in our little craniums by one headlong perusal. If an author has a right to expect to be read, the reader has a right to expect a good index for future reference. It is strange to us that an author, to save himself a little trouble or expense, will, nowadays, so commonly ignore the rights of the reader. It is strange that the publisher will not require the author to provide an index. "Missions and Politics in Asia" is defective in this respect—no index whatever. Each chapter has fifty or more pages, and any matter that calls for re-examination must be searched for, page by page, through a whole lecture of said length, if one is so fortunate as to remember the lecture in which to search. True, there is a sketch of each lecture in the table of contents. But that is of little service, for, after you have found your topic—if you are so fortunate—in these catch-words, you must still search page by page, because these catch-titles are not indicated in the body of the lecture nor in the margins. Of course we have in mind the average reader: the man who has to waste his precious time over such books a great deal acquires a certain dexterity with a table of contents or even without one. But we maintain that the purchaser and reader of a book is entitled to that much consideration, and we get indignant at such frequent violation of the right

D. J. BRIMM.

Columbia, S. C.

PERSIA. WESTERN MISSION. *By the Rev. S. G. Wilson*, author of "Persian Life and Customs." With Map and Illustrations. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1896. 16mo. Pp. 381.

This volume is in some measure a supplement to that mentioned on the title page, "Persian Life and Customs," which the author published, through the Revell Company, in 1895. It is a supplement, and yet in the main complete in itself. Certain terms employed without explanation, as *shahi*, *kran*, *toman*, and certain sects alluded to without description, as *Shiahs*, *Sunnis*, presuppose familiarity with the antecedent volume. With some hesitation we may venture the opinion that the two works overlap each other unnecessarily. Each might have been somewhat condensed and a clearer line of demarcation drawn between them. And yet, many will read only one volume, and for such it is better as it is. We would by no means give the impression that reading one will dispense with the importance of reading the other. Mr. Wilson is a good writer and thoroughly informed, and both volumes are full of matter.

Persia is an interesting country. The racial, religious and political conditions are very interesting. In the volume before us, "the history

of Christianity in Persia and the conditions of religious liberty are sketched; and the narrative of the mission work, the equipment for its prosecutions and triumphs are detailed with reference to Nestorians, Armenians and Jews." So says the Preface, and our perusal leads to the judgment that it has been quite thoroughly and withal pleasingly done. The author's own work is among the Armenians at Tabriz. What a religious condition he has portrayed! How bigotry begets bigotry! And how dense ignorance fosters it all! Mussulman, Jew, Gregorian, Nestorian, Romanist and Anglican, almost equally intolerant of each other, and all intolerant of the Evangelicals or Protestants or Presbyterians. A curious picture it is, of the Anglican trying to frustrate the Presbyterian and prevent the reform of the Armenian and Nestorian, even saying that the Presbyterians are not Christians. This is the fruit of the "historic Episcopate" under the banner of which we are exhorted in this day of liberalism to unite.

But the Anglican Mission does not seem to be prospering. The Presbyterian Mission is steadily growing and enlarging its influence. We are all the more amazed that the Anglican Church should be devoting men and money to such an object—just as when we find Episcopalians trying to reconvert Sandwich Island Congregationalists while proposing to withdraw from Korea if the Russian Greek Church enters—when so many parts of the world are yet utterly waste and desolate and dark; especially so, when we read of the character of the Nestorian and Armenian priests and bishops, particularly the Gregorian—strikers, brawlers, given to wine, greedy of filthy lucre, husbands of more than one wife, assassins in some cases, densely ignorant all.

Much is said for Medical Missions and also for Bible Distribution. We were surprised in the last chapter to learn of the prevalence of intemperance among the Mohammedans of Persia, and delighted also to read of how a revival under the auspices of the Presbyterian Mission led to the emptying of so many wine-cellars and pouring the stuff into the drains.

Though the title page leads us to expect a map, our copy has none, which we hope is only a binder's blunder. The book needs a map. There is an excellent index. The illustrations are good half-tones. The book is well gotten up, in spite of some typographical errors. Good binding, paper and type.

D. J. BRIMM.

Columbia, S. C.

TATONG, THE LITTLE SLAVE. A story of Korea. *By Annie Maria Barnes*, author of "Ninito," etc. Richmond: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1899. 16 mo. pp. 252. \$1.00.

Since Mrs. Stowe published the volume that drove one part of this nation in blind and fanatical fury to try to destroy the other part, we have been chary and suspicious of fictitious portrayals, at least of social conditions. However, from what we have read, the picture is

not overdrawn in "Tatong." The author is probably known to most of our readers through others of her works, "Ninito," "Children of the Kalahari," "Izilda," "How A-chon-ho-ah Found the Light," etc. "Tatong" is a touching little story, with a neat and simple plot. It will awaken the interest of young people in the Koreans, and make them appreciate Christianity more, perhaps. The authoress seems to have made a resolution to banish the word "that," in all its uses, from the English language. What grudge has she against it? Take some specimens: "but was now so soiled and worn all whiteness had gone from it;" "but they did not have the effect upon her Mrs. Ni desired and expected;" "the former singing so it seemed they could not tell the flowers, etc.;" "a thick paste that did its part so well not a ray of light found its way to her;" "while her eyes had so intense a glow Tatong could almost feel it upon her face." Here is a sentence of another kind: "Had they been like we buy eggs, some, if not most of them, would surely have been broken." Grammar and punctuation are both bad, here.

The publishers have given us a neat, attractive, durable volume in good type and on excellent paper.

D. J. BRIMM.

Columbia, S. C.

MONTEVIDEO—MAYBANK: Some Memoirs of a Southern Christian Household in the Olden Time; or, The Family Life of the Rev. Charles Colcock Jones, D. D., of Liberty County, Ga. *By his Son-in-law, R. Q. Mallard, D. D.* Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1898. 16 mo. pp. 87. 50c.

From the facile pen of the able editor of the *Southwestern Presbyterian*, this book attracts at sight the interest of a Southern Presbyterian. It recalls the Georgia joke about the man's compliment on the dish of butter: "Very nice butter, what there is of it; ah! excuse me! Plenty of butter, such as it is." There is very considerable display of paper and pasteboard and muslin, and when we get through the perusal of an hour or so we feel that all there is might have been put in so much briefer compass. Again, as we read we wonder at the remarkable brevity of the chapters and our mind is constantly enquiring, why did not the author expend some of the energy of his useful pen in developing and elaborating the important topics chosen. We continually feel as a tethered animal must feel, as he moves off in one direction and, suddenly, before he has well started, is stopped by a sharp jerk, which shows him that he can go no further in that direction. He goes back and starts again on a new course only to meet the same experience, and so it continues.

The object of the sketch is to show a somewhat ideal Christian family, a real family and therefore imitable. Certainly a commendable object, a lofty purpose, and heads of families, in this lax age, will be benefitted by a thoughtful perusal. Our chief regret is, as we have already intimated, that the author has largely cast away his opportunity

for preaching. The chapter on "Sabbath and Church" is the best because he has in it given himself most tether.

With one sentence in the book we can never agree. "The one section (the North) has honored herself by self-restraint in the hour of victory; no blood was shed by axe when the sword had been sheathed; and a million of men in blue, their task done, went back to their old occupations." All three statements are entirely too broad and sweeping. If it were possible, the North has disgraced itself more by its behavior since the war than by its uncivilized warfare during the actual conflict, and there is no use in our trying to conceal the facts for them. There are but three periods in the history of this Republic: 1. The efforts of the North to get the South down; 2. Subjugation; 3. Determined efforts to keep the South under. But we refrain.

D. J. B.

[We suppose the reviewer does not consider these statements sweeping.—ED.]

LIGHTS AND SHADOWS, OR MISSION WORK IN THE FAR EAST. Having the record of observations made during a visit to the Southern Presbyterian Missions in Japan, China and Korea in the year 1897. *By S. H. Chester, D. D.*, Secretary of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 16mo. Pp. 133. 75 cents.

This is a valuable book, being the observation of a close and interested observer. The officer is the efficient Secretary of the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions in the Southern Presbyterian Church. In the autumn of 1897 he visited the missions of this church in Japan, China and Korea, for the purpose of studying the fields and work from the point of view of the committee and the churches at home. On his return an account of his observations was given in a series of addresses. The interest awakened, and the impossibility of reaching more than a small section of the Church in that way, led to the preparation of this volume. Its objective, therefore, is all homes and all missionary libraries in all parts of the Church. We wonder how nearly this will be realized! The extent of its realization will depend largely on the ministry, whether or not it will bring the book to the attention of the people and the attention of the people to the book.

The work merits the widest circulation for several reasons: First, whatever accrues from the sale of it will be given to Foreign Mission work through our treasury; second, it comes from our own secretary as his careful and discriminating observations during an official tour through these three interesting countries of the Far East; third, because of its intrinsic worth. It is interesting, instructive and impressive. In style it is easy, natural and pleasant. In matter it tells of country, customs, scenery and missionary difficulties. We were especially impressed by what is said of the difficulties. That one effect of the book, if produced upon all readers as on us, would doubly repay the author, the committee and the Church for the money and time expended. Our

missionaries are so faithful and their hearts so absorbed and enwrapped in the work, that they tell us of the many good things while they speak but little of their many hardships. The information Dr. Chester brings us heightens our admiration, deepens our sympathy and quickens our interest for our honored, God-serving, self-sacrificing missionaries. There are the trials and there will be the far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.

We warmly commend this book to all—to pastors, to laymen, to parents, to children. Every family and every Sabbath-school should secure it. It will greatly please and profit those interested in missions, and we confidently believe will awaken interest in those not interested already.

The mechanical execution is excellent. It is printed on a fine quality of paper, embellished with thirteen full-page half-tones, and is beautifully bound. Surely all who can will at once order "Lights and Shadows, or Mission Work in the Far East."

S. C. BYRD.

Columbia, S. C.

THE CONVERSION OF THE MAORIS. *By the Rev. Donald MacDowall, B. D.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work. 1899. 16 mo. Pp. 216.

This book is the work of a tourist, not of a missionary. His object in the publication may be stated in his own prefatory note: "Profoundly convinced, by what I have seen and learned while in New Zealand of the triumph of the gospel of Christ, in the conversion of the Maoris from cannibalism to Christianity, that it is a stronger and more cogent argument for the power of the gospel than any statement I have ever read in apologetic books; and also quickened by the hope that this brief story of the wonderful conversion of these cannibals may convince others of the living power of modern missions, and hasten the coming of our Lord, I now offer this book to all who long for the conversion of the world."

There is no question that the regenerating, transforming power of Christianity, when planted among the most degraded savages as well as its elevating and ennobling effect upon the higher heathen and Mohammedan peoples is one of the most irrefutable apologetic arguments that we can employ. The Maoris furnish one of the notable examples. In this volume the author describes their early condition, their superstitions and their government and customs. He then gives some account of the efforts, finally successful, to establish missions among them and of the leading missionaries, Marsden, Selwyn, Leigh. This part is rather disjointed. Something is also told us of colonization efforts, of the present condition of the Maoris, and of religion and education in New Zealand.

The last chapter is devoted to Samoa. We don't exactly see why this is put in, as the Samoans are not Maoris, and the political situation is the main thing presented. We suspect that the larger part of this book

was written for the papers, first. There is a very large tail, or perhaps we should say ell, in the form of an appendix of 60 pages, which gives a sort of itinerary of the traveler. This would have been better left out, or condensed into about ten pages. There is all the minute circumstantiality, the tiresome particularity of a female newspaper reporter trying to fill so many columns. Certainly he has not mastered the art of interesting description. Just one out of scores or perhaps hundreds of sentences. In describing the streets of one city, he says: "The young trees are inclosed for protection within four narrow pieces of wood driven into the ground and connected near the top by four short pieces nailed on to them at right angles." There is considerable instruction in the book for one who has not read more fully elsewhere. Mechanical execution excellent. A number of good half-tones. No index. All books with as many foreign words as this work should have some pronouncing apparatus. For instance the name "Ti White," in this book, might be pronounced in four different ways, and the reader is at a loss which to adopt.

D. J. BRIMM.

Columbia, S. C.

LIFE OF MRS. SARAH A. LANKFORD PALMER. *By Rev. John A. Roche, D. D.*, with an introduction by Rev. John P. Newman, D. D., LL. D. George Hughes & Co. New York: Pp. 286. \$1.50.

Beyond all question the subject of this memoir was an earnest and devoted servant of God, and if the object of the writer had been to glorify the grace of God as exhibited in her life, and to stimulate the zeal of others by her example, he might have found an abundance of material in her long and active life. But such was not the aim of the writer. The book is intended to be a plea for the doctrine of entire and instantaneous sanctification, and was prepared at the request of Mrs. Palmer herself. In this work she is presented not only as an earnest advocate and exponent of this idea, but also as a shining example and illustration of it. Indeed the biography is only a minor and incidental feature of the work, and a very considerable part of the book is taken up with arguments, historical and exegetical, going to show that this teaching is in accord with the Word of God, the views of Wesley, and the experience of men.

It is one of the most striking peculiarities of the doctrine of entire sanctification, or perfectionism, that even its ablest advocates are unable apparently to state it in terms clear and unmistakable. Apparently there are no words in our language capable of setting it forth clearly, and the terms used are always qualified and limited to such an extent that the mind is lost in its attempt to locate itself. Take for example the following quotation from Wesley as a fair sample of the "guards" which must be thrown around the doctrine: "Certainly, in the proper

sense, it is an instantaneous deliverance from all sin, and includes an instantaneous power then given always to cleave to God. Yet this sanctification, at least in the lower degrees, does not include the power never to think a useless thought, nor ever speak a useless word.

I, myself, believe that such a perfection is inconsistent with living in a corruptible body; for this makes it impossible always to think right. While we breathe we shall more or less mistake. If, therefore, Christian perfection implies this, we must not expect it till we die.

Indeed my judgment is that, in this case particularly, to overdo is to undo, and that to set perfection too high—so high that no man that I ever heard of or read of attained—is a most effectual, because unsuspected, way of driving it out of the world. . . . Absolute or infallible perfection I never contended for. Sinless perfection I do not contend for, seeing it is not Scriptural." (P. 93.) Imperfection we know, and perfection we can comprehend, but when we are directed to something that comes between, and is neither the one nor the other, we find that the idea eludes our grasp. That the sharp line drawn between the the so-called "perfection" and a lower state is an entirely arbitrary one, and may be shifted at will, may be clearly seen in the warning given by Wesley in the passage quoted above, that we must not set the standard of perfection too high lest we drive it out of the world. The idea seems to be to look around and see how high the most earnest souls have attained and then fix that as the standard, very much as Fahrenheit fixed the zero of his thermometric scale.

In the conclusion of the work the author argues that as one single case of conversion, like that of the Apostle Paul, is sufficient proof of the existence of such a thing as conversion, so "a single case of entire holiness, attended with the Scripture evidences of its reality" should satisfy the candid mind. We readily grant it, but where is that single case to be found? Certainly not in the subject of this memoir, as her biographer thinks, for while she was eulogized after her death as one "wholly sanctified," the same writer candidly admits that she was not without her "faults," which however were only "minor defects" (p. 240).

But according to the author Mrs. Palmer was not the only instance of entire sanctification, but it is attributed to some who never claimed it for themselves, and would doubtless have repudiated such a claim in their behalf, such as Isaiah, Paul, Jonathan Edwards and his wife, Flavel, Cowper, Howe, Payson, &c.

The biographical portion of the book is interesting, but the argumentative portion of the work is neither striking nor original, and the author produces the impression that he is more anxious to show that the doctrine in question is in accord with the views of Wesley, than to show that it is the teaching of the Word of God.

T. R. ENGLISH.

Richmond, Va.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE CREW OF THE DOLPHIN. *By Hesta Stretton.* Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Association. 15 cents.

The author of "Jessica's First Prayer" needs no introduction. This is another of his delightful English stories, illustrating the watchful care of him who "holdeth the sea in the hollow of his hand." A good book for our Sabbath-school libraries is this.

SONS OF ADVERSITY. *By L. Cope Cornford.* Boston: L. C. Page & Co. Pp. 313. \$1.25.

The scene of this tale of love and adventure is laid in England and Holland, and in the time of Elizabeth, petty intrigues with Spain forming the basis. The plot is well conceived, an unusual feature being the villany of the hero's father. There may be those who will find it to their liking, but for us it savors too much of the dime novel. Kennedy's frontispiece illustration is a happy conception.

FABIUS THE ROMAN, or, How the Church Became Militant. *By E. F. Burr, D. D., LL. D.* Pp. 388. \$1.50. New York: The Baker & Taylor Co.

In the wake of "*Quo Vadis*," very aptly comes this thrilling narrative, almost as full of interesting matter and without the objectionable qualities of the former. Dr. Burr is an American writer of versatile genius. As the author of religious and mathematical works, he is already well known to many, but here we have one of his departures. "Fabius the Roman," is a poetical romance in prose, full of daring deeds and noble lives.

The scene is laid in Rome during the rule of Maxentius, when the blood of martyrs had sprang up as seed sown in good ground, and had brought forth an abundant ingathering into the Christian field. Though well-nigh outnumbering their persecutors, the Creed of the Church continued to be, "He was led as a lamb to the slaughter," and many chose death to offered deliverance, that they might the more readily obtain the crown. The effort to combat this spirit, and the work of turning the eyes of the Christian to a deliverer in the person of Constantine, forms the basis of the plot.

The task is committed to Fabius, the hero of the story, a man of daring courage, combined with an almost omniscient insight and unerring judgment, "a crystal sided observatory facing all the azimuths." After the most thrilling adventures, he succeeds in a desperate throw, and marches in triumph to meet the Emperor Constantine, who is at the gates of Rome. Of course a maiden is rescued, and before we leave, we

hear the inevitable "*Ubi tu Caius*," etc., without which all would be incomplete.

Particularly well drawn are the descriptions of the reeking dungeons of Rome, the spirit of the Christian martyrs, and the character of the Pontifex Maximus, upholding the worship of Jupiter and Venus against his reason, knowing that its fall is his ruin. The book closes with a spirited poem.

As a matter of history, made absorbingly interesting for youth, we can commend this work for a place in all libraries.

A DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. *By John D. Davis, Ph. D., D. D.,* Professor of Semitic Philology and Old Testament History in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. With many new and original Maps and Plans and amply illustrated. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 1898. 8 vo. Pp. 802.

That which gives us what we want in the briefest time and most limited space is to us the most valuable. Certain works intrinsically meritorious are oftentimes without utility because of their extensiveness and hence cumbrousness. In this "Dictionary of the Bible" it appears that we have everything to be desired in such a work. Moderate compass, wide range of subjects, adaptation to the Revised as well as the Authorized Version, uniform ability of articles and thorough, competent, accurate scholarship make it almost absolutely what it should be. It must be, therefore, eminently serviceable to all students of the Bible—to the pastor, the theological professor, the theological student, the Sunday-school teacher and the intelligent layman. We have consulted no similar work that was as satisfying. It compares favorably with "Smith's Dictionary of the Bible," which has been so deservedly popular, and has the great advantage of much learning compacted solidly.

As the author says, "the book aims to be a Dictionary of the Bible, not of speculation about the Bible." The interpretation of Scripture is "sober, fair and just." Its facts may be accepted with confidence as the utmost known now of the subjects treated. Disputed questions are stated frankly from both sides, and absolute fairness obtains in all discussions. The position of the author on all questions is admirably conservative. To him the Scriptures are the rule of faith. Their declarations are accepted as true. Sacred history has with him no reconstruction. Neither is there a chafing impatience under the Old Theology, and modern speculations of the schools of the Regenerated Theology are calmly set aside. A reverent, believing, devout attitude is maintained toward the Bible.

We both congratulate and thank Mr. Davis, and bespeak for this Dictionary a wide circulation.

S. C. BYRD.

Columbia, S. C.

IONIA: LAND OF WISE MEN AND FAIR WOMEN. *By Alexander Craig.* Illustrations and cover design by J. C. Leyendecker. Chicago: E. A. Weeks Co. 1898. Pp. 301.

"Ionia" shows close kinship to two well known works, "Utopia" and "Looking Backward." It lacks, however, the originality of the former and the strength of the latter. The title and cover designs would lead the buyer to suppose that he might look forward to a feast of wisdom, wit, pathos and passion, but all such expectations are disappointed.

The hero, Alexander Musgrove, who by the way is not much of a hero, is a young Englishman, the son of a wealthy and benevolent widow lady. He determines to devote his fortune to the cause of suffering humanity, and proposes, with two million pounds, to "abolish all the London slums and make tens of thousands of people happy." While in this laudable work he meets with a Mr. Delphian, a citizen of Ionia, who invites the young philanthropist to visit his country and observe their marvelous advancement and study their wonderful achievements. The rest of the book records Alexander's experience and observations while in this "other world."

The book is not worth reading. There is nothing new in it, and the old is not presented in a manner especially attractive. As in some other cases we are forced to wonder why the book was written. The edition is very attractive, and the mechanical work is good: the paper, printing and designs being especially good.

THE CHAPEL HYMNAL. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work. 1908. 8 vo.

The Northern Presbyterian Church has felt the need of a suitable hymn-book perhaps quite as much as our own Church is feeling that need to-day. Its Committee has already prepared a "Hymnal," which is intended to be a complete manual of praise covering every character of church service. The "Chapel Hymnal" before us is a second book, in smaller compass, designed for use in prayer-meeting and social service. A third book in the series is yet to be issued and will be one specially fitted for Sunday Schools.

The "Chapel Hymnal" embraces three hundred and seventy hymns, with tunes appropriate to them. These are taken mainly from the "Hymnal," though a few not published in that collection are given here, as some of the popular "Gospel Hymns." The topics covered are many and varied, and a very full index is given, adding greatly to the facility of choosing hymns appropriate to occasion or topic. Fifty-two pages of the book are devoted to a selection from the Psalter, for use in responsive readings. The selections are from the version used by the American Bible Society. In the case of many hymns, the arrangement of the page is such that a choice of tunes may be made. The Indices are full and helpful. The collection embraces the more widely popular and well established hymns and tunes. The devotional element is predominant, and a much smaller proportion than usual is given of the objectionable modern jingles and rhymes. In clearness of type, for both music and words, and in binding and size, the book is a model.

EDITORIAL.

RECORD AND REVIEW.

THE SOUTHERN ASSEMBLY.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States met in Richmond, Va., Thursday, May 18th, at 11 a. m., and was opened with a sermon by the retiring Moderator, Rev. E. M. Green, D. D., on the words of Christ found in Matt. 10: 34. "I came not to send peace, but a sword." The First Church is a typical Presbyterian building, solid and massive, and with one or two rooms secured outside furnished ample accommodations for the Assembly's need. Richmond was an ideal place of meeting for the Assembly, rich in historic interest, associated with such names as those of Patrick Henry, Washington, Marshal, Robert Ould, Jefferson Davis and Robt. E. Lee in the sphere of the State and with John Holt Rice, William S. Plummer and Moses D. Hoge in Presbyterian Church circles; containing such monuments as the bronze effigy of A. P. Hill, the pyramid of granite in Hollywood, marking the graves of 30,000 Confederate soldiers, the equestrian statutes of Washington and Lee and the bronze figures of Jackson, The Howitzer, and the Private Confederate Soldier; and such noted buildings as the Capitol, the State Library, the Davis Mansion, the Confederate Museum, the Soldiers' Home and Union Seminary Buildings—the city presented many attractions to the sight-seers. The city is beautifully situated, located on fine hills and plateaus at the falls of the James River. There are now ten active and vigorous Presbyterian Churches in the city and the suburbs, and the honor of entertaining the commissioners was shared by several. The hospitality of the city was unstinted and the general air of kindly feeling which distinguished the As-

sembly was traced by one of the speakers to the atmosphere of refinement and Christian courtesy which were found in the homes from which the commissioners came to their work. At the opening service, the congregation filled the church and overflowed into the galleries. On the platform with Dr. Green were seated Rev. R. P. Kerr, pastor of the First Church, Rev. Jas. Woodrow, D. D., Rev. E. P. Palmer D. D., and Rev. Alexander Sprunt, D. D. After the invocation the congregation sang, "Before Jehovah's Awful Throne." Dr. Woodrow read the tenth chapter of Matthew. Dr. Palmer made the intercessory prayer, and Dr. Green preached the admirable sermon, which was printed in our Church papers and favorably commented on at the North.

After the sermon the Assembly proceeded to the election of a Moderator. Rev. Roger Martin, D. D., moved that the Assembly elect by ballot without nomination, after a prayer for the guidance of the Holy Spirit. This was amended so that after the second ballot it should be understood that the Assembly had been guided to one of the three names receiving the highest number of votes. Rev. John F. Cannon, D.D., from St. Louis, Mo., was elected on the second ballot and made one of the best presiding officers the distinguished body has ever had. With a thorough knowledge of parliamentary law and a clear head, possessed of unfailing courtesy and tact, neither rushing the business through precipitately nor allowing it to be unduly retarded, he also made the Assembly proud of its choice when called upon, as he frequently was, to represent the Assembly in public address. But we feel that a protest should be made against the method of electing without nomination. It savors of Quakerism. There is no reason why the Holy Spirit should not guide a commissioner in making a nominating speech, nor why a voter should not be better guided after receiving information as to the qualifications for the Moderator's chair which the different

nominees possess. If it is once understood that no nominations are to be made, the eloquence which has been formerly bottled up for the use on the floor of the Assembly, will leak out in buttonhole electioneering, caucusing on the trains, or even nominations by newspapers—from all of which may the Southern Church be delivered.

One of the first acts of the Assembly was the adoption of a minute on the death of Rev. W. U. Murkland, D. D., who had been elected a commissioner. The Moderator was fortunate in the appointment of different committees. The Chairmen of the most important ones were: of Bills and Overtures, E. M. Green, D. D.; Judicial, Jas. Woodrow, D. D.; Foreign Missions, Russel Cecil, D. D.; Home Missions, W. M. Scott, D. D.; Publication, J. B. Shearer, D. D.; Education, Geo. Summey, D. D.; Colored Evangelization, R. F. Campbell, D. D.; Foreign Correspondence, J. H. McNeilly, D. D. There were fewer overtures presented than usually afflict an Assembly. Those that were received were given a fair and impartial hearing. The new Stated Clerk and his temporary assistants, Rev. Alexander Sprunt, D. D., and Rev. T. H. Law, D. D., were most efficient in the services they rendered. The venerable Dr. Farris was as accurate in method and as strong of voice as he has been for a generation of Assemblies, but we missed the figure that was so long a time his companion and friend, Dr. Joseph R. Wilson, one of whose principal claims to remembrance was his ability to veto an overture by his method of reading it, accompanied by an expression of countenance which said to the Assembly with comical emphasis, "What on earth was meant by sending such an overture to the Assembly?"

There were several outings and special entertainments which the Assembly enjoyed, and it received several invitations which it was compelled to decline. On the first afternoon of the Assembly the Ladies' Auxiliary of the First Church took the whole body on an excursion down the James River in the steamer "Pocahontas." It was an exceptional op-

portunity for the commissioners to renew old acquaintanceships and to form new ones among themselves. The reception given by Union Seminary on Monday afternoon was of much interest and profit. Dr. Johnson made an address of welcome, which was of the sledge-hammer variety in its heartiness. He said that he was glad to welcome the Assembly, because its members were Christians, were Presbyterians, and were Southern Presbyterians. Only one Church in America could sympathize with the Southern Presbyterian Church in its devotion to the crown rights of Jesus Christ, and he sympathized with that minister of the Dutch Reformed Church, who "thanked God that his Church had never hung the rags of political expediency on the Cross of Christ." Moreover the Moderator and one-half of the Commissioners to the Assembly were Union men. Dr. Cannon's reply was most happy. He had words of hearty congratulation to the Seminary and its students for their beautiful buildings; he had words of commiseration also on the loss of those rural experiences which made the life of old Hampden-Sidney unique. His heart framed the wish that the Union Seminary in future should keep the spirit and genius of the Union Seminary of the past. There were two factors in the individuality of the old Seminary: First, the character of the Professors. They were simple in manners, spiritual in life, scriptural in thought. The second was the attention given to the spiritual life of the students. Dr. Dabney once brought to the students a message from the death bed of the sainted Dr. Ramsay: "Tell them from me, as from a dying man, not to allow their intellectual acquaintance with the word of God to outstrip their experience of its sanctifying power"; I hand the message on to you.

The reception given by the Covenanters, an organization peculiar to the Southern Church, and which promises by its business methods, its excellent constitution and its adaptation to the nature of the *genus puer* to spread widely, made a profound impression on the Assembly.

Saturday night the First Church was filled with interested spectators and auditors and the boys of the Richmond companies marched in with their banners, a white St. Andrews cross on a blue ground. They sang as they marched,

“Onward, Christian Soldiers.”

It was good to see boys, not young men and not babies, just boys, singing with all their hearts the old church hymns, having evidently long passed the stage of boyish diffidence. Their pride in the order and enthusiasm for their work was contagious. One little fellow with an air of business that would have done credit to a banker read the treasurer's report of Company I, from which we gleaned the fact that out of \$200 collected the sum of \$183 had been contributed to Home and Foreign Missions. The excellence of the organization was shown by the fact that reports were sent to their “rally” from every company that has been enrolled.

The Assembly's Communion was celebrated on Friday evening. Rev. J. H. McNeily, D. D., preached an earnest and impressive sermon, and Dr. Cannon and Dr. Green officiated in the distribution of the elements. One of the best missionary meetings ever held was that in which brief messages from three continents by five of our missionaries at home on a furlough were heard. Frank Price, the beloved, presided. Rev. Samuel Phillips Verner brought a message from Dombi, the great-hearted King of the Beni Bakenga, asking the great white chiefs of America to send him not men to take away their land and their liberty, but men to preach the Gospel and to build churches and schools. Rev. W. C. Buchanan spoke of the failure of civilization in Japan to save the people for Christ. Out of forty-two million of people only 900,000 had ever heard the Gospel. Rev. M. B. Grier, who came to us from the A. R. P. Church, gave a clear account of the complications and perhaps international difficulties on account of the political influence

of the French Catholic Priests and their persecution of the Protestant natives. Rev. Geo. Henderlite spoke of Brazil as a part of "the neglected continent." He was on the eve of sailing, and rejoiced to know that he would soon meet the little band of believers who had gathered together under his ministry. Rev. Frank Price closed with a glowing and eloquent appeal for Foreign Missions. There was also a popular meeting in the interest of Assembly's Home Missions, at which interesting addresses were made by representatives of our Home Mission work, from Florida and the Southwest. The speakers were Rev. J. L. D. Houston, from northwestern Arkansas, Rev. Jno. D. McCall, from the western frontier of Texas, Rev. R. M. Hall, of San Antonio, who was thoroughly acquainted with the Mexican work, Rev. W. J. B. Lloyd, who gave an account of the Indian work in the Territory, and Rev. W. S. Milne who spoke of the needs of Florida. And there was another meeting in the interest of Foreign Missions at which Dr. Chester gave one of his spicy and instructive addresses, reciting the facts that came under his own observation in traveling in the East.

Judging from the time occupied and the interest excited, the adoption of the report on Parochial Schools was the most important act of the Assembly. Dr. Kerr, the chairman of the committee, read the report and made a brief but lucid explanation. The following are the resolutions:

"In furtherance of this cause of Church and Christian Education your committee would recommend the Assembly to approve and adopt the following plan of organization for systematic effort throughout the Church, which plan substantially has been in operation for some years in the four Synods of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Florida, and has been productive of excellent results in many places, to-wit:

1. That the General Assembly appoint a Committee on Church and Christian Education, and urge the Synods and

Presbyteries throughout the Church to appoint similar committees, the duty of all of which committees shall be to gather and disseminate information and excite interest in Church and Christian Education as best they may, and make annual reports to their respective bodies on this subject. These committees ought to be organized as permanent committees similar to those which have charge of other departments of Christian work.

2. The chairman of the Assembly's Committee shall be the organ of communication with the chairmen of the several Synodical and Presbyterial Committees.

3. The Assembly urges upon the ministers under its charge to preach and instruct the people on the duty and necessity of providing as far as possible, for the education of our sons and daughters, giving special emphasis to the cause of female education.

4. That the Synods, Presbyteries, Sessions, Officers and private members of the Church be exhorted and encouraged to provide, in every possible way, for schools, both primary and preparatory, in which the Bible shall be a text book.

5. That the Presbyteries are urged to prepare and circulate pastoral letters on this subject, to all our people.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

ROBERT P. KERR, Ch'm.,
J. B. SHEARER,
S. E. SPENCER,
JOHN E. WHARTON,

Committee."

For this Dr. Walden offered the following substitute:

"Recognizing and lamenting the modern tendency towards the secularization of education, and believing that true education cannot ignore the moral or spiritual nature, this General Assembly hereby enjoins upon the ministers and members of our great communion in an individual and associated way to lend their influence, personal and financial, to the establishment and maintenance of schools and

colleges under Church and Presbyterian influence, and it also affectionately urges the families of our various churches and communities to give their patronage to such schools and colleges; and this not only for the safe and true education of their own children, but as a measure promoting true religion in this land."

Dr. Woodrow led the debate against the report of the committee, preferring the substitute yet denying that education was the Church's business at all. He admitted the force of the precedents that have been set by other Churches and by sections of our own Church, but declared that the Southern Church was not to be governed by precedents. There are three divine institutions, the Family, the Church and the State, with distinct and independent functions. The State has police power and that only. The principle was socialistic that the State had the right to educate; it had just as much right to feed and clothe its citizens. The Church on the other hand had the right to educate its ministers or teachers. When that education should begin, must be determined by the state of society. The education of ministers, however, is only a means to an end. The mission of the Church is the preaching of the Gospel.

But the Family, like the State in the Federal Government, has all the powers reserved to itself that are not expressly given to Church or State. This scheme of Church education is a usurpation of the rights of the head of the family to whom it is left to say how and where his children should be educated.

Dr. Shearer replied to Dr. Woodrow, declaring that education was a spiritual function and not a secular. There are studies that are neutral so far as religion is concerned, but when those studies which are distinctly religious are blended with these, the resultant is a Christian education. The objection to the substitute is that there will be no uniformity of effort and no permanence of administration

without Church control. Some Christian schools, as they were originally founded, have gone far from the intention of their founders, and become anti-theistic. The danger of bringing Church politics into Church courts is nullified by putting the whole administration of the schools into the hands of a board of trustees, while the Church retains control at the pivotal point by electing the board. Dr. Shearer then read the action of the Assembly of 1871, and continued the argument with an exhaustive history of the parochial school system in Scotland, and of the earliest educational institutions in America.

Judge James took the floor in support of the substitute. He was in favor of Church institutions in localities where they were needed, and thought it best for the Assembly to keep its hands off the matter and allow these institutions to be established as had already been done wherever they could be supported. Where the State has already been doing the work of education well there was no need for the Church to establish its own schools. Dr. Walden's plea was for the spirituality of the Church. Dr. Shearer's distinction between ecclesiastical administration and ecclesiastical control, was itself an apology. It was admitted that ecclesiastical administration would be fatal, but ecclesiastical control involved the same principle, and it would be impossible to keep serious differences in the Board of Trustees out of the Church courts that elect the board. The common school system is an example of the evil tendency of paternalism in the State, and Church education is an example of ecclesiastical paternalism, the tendency of which is only evil.

Dr. Kerr summed the case for the parochial school. Dr. Thornwell in 1871 had advocated a great Presbyterian University under the care of the General Assembly. A letter from Dr. Dabney, written a few months before his death said, "I would like to see a system of parochial education as universal as that of John Knox."

The debate was closed by a brief rejoinder from Dr. Woodrow, in which he pierced the armour of his antagonists without convincing the Assembly that his principles were correct. Both he and Dr. Walden weakened their case by admitting that their principles demolished the public schools, as well as the Church schools and left all education to private enterprise, while the other side did not bring out with sufficient clearness the central fact that Church education is religious propagandism. Presbyterian education will undoubtedly make good Presbyterians.

In carrying out the scheme which was adopted by a large majority, three things should be carefully guarded, the liberty of the head of the family to direct the education of his children without interference by the cry of Church loyalty; the establishment of Church schools only where they can be adequately supported; and the pre-eminence of direct missionary enterprises over educational work.

The change in the baptismal formula from "into the name" to "in the name" was effected without debate, a large number uttering their protests simply by their vote. The second change in the Book of Church Order, giving the elder authority to charge the people in installation services, provoked some debate. One important principle was settled by the Moderator's ruling, which was accepted without appeal, viz., that the Assembly had the right to veto a change in our Constitution, even after a majority of the Presbyteries had voted for the change. There were three parties in the Assembly on this question of the ruling elder and the charge. Rev. P. D. Stevenson, D. D., representing the party which held that the charge was a function of the minister's office, moved that the question be referred to the next Assembly and an *ad interim* committee be appointed who should study the whole question of the relation between the ruling elder and the minister of the Word. This motion was defeated, then the ayes and noes were called

and several gave their reasons for their votes. Those who sided with Dr. Stevenson voted "no," while those who held to the other extreme that there should be no discrimination against the elder, but that he should be allowed to deliver the charge to the pastor, also likewise voted "no." Those who voted "aye" believed that the delivery of the charge pertained to the governmental functions, and therefore could be performed by an elder. Many of these believed that the elder should be allowed to charge the pastor also. There were some who voted "aye" who believed that the Assembly was bound by the action of the Presbyteries. The question was settled by a vote of 77 ayes to 43 noes, and is still as unsettled as a question can well be.

Some of the important overtures that were answered by the Assembly was one from the Presbytery of Athens touching the observance of Christmas and Easter as religious days. Answer: that there is no warrant in the scriptures for the observance of these days as holy days, but on the contrary that such observance is contrary to the principles of the Reformed Faith, conducive to will worship and not in harmony with the simplicity of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. In answer to the overture from the Presbytery of Albemarle as to principals and alternates in a Church court, the Assembly declared that the alternate may be substituted for the principal after the court has been constituted whenever in the judgment of the court, such a change is deemed necessary or proper. In answer to the overture of Central Texas Presbytery it was affirmed that in emergencies the Moderator of the Church court could call the regular meeting at some other time or place than the one appointed. Fayetteville Presbytery overtured the Assembly to send down a pastoral letter to the churches on the subject of worldliness, with special reference to card playing, dancing and theatre going. The Assembly granted the request, The overtures with regard to the new hymn book, one from the Presbytery of Louis-

ville asking that the action of the General Assembly at New Orleans be reconsidered, others making suggestions as to the preparation of the book, were referred to the Hymn Book Committee. The Century Co. made an admirable offer, agreeing to re-print the "Laudes Domini" for the Prayer Meeting, adding 100 hymns to it of our own selection, giving it a new name and selling at from 60 to 40 cents a copy. There was a very strong feeling that this offer should be accepted. Dr. Walden, who has been the main mover in the matter of the new hymn book, reported progress on the part of the Committee.

During the sessions of the Assembly fraternal greetings were sent to and returned by the Episcopal Convention of the Diocese of Virginia, then in session in Richmond ; the Northern General Assembly, and the Cumberland Presbyterian Assembly. The elders of the Northern Presbyterian Assembly also sent a message of fraternal greeting to the elders of the Southern Assembly.

A movement inaugurated by the Presbyterian pastors of Richmond that the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions be removed to that city from Nashville, met with vigorous protest from the Nashville brethren, and was not seriously considered by the Assembly.

There was quite a spirited contest between Atlanta and Marshall, Missouri, over the place of meeting for the next Assembly. Atlanta Central Church had sent its pastor, Rev. Theron H. Rice, to present to the Assembly the attractions of Atlanta. Rev. Frank Mitchell made a vigorous appeal for the Assembly to meet at Marshall, in the centre of Missouri Presbyterianism. The vote was close, 94 to 83 in favor of Atlanta.

The work of the Church as represented by its different executive committees had a patient and careful hearing. Besides the time already given to Foreign Missions, of which we have spoken, the Standing Committee made a careful report, Rev. Russell Cecil, D. D., Chairman. The

net receipts for the year were \$144,990. This is a falling off of \$1,500 from last year, although from rigid economy the year was closed without debt, and this does not mean as in the case of the Home Mission, Invalid and Education funds that the salaries of missionaries and beneficiaries are scaled down so as to make the report "No debt." The movement was authorized to signalize the opening of the 20th Century by a special effort to raise \$200,000 for the cause of Home Missions during the present year. Co-operation with the Œcumenical Conference, representing the Protestant Missionary Societies of the World, was ordered by the Assembly, and delegates appointed to the meeting to be held in New York City, April 21st, 1900. The inauguration of the mission in Cuba was endorsed and a further prosecution of the work was urged, especially upon the young people of the Church. None of our missionary publications are paying expenses, notwithstanding the marked ability with which they are edited. Only four new missionaries were sent out during the year, but the losses from the field equalled the gain. The number of missionaries remained 155, the same as last year. Rev. S. H. Chester, D. D., was heartily and unanimously recommended and elected Secretary for the coming year.

The report of the Standing Committee on Home Missions commended the present plan for conducting this department of work and urges the Churches and Sabbath Schools to raise the sum of \$40,000 in the September and January collections. Each session is asked to appoint an elder or deacon to see after the distribution of envelopes and leaflets. The publication of a Home Missionary Magazine was not deemed advisable. It was urged that the sum of \$18,000 be raised for the Invalid Fund and the request of several overtures was granted that an *ad interim* committee be appointed who shall make a report to the next Assembly on some method of securing more adequate provision for the needs of our invalid ministers. Rev. J. N.

Craig, D. D., was re-elected Secretary and the same Executive Committee appointed, Rev. C. P. Bridewell being substituted on the committee for Dr. Barnett. It is worthy of note that while some thirty thousand dollars is reported for Assembly's Missions including the work among the Indians and Mexicans, the sum of \$105,000 was raised for Presbyterian and Synodical Missions. But the Assembly officially knows nothing about this great work and devotes its whole time to the consideration of the work in three of its Synods.

The same thing is shown in the work of the Education Committee, only a part of the funds for the education of candidates for the ministry passing through the hands of the Secretary of Education, Presbyteries and Churches acting independently whenever they please. The unification of these two causes is one of the crying needs of our Church to-day.

The Standing Committee on Publication answered all overtures in the negative looking to any changes in the publication work. The present net assets of this committee are \$117,000, and there is a small margin of profit on the business of publication, so that all the collections can be used for colportage work.

Unusual interest was excited by the report on Colored Evangelization, Rev. R. F. Campbell, D. D., Chairman. The committee approved of the conclusion reached by the Executive Committee in the matter of the Ferguson William School ; tendered the thanks of the Church to Rev. R. L. Liston, of Oxford, Ala., for his donation of property, valued at \$30,000, to this cause ; noted with gratification the evidences of increased prosperity in the liquidation of all debts, better provision for men in the field, the enlarged work of Stillman Institute and the rigid economy with which the work has been conducted. Both the Secretary and Superintendent set the example of self-denial in giving their services freely to the Church. An appeal was made

for a great forward movement in the work of Colored Evangelization, because of the wide range of the work, including every detail of the elevation of a race: the fearful strides of immorality and crime which the present generation of negroes is making; the peculiar adaptability of the Presbyterian Church to the negroes' needs, with an educated ministry, sober instruction, simple modes of worship and an orderly system of government and discipline; the opening of a wide door in Africa; and the crisis which our work among the colored people has reached on account of the organization of the Independent African Presbyterian Church. The sum of \$15,000 is asked for, for the prosecution of this work during the coming year.

All things considered, the Southern Church has reason to thank God and take courage for his blessing upon its work and the prospect of yet larger usefulness in the century that is almost upon us.

The Assembly adjourned on Friday night after a meeting of a little over a week. Its sessions were for the most part uninteresting, being taken up with routine work and the body was too homogeneous for many great debates. From the point of view of this Assembly there are no divisive questions in the Southern Church, and harmony prevails throughout her borders.

The closing exercises were somewhat prolonged, as many of the commissioners had a burden of gratitude to the hospitable people of Richmond, which they were obliged to roll off in a parting speech. And when some of them dropped off into war-time reminiscences, the Moderator almost broke his record for unflinching patience. At a late hour, after singing, prayer and the apostolic benediction, the Assembly was formally dissolved and passed into history, a new one elected in like manner to meet in Atlanta on the third Thursday of May, 1900. May the blessings of the Head of the Church attend all his servants, and crown their labors with enduring success!

THE NORTHERN ASSEMBLY.

The growth of the twin-cities, St. Paul and Minneapolis, are not more remarkable than the growth of Presbyterianism in them. In 1835 Rev. Thomas S. Williamson, M. D., organized the first Presbyterian Church and the first Protestant Church as well, of the Northwest, at Fort Snelling, half way between St. Paul and Minneapolis. It had twenty members—soldiers and traders. In 1852 the First Presbyterian Church of Minneapolis was organized, and it united with the former organization at Fort Snelling. Now the twenty members of 1885 have grown to a Synod of 22,000. In 1882, the population of Minneapolis having doubled in three years, Presbyterianism took on new life, and eight churches were organized in nine months. At the beginning of Dr. Sample's pastorate Westminster Church numbered 106 members, and now it numbers 1,600. This is the church that entertained the Assembly, and Dr. Sample, the former pastor, was elected Moderator, to the great delight of his people.

The sermon by Rev. Wallace Radcliffe, retiring Moderator, on Proverbs, 19:18, "Where there is no vision the people perish," was delivered to an audience of 2,000, and was well received by the members of the Assembly. The analysis of the text, however, belongs rather to the department of eisegesis than of exegesis. For example, "The vision is threefold. The vision of Christ, the Divine ; the vision of Christ, the Sacrifice ; the vision of Christ as King."

The first question of interest was the election of a Moderator. The Liberals nominated Dr. R. F. Coyle, of Oakland, California. The Moderates put forth Dr. Matthias L. Haynes, of Indianapolis. Dr. Robert F. Sample, of New York, representing the Conservatives, received a majority of the votes on the first ballot, the vote standing, Sample, 338 ; Coyle, 137 ; Haines, 133.

The overshadowing question before the Assembly was

the McGiffert case and it came early before the body in a communication from Dr. McGiffert from which we quote:

Waiving at this time all questions of Constitutional right and order, I have thought it proper to look upon this action (that of the last Assembly) in the light of friendly advice from Christian brethren, in which light, indeed, it would seem that it must have been looked upon by those who joined in it.

Regarded thus, the action evidently requires no response from me, nor did the Assembly intimate in any way that the response was either expected or desired. But it is my wish to be governed entirely by the spirit of Christian courtesy, and I therefore take this opportunity of informing the brethren, gathered in the first General Assembly since the action was taken, what I have felt my duty to be in view of the fraternal counsel offered me.

The action of the Assembly as well as the overture from the Presbytery of Pittsburg, upon which the action was based, make it evident that many of my positions, together with the spirit and purpose of my book as a whole, have been seriously misapprehended. Such misapprehension I sincerely regret, and I wish here emphatically to repudiate the false constructions that have been placed upon my book in many quarters. So far as my views are concerned, they have been and remain, as I believe, in accord with the faith of the Presbyterian Church and of the Evangelical Christendom in all vital and essential matters, and I, therefore, cannot feel that it is my duty, or even my right, in justice to myself and to my brethren, and to the Church of our Divine Lord and Master, in which I am an office-bearer, to withdraw from the ministry of the Presbyterian Church. In taking this position, to which I am constrained by a profound sense of duty, I desire to say that I recognize gratefully the spirit of Christian kindness which animated those who joined in the action of the last Assembly, and appreciate the devotion to the truth and the concern for the welfare of the Church which prompted their action. I desire to say also that I yield to no one in my devotion to the truth and in my concern for the welfare of the Church.

Praying for the blessing of God upon the Church universal, and especially upon that branch of it within which I was born and bred, and whose interests I have most deeply at heart, I am respectfully and fraternally yours,

A. C. MCGIFFERT.

The letter was referred to the Committee on Bills and Overtures, together with the several overtures from the Presbyteries on the subject. Thursday of the second week was appointed for taking up the case. The committee was unanimous in the preamble to the resolutions, consisting mainly of a strong declaration of faith in these as funda-

mental doctrines : The Inspiration of the Scriptures ; The Divinity of Christ ; The Historical Institution of the Lord's Supper, and Justification by the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness. It was a feat of generalship on the part of the committee that this part of the report was adopted unanimously, though all connected with the history of the case know that Dr. McGiffert's book at least seems to impugn all of these doctrines. The committee divided on the question of procedure. The minority, headed by a Southern man, Rev. B. L. Hobson, D.D., held out for instructing the Presbytery of New York virtually to proceed with the trial. Eight out of twenty signed this report :

"The General Assembly, while deploring the controversy occasioned by Dr. McGiffert's writings, hereby direct the Presbytery of New York, of which he is a member, to appoint a committee to confer with him ; and if it should appear to the Presbytery that Dr. McGiffert fails to modify his views so as to conform them to the standards of the Church, the Presbytery is directed to use every means to induce Dr. McGiffert to withdraw peaceably from the Presbyterian ministry. But if he should refuse to do so, then the Presbytery is directed, as the last resort, to proceed with the case in accordance with the provisions of the constitution of the Church. And in all these proceedings the Presbytery is to maintain the spirit of Christian kindness and love, as well as fidelity to the truth."

The majority of twelve signed the following report :

"We recommend that the whole matter of the teachings of the book of Rev. A. C. McGiffert, D. D., entitled, 'A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age,' be referred to the Presbytery of New York, to which belongs the primary constitutional responsibility for such disposition as in its judgment the peace of the churches and the purity of doctrine may require."

Dr. Wallace Radcliffe, the Chairman of the Committee, made an impassioned speech in behalf of the majority report and captured the Assembly. He was ably seconded by the appeal of Dr. Balcolm Shaw, who appealed to the Assembly from the point of view of the troubles of New York Presbyterianism. It seems to us that there is a little too much consideration shown to the sensitiveness of the New York churches. It ill becomes the dignity of the

Church of Christ to be deferring to the tastes of one city lest there should be forsooth a larger exodus into the Episcopal Church. The minority report was ably defended by Dr. Hobson, and he and his colleagues by their steadfastness at least accomplished the adoption of the majority report, without dissent from the Liberals. There is really little essential difference between the reports. Both refer the matter to New York Presbytery, where it belongs, and where it should have been sent a year ago, on the advice of another Southern man, Dr. W. S. Plumer Bryan. The Presbytery of New York has since met, appointed a committee to take up the case, and the committee has already had one conference with Dr. McGiffert. So in spite of the parallel which Dr. Daniel draws for us in his article on the Regenerated Theology, we can predict that Dr. McGiffert will either withdraw from the Church before the next Assembly meets, or will be put out by the Assembly itself. When the lines have been drawn the Northern Church has heretofore proved itself as sound as could be desired.

The Board of Freedmen, the only Board that reported a debt to this Assembly, made a vitriolic report on Southern outrages, the plan appearing to be to make so much cash out of the sympathy excited in behalf of the oppressed and martyred negroes. But the making of the negro criminal a hero was almost too much, and the report was recommitted and toned down to the resolve to redeem the negro from his sufferings and from his sins. Both theologically and historically the sins should have been put first. An extraordinary effort was made to lift this, the only debt of the Church to its benevolent causes.

The Board of Home Missions reported the goodly sum of \$856,000, and that of Foreign Missions the sum of \$785,000 contributed to these great causes, the latter being administered at the cost of four and three-fourths per cent.

One of the youngest of the Boards is the Board of Aid

for Schools and Colleges, answering to the Committee on Church and Christian Education of the Southern Church. This Board has already accomplished wonderful things, and asks for \$150,000 for the coming year. The plan for reducing the representation of the Presbyteries in the Assembly met with crushing defeat.

The Assembly took strong action on the Mormon Congressional case, and set forth its views anent the Peace Conference, besides sending a telegram of congratulation to Queen Victoria. But there were fewer political questions up than usual.

In spite of the overtures from sixty Presbyteries on the subject of Organic Union, the Committee recommended no action this year, and after a few words of explanation to the effect that they were waiting for some motion from the Southern Church, the report was unanimously adopted.

The *Assembly Herald*, a publication run by the Assembly in the interests of its benevolent work, was a troublesome matter, as it has succeeded in piling up a debt of \$5,000 in four months. But it was resolved to continue the experiment.

After one of the briefest sessions on record, the Assembly adjourned on the ninth day, Saturday, to meet in the Compton Avenue Church, St. Louis, on the third Thursday of May, 1900.

UNITED PRESBYTERIAN.

The Forty-first General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church met in Philadelphia the last week in May. There has been a slight falling off in membership during the year and a large decrease in the number of additions to the church. The sum of \$283,000 was contributed by 126,000 members for the benevolences of the Church.

THE LUTHERAN GENERAL SYNOD.

The Thirty-ninth Biennial Convention of this body met at York, Penn., May 4. There were 238 lay and clerical

delegates and a large concourse of visitors. The Church is prospering in all its departments of work. Debts have been reduced and the contributions of the Church increased. The utmost fraternal feelings were expressed toward the Lutheran Council, with which a union will soon be effected. A movement was set on foot to establish a Church paper under the control of the Church, this step being taken on account of the partisanship and personalities of the present editors of the denominational papers.

GENERAL SYNOD OF THE REFORMED (DUTCH) CHURCH.

The ninety-second session of this orthodox and aggressive Presbyterian body was held at Catskill, N. Y., beginning June 4. Rev. George S. Bishop, of New Jersey, was elected president. The Foreign Mission Board received \$115,000 for the prosecution of its work, and the Board of Domestic Missions \$83,000. A mission in Oklahoma excited especial interest. Rev. Ferdinand S. Schench, D. D., of New York, was elected Professor of Pastoral Theology in the New Brunswick Seminary, and a young man, Rev. J. H. Haven, Professor of Hebrew and the cognate languages. An energetic effort is being made to increase the endowment of this institution \$250,000. Strong papers were adopted against the evils of polygamy and divorce, the former taking the form of a petition to Congress as to the expulsion of Roberts.

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN.

The Cumberland Presbyterian Assembly met this year in Denver, where five years ago it did not have a congregation. This Church has Foreign Mission work in China, Japan and Mexico, and four new missionaries have been sent out. The new theological seminary is doing satisfactory work. The work of establishing parochial schools was entered upon with great unanimity and heartiness.

CANADIAN PRESBYTERIAN.

The Canadian General Assembly convened in the city of Hamilton, Ontario, on the 14th of June. Dr. Renfrew, a country pastor, was elected Moderator. It was unanimously resolved to raise a million dollar twentieth century fund. The Canadian Assembly is about the size of the Southern Presbyterian. It gave last year to Foreign Missions \$175,000, a good increase over last year, and for Home Missions 177,000. There is an interesting Home Mission work conducted among the French Canadians of Quebec. This missionary spirit of the Church is most commendable.

The constitutional question as to the eligibility of an elder to the Moderator's chair was earnestly debated and then referred to an *ad interim* committee. There was also a discussion as to the disposal of the Mission College in India, and it was decided to take it from the control of the Presbytery in India and put it into the hands of the Foreign Mission Committee. The proposal was favorably received to cut down the representation in the Assembly, and it was also suggested to appoint an Executive Committee to represent the Assembly between the meetings of that body.

The next Assembly will meet in Halifax, Nova Scotia.

REFORMED (GERMAN) SYNOD.

The Reformed (German) Synod met in triennial session at Tiffin, Ohio, on May 23. The work of the Church was reported in flourishing condition. A new mission was ordered opened in China and the sum of \$40,000 apportioned among the Churches for that purpose. The Home Mission Board has 142 Home Mission fields under its care. The report of the Committee on the State of Religion showed steady progress on the part of the Church.

THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION.

This body met this year in Louisville, Ky., and its central location and the interest excited by the Whitsett case, made the representation an exceedingly large one. Dr.

Whitsett, president of the Louisville Baptist Seminary, made some independent investigations into early English and American Baptist history, and found that the facts were not as Baptist tradition held them. It would seem that this was a very unimportant matter. But when Dr. Whitsett's researches were published in his own name they aroused a storm of opposition to his teachings, to him personally, and finally to the seminary of which he was the head. Twice the Board of Trustees stood by him, and the convention at Wilmington and at Norfolk endorsed the action of the Board. But the debate became so bitter that Dr. Whitsett yielded to the pressure and offered his resignation. By a vote of twenty-two to twenty the resignation was accepted. So the Landmark party among the Baptists receives at least the encouragement that continual and disagreeable agitation will accomplish what they want. They are the apostolical successionists of the Baptist Church, and their historical claims are childish and ridiculous. Education is the only hope of a cure, but in the meantime a worthy and scholarly professor has been sacrificed to popular clamor. The episode is one to be ashamed of.

Ex-Governor W. J. Northen was unanimously chosen president of the convention.

The Board of Foreign Missions reports \$108,716 received during the year, which, considering the size of the body represented by the convention, is a small sum, according to Presbyterian standards of measurement. The sum of \$61,794 was contributed for Home Missions.

Before the adjournment of the convention the Board of Trustees of the Seminary elected Dr. John P. Greene president of William Jewell College, Missouri, to the presidency. Later the news came that he declined the honor.

The report of the statistical secretary showed that there are in the South 1,586,000 white Baptists, and 1,563,000 colored Baptists. The Southern Baptists raised for all purposes the sum of \$2,857,000.

The next convention will meet at Hot Springs, Ark.

EPISCOPAL.

The only event that has stirred American Episcopacy during the quarter was the admission of Professor Briggs into the priesthood. This event occurred on Sunday, May 14, in the Pro-Cathedral on Stanton Street, New York. There had been the promise of public opposition, but it failed of fulfillment. Dr. DaCosta and Dr. Clendennin were vigorous in their protest against the ordination. But Bishop Potter published an open letter to a layman who had written protesting against the appointed ceremony, and the opposition was silenced for awhile. It is understood, however, that there is going on a quiet organization against Dr. Briggs, and the end is not yet, though the Professor has been preaching about Holy Church in a way that left nothing to be desired.

The agitation in England still continues over the lawlessness of the priests and their persistent use of the Romish ritual.

NOTE.—Except for Missionary literature, our Review Department is lacking this quarter. We earnestly ask the help of our friends to bring this valuable department up to the highest standard. Sometimes, when a book is wanted for review, we can secure it from the publisher, and will gladly turn it over to the reviewer for his trouble.

UNION

Theological Seminary,

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA.

SESSION OPENS LAST WEDNESDAY IN SEPTEMBER.

SESSION CLOSES LAST WEDNESDAY IN MAY.

FACULTY.

THE REV. WALTER W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D.,
Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature.

THE REV. CHARLES C. HERSMAN, D. D., LL. D.,
Prof. of Biblical Literature and the Interpretation of the Testament.

THE REV. THOMAS C. JOHNSON, D. D., LL. D.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Polity.

THE REV. THOMAS R. ENGLISH, D. D.,
Professor of the English Bible and Pastoral Theology.

THE REV. GIVENS B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology.

For catalogue, or other information as to course of study, rooms, etc.,
apply to—

Dr. ENGLISH,
Clerk of Faculty and Intendant,
Richmond, Va.

THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

No. 50—OCTOBER, 1899.

I. WHY DO WE PUNISH CRIME ?

Vacationing at Saratoga one summer, I saw bulletined for a hearing at one of the sessions of the American Social Science Association, there holding its annual meeting, this topic : "The punishment of crime. Is it for reformation or retribution ?" I dropped in to hear the discussion. The paper was by a New York lawyer of repute, and it was an enthusiastic advocacy of the reformative idea in the administration of law. The topic has had wide attention in recent years. The right understanding of it is of vital concern to good government and public weal. The principles involved concern all government, human and divine. Why do we punish anywhere ? Why does a parent punish in the family, or an officer in the State ? And if God punishes, why does he punish ?

Let us first define some terms, common to this discussion. Justice, in the exact formula of the ancients, is *suum cuique*—to each his own. The figure representing it is the scales held in perfect balance. It is exact requital of desert.

Law, in brief and apart from a mode of procedure, is command imposed by authority. Essential to the idea of law is sanction. Without penalty, or punishment for disobedience, law sinks to the level of mere advice. It is no longer law, but counsel.

Punishment is inflicted for the violation of law ; penalty, pain, penal sanction. Grotius defines it, "the evil of suffering, inflicted on account of the evil of doing." It is the desert of wrong-doing.

Crime is an offence against human law. A criminal is a breaker of human law. The difference between crime and sin is this : while each is a violation of law, crime is a violation of human law and sin is a violation of divine law. It may easily come to pass therefore, that what is a sin in a given case is no crime, and what is a crime is no sin.

With these definitions in mind, let us consider the end of punishment, or the reason for its infliction.

There are three views that have had more or less of public advocacy, viz: the retributive, the protective and the reformative.

The retributive is the oldest, looking chiefly to the crime.

The protective is the second born, looking to the safety of society.

The reformative is the latest, looking to the criminal, and seeking solely his reformation.

Taking the liberty of reversing this historic order, let us give the last theory our first attention. By this theory, the prison becomes a reformatory and the prisoners are classed as lunatics and idiots are, i. e., as wards of government. The paper heard at Saratoga in advocacy of reformation as the end of punishment, distinctly and explicitly held that, "by the true psychology of crime the prisoner demands governmental care and treatment, on the same grounds with the lunatic, the idiot, the blind and the dumb." (*Journal of Science*, January 1894, p. 79). And further, that "prison discipline" must be therapeutic ; that "cure" must set the limit to the duration of imprisonment, and that "the incurable must be confined for life."

That this writer is not extreme in putting forth the reformatory theory, will be perfectly apparent from other

and leading advocates. Prof. Collin, of Cornell University, says: (Address before Massachusetts Prison Association, December 10, 1893) "The true conception of the functions of a prison is that it shall be a hospital for the treatment of depraved bodies and diseased souls."

Sanford M. Eveen, late Judge of Supreme and Criminal Courts of Michigan, in his work on "Crime" states that he was accustomed while on the bench to "advise jurors that they were summoned as a council of physicians to diagnose the prisoner's case as one alleged to be morally diseased; and if such was proven to be his condition, the proper treatment ought to be administered for his cure upon the same principle in all respects as in the case of an insane person." The report of a Committee on Prisons, 1881, to the Legislature of California, says: "All persons convicted of crime shall be deemed wards of the State and committed to a Board of Guardians." And the Michigan State Board of Corrections and Charities in their fifth biennial report, 1879-80, commenting on the fact that eight convicts were sent to prison in one year in that State for assault with intent to commit murder, 1 for 45 years, 1 for 25, 1 for 15, 1 for 9, 1 for 6, 1 for 5, 1 for 2 and 1 for 1, say, "If there were high courts or commissions in lunacy, and they were to commit eight maniacs, who had attempted murder, to an insane hospital for terms varying from 1 to 45 years, it would be at once apparent to all that the high court itself was wildly insane. If on the contrary, the would-be murderers were sent to a hospital until wholly restored to reason, the conduct would appear to be reasonable."

Clearly, therefore, the reformatory theory has this as its fundamental idea, that the criminal is a person morally diseased, whether by heredity or environment, who is to be placed in hospital or asylum for therapeutic treatment and kept there until he is cured.

This theory is certainly open to some very serious and damaging objections.

1 In the first place it not only plays havoc with accepted terminology, but revolutionizes some fundamental convictions, and even challenges some of our primary beliefs.

Our courts are no longer courts of justice, but courts of inquiry or commissions in moral lunacy. Juries are councils of physicians. Prisons are hospitals. Prisoners are patients. Nay, more than this: there can be no crimes and no criminals, for there is no law. There can be no law, for there is no punishment. Law is mere opinion until a penalty is attached for its violation. There can be no punishment, for "by the true psychology of crime (although there can be no crime, for crime implies responsible violation of law) the criminal (so called) demands governmental care and treatment, on the same grounds with the lunatic and the idiot." We do not inflict penalties on lunatics and idiots. We put them under restraint, so that they may not do harm. And then we treat them, but we do not punish them.

Thus the theory degrades human nature. For it assumes that man is not responsible for his evil action. Law and punishment recognize free agency, are based upon voluntariness, and therefore honor human nature. This curative theory makes man a victim of circumstances, environment, heredity; and robs him of his peculiar glory, viz: the endowment of free will—the self-election of the right and the wrong. If immorality is a mere disease to be cured in hospital by physical and mental discipline, then human freedom is a delusion. But that theory flies right in the face of the conscience of the race. It is guilt we punish, not misfortune. "The thief doth fear each bush an officer." "Conscience doth make cowards of us all." "It mutinies in a man's bosom." "Out damned spot." "What, will these hand's ne'er be clean?" "Here's the smell of blood still. All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand." "Which way I fly is hell. Myself am hell."

These whips and stings of conscience prove that the trouble is too deep for hygienic treatment.

The reformatory theory is also in contravention of the deep-rooted belief of man, that there are degrees of guilt. This theory recognizes no gradation of offences. Its provided discipline, both as to its nature and its duration, is wholly independent of the character of the crime. Cure determines when release shall be given. And cure is to be effected by physical training, healthful diet, a work 'shop and a school. This is the one sovereign panacea for "depraved bodies and diseased souls." And it is applied in every case, in utter disregard of the magnitude of the crime. Hobbes says of the Stoics, "They held it as great a crime to kill a hen as to kill a father." But their blotting out all gradation of offences came from their condemning so immeasurably all wrong doing. This modern theory of reformation blots out all gradation of offences because in treating criminality as a disease it really condemns no wrong doing. A man commits a petty theft, and he is to go to a prison hospital until he reforms; a man commits a brutal murder, and he is to go to a prison hospital until he reforms! The prescription is exactly the same. But therapeutic treatment like this is sheer quackery. Blackstone well says, "It is a kind of quackery in government to apply the same universal remedy to every case." (iv: 17). And he further impressively says, "When men see no distinction made in the nature and gradation of punishment, the generality will be led to conclude there is no distinction in guilt." (iv: 17). Let that doctrine prevail and life will be cheap indeed.

If it be said the unlawful taking of human life is an exception to the reformatory rule, then the theory breaks down with homicide. And it breaks down just at the point where it is most needed; for if any man on earth needs this moral therapeutic, this process of treatment for reformation, before he goes to judgment (if there be any judgment) it is the man whose hands are reddened with his brother's blood.



But another objection to the theory is that it abandons its fundamental principle in the very administration of the theory.

Let it be borne in mind that the theory is opposed to the retributive—it regards the criminal as diseased—it puts him in hospital, not as a punishment, but that he may be treated, and on exactly the same ground that the insane and the idiotic are treated; he belonging to one of the “defective, abnormal classes” which are “the wards of government.” But just so soon as he gets inside the reformatory prison, *presto*, what a change! He is placed under rigid law, with exact and severe penalties, and if he breaks a prison rule he is at once and inexorably punished to the full and the severe extent of the prison law. That I may not do injustice to the advocates of this theory, let me quote from Prof. Collin, one of the Directors of the American Social Science Association. Speaking of the criminal in the Prison Reformatory, he says, “First, last and all the time, he must obey the prison regulations. . . . must be broken to harness, and this usually means severe physical compulsion—scientifically administered corporal punishment. Physical compulsion in prisons must be. I believe in making it short, sharp and effective.” And a report of the National Prison Association’s Standing Committee on Prison Discipline, read at Chicago some years ago, says, “Penalties must fall upon infractions of prison rules invariably;” “disciplinary treatment consisting in the scrupulous exactitude of absolute obedience.” And the very severity of this punishment in the Elmira Reformatory of New York was made the occasion of a terrific assault on that institution. Thus the reformatory theory is obliged to abandon its fundamental idea in the very process of carrying it out. Outside the Reformatory the criminal is a victim of heredity and evil circumstances, and not, therefore, a subject of punishment, but of curative treatment. But once inside the Reformatory, if he break law, woe betide him.

Heredity cuts no figure now. The theory is whistled down the wind. His punishment must be instant, inexorable, severe. The Reformatory is established to avoid the infliction of punishment, and then punishment is inflicted to keep up the Reformatory ! And out of this anomalous and contradictory state of things, there grows an inevitable tendency to what, if possible, is a greater wrong, viz : a tendency to make the punishment out of all proportion to the offence. A slight infraction of prison reformatory rule is punished with fearful severity. This was the root of the trouble at Elmira. The revolt was against brutal punishment for what might be scarcely more than an indiscretion.

And this tendency to excessive severity is the direct outgrowth of the mischievous theory. The theory is reformatory and not retributive. It claims that justice has no place as a factor in determining what shall be done with an offender. And when you have taken justice away as a base of procedure, what is there to prevent the most outrageous tyranny and brutality in the interests of this process of cure ? The prison reformatory has nothing to keep it from becoming a relentless despotism, for its punishment is scaled to suit the theory and not at all to suit the offence. It has no ground in justice ; only in the exigencies of a theory. Therefore, in the long run, nothing is kinder than justice. Justice is never "seasoned" by mercy, Portia to the contrary, notwithstanding. Justice is right just as it is, for it is rightness, and can be improved by nothing. Any change from rightness is, so far, wrongness. Just so far as kindness is at the expense of justice, it is a blow at government, a blow at law, a blow at social order, a blow at every sanctity of home and altar. Consistent with justice, there may be mercy with God and man ; but never counter to justice.

There is one other grave objection to the reformatory theory. Let it be remembered, the prison discipline is to be "therapeutic ;" cure is "to set the limit of imprisonment ;"

3.

imprisonment is to "continue until it becomes safe for the community that a convict be released." But to determine when cure has been effected; this is the transcendent difficulty. See the complications: Reformation means such a change in the criminal that he no longer has the inclination to repeat offences. The ~~top~~ root of crime is deeper than the body—deeper than the mind. Diet and education, work and school, cannot kill it; may not even touch it. It has struck through and through the man's moral nature. Where is the mental necromancer who can tell when that is changed? Who can certainly know all the subjective and psychological elements involved in determining when prisoners are so far reformed as to make their discharge safe to society? The Fifth Biennial Report of the Michigan State Board of Corrections, already referred to, anticipates this objection, and replies to it by saying, "It cannot be certainly known, but it can be known at least equally well in this case as in the case of insanity." *Mirabile dictu!* As if insane people were as conscious of their insanity as criminals are of their crimes, and sane enough to conceal their insanity as criminals are sane enough to conceal their criminal disposition; and as if both could be equally and mightily influenced to deception by the prospect of freedom!

Let "cure" set the limit of imprisonment, and the biggest rascals would often be the first to take the easy doses of reform, and to exhibit the magic transformations of the prison panacea.

"When the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be.
When the devil got well, the devil a monk was he."

It is said the devil can "clothe himself as an angel of light." If there be doubt as to the personality of the devil, no one will deny that the devilish can effect that change of apparel. And if men will "steal the livery of heaven to serve the devil (or the devilish) in," they will certainly be willing to don that livery to get out of prison.

And thus we might easily, we would almost inevitably, be faced with this strange travesty of justice: a petty thief imprisoned for life, and a damnable villian, guilty of some brutal crime, out of jail in a twelve-month. The mighty words of Blackstone may well be heard again: "It is indeed a kind of quackery in government to apply the same universal remedy to every case."

Let us now briefly consider what we have termed the protective theory, which makes the end of punishment the protection of society.

Here we shall be obliged to make some large concessions. That the protection of society is very closely connected with our laws, and their penalties cannot be a matter of question. We are ready to affirm that the legal prohibition of any act whatever is solely on the ground of its evil effects upon society, and not at all on the ground of the inherent evil of the act itself. Public law does indeed make a distinction between the things it prohibits, classifying them as evils in themselves (*mala in se*) and evils prohibited (*mala prohibita*): but the ground of their prohibition is exactly the same. Ten thousand things are wrong in themselves that the law never touches, and never ought to touch; while things right and innocent in themselves, the law often prohibits. The law does not prohibit my swearing to a lie with my hand on a Bible when I am on the street, but it thunders prohibition against my doing that same thing on the witness stand in a court of justice. Why? Because government must have a place where truth shall be told. Swearing falsely is just as much a wrong *per se*, in one place as in another. But it is prohibited in a court of justice, solely to protect society. The law will punish me if I attempt homicide. In most states the law will not punish me if I attempt suicide. Yet each is *malum in se*. The law prohibits my destroying my house by fire, but not by pick and crowbar. Yet neither is *malum in se*. In a densely populated city driving a horse over six

miles an hour is a crime ; building frame houses in the fire district is a crime ; following some useful, but offensively odorous trade, is a crime. Why all this ? There is but one answer. The protection of society ; and not at all the inherent rightness or wrongfulness of the thing prohibited.

But conceding this to be the ground of all prohibition by human law, when it comes to the adjustment of the penalty in connection with the crime, is it still exclusively the protection of society that is had in view ? It is at this point that the theory is inadequate as a full statement of the truth. Punishment that is regulated with no reference to inherent guilt, but with sole reference to supposed public advantage, has lost its basis of justice, and become a matter of expediency.

Hence the multiplication of capital crimes. When Blackstone wrote, there were upwards of a hundred and fifty actions declared by Act of Parliament to be worthy of instant death. Offences against property were expiated by human life. And the statutes weighed out a man's blood against dollars and cents. As if the public good could ever be promoted by such an outrage on justice. When any act made punishable by law is inherently and flagrantly wrong, what is the swift judgment of one witnessing the wrong act ? Why, that the guilty doer ought to be punished ; and this without any reference whatever to the good effect of the punishment, either on the criminal or on society. Such judgment is instinctive, founded in the very constitution of the human mind. The criminal who is made to suffer the penalty solely for the public good is made thereby what any inanimate thing is when put to good use. He is punished for the sake of others as a matter of expediency, and not because it is just and right that he should be punished. The reason for his punishment is found wholly outside of himself ; and this is treating him not as a responsible being guilty of voluntary wrong, but as a dog might be treated—that for the benefit of society. The oft quoted remark of

the English judge to the horse-thief, "You are not hung because you have stolen a horse, but that horses may not be stolen," instead of involving a sound principle of law, involves a two-fold absurdity; for in one breath it makes nothing of horse stealing, and yet makes a horse of more value than a man. It belittles the crime, yet hangs the criminal. The improvement of the criminal classes is not along that road.

III.

There is hardly need of an extended discussion of the third, or Retributive theory, as indicating the reason for punishment; for already and necessarily it has had our thought, in considering objections to the Reformative and Protective theories. Some further word, however, seems important in order to a full presentation of the case, and especially do some of the objections urged against it deserve reply.

The principle that underlies and pervades this theory is justice, the demand for which is "mortised into the moral constitution of man," as shown by the prevailing sense of guilt and of fear where wrong has been done. Justice Lilly, out of a wide experience of criminal magistracy, says, "Resentment at wrong, and desire of retribution upon the wrong doer are primordial principles, as deeply implanted in our nature as pity, or the desire of self-preservation." Just because Socrates was right in saying, "the greatest of evils is for a guilty man to escape punishment"—for that very reason, the greatest good that can be rendered to the unjust is justice. The first and vital step in any true reformation is for the criminal to see and admit that his punishment is deserved. How can punishment have any beneficial effect whatever, either on the criminal or on society, except the punishment be just and right in itself.

In society and under government, the personal redress is transferred to the State. Personal revenge is forbidden. But the very end of government is justice. It is organized

to protect and vindicate rights. He who planted in the human bosom the instinct of self-preservation, and its corollary, resentment at wrong, in setting the solitary in families and constituting society and government, ordained expressly that the sense of justice in all men should find its expression through rulers and law, making the powers that be "an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil." So that that sagacious, far-sighted statesman, Alexander Hamilton, was in harmony with the power that makes for righteousness, when he said, "Justice is the end of government. It is the end of civil society. It ever has been and ever will be pursued, until it is obtained, or until liberty be had in the pursuit." But how is justice possible, how is government possible, with no punishment for crime? It can neither be founded nor administered, unless the power to punish crime is conceded. The actual infliction of punishment, therefore, has its root in justice, and is retributive.

Moreover, it is the most effective restraint upon crime. Fear is a potent element in preserving the peace and good order of social and civic life. Multitudes are kept obedient to law through fear of its penalty. The oft quoted sneer about making people good by law, as if morality and decency were a matter of thumb-screws and the lash, loses all its sting here, because of the utter irrelevancy of its application. Men are not made good by law, but they are restrained by law from letting a good deal of their badness out upon others. What imagination can conceive the horrors we should be plunged into, if once it came to be understood that rulers were no longer to execute wrath upon evil doers, but only to seek reformation. We must have short memories if we have forgotten the long hush that came upon lawlessness when we hanged the anarchists at Chicago. Let it be once made clear that no retribution waits these fellows, and who dare predict how soon they would be at our throats?

It is objected that the retributive system breeds crim-

inals. But this is a fault of administration, not of system itself. That there are glaring evils connected with our management of criminals goes without saying. The herding them together without careful classification, the leaving them in confinement without occupation, the discharge of them with no preparation whatever for their freedom, are inconceivably bad, and cry aloud for remedy. But those are incidents and attendants, not vital to the system in any way. They could, and they should, all be swept away, and yet the retributive element be left intact, making the prisoner still feel the weight of the vindication of the majesty of law, and facing him still with the fact that he is punished for his violation of law, and that his punishment is just.

But it is further objected that this retributive theory hawks crime at a price. The New York lawyer, in his paper at Saratoga, said, "If a crime can be expiated by suffering the prescribed penalty, that penalty marks the cost price of the crime." And he further said, "that the penal code presents a price list of crimes, and that, so far as the State is concerned, one can commit any crime, the fixed penalty for which he is willing to pay." But clearly, this is a misapprehension of the province of penalty. Penalty does not pay debts. Penalty shows an outstanding obligation. It does not discharge it. Penalty is pain. If I recklessly break my limb, the pain of it does not mend the break. If I am criminally wronged by another, the wrong is not righted by his suffering a penalty for it. The State, in the punishment of the criminal, expresses its sense of the injury done by the crime, but this does not repair the injury. Nothing can repair it in human jurisprudence. The *quid pro quo* is impossible. The reasoning that would make penalty a warrant for crime, would make hell a warrant for sin.

Instances of injustice are cited, as another objection to the retributive theory. A man steals a watch. If the

watch is worth only \$24, the crime is petit larceny, and the penalty is imprisonment for not more than one year. But if the watch is worth \$26, the penalty is imprisonment for not less than five, nor more than ten years. Well, of course, this presents a difficulty—just as fixing an age when a minor may vote, presents a difficulty. It works hard on some minors, who can vote more intelligently at eighteen or twenty than others can at any age. Shall we therefore seek no equitable adjustment of the right of suffrage? Because justice cannot be properly administered, is certainly no reason for not trying to administer it. Rigorous and exact justice, owing to the subtleties of motive, the influence of environment, the possibilities of deception and concealment, is impossible in human jurisprudence, but its approximation is nevertheless to be sought.

Nor need it be denied that the three ideas, viz., the reformative, the protective and the retributive, may each have their place in the treatment of the criminal. Certainly the protection of society should be kept in view. And to be indifferent to reformation in the criminal, would be to have a prison discipline through which a prisoner might pass without any care on the part of society and the State, whether he grew human or beastly, divine or devilish, in the process. The consequence of prison discipline should be the making, if possible, invariably a better man. His better nature should be constantly appealed to. Inducements should be held out for fidelity. Severity of treatment might be relaxed in view of desert. Classification of criminals should be a *sine qua non* in every prison. Provision should in some way be made, so that the prisoner's discharge would not be an open and almost overwhelming temptation to new crime. But all this and all else beside, of civil expediency and social utility, is not the purpose of punishment or retribution. Let justice be done though the heavens fall. The heavens will not fall. They will be all the more stable for the justice done.

Now, if we carry these changeless and vital principles of government over into the realm of divine government, we shall be able thereby to correct some very prevalent and pernicious notions.

Justice is not changed by the transfer. It remains immutably the same: "to each his own." Law is also immutably the same: "command imposed by authority, and necessarily involving punishment for disobediences." And punishment is still what it is everywhere and always: "penalty, penal sanction, the desert of wrong doing." The sinner is a breaker of law, and sin is lawlessness.

Hell, therefore, cannot be a reformatory. Whether a place, or a condition, or both, it is punishment. And punishment never reforms. It may restrain from wrong doing, but there is nothing in it or of it, to change the wrong doer, and put him in love with righteousness.

But neither is hell a dead level of penalty for sin—an equal amount and desert of suffering for any and every kind of wrong doing. This would be characterizing God's moral government as an infinite quackery. Surely there are different heights of heaven, and just as surely there are different depths of hell. This the Scriptures do most plainly declare. There is "an abundant entrance" into heaven, and a being "saved so as by fire." Paul and the dying thief passed "through the gates" alike free from sin, but in capacity for joy, and sources of joy, what a difference! "Thy pound hath gained ten pounds; have thou authority over ten cities." "Thy pouud hath gained five pounds; have thou authority over five cities."

Equally clear is the Word of God as to the other of the two eternal conditions: "As many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned under law shall be judged by law." (Rom. 2:2).

'The servant that knew his Lord's will and did it not, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he that knew not his Lord's will and did unworthy things, shall be beaten with

few stripes." (Luke 12:47). And what tremendous emphasis Christ himself gives to this principle of gradation in guilt and punishment, by his words to privileged Capernaum: "It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee." (Matt. 11:24).

Is there no mercy with God? There is infinite mercy. But it is not the mercy that is counter to justice. This would be injustice. It is not the mercy represented by the yarn and tow and wish-wash of sickly sentimentalism. This would be lawless license. It is the mercy whose sublime and culminating exhibition is seen at the Cross of Christ. That remedial agency, with its measureless wealth of pathos and entreaty, of tenderness and tears, is from the innermost heart of God. But the pillars of divine government do not tremble—they are made firmer by its exhibition. The tables of the commandments lean against the cross. Beneath the mercy seat God places his holy law. And the sinner knows as he looks up into the face of the crucified that there is a divine *ὁργή* as well as a divine *ἀγάπη*, and that this remedial and reformatory agency is consistent with law, and maintains the sovereignty and the majesty, as well as the tenderness, of love; and instead of issuing a license of lawlessness and making the gospel an eternal lullaby, it gives a deeper meaning to that most terrific thing of Scripture, "the wrath of the Lamb."

HERRICK JOHNSON.

Chicago, Illinois.

II. ST. PAUL'S VIEW OF WOMAN.

Of the many misconceptions of St. Paul's views, the strangest is that currently spoken of as his low estimate of woman. The power of his intellect, the reach and insight of his spiritual vision and the breadth of his sympathies are generally acknowledged. But that he held a high view of Christian womanhood, and that principles to promote its advancement are a feature in his foundation work for the church are not so readily discerned. And yet a spirit of fair investigation must so judge him out of his own mouth. This is a vital issue if he is to hold the unquestioned place in the church of the future that he has held in the church of the past. The changed position of woman historically re-opens the discussion of the subject. The outcome must be a better interpretation of his words, an interpretation in harmony with his character. And his real conception of woman's worth and her place must give a wider, deeper, higher comprehension of God's word to the world through the Apostle to the Gentiles.

The more we consider the man the greater he becomes. To study his personal life is to be roused by his courage, moved by his humility, and fired by his love. His energies are too great to find scope in one flock, one nation, one country. "Who is offended" throughout Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, Rome, or the islands of the sea, "and I burn not?" When he expresses the measureless reach of his feelings, his vehement words are not exaggerations but the poverty and inadequacy of language to set forth his passion of soul which covets for the sake of blessing others, the divine cup of self-sacrifice. "I would even be accursed for my people." And the fires last. Their glow and fervor show what refining is going on in his own large nature. The care of his churches weighs him down, but his wisdom, faith and

patience, rise the higher. Perils, sufferings, loss, chains and impending martyrdom face him, and all the while his undaunted spirit beholds visions of triumph. The "course" he laid out for himself under his Lord and Master, he is able, to his great joy, to finish. Where has that course its boundaries? And who is left out from his thoughts, his plans? He is concerned for all people, and considers all classes. He writes general and personal epistles. His long-suffering patience turns back from the rapt joys of the third heaven, and the contemplating of mysteries that the angels desire to look into, to guide as a "father," uncontrolled and well nigh uncontrollable Gentile converts addicted to coarse vices. He enters different grades of society; he meets each human being on individual ground, with tact and charity becoming all things to all men, if by any means he may win some to what he loves to call his gospel.

Could this man disesteem women? Would this large-hearted benefactor lavish inexhaustible riches of feeling and thought upon one half of the human race and hold the other half in contempt? Does this apostle whose love is surpassed only by that of the Master, frame church codes and rules for civil and even for domestic life in harsher forms than are known in the lines of caste? Nay, but on the contrary, he exalts woman. And because of the fact that he knows and realizes her true worth in the eyes of her Maker, he spares no pains to teach the whole truth; to show her the way, the peculiar highway, marked out by Unerring Wisdom for her feet, and so direct her into it that, walking therein, she shall comprehend the meaning of her lot.

His exalted view of womanhood did not grow up moulded and made beautiful by happy circumstances in his own experience. When we look to see his ties as a man and what part woman as an individual played in his personal life, we find her influence markedly absent. His converts are his "beloved sons, begotten through the gospel." To

this gospel he is wedded. He calls Phœbe, the servant of the church at Cenchrea, "sister," and the mother of Rufus he calls "mine." Neither mother, nor sister, nor woman beloved, comes into any of the pictures to be immortalized because she belongs there with him. Our gaze following him finds him surrounded by a little group of men or alone.

How notably different in this respect is the earthly life of his Lord ! In the circle which received Jesus at his birth, the atmosphere is radiant with woman's love and incense-laden with her prayers and praise. Earth breaks into song in ante-natal joy at his coming, and the two inspired hymns are each from the lips of a woman. When Mary presents her Divine Child in the temple she is there met by the prophetess who blesses him. From first to last holy women attend his footsteps. In the close circle of his chosen friends, women follow him to minister to him as he goes preaching through the villages. Aye, and sinful women, too, follow the Sinless One, and wash his feet with penitential tears. The sisters at Bethany, whom he loved, as he loved Lazarus, their brother, serve to the uttermost when he shares their home. With word and deed they worship and anoint Him, the Resurrection and the Life. Women of all classes are drawn to him in whom dwelt grace and truth. Looking into his face the Samaritan woman as she gave him water to drink from Jacob's well, felt the falseness of her old life and forsook it when the Lord gave her to drink of the water of Life. Speeding away after that interview she stirred the city with her glad news that the Christ is come, and had talked with her. At his call a little girl comes back from the dead. In the throng a suffering woman's trembling touch draws healing from his garment's hem. From afar women who are strangers believe on him and come to seek him, and with rewarded faith go on their way rejoicing. Mothers gain his touch to bless their children. At the last, in his trial, a Roman woman pleads for his acquittal. Along the Via Dolorosa rises the

sound of Jewish women's voices in weeping and lamentation. Nearer him and faithful to share his shame, as they had shared the day of his glory, follow Mary Magdalene and the other women, and Mary, who is now become the mother of sorrows. At the cross, at the burial, at the tomb, they watch and wait, and their long dumb agony of grief calls out the heartening words of sympathizing angels. Earth keeps silence till the dawn of the Lord's Day, when the early stillness is broken by Mary Magdalene's wondering, rejoicing cry, "My Master!" She and the other women who first see the Lord are his swift messengers answering the command, "Tell that he is risen."

Woman's soul is an altar for love, and she gave her all to her Master. But she gave no gift to her Master's greatest apostle. "Devout and honorable women" at Pisidian Antioch, joined in a persecution which drove Paul and Barnabas out of their coasts. The one woman whose kindness we know of from another source than the apostle himself, is Lydia, and her grateful, noble hospitality is the one womanly deed signal enough to get itself mentioned. St. Luke's expression regarding her, "whose heart the Lord opened," might suggest that the heart of the women with her that Sabbath by the riverside, were not open by kindly nature, nor by grace. We wonder whether Euodias and Syntiche, whom St. Paul mentions, were there that day. The sooth-saying girl of Philippi is the cause of Paul and Silas being thrown into prison. And yet women could not but be moved and converted by the power and truth of his gospel. Thessalonica in her multitude of believers counted "chief women not a few." Scripture-reading Berea, too, had her believing "honorable women." In Athens one woman heard him and believed. At Corinth he abode with Priscilla and her husband, and when he left for Syria he took them with him. But it is St. Paul's own three-fold mention of Priscilla that makes us longingly wish that modern discovery had found out something more

about her than just her house. We honor her as benefactress of the church; we look up to her as teacher of Apollos, but when we hear from St. Paul that she was ready to lay down her life for his, we love her because she loved him. The "Acts" once more mentions women. They mingle in the little Tyrian company, bidding the Apostle good-bye at the close of that week's visit while the ship unloaded at Tyre, whence he is going up to Jerusalem. It is good to leave the women and children there in that group around him kneeling on the sea-shore while he prays.

According to the record St. Paul's long life singularly lacked woman's love. The facts show little more than such attention, regard and hospitality as might be accorded any great religious teacher. No woman ever did aught against the Master, but St. Paul suffered at the hands of women. His sister's son speaks and saves the apostle's life, but the sister herself is silent.

If his mother were living and had cast him off, this would account for the violence in his speech indicative of deep feeling when he tells how he had suffered the loss of "my all" for Christ. Whether she did so reject him and he got by inheritance from her his spirit of persecuting for conscience sake, or whether being long dead she never knew of his defection from the faith of his fathers, to which in the hour of his birth he was set apart, is a question. But other strict and honorable Jewesses persecuted him. Some of the Christian women vexed his soul and occasioned much trouble in his churches. And in the crisis of his life Drusilla, the Jewish wife of the Roman Felix, and Bernice, Agrippa's queen, when they heard him in his pleading, lifted no finger to save his life.

In view of all this it becomes interesting to note his manner of speech regarding individual women. Many are named in his salutations. Euodias and Syntiche, in open discord in the Philippian church, are the only ones reproved. And could reproof be gentler? "I beseech Euodias; I

beseech Syntiche, to be reconciled in a Christian spirit. True yoke-fellow, help these women to be reconciled, for together they labored in the gospel with me." To the Romans, he tenderly commends Phoebe, and writes, "Help her, for she helped many and myself also." He greets Priscilla with Aquila, and tells of their love, for which he gives his thanks and the thanks of all the Gentile churches. Mary is to be greeted, and Tryphena and Tryphosa, (the dainty ones) who "labor in the Lord," and "the beloved Persio," and the sister of Nereus, and the mother of Rufus, and Julia. In the first Corinthian letter he speaks of Chloe, that distinguished woman whose household bore him messages and information of the church. And Priscilla is again mentioned. In the second letter to Timothy he greets Prisca, as he calls her, and her husband a third time, and twice he puts her name before Aquila's. This, his last letter, written when he was "ready to be offered," opens with a remembrance that gleams out and pictures a home such as he himself never had—a home wherein abode Christian womanhood's grace and goodness, the saintly grandmother Lois, and the sweet mother Eunice, teaching the Scriptures to the young child Timothy. The very last name he traces is a woman's, that of Claudia.

This remembering by name which is counted so tender a trait in our blessed Lord, does not lose its significance in St. Paul. It shows that he did not forget to individualize women in any service they rendered to him or to the church.

St. Paul's whole life and character, high, noble, and "kindly affectioned," show regard for women. And since in him the man and the teacher are singularly blended, this fact indicates that he would not and did not in his teaching discriminate against woman. Without the influence of a Monica, a Beatrice, or a Vittoria Colonna to inspire him, he drew the outlines of an ideal which they in their lives filled in, and their beauty of character witnesses that he taught

the truth. As he in his day saw women throughout the world, they as a class made no great claim upon his respect, and yet we see that he treated them in individual life with general consideration. Moreover his view of woman is a triumph over his education. Unlike the other apostles, he himself had been a Rabbi. Reared a Hebrew of the Hebrews, though in Tarsus, a city famous for Grecian influence, literature and philosophy, he had been taught in Jerusalem, at the feet of the great Gamaliel, the rival doctrines of the schools of Judaism. Familiar with their opinions regarding woman and marriage and the "unsavory question of divorce," which the Rabbinic law allowed "on almost any ground," (*Edersheim*) it would scarcely be surprising if Rabbinical notions sometimes cropped out in his writings. But if St. Paul abolished the Law itself much more the Talmud. And so far does he go beyond the tenets and conclusions of the Rabbis that his estimate of woman's duties and her privileges re-iterate Old Testament ideas at their best. So fully does he found his ethics here on the eternal principles of God as enunciated by the Lord Jesus, that his view of woman and her rights, her God-given place and its obligations, won acceptance in the church universal, and to-day convicts modern society of folly as well as hardness of heart, and looseness of doctrine, and lack of vision to see the meaning of the mystery of marriage.

St. Paul's great contest for Christian liberty raised women out of the place she had in the Gentile world. He declared freedom in Christ from the three kinds of bondage then universal: Race distinction, slavery, and the servitude of woman. He proclaimed, "There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female." Mistaken notions as to what this freedom implied were common enough, among the men as well as the women. "There was an unmistakeable disposition attendant on the new faith, to break with the existing rule of

life." (*Weissacher*.) St. Paul is obliged to say again and again that moral freedom does not level down outward distinctions. He shows that "equality by no means signifies identity in position." He argues with the Thessalonians who had quit work. He tells the Romans to pay their (exorbitant) taxes, and to render due respect to men in authority. He commands slaves not to seek civil liberty on the ground of their being the Lord's free-men. But there was no rising of the Christians who were in slavery. Even if men here and there were dissatisfied, there was no organized attempt to blot out class and race distinctions, and political subjection. It was the "advanced women" of Corinth who made the bold stand against man's headship. Their veils were cast aside, that significant part of their dress taken by the bride as the sign of her subordination to one man. Evidently they argued: If a woman is man's equal before God she should be recognized as his equal in the eyes of men. They consider that putting themselves on the same footing with man they are giving sufficient proof that he is not her head. How much easier to assert equality than to manifest it! Corinth was the leading church, and the women had their champions, men who thought themselves prophets and "spiritual," and who wanted no test of facts. They permitted women to address the congregation, and each ask her questions aloud.

St. Paul being orally informed of these new customs as well as the other and greater troubles in the church which caused him such anguish of heart, wrote his first epistle to the Corinthians. His words are remarkably patient for a man so quick to see the relations of things, and who would give place to no error, not even from an apostle, "no, not for an hour." The whole letter, so conclusive in reasoning, so noble in sentiments, shows intensest feeling. He tells afterward how it was written in tears. With his remarkable mobility of feeling he takes up one by one the matters that call for counsel and correction. And among others, the

new behavior of the women. He had but just written on another page, "Who maketh thee to differ?" His wonderfully clear-eyed faith saw his God everywhere manifest as the Creator. Therefore all the distinctions which obtain in the world must be there by God's will. Moreover his God was present in the world as the Governor. Therefore the divine plan would work out "all things" for good to his children. Furthermore, he realized that to live for Christ takes the sting out of any existing subjection. He could even understand a certain kind of loyalty which would make a man want to keep the position he had when he became the Lord's; and as he writes, "Let each man wherein he was called, therein abide with God." It is characteristic of his teaching that he always refers minor points to great principles. And yet he does not stop with this general teaching; he instructs directly. As to the case in hand, the veil and the headship are related. The women's irreverence is treated separately in the place it belongs. In what he has to say he but amplifies and explicitly states what his Master's teaching implies and takes for granted. When the Lord calls himself the Bridegroom nothing could more honor marriage, nor more plainly teach his headship, and the subjection of the bride, his church, whose glory is her union with him, and who by partaking of his life, becomes spotless and beautiful. St. Paul's appeal is clear, and as often, it carries two arguments, neither of which can be gainsaid: God's teaching in nature, and in the Scriptures. 'Judge for yourselves,' he reasons with them, 'Nature veils woman and does not veil man.' Is it seemly to disregard distinctions which inhere in the very constitution of things? And what God indicates in nature he expressly states in His Word, wherein from the beginning, woman is made subordinate to man for service. This subjection does not touch the question of equality. Christ (who instead of counting his equality with God a prize to be held, emptied himself and became a servant) is

the head of the man, and the head of Christ is God. Man is the image and glory of God, but the woman is man's glory, framed out of him and created for him, (the type of the church in relation to Christ). Nevertheless, in mutual dependence and unity, "in the Lord it holds good that the man without the woman is as imperfect as the woman without the man." (*Weissachrr.*) St. Paul is more moved when he comes to consider the women's irreverence, their speaking out in the church's holiest conference, in the meeting which existed for the manifestation of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. When the Spirit poured out gifts of tongues and prophesying the brethren needed self-control in the exercise of these gifts lest there should be a scene of confusion. He gives them wise and explicit directions on this subject. He does not say that women are to try to keep silent if the miraculous gifts should be poured out on them. When they are moved to ecstatic prayer or prophesying they must be guided by the same rules he has given the brethren, and adds only one other direction, and that is to be womanly and keep their heads covered. But when they are not so moved by the Holy Spirit he says, and says it emphatically, that they shall keep silence. And that they shall ask their questions at home. And for their champions he has the quick, keen sarcasm, "What! Are you the beginning and the end of the gospel? If any one of you really was what he thinks himself, a prophet and spiritual, he would know and acknowledge that the things I write unto you are the Lord's commandments."

Regarding the office of public teaching, "Paul the aged," in a letter written to Timothy, says, "I suffer not a woman to teach." This with a swift touch of argument he carried after his usual method straight to nature and back to the beginning, the typical woman and her Creator. In these rapid, abridged expressions of his thoughts, the one man writing in private to the other shows his sympathetic heart by a hopefully confident reference to woman's peculiar

danger and sorrow. As to the facts out of which St. Paul speaks with the knowledge that Timothy knew them as well as himself, they are very plainly to be discerned. St. Paul esteemed public teaching Christ's gift on his ascension, for the edifying of the church, his body. Neither in the Scriptures, nor by the Lord's example, nor by special revelation was there any authority whatever for a female order in the ministry. God never introduced a dispensation by a woman. There were no Jewish priestesses under the Old Covenant, and no women apostles under the New. The Lord Jesus never indicated that woman is or is to become the representative of God. Among the seventy he sent out no woman. The Holy Spirit never said to the church, "Separate me this woman and this for the work whereunto I have called them." St. Paul had need of no further direction to guide him. Except by direct Divine command he would not put together offices that God had kept asunder.

In arguing, some say that St. Paul counselled observances to suit the time, and that in his views of matrimony he spoke of marriage as he found it. But the position of Gentile women, though interesting in itself and for the historic light it throws on the conditions he had to meet, is of no moment as touching the only question of importance. The real point is : whether his words are for times and conditions, or for human nature. Did he speak as a man whose circumstances and disposition called forth decisions which naturally give place to modern opinions and the changed position of woman historically, or did he speak as a prophet and apostle who set forth God's wish and will ? Was the truth revealed to him concerning the daughters of God, or was his revelation singularly defective in that the matter on which he laid so much stress was in form and fashion to pass away ?

It is true that we have no such full expression of his mind on this subject as we have on the vital doctrines of

the Christian life. He never lifts any secondary principle to a place of first importance. He answers only the few questions that are put to him and he makes comparatively few references to marriage, and yet being a thinker spontaneous and powerful, he is able to pack an occasion with far-reaching conclusions. A teacher who "needeth not to be ashamed," he gives abundantly more than is asked, or can at once be comprehended. Startling those unchaste Corinthians by declaring that the bodies of believers are the temples of the Holy Spirit, he proceeds to take up their question on marriage. These inquiries deal with the subject altogether from the sensuous side, for they grow out of disputes and fanaticism, the Jew trained to regard marriage as obligatory, the Gentile either on the one extreme of heathen license or on the other of contending that the body itself was impure. St. Paul's answers become an added self-revelation, for as a man he speaks his own opinions. There is evidence enough to show that he had thought deeply upon the whole subject of woman's position and her destiny. Being a man of prayer he undoubtedly went to God with this problem which had such important practical bearings. As he cried unto God when called upon to decide questions that involved issues touching the lives of many, he was answered. He received wisdom from the "One who giveth liberally." And when the Holy Spirit illuminates the mind and soul what a flood of clear light is thrown upon dark and perplexing things! He who has such private revelation will by word or deed make it known. Every experience of this nature is so real that oftentimes it gets lifted into undue prominence. But how guarded St. Paul is against putting any conviction of his along side of God's open Word. "I speak by permission," he says, "I have no commandment of the Lord on this. I give my own judgment. I speak for your profit, not to bind you."

It is not to be wondered at that St. Paul should have

called virgin chastity "good," in writing to men who called themselves Christians but whose spiritual perceptions were of so low an order that they could not discern the evil in their own ways and much less rise to the conception of God's thoughts, wise and holy, when he gave the woman to be a helpmeet of man. And yet in all the apostle says how prudent he is, and how free from asceticism! He who talked so strenuously of the subjection by which in all things he kept his own body under, knew the special temptations and dangers of marriage, and that for them who married there must be long disciplinary warfare and dearly bought victory before the fruits of the Spirit abound, and he would save them. Distress and perils were present and to be looked for, and he would have them "free from cares." "The time is short," he exclaims; and no earthly tie, circumstance, or business seemed to him of very much moment in view of the profound changes he felt to be imminent. He knew by experience that a believer who had the "gift" of absolute devotion to Christ in inward and outward life could do more for his Master's cause if single. Hence he elevates virginity, and gives the individual the right to decline marriage for the sake of higher motives. It is a little touch but significant and a part of the whole that St. Paul thinking of the ordinary and not the exceptional marriages, should assume it as natural and so right, that the husband's chief thinking will be how he may please his wife, and her care how she may please her husband. "But if you marry you have not sinned," he says, and the widow is "at liberty to marry whom she will in the Lord." To Christians who are married he states with double emphasis the inviolability of the marriage-bond as opposed to divorce. "I give charge, yea, not I, but the Lord." As to marriage where one had become a Christian and not the other, he will not have the believer break the bond, but the unbeliever breaking it is allowed to go in peace. And then comes one of those bursts of feeling

when his heart breaks out in a holy exclamation of high incentive or sweet, constraining motive, "O wife, how do you know but that it is possible by binding your husband afresh in the earthly tie, to knit him into the heavenly, and because of your union with him save him? O man, how do you know whether you shall not thus save your wife?"

To the voluptuous Corinthians he recommends voluntary celibacy. Throughout the other epistles his directions and references accept the Christian rite of marriage as the normal state, and put honor on the home, incomparable as the birthplace of Christian culture. To Timothy he classes forbidding to marry as one of the doctrines of demons. His ethical thought underlying the comparison and arguments in Galatians and Romans on the difference between the son of Abraham's marriage with Sarah and his son by the bondwoman, shows that St. Paul knew of a perfection of marriage beyond the barely literal and legal. And in Ephesians, that ripe, profound and spiritual epistle, he plainly states the mystical meaning of marriage, true and honorable marriage, based upon the mind's choice, a union in unity maintained by mutual love. His words sound like an echo repeating the word of the Lord Jesus, who called himself the bridegroom: "The husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church. Husbands love your wives, every one of you in particular nourishing and cherishing as the Lord nourishes and cherishes the church."

St. Paul's whole view of marriage thus set forth in his letters is as spiritual and beautiful as it is high and profound. Moreover, he divined what it is, after all, that woman wants and needs. It is not the desire of the eyes, nor the pride of life. In the Ephesian letter summarizing it, he did not say to the husband, "Give her—," "Put her—," he said, "Love her," and he gave an infinite measure for that love.

In that Corinthian letter St. Paul twice referred to his own unmarried state. He felt that in all the facts of his

personal life he was made an example. And we can see even better than he did how more things than one were in a figure transferred to him for the sake of many who should believe through him. The great temporal blessings promised God's people under the Old Covenant of which marriage was one, had to be cut off until the fulness of the spiritual blessings had manifestly come in. St. Paul himself is such a living lesson of this that at first blush it looks as though poverty, persecution, and every form of suffering and self-denial are to constitute the rule of the Christian life. Yet he guards against this limited interpretation, preaching trust "in the living God who giveth us richly all things to enjoy." And apostle for liberty that he is, he waived his rights of personal comfort not because he lacked power and freedom, but to make himself an example. "I am free to have a wife." Since he was so appreciative of the few kindnesses he did receive from women, we may have some conception of what would have been his joy and gratitude if he had known the ministering attentions of a wife whose affections were centered in him, the love of a woman whose powers of devotion were equal to his own. We know the affections of this man who could and did so attach men to his person as to bring about that scene at Miletus. Possibly it is in these very questions concerning woman and marriage, together with the circumstances of his experience, that we have a means of measuring the height and depth of his love for Christ, whereby he was dead to the world. By no Confessions does any man lay his heart more bare than does St. Paul. We see in his youth his ascetic purity, and in his middle and later life the light burning within is kept by more than vows in that white steady flame. He did not underate the sweet family ties which he believed to be God's gift to man. 'Twas the higher love constrained him.

Studying all that St. Paul says concerning woman, we find that his conceptions form the outline of one view.

From first to last they are parts that consist together in one completed whole. Early and late we hear him calling woman unto her home. Tenderly if he may, sternly if he must, he directs her into the rights and honors and duties she has at God's hand. While St. Paul lays great stress upon the submission of women as becometh them "who profess godliness," his cautions and rebukes are not given without the holding up of an ideal. The Ephesian women belong to the Christians who are "in the heavenly places," and so to them he can reveal the mystery of marriage and high, spiritual love. To the women of Corinth, ambitious of a place in the eyes of the world, he presents the grand conception of man and woman contemplating each the life of the other. To the woman Timothy had to deal with, neither spiritual nor intellectual, he gives the word "home." Their misdirected energies are to be guided into "good works," learning with their children "first to show kindness at home." Evidently they considered any other place better than home. What St. Paul has to say regarding their behavior is in tones of righteous severity. But over and above the manifest need for rebuke, some facts as to the writing must be taken into account. He is writing to a young preacher, and his apostolic directions naturally take an authoritative form. And then he is not addressing the women directly by a message. The picture in his mind is his "own son," their pastor and bishop who was grieved and troubled by their faults and follies, and especially tried by the young widows in his flock who made selfish gain out of the church. It is easy to see that Timothy was a gentle, shrinking, studious man, who neither in disposition nor years was able to manage such women, vain and extravagant of dress, spending hours doing their hair in the multitudinous little braids then the fashion, and going about doing harm. Moreover, it is Paul the aged who is writing, and these pastoral epistles are somewhat different from the general epistles in their plainness of speech and their

charges on details of conduct. He puts especial emphasis upon godliness, a term not used by him before. He exhorts and commands that all, bishops and elders and deacons, men and women and the children, should be taught the practice of reverence, adoring reverence. The exercise of this attitude of soul toward God would naturally lead to such conduct in daily life as he rules for all. So urgent is he that he might say, "This one thing I write: Be reverent." His words are the frankness of an old man privileged in advice. And all that he says make for the reign of this spirit of reverence. Read thus, the seeming harshness disappears and there is only the candor of the wise and holy apostle. To Titus also he gives a like direction, counselling him to speak the doctrines which would draw the women of his flock to the ideal home. "The aged women that they be in behavior as becometh holy women, teachers of good things. The young women wise, discreet, chaste, workers at home, loving their husbands, loving their children." The very words suggest the picture of Lois and Eunice, and above all of Elizabeth and Mary.

St. Luke who so tenderly mentions women and children, and to whom we owe our knowledge of the Virgin's thoughts and words, wrote his gospel while he was living in the companionship and under the influence of the apostle Paul. And it may be that St. Paul's own view of woman was unified by what he knew of Mary herself, she who in her heavenly meekness submitted to judgment. If Adam "is the figure of him that was to come," it is suggestive also to contrast Eve the mother of natural life and Mary the mother of him who is Spiritual life. To one the devil comes; to the other the angel. One being deceived, falls; the other, kept by the Holy Spirit, is raised to blessing and honor. As disobedience is the sin of the one, obedience is the grace of the other. Eve stands as the type of a kind of beauty fascinating to the natural mind, and even Christian women 'snared by their liberty' oftentimes confound the

two kinds of womanhood; that of the first Eve seeking her own pleasure and doing her own will, with a show of liberty, tendeth to bondage; that of the second Eve humbling herself to the will of God and accepting and rejoicing in her appointed place, is made free indeed and forever exalted.

These two types of womanhood seem to lie in St. Paul's mind. He carries his questions about women back to that first one, who in her transgression brought sin into the world, and death. His ideal of Christian womanhood is met in the "Handmaid of the Lord," by whom in the flesh came the Resurrection and the Life. The second Adam gave back to woman the place she lost, and raised her again into the rights accorded her by the Creator in the beginning. St. Paul shows womankind the pathway to take in order to enter into possession of that restored gift. All his instructions and mandates are explained by his high view of the will of God concerning women. He spared not the scrutinizing frown and severity of the wise teacher. He gave rules to cover the points of social, civil, and public religious life wherein woman is distinguished from man. Where these distinctions do not hold, he never draws the discriminating line. He puts woman on precisely the same level with man in all the highest matters, and preaches alike to both the glorious truths he himself lived for. St. Paul honored woman by setting her in her true place, and showing the meaning of her position. He held up the possibility of moral purity and its objection. He made the marriage-tie inviolable. It is by the spread of that gospel he loved to call his, that woman owes her changed position historically. The ideal for all time is his Hymn of Love. Christian men and women with noblest efforts can never go beyond his command to vie with one another in manifesting each a glory whose meaning is incomplete without the other, the glory of headship and the glory of service. And no more beautiful words ever entered into the heart of man

to conceive as a guide in married life than, "As the Church is subject to Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands. And husbands, love your wives as Christ loved the Church."

EMMA G. WILBUR.

Chicago, Illinois.

III. MORMONISM.¹

On the 22d day of September, in the year of our Lord 1805, Joseph Smith was born at Sharon, Windsor County, Vermont, of poor, ignorant, thriftless and not over honest parents. Along with them he removed, ten years later, to a poor farm in the western part of the State of New York, where he reproduced the shiftlessness, ignorance, meanness and dishonesty of his parents in his own character. For years in his youth and early manhood he spent much of the time in befooling men and defrauding them, by pretending that through the aid of a marvelous stone which he possessed he could discover hidden treasures, gold mines and the like. For such practices he was brought before a justice of the peace in Bainbridge, Chenango County, New York, on the 20th day of March, 1826, and adjudged guilty of being a disorderly person and an impostor.

Meanwhile the region in which he lived had been visited by a religious revival when he was about fifteen years of age, and his own mind had been wildly agitated.

Under the influence of this religious excitement several members of the Smith family joined the Presbyterian Church. But Joseph was more inclined to the Methodists. He tells us that he prayed much to be guided aright ; that he was greatly perplexed by the numbers and varieties of the sects ; and that he saw none that seemed to be correct. He would have us believe that like Mohammed, whom he more nearly resembled in the ethical features of his teaching than any other with whom we could compare him, he was dissatisfied with any form of Christianity which he knew, on the one hand, and equally dissatisfied on the other with Judaism as he saw it.

¹This paper was read before the student body of Union Theological Seminary in the month of March, last. There have been several requests for its publication.

He tells us, also, that he began to see visions from this time on, and that in one of these visions, which occurred on the night of the 21st of September, 1823, the angel Moroni appeared to him three times, and told him that the Bible of the Western Continent, the supplement to the New Testament, was buried near the adjacent town of Manchester, and that thither in 1827, after the necessary disciplinary probation, he went and received from the Lord a stone box, in which was a volume six inches thick, made of thin gold plates 8 inches by 7, and fastened together by three rings; that the plates were covered with small writing in the "reformed Egyptian" tongue, and that there was with them a pair of supernatural spectacles, in the shape of two crystals set in a silver bow, and called "Urim and Thummim." As the illiterate Smith could write with difficulty he employed as amanuensis Oliver Cowdery, to whom from behind a curtain he dictated, as he claimed, a translation of the unsealed contents of the plates. With the aid of a farmer of some means, Martin Harris, the copy thus produced by Oliver Cowdery was printed and published in 1830 under the title of "The Book of Mormon."

It was prefaced by the sworn statement of Oliver Cowdery, David Whitmer and Martin Harris, that an angel of God had shown them the plates of which the book was a translation.

This book—the so-called "Book of Mormon"—in which Joseph Smith is declared to be God's prophet, with all power, and entitled to all obedience, tells us that certain Hebrews settled in America in 600 B. C.; that they subsequently divided over a question of leadership, and that the victorious party, which was also the party of insubordination to God, suffered the darkening of their skins as a curse for their insubordination and became the red Indians of America. It tells us that subsequently the party of the servants of the Lord became still smaller through apostasy and that finally it was destroyed by the Indian Hebrews in

the year 384, A. D.; but that among the few who escaped destruction were Mormon and his son Moroni; that Mormon collected the sixteen books of records, kept by successive kings and priests, into one volume, and that Moroni supplemented the work of Mormon by some personal reminiscences and then hid the volume in the hill of Cumorah, being assured of its going, one day, to be discovered by God's chosen prophet.

Such is the account of the water-wizzard, the cheat and the fraud, Joseph Smith, as to the origin of the "Book of Mormon." In a part of this account he was at first supported by the sworn statement of his three friends, Cowdery, Whitmer and Harris. But some years later, all three of these renounced Mormonism and denounced their oaths as false.

There is little reason for believing that Joseph Smith ever was as profoundly agitated on the subject of religion as he professed; there is still less reason for believing that he made an intelligent study of either Christianity or Judaism and thus intelligently rejected them as insufficient. There is the best evidence for believing that the "Book of Mormon" came not through angelic ministrations, but in quite a different way.

The most of this book was written by an invalid and crack-brained Presbyterian preacher, Solomon Spalding, by name, to while away the tedious hours of his invalid years. He had been accustomed to maintain that the Indians of America were descendants of some of the Israelitish tribes, and in a period of infirm health he wrote a romance to support his views. He called his work the "Manuscript Found," and tried, but in vain, to find a publisher. This work fell into the hands of Smith, and after some slight manipulations, came out the "Book of Mormon."

That Spalding's romance was the original of the "Book of Mormon" was the confident affirmation of contemporaries of Joseph Smith, who had examined both books. And

these men not only asserted such a relation between the "Manuscript Found" and the "Book of Mormon," but they proved it by pointing to numerous and distinctive names, phrases and characters in Spalding's manuscript which re-appear as distinctive features in Smith's work. And so strong do they make their case that Gentile historians of Mormonism generally, and perhaps universally, agree in taking this view of the origin of the so-called "Book of Mormon."

Joseph Smith gave his people not only the "Book of Mormon." In 1830 he claimed to have received another revelation proclaiming him "seer, translator, prophet, apostle of Jesus Christ, and elder of the Church." The revelations thus begun continued to his death, in 1844. They include that which sanctions polygamy and which was privately given in the year 1843 to pacify his lawful wife and to silence the objections of the saints to his living with a number of women whom he had persuaded to worse than polygamous relations. For reasons of policy this revelation was not published abroad for ten years, until 1853. These revelations to Smith, together with one to Brigham Young, written and published by him at "Winter Quarters," in the year 1847, to inspire and guide the saints in their projected western pilgrimage through the wilderness, were collected and published under the title of the "Book of Doctrine and Covenants."

Ah, suppose an up-to-date "Book of Doctrine and Covenants" would to-day include one or two other revelations, as for instance, one which, while still justifying polygamy as ethically proper, advised its cessation as a condition necessary in order to the admission of Utah to the Statehood!

These are the two distinctive books of the Mormons.

They comprise their "inspired writings," which as "modern revelations," they place alongside the ancient scriptures "properly translated," contained in the Old and

New Testaments. In theory the Mormons hold the Bible "properly translated" the Christian Bible, and the "Book of Mormon" and the "Book of Doctrine and Covenants" to be the God-given scriptures of authority and direction. They hold that the Old Testament was addressed particularly to the Jewish Church ; that the New Testament was similarly addressed to the Judaic and European Christian Church ; the "Book of Mormon" to the American Christian Church,, and the "Book of Doctrine and Covenants" to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.¹

We must not, however, think of their canon as being as important to them as ours to us. They believe that continuous revelation is necessary ; that "without new revelation their officers never could be qualified to perform the various duties of their calling." There is no other people more completely under the domination of their priesthood. It is unlike Christianity in this respect.

In theory, nevertheless, Mormonism is Christianity perfected. It is the theory and the boast of Mormons that, as Christianity surpasses the religion of the Jewish Dispensation, so Mormonism surpasses Christianity. And as a matter of fact Mormon teachers are constantly making false appeals to the Christian Scriptures in order to establish Mormonism, as Paul indubitably proved the truth of Christianity from the Old Testament. Mormon propagandist literature is chock full of references to the Old and New Testament, illustrating with indefinite fulness the pregnant saying, "In religion, what damned error but some sober brow will bless it and approve it with a text?" Not one of the college of the apostles quoted scripture with greater show of unction. But this Mormon unction is the unction of the deceived, of the ignoramus, or the hypocrite ; and

¹With this historical sketch of Smith and the books, compare the account of Bishop Daniel S. Tuttle on "Mormons" in Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, the article in the Encyclopedia Britanica, and especially Orson Pratt's Works, Tract No. 6, "Remarkable Visions."

the theory of Mormonism that it is a legitimate development of Christianity is false. The distinctive teachings of Mormonism are in direct and absolute antagonism to those of Christianity.

Let us examine them briefly: In the first place, the Mormon notion of God is of an immense material substance, di-personal in a pre-eminent sense and in a more remote sense many-personal. Naive materialism, tritheism with two out of the three gods personal, only, and progressively increasing polytheism are scrouged into their notion of God or Gods. But let Mormonism speak for itself:

In "an epitome of the faith of the Latter Day Saints" prepared by Joseph Smith himself, the first article reads, "We believe in God, the Eternal Father, and in his Son, Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost." This article in the Mormon mouth means something very different from what it does when pronounced by a Christian. Orson Pratt, perhaps the most eloquent and able of the expounders of Mormonism, an apostle, and claiming inspiration, if we understand him aright, says, "The Godhead consists of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The Father is a material being. The substance of which he is composed is wholly material. It is a substance widely different in some respects from the various substances with which we are more immediately acquainted. In other respects it is precisely like all other materials. The substance of his person like other matter, cannot be in two places at the same instant. It also requires time for him to transport himself from place to place. It matters not how great the velocity of his movements, time is an essential ingredient to all motion, whether rapid or slow. It differs from other matter in the superiority of its powers, being intelligent, all-wise, and possessing the power of self-motion to a far greater extent than the coarser materials of nature. "God is a Spirit," but that does not make him an "immaterial being"—a being that has no properties in common with matter.

The expression, "an immaterial being" is a contradiction in terms. Immateriality is only another name for nothing. It is the negative of all existence. A "spirit" is as much matter as oxygen or hydrogen. It has many properties in common with matter. . . . He is not a being "without parts," as modern idolaters teach; for every whole is made up of parts. The whole person of the Father consists of innumerable parts; and each part is so situated as to bear certain relations of distance to every other part. There must also be, to a certain degree, a freedom of motion among those parts, which is an essential condition to the movement of his limbs, without which he could only move as a whole.

"All the foregoing statements in relation to the person of the Father, are equally applicable to the person of the Son.

"The Holy Spirit being one part of the Godhead, is also a material substance, of the same nature and properties in many respects, as the Spirits of the Father and the Son. It exists in vast immeasurable quantities in connection with all material worlds. This is called God in the Scriptures, as well as the Father and the Son, God the Father and God the Son cannot be everywhere present; indeed they cannot be even in two places at the same instant; but God the Holy Spirit is omnipotent—it stands through all space, intermingling with all other matter, yet no one atom of the Holy Spirit can be in two places at the same instant, which in all cases is an absolute impossibility. It must exist in inexhaustible quantities, which is the only possible way for any substance to be omnipresent. All the innumerable phenomena of universal nature are produced in their origin by the actual presence of this intelligent, all-wise and all-powerful material substance called the Holy Spirit. It is the most active matter in the universe, producing all its operations according to fixed and definite laws enacted by itself, in conjunction with the Father and Son. What are called the laws of nature are nothing more nor less than

the fixed method by which this spiritual matter operates. Each atom of the Holy Spirit is intelligent, and like all other matter, has solidity, form and size, and occupies space. Two atoms of this Spirit cannot occupy the same space at the same time ; neither can one atom, as before stated, occupy two separate spaces at the same time. . . . If several of the atoms of this Spirit should unite themselves together into the form of a person, then the person of the Holy Spirit would be subject to the same necessity as the other two persons of the Godhead, that is, it could not be everywhere present. No finite number of atoms can be omnipresent ; an infinite number of atoms is required to be everywhere in infinite space. Two persons receiving the gift of the Holy Spirit, do not each receive at the same time the same identical particles, though they each receive a substance exactly similar in kind. It would be as impossible for each to receive the same identical atoms, as it would be for two men at the same time to drink the same identical pint of water,"¹

In his treatise, "The Kingdom of God," Part IV., p. 15, the "inspired apostle," Pratt, gives a summary of his doctrine of God. He says : "We have endeavored to point out the nature and character of the great supreme governing power of the universe, consisting of the Father, Son and the Holy Ghost. The person of the Father consists of a most glorious substance, called spirit, which we have shown must have extension and parts, and consequently must be material. Without these qualities no substance could exist.

The Son is the express image of the Father, and is also a material being. The same material body that was crucified and laid in the tomb, rose again. The same flesh, the same bones, were reanimated by the same material spirit. This glorious compound of flesh and bones, and spirit—all

¹Orson Pratt: "Kingdom of God:" Part I. Pp. 49. In Series of Pamphlets. Liverpool. 1857.

material, ascended into heaven to dwell in the presence of the glorious personage of the Father, of whose express image and likeness he was the most perfect pattern. Therefore from the description given of Jesus we are irresistibly led to the conclusion that both he and the Father must appear, so far as relates to form and size, very much like man. If then both these glorious personages are about the size of man, they must, like man, occupy a finite space of but a few cubic feet in dimension; and according to the admitted truths of philosophy, no substance can be in two or more places at the same time, therefore neither the Father nor Son can, consistently with those truths, be in two places at once. Revealed truths never will contradict any other truths. The revealed truths contained in the Bible inform us that God is everywhere, sustaining and upholding all things, and that in him we live and move and have our being. How can those important truths of divine revelation be reconciled with other admitted truths of philosophy which are equally certain? They can be reconciled in no way except by admitting the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit. This all-powerful substance extends throughout the material universe, uniting and mingling with all other matter in a greater or less degree, not absolutely filling all space, for then there would be no room for other matter, but like the rays of light or heat, existing in different degrees of density in different parts of space. By it all things are governed in the most perfect order and wisdom, according to the will of the Father and the Son. This view of the subject does not necessarily do away with a personal spirit, acting in conjunction with the other two persons of the Godhead; for myriads of personal spirits could be organized out of the inexhaustible quantities which exist, and still an abundance would be left to govern and control the various departments of the universe where those personages could not always be present."

In another passage the great expounder of Mormonism

exclaims at an enemy for not seeing that the Holy Spirit, if a person, could not be omnipotent.¹

Similarly in a so-called "Revelation" to Joseph Smith, dated December 27th, 1852, the omnipresence of God by his Spirit universally diffused, is taught. There is no shadow of ground for doubt that Pratt expounded the Mormon doctrine of God in harmony with Smith's teaching.

Thus we have in this beggar's basket of a doctrine of God the assertion of absolute materiality, on the supposition that matter is the only substance. We have two personal Gods—God the Father and God the Son—stripped of the attribute of omnipresence and by implication and logic of every divine attribute. Personality is denied the Spirit on the ground that to make him personal would be to make him finite. He is turned into It.

What a hotch-potch! An infinite, material, personal God—a sort of material soul of the world—two material, finite, personal Gods, making materialism, tritheism, practical atheism.

But this Mormon theology—these bizarre, confused and conflicting representations of God become still more grotesque, absurd and contradictory when Brigham Young, the "Prophet of the Lord" who succeeded Joseph Smith, publicly taught as he did on the 9th of April, 1852. These are his words: "When our father Adam came into the Garden of Eden, he came into it with a celestial body, and brought Eve, one of his wives, with him. He helped to make and organize this world. He is Michael the Archangel, the Ancient of Days, about whom holy men have written and spoken. He is our Father and our God, and the only God with whom we have to do."² Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse, in her thrilling work, "Tell It All," or "The Story of a Life's Experience in Mormonism," after quoting these

¹Orson Pratt: "Absurdities of Immaterialism:" P. 25. In a Series of Pamphlets. Liverpool. 1857.

²Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse: "Tell It All:" Pp. 299-300.

words of Brigham Young's, says: "This public declaration gave great offense and led to the apostasy of many. Nevertheless, Brigham Young thinks that just as Adam came down to Eden and subsequently became a God, in like manner he also himself will attain to the Godhead. Heber C. Kimball, zealous to go a step further, declared that Brigham was God, and that he (Kimball) stood towards him in the same relation as the Third Person in the Blessed Trinity does toward the First."¹

Dr. Sheldon Jackson, ex-Moderator of the Presbyterian Church North, who "was for twenty years a missionary among the Mormons," says of Mormonism: "God [God the Father] is none other than Adam the first man. Adam married many wives here and begot many children. He died, went to heaven and was made God of Earth because of his many wives and children. He has many wives in heaven and begets many children there still. Every man after death is God over a world, the magnitude of which is proportioned to the number of wives and children he has here. If he has many wives and children here he will be a god over a large kingdom hereafter."² Thus gods of smaller size than the Father and the Son are growing daily.

Mrs. Stenhouse says, and truly: "The Confession of Faith published by Joseph Smith during his life time, would certainly deceive an uninitiated person; and it was in consequence of the ambiguity of that very document, that so many unsuspecting persons were from the beginning of Mormonism led astray by the teachings of the missionaries. The convert was told that the Mormon faith proclaimed the existence of one true God, but he was not told that Father Adam was that deity, and that he is "like a well-to-do farmer." He was told that Christ was the Son of God, but he was not taught that the Virgin Mary was "the lawful wife of God the Father," and that he intended after the

¹Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse: "Tell It All:" P. 300.

²R. W. Jopling's Report.

resurrection to take her again as one of his own wives, to raise up immortal spirits in eternity. . . . He was taught that the saints believed in the Holy Ghost, but he was not told that "the Holy Ghost is a man, [i. e., that a personalized part of the Holy Ghost is a man] and our God. You think our Father and our God is not a lively, sociable and cheerful man. He is one of the most lively men that ever lived."¹

If Dr. Sheldon Jackson can be trusted, Mrs. Stenhouse might have gone still further. She might have said: "Though they taught men to have faith in Christ, they did not teach that the marriage in Cana of Galilee was Christ's own marriage; that the Marys and Mothers of the New Testament were wives of his, and that he begat many children and still begets children in heaven."² These esoteric teachings of Mormonism were left to be unfolded later.

Now place, if you please, alongside this mass of drivelling assumption, of discordant, rampant and warring blasphemy of materialism, bi-personality, tri-personality according to some later teaching of the tabernacle, impersonality of the Spirit according to Joseph Smith and Orson Pratt, ditheism, tritheism, polytheism, atheism, (for these gods are but man) place, if you please, alongside this compact heap of retold fancy the Christian conception of God: "God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth." "There are three persons in the Godhead: the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory."

The Mormon degradation and defamation of the notion of God marks it as no development of Christianity, but a most foul and blasphemous apostasy.

¹Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse: "Tell It All:" P. 296.

²Private Report of Dr. Jackson's Address, by Mr. R. W. Jopling.

In the second place, the Mormon anthropology includes the doctrines of the soul's divine origin and nature, its materiality, its pre-existence, its fall which they regard as no more serious than Pelagians say, and its entire ability to save itself, once Christ has died, and to make for itself an estate of material happiness in the world to come.

Says Elder Franklin D. Richards, of, Salt Lake City : "Mormonism teaches that the spirit of man is the off-spring of God and existed as a living entity before incorporation into a mortal body."¹ In "Revelation of May 6, 1833," Joseph Smith teaches that the spirits of men are the offspring of God in these words : "And now verily I say unto you, I was in the beginning with the Father and am the first born ; and all those who are together through me are partakers of the glory of the same and are the Church of the First Born. Ye were also in the beginning with the Father."² Mrs. Stenhouse says, "The soul was said to be immortal, and it had three stages of existence. The first was the purely spiritual stage—the stage of the soul before it came into this world. Spirits in that condition were not perfect. They must first take a fleshly body and pass through the trials of life before they could attain to the highest state of existence. Hence it was the solemn duty of, as well as the highest privilege of men, to practice polygamy ; their duty by this means, and this alone, the yet imperfect souls now waiting to come into this world could never hope to be admitted into the "Celestial Kingdom,"—and a privilege, as all the souls whom they thus assisted to emigrate, would form their own "kingdoms" in eternity, over which as kings and priests they would reign forever and ever.

"The second stage of the soul's existence is the mortal, with which we are all sadly acquainted. The third is the condition subsequent to the Resurrection, when they believe the flesh and bones will form the raised body, but that the

¹In Progress. No. 11. Vol. III. Art., "The Mormon Church."

²Quoted "In Progress." Vol. III. No. 11. P. 686.

blood will not be there ; for the blood is the principle of the corrupt life, and therefore another spirit supplies its place in heaven. That Christ partook of some boiled fish and part of a honey comb is evident from Holy Scripture. The Mormons therefore teach that heaven will be very much the same as earth, only considerably improved. We shall not marry there or be given in marriage ; hence it is necessary for us to marry here, and to marry as much as we can, for then in heaven the man will take the wives whom he had married on earth, or who have been sealed to him by proxy ; they will be his queens and their children will be his subjects. We shall eat and drink and spend a happy time generally. We shall thenceforth never die—thence we shall ourselves be Gods!

It was in the pre-existent state, the Mormon tells us, that the work of salvation was first planned—but not after the fashion believed by all Christians. A grand celestial council was held, at which all the sons of God appeared. Michael the father of all, presided and stated that he proposed to create a new world, of which he proceeded to give some details. His first begotten then arose, and made a speech in which he proposed that Michael, his father, should go down to the world, when created, with Eve his mother, and do there much after the fashion of what is related of our first parents in the book of Genesis ; he himself would descend some thousand of years subsequently, and would lead his erring brethren back, and save them from their sins. Lucifer the second son then stood forth and unfolded his plan. Jealous of the popularity of his brother, he proposed to save men in their sins.

“Great discussion ensued, in which the unnumbered family of heaven divided into three parties—one under each of the two elder sons, and the third standing neutral. After a terrible conflict Lucifer, the second son, was defeated, and with all his followers was driven out of heaven. They descended into the abyss where they founded

the imperial kingdom, of which Lucifer became the chief. He was henceforth known as the Devil. [Michael or] Adam created his world and carried out his part of the plan; and in due time the eldest son, who conquered in heaven, took upon him the form of flesh, dwelt among men and was known as their Redeemer. The spirits who stood neutral during the conflict subsequently took upon them forms of flesh, entering into the children of Ham, and were known as negroes. Therefore it is, that although the American Indians and all other races are eligible for the Mormon priesthood, the negro alone can never attain to that high dignity."¹ Such is the Mormon anthropology.

Since the time of Plato, and perhaps before, the intellectual world has been acquainted with the fancy of the pre-existence of souls and has regarded it as baseless. But the Mormons suppose all souls to have existed eternally and in an imperfect state. In the first pair on earth, their Father, God, Michael, Adam, or whatever he may be called, and his wife, the race fell further, but owing to the redemptive work of Christ no man suffers for this primeval earth's sin. They teach that men are naturally able to comply with the requirements which entitle to salvation.² They teach a view of heavenly man about as grossly sensual as the Mohammedans, but in other respects like the Pelagians.

Compare now with this puerile, superficial, absurd and palpably false, vagarious, and heathen view of man with its accompanying defamation of God, the Christian doctrine as to man's creation, fall, sinfulness, moral helplessness, salvation by grace if at all, freedom in Christ, everything through Christ: "God created man male and female, after his own image, in knowledge and righteousness, and holiness. When God created man, he entered into a covenant of life with him on condition of perfect obedience. Our first

¹Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse: "Tell It All." Pp. 297-299.

²Compare Ben. E. Rich: "A Friendly Discussion." P. 11.

parents, being left to the freedom of their own will, fell from the estate wherein they were created by sinning against God. The fall brought mankind into an estate of sin and misery. The sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell, consisted of the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of his whole nature, which is commonly called original sin, together with all actual transgressions which proceed from it. But God, having out of his mere good pleasure from all eternity elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace, to deliver them out of the estate of sin and misery, and to bring them into an estate of salvation by a Redeemer."

Christianity teaches that man was created by God. It teaches the doctrine of *ex nihilo* creation. Mormonism teaches the eternity of matter, and regards the souls of men as a part of that eternal matter. Christianity teaches that mankind fell in Adam, our ancestral head, from an estate of holiness. Mormonism teaches that souls in an imperfect state were embodied as a necessary stage in their progress toward perfection. Christianity teaches the moral helplessness of man and the need of divine grace in order to salvation. Mormonism teaches that man can do everything necessary to salvation once the eldest son of the Michael, who became Adam, has died in the race's behalf. Mormonism looks forward to a heaven of sensuality much like that of Mohammed. Christianity looks forward to a heaven in which fleshly appetites have no scope. Mormonism is no development of Christianity. It is another gospel than that which Paul preached.

In the third place the Mormon doctrines of soteriology are equally crude and unchristian.

Joseph Smith says, in his Articles of Faith, "We believe that, through the atonement of Christ, all mankind may be saved, by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel. We believe that these ordinances are: First,

faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; second, repentance; third, baptism by immersion for remission of sins; fourth, laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost."¹

The theory of the Mormons is that the sacrifice of Christ so far does away with the effect of Adam's sin that all men suffer for their own individual sins only. Moreover the sacrificial death of Christ, they teach, so far clears the way that man can save himself. They describe faith as follows: They who believe "must believe first, in the existence of God, secondly, in his revealed law, and thirdly, in the sufferings of the Son of God"² as satisfying divine justice. They define repentance with more apparent adequacy. They teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism sanctioned by our Lord. They say also that "baptism is not, as many false teachers now affirm, 'an outward sign of an invisible grace,' but is an ordinance whereby a believing penitent obtains a forgiveness of all past sins."³ They thus teach the *ex opere operato* theory of the efficiency of the sacrament with a vengeance. They make water baptism to be essential to salvation, as well as baptism with the Holy Ghost. Joseph Smith teaches this in "Revelation" dated November 1831. He represents Christ as saying, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, they that believe not on your words and are not baptized in water in my name for the remission of their sins, that they may receive the Holy Ghost, shall be damned and shall not come into my father's kingdom."⁴ The Mormons also teach that after a man has believed and repented and been baptised for the remissions of sins, he must then receive the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands,⁵ and so be empowered to heal the sick and work miracles generally.

¹Articles of Faith, 3 and 4.

²Orson Pratt: "Kingdom of God." Part II. Pp. 3, 4.

³Orson Pratt: "Kingdom of God." Part II. Pp. 4, 5.

⁴Quoted in Progress. Vol. III. No. 11. P. 687.

⁵Ben. E. Rich: "A Friendly Discussion." Pp. 15, 16.

Now observe that this soteriology of Mormonism is fundamentally unlike that of Christianity. The Christian system is the plan of the uncreated and independent tri-personal God for saving a creature in the absolute sense of the term creature. The Mormon system is the plan by which persons called eternal try to save other beings equally eternal and uncreated. Christianity represents the atonement as an infinite satisfaction by a person of the triune Godhead to divine justice for the sin of finite beings. Mormonism represents the atonement as satisfaction by one of two persons clothed with some of the divine attributes for the sin of being not their creatures, and also clothed with the attribute of eternity. Mormonism represents faith as purely intellectual. Christianity represents it as of the heart as well as the head. We distinguish between the mere historical faith of the intellect which even devils may have and that faith of the mind and heart and whole man which the child of God must have. Repentance in the two systems, notwithstanding any superficial likeness, is essentially unlike, since God, sin and sinner, are different things as seen by Mormons and by the teachings of Christianity. The Mormons clothe baptism with water with an efficiency which is never affirmed nor implied of it in Scriptures, and which is never taught even by any branch of nominal Christians but the most apostate and devotedly superstitious. Nay, it may be doubted whether any branch of the nominally Christian church, even the most apostate and degraded, has taught sacramentalism so fully. The Mormons are like a few Christian enthusiasts indeed, in claiming that the maraculous gifts of the apostolic age are continued in this age. But here, too, they stand in sharp contrast to the very best and noblest part of the Christian church in all ages and countries save the darkest.

But we are not yet done with the Mormon soteriology. They tell us that "the living saints may perform ordinances for the repentant dead." And as a matter of fact the dis-

covery of repentance on the part of the dead does not seem difficult. Accordingly, Queen Anne of England, George Washington, Napoleon Bonaparte, and how many others time would fail us to tell, have been baptized by proxy into the Mormon communion.

Marriage is an element in Mormon soteriology. They call it a sacrament. They say "it is solemnized for time and for eternity. It is sealed on earth by one having divine authority, and it is therefore sealed in heaven. . . . This union of the sexes is essential to perfect exaltation in the celestial world. The marriage does not take place in or after the resurrection, but in this life, when the parties are tested in their probation. Those persons who arrive at no higher conditions than that of angels, are ministering spirits unto the sons and daughters of God."¹ That is, those who are not married after the Mormon fashion shall be underlings, scullions and kitchen-maids in heaven. For woman or man, according to Mormonism, the way to the heaven of heavens is through marriage. Those who do not marry, even if they reach the celestial portals, must be hewers of wood, drawers of water, attendants and boot-blacks to the saints. [See "Tell It All." P. 257.]

We have now passed in rapid review the Mormon doctrines of God, of man, and of salvation. We have seen that instead of holding to Christian theism, they hold to materialism, tritheism in union with the impersonality of one of the gods, the other two gods being little more than indefinitely big men. We have seen that they make man an eternal material being, who existed before he was clothed with flesh, who clothed himself with flesh in order to improvement of character, and getting rid of original imperfections, but who tumbled into more trouble in the person of God the Father who became Adam, but was redeemed by his eldest son who became Christ, and hence

¹Elder F. D. Richards: "In Progress." Vol. III. No. II. P. 685. See also, "Tell It All." P. 136.

is able to work out his own salvation by obeying gospel ordinances. We have seen that they make this Christ work out a sort of an atonement ; that they then condition man's salvation on his entertaining intellectual faith,¹ on his having repented of his past and determined to live according to their teachings, on baptism by water, on receiving the miraculous powers of the Holy Ghost by the imposition of hands, and on his marrying under the Mormon authorities.

This system has no kinship with Christianity. As the "Book of Mormon" uses a few phrases found frequently in our Sacred Scriptures, such as, "And it came to pass," so the Mormon system is set forth by the use of our Christian terminology in part. As we have the words God, Lord, Christ, man, sin, salvation, atonement, faith, repentance, baptism and so forth, so Mormonism has these words. But the meanings in every case are different. Mormonism is no development of Christianity, but the contrary. It is a religion as unchristian as Manichæism, or Mohammedanism. It is a true child of its founder, Joseph Smith, the cheat, the fraud, the liar and the devotee of lust.

The essentially contra-Christian character of Mormonism may be shown still more convincingly by examining some distinctive peculiarities of Mormon ethics, viz. : polygamy, and the unusual distinction between innocent and guilty blood, the blood atonement or the principle that the end justifies the means.

In 1843, in Nauvoo, Joseph Smith claimed to receive a revelation from God sanctioning a plurality of wives. The revelation is long, full of argument and assertions warranting polygamy. Paragraphs 20 to 25 read as follows :

"Verily, I say unto you, a commandment I give unto mine handmaid, Emma Smith, your wife. . . . Let mine handmaid, Emma Smith, receive all those that have been

¹The uninspired elder, Ben. E. Rich, has a better view of faith.

given unto my servant Joseph, and who are virtuous and pure before me ; and those that are not pure and have said that they were pure, shall be destroyed, saith the Lord your God. . . . I give unto my servant Joseph that he may be made ruler over many things, for he hath been faithful over a few things, and from henceforth I will strengthen him.

And I command mine handmaid, Emma Smith, to abide and cleave unto my servant Joseph, and to no one else. But if she will not abide this commandment, she shall be destroyed, saith the Lord ; for I am the Lord thy God, and will destroy her if she abide not in my law ; but if she will not abide this commandment, then shall my servant Joseph do all things for her even as he hath said ; and I will bless him, and multiply him, and give unto him a hundred fold in this world of fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, houses and lands, wives and children, and crowns of eternal lives in the eternal world. And, again, verily I say, let mine handmaid forgive my servant Joseph his trespasses, and then shall she be forgiven her trespasses, wherein she has trespassed against me ; and I, the Lord thy God, will bless her, and multiply her, and make her heart to rejoice.

And again, as pertaining to the law of the priesthood : If any man espouse a virgin, and desire to espouse another, and the first give her consent, and if he espouse the second, and they are virgins and have vowed to no other man, then is he justified ; he cannot commit adultery, for they are given him, and to none else ; and if he have ten virgins given unto him by this law, he cannot commit adultery, for they belong to him ; and they are given unto him—therefore is he justified. But if one or either of the ten virgins, after she is espoused, shall be with another man, she has committed adultery ; she shall be destroyed ; for they are given unto him to multiply and replenish the earth, according to my commandment, and to fulfill the promise which was given by my Father before the founda-

tion of the world ; and for their exaltation in the eternal worlds, that they may bear the souls of men ; for herein is the work of my Father continued that he may be glorified.

And again, verily, verily I say unto you, if any man have a wife who holds the keys of this power, and he teaches unto her the law of my priesthood, as pertaining to these things, then shall she believe and administer unto him, or she shall be destroyed, saith the Lord your God ; for I will destroy her ; for I will magnify my name upon all those who receive and abide by my law. Therefore, it shall be lawful in me, if she receive not this law, for him to receive all things whatsoever I the Lord his God, will give unto him, because she did not believe and administer unto him, according to my word, and she then becomes the transgressor, and he is exempt from the law of Sarah, who administered unto Abraham according to the law, when I commanded Abraham to take Hagar to wife. And now, as pertaining to this law : Verily, verily I say unto you, I will reveal more unto you hereafter ; therefore let this suffice for the present. Behold I am Alpha and Omega. Amen."

This quotation shows us how restive Emma Smith, Joseph's first and lawful wife, was under polygamy. The threats of destruction which were intended to subdue her, betray also the nervous uneasiness of the polygamous prophets. The incongruous plea that Emma shall forgive the trespasses of Joseph against her, betrays the prophet's own sense of the immorality of his polygamous relatives. But cheat, liar, fraud, libertine, coward as he was, he naturally invoked the authority of the God whom he dishonored with his every breath, in reducing the wife he ought to have protected, to the intolerable ignominy of polygamy.

This is not only anti-Christian ; it is in the teeth of the teaching of natural religion. Go to Utah. Visit the homes of polygamy. In this yard is a row of small houses, much alike, three or four, half a dozen or a dozen or more of

them, each inhabited by a polygamous wife of the same man. In an adjacent yard is a single house with a number of rooms, in every room save one, the parlor, a wife and her children, all belonging to one man. In still another yard is a cabin with one room in which a man lives with a plurality of wives. See the prevalent look of hopelessness on the women's faces, save in the cases of new-comers, temporary queens of the harems, a few fanatics, and hardened wretches. See in this land of boasted freedom these slaves. See in this vaunted civilization this sign of blackest savagery.

Ye men who hear me as well as ye women: is not this against the demands of your own highest nature? Is not conjugal love exclusive in its demands? Is it not exclusive in proportion to a man's elevation of character? Don't you count that man close akin to a beast who would be willing to live in relations of polyandry? Does not logic compel you to take a similar view of woman and polygamy? Can you think of yourself with any degree of moral complacency as living in polygamy? There is not a man here who will dare say it openly!

The Bible condemns it. The original institutions of marriage, of which we have record in Genises 2:24, is strictly and only monogamous. Moses prohibited polygamy. Malachi rebuked it. Christ soundly condemned it, and re-established the monogamous character of marriage. His inspired apostles set a stigma of disapproval on polygamy by forbidding that any such man should be allowed to hold office in the church.

Joseph Smith did not get his revelation sanctioning polygamy from Jesus Christ, who is the same yesterday, to-day and forever.

The Mormon distinction between murder and the shedding of innocent blood, was in the words of Mrs. Stenhouse as follows: "Shedding innocent blood is the crime of killing a saint, which can never be forgiven but by the

death of the transgressor; but the spilling of a Gentile's blood is of quite a different character. To murder a Gentile may sometimes be inexpedient, or perhaps even to a certain extent a wrong, but it is seldom if ever, a crime, and never an unpardonable sin."

The doctrine of the Blood Atonement is, to quote Mrs. Stenhouse again, "that the murder of an apostate is a deed of love! If a saint sees another leave the church, or even if he only believes that his brother's faith is weakening and he will apostatize before long, he knows that the soul of his unbelieving brother will be lost if he dies in such a state, and that only by his blood being shed is there any chance of forgiveness for him; it is therefore the kindest action that he can perform toward him to shed his blood—the doing so is a deed of truest love. The nearer, the dearer, the more tenderly loved the sinner is, the greater the affection shown by the shedders of blood. The action is no longer murder or the shedding of innocent blood, for the taint of apostasy takes away its innocence—it is making atonement, not a crime; it is an act of mercy, therefore meritorious."¹

Brigham Young said in one of his sermons in the Salt Lake City Tabernacle, "I have known a great many men who have left this church for whom there is no chance whatever of exaltation, but if their blood had been spilled it would have been better for them.

"The wickedness and ignorance of the nations forbid this principle being in full force. But the time will come when the law of God will be in full force. This is loving our neighbor as ourselves. If he needs help, help him; if he wants salvation, and it is necessary to spill his blood on the earth in order that he may be saved, spill it.

"Now, brethren and sisters, will you live your religion? How many hundreds of times have I asked that question? Will the Latter Day Saints live their religion?"²

¹Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse: "Tell It All:" P. 312.

²Quoted in "Tell It All:" P. 318.

The inculcation of those principles and the example of Mormon elders explain in considerable part the peculiarly long list of murders and other horrors in the history of Utah, including the infamous Mountain Meadow's Massacre.

Our Lord Jesus forbade the use of force of any kind in religion. It has been a law of God for the State from the time of Noah: "Who sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." But Mormon law makes a Mormon's murder of a Gentile no crime. Nothing more diabolical can be found in the moral teachings of any people than these principles of Mormon ethics.

Such is the Mormon theology, and ethics. They claim that they are a development of Christianity. But what concord hath Christ with Belial? Mormonism is not of the Old Testament nor the New. It treats of a different God, of different sinners, a different salvation, accomplished by different means, of different ideals of high life and duty. While Christianity is from heaven and bears writ all over its celestial character, Mormonism is the monstrous offspring of earth and hell.

It is a huge monster that would roll back civilization thousands of years and grind the weaker sex as degraded orientals or brutal and naked savages do. It would re-establish in our Western world, blessed of high heaven with independence of Church and State, that adulterous communion from which comes the motley brood, Intolerance, Priesthood and Persecution unto death.

Mormonism aims to control this nation in its politics as it tries to control Utah.

We are told that in the State of Utah no Mormon can be a candidate for office of any kind save one authorized by the President of the Church, and that he will authorize no one but an actual and avowed polygamist; that no bill can pass the legislature save by the consent of the Mormon Church; that all objectionable bills are strangled in the committee rooms; that the church has a committee to devise and

and supervise all legislation; that their approval means passage and their disapproval failure; that all schools are in the hands of Mormons, even the State University and the Agricultural School, which is largely supported by the aid of the National Government; and that all of these are branches of the Momon propoganda.¹ If this be regarded as an over-statement of their power in Utah, it may nevertheless be taken as a just exhibition of their aim.

Mormonism would turn right into wrong and wrong into right. It would deprive us of that God who is glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders; and give us instead its gods with ethical ideals lower than Jesuitism ever reached in its lowest grovelings.

We have called this monster huge. It has grown great and is still growing. It has met obstacles many. Its wanderings from 1831 to 1847 are matters of familiar history. Hundreds of Mormons have perished at the hands of their incensed neighbors. Elder Richards, speaking from the point of view of a Latter Day Saint, says: "Persecution raged against the church from the beginning. All kinds of misrepresentation were resorted to by its enemies. The Saints were driven from their possessions in Missouri and afterwards in Illinois; many of them were slaughtered by mobs, their property was confiscated, and in 1844, on June 27th, the Prophet Joseph Smith and his brother Hiram were shot to death by Mobocrats with blackened faces, at Carthage, Illinois. Subsequently the body of the Saints were driven from Nauvoo, which they had built on the banks of the Mississippi, and under the leadership of Brigham Young, who was the President of the Twelve Apostles, the persecuted Saints made their way to winter quarters, on the banks of the Missouri, near where Council Bluff now stands. . . . In 1847 the famous journey from the Missouri river across the plains and mountains was

¹R. W. Jopling's Report of Dr. Sheldon Jackson's Address.

accomplished by Brigham Young and the pioneers, numbering one hundred and forty-three men, three women and two children. They reached the spot where Salt Lake City now stands, the 24th of that year. The great temple, costing more than three million dollars, rears its towers on the spot where Brigham Young declared at that time: 'Here we will build the temple of our God.'

"The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints has now its branches in all the civilized nations and upon many islands of the sea. It has sixteen hundred elders in the mission field, laboring without pay. Its membership numbers about three hundred thousand. It has four magnificent temples in which are administered ordinances for the living and the dead. It is presided over by Lorenzo Snow, George S. Cannon and Joseph F. Smith, Apostles of Jesus Christ, holding the keys of the kingdom of heaven, with the binding and loosing power which Christ conferred on Peter, James and John, and which they restored to earth. It has twelve Apostles to open the door of the kingdom in all nations, and set in order the affairs of the church. It has all the orders of the Christian ministry and priesthood which were in the church during the first century of the Christian era. It administers the same ordinances and enjoys the same unity, power, spiritual gifts and divine communications as were then bestowed."¹ Thus speaks Elder Richards, telling the truth, too, so far as his account is concerned with the progress of Mormonism and the surmounting of difficulties, the growth and spread of the sect, the zeal of its representatives, and its spirit of propogandism; but misrepresenting anew the relation of Mormonism to Christianity. This Mormon Church is no more like the Christian Church of the first century than that arch-rebel who was cast from the heavenly heights to the infernal depth, is like those pure spirits that kept their first estate and minister about God's throne this hour.

¹In Progress. Vol. III. No. 11. P. 684.

The growth of Mormonism is probably to be explained :
1st. By its religious earnestness. Some Mormons are earnest to spread their tenets because of the temporal gain they will thus get. Some have been given over to a strong delusion, to believe a lie, the lie they teach ; because they wished to believe it instead of God's truth and to serve gods of their own instead of the true God. Some are honest fanatics, deceived and deceiving. This earnestness is a powerful faction in their growth.

2d. They are organized compactly and are under the direction of one all powerful will. Officers abound. Every officer has absolute control over all beneath him. At the head stands the President, who is the Prophet, Revelator and Seer. Near him stand his advisers, who can advise only. Next comes the College of Apostles ; next the Seventy. These are the general officers. Each district has its subordinate organization.

Everywhere official promotion is the certain result of efficiency in office already held. Scores of men are appointed to go out and serve as missionaries, says Bishop Tuttle, every year ; and they go usually without purse or scrip, save such as they themselves provide. This compact organization helps it to grow.

3rd. Polygamy welds the Mormons together in a solid unity, inasmuch as it separates between the Mormons and the rest of the world ; and inasmuch as having permeated Mormon society it cannot be condemned without disgrace either in one's self or kinfolks. The very women who hate it, know that its overthrow will affect themselves and their daughters with dishonor.

Hence to-day, while they publish to the world that they have ceased to contract polygamous marriages since Utah was made a State, they still do make them, if outside witnesses can be trusted. 'The missionaries of the Northern Presbyterian Church last year found 2,000 polygamous marriages that have been celebrated since Statehood was

conferred, and over 1,000 children born of these marriages." And these children are having Mormonism instilled into them from their earliest years. Thus Mormonism grows. It claimed 65,000 additions last year.

This groveling monster, for a time fed chiefly on the peasantry of Europe, but alas! it is now preying on our own land. Nor is it confining itself to the more out of the way places and the homes of the illiterate and morally untrained. It has become bolder. It has newspapers in prominent cities. It held a convention recently in Atlanta, Georgia. The Atlanta Constitution gave a broadside to it, and no condemnation. These are but illustrations of the present history of Mormonism. We should arouse ourselves, my brethren. Christian people generally should arouse themselves.

If the people were properly instructed in God's truth comparatively few of them could be led off. But now vast numbers about us are as sheep having no shepherd. They are the prey of wolves. We ought to teach God's truth and so fill men's mind with it as to fortify them against such anti-Christian religions, and we ought to expose Mormonism, and we ought to pray to God to bring this pestiferous religion to naught, at once. What are you going to do about it, my brethren? Carry this question with you. A part of the responsibility for the future evil of Mormonism rests on you. God help you to meet it! Amen.

THOS. C. JOHNSON.

Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.

IV. SKETCH OF THE POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF BRITAIN WHEN THE WEST- MINSTER ASSEMBLY WAS CONVENED.

The English Revolution was in effect begun by the Reformation and the principles of truth which were triumphant in politics and religion in the middle of the 17th century were disseminated through Britain by the scattering abroad of the Sacred Scriptures in the English tongue. If, however, we seek some formal point of departure, or definite fountain-head for a great stream, we may find it in the lectures of Cartwright, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, delivered in 1570. In these lectures prelacy, ecclesiastical vestments, and various things in which the Anglican Church was declared to be nearer Rome than the Bible, were denounced, as was the low standard of piety accepted by the Church. As an essential element of the movement thus inaugurated, side by side with the demand for a freer, more spiritual and more scriptural Church, went a demand for deliverance from despotism in the State, the removal of political abuses, the recognition of the rights of the subject and the authority of the parliament as a representative assembly. In short, the party siding with Cartwright is immediately marked as the champion of civil liberty as well as religious truth. But Queen Elizabeth, with that rare sagacity which compared with the true patriotism in her official life, recognized the justice as well as force of the rising tide, and making just concessions to its demands prevented any active antagonism or actual bitterness from arising. Moreover, in a fit of temper Elizabeth dealt harshly with some especially zealous divine, she cared not a jot for the result, knowing that this same divine in his dungeon would in

unison with his brethren on the outside, earnestly pray for the preservation of her life and health, and invoke every blessing upon her head, inasmuch as though her personal piety might be limited, she was recognized as the true and honest champion of Protestantism and its grandest bulwark against the colossal efforts of Rome to stamp it out by force. In March, 1603, the great queen died, having named in her will as her successor her cousin, James II., of Scotland, the son of that unhappy queen Mary, whom she had sent to the scaffold. Mary's sad fate has obscured through sympathy her many faults, but those of her son are known to all men. From one of the weakest and poorest thrones in Europe, James was suddenly translated to one of the strongest and wealthiest, without losing his Scottish throne, but combining the two kingdoms under himself as the common head. He discovered also that not only was England greater and richer, but the authority of the throne in England was far greater than in Scotland. And these things seem to have completely turned a head which was never remarkably strong. James was a bundle of contradictions. Uncommonly shrewd and cunning, he was also remarkably silly, so that Henry IV., of France, called him "the wisest fool in Christendom." A learned man, he was not an educated one, so that his teacher said he was a pedant because it was impossible to make anything else of him. In a way zealous for religion and anxious to pose as a theologian and an eminent saint, he yet went so far in his extravagance, buffoonery and love of pleasure as to give rise to suspicions of abominable and debasing practices. However, he conferred a lasting benefit upon his nation and the world in encouraging the magnificent English version of the Scriptures which still bears his name.

Just here we may note that the Bible was the prime factor in the stirring events of the century. It became for a time largely the literature of Britain. It colored the thought, the language, the life and manners of the people.

It dominated everything, and men looking to it for true ideas of religious doctrine and ecclesiastical polity, the shackles of tradition and Popish tyranny being broken, also began to look to it as the source of light as to true theories of civil polity. These things King James was poorly able to appreciate. His experience with the Presbyterians in Scotland had been most distasteful to him. There they were too strong for him, and told him plainly there were two Kings in Scotland, and King James must not trespass upon the Kingdom of King Jesus.' He dissembled with them and declared himself a staunch Presbyterian, and thanked God that Scotland had the soundest and purest Kirk in Christendom. But the mask was quickly thrown off when he came to London. Henceforth he was the implacable foe of Presbyterianism and the champion of Prelacy. "No Bishop no King," was his theory, and the aim of his life being to exalt the throne and exaggerate the royal powers, he hated the Presbyterians as being necessary foes to despotism. And throughout his life he confounded all English, the Puritans with the Presbyterians, being unable or unwilling to distinguish between them.

The term Puritan was first employed by De Dominis, a Romish Bishop, who during James' reign came with quite a flourish of trumpets to England to embrace the Protestant faith. James at once made him an Anglican bishop. But some years later, tempted by the offer of a cardinal's hat, he returned to Rome to become again a Papist, but found himself trapped, as after his second recantation instead of a cardinal's hat he was given a dungeon in the Inquisition, where he died. The English Puritans—so named by this time-serving priest when an active supporter of King James' theories, were some of them evangelical and moderate Prelatists, some inclined to Presbyterianism and others to theories of Independence or Congregationalism in church polity. But to James they were all Presbyterians—suspicious personages, who were not

apt to properly regard the king as supreme in religion and politics alike. The Puritans, finding the ablest and best organized resistance to the encroachments of the throne upon their civil and religious liberty in the Presbyterians, did more and more take their places behind Presbyterian leaders. They objected to many things in their king. His favorites, first Carr, whom he made Earl of Somerset, and enormously enriched out of the public revenues, and then Geo. Villiers, made Duke of Buckingham, and still more prodigally endowed with the peoples' money, being men of evil life pleased them not; nor did other forms of royal extravagance. Still less did they like the determined usurpation of their sovereign. When James on ascending the English throne discovered that appointing powers were his in respect to both ecclesiastical and judicial offices, he exclaimed in delight: "I make Judges and I make Bishops, do I? Then (God's hands) I make Law and Gospel;" and he proposed nothing short of this: A careful student of this period tells us that the king had ever consistently in view three principal objects: 1st, To establish the royal prerogative according to his own principles. 2d, To protect and befriend the Papists in England, provided they lived peaceably and took the oath of allegiance. 3d, To express his hatred for the Puritans (whom he regarded as Presbyterians) and to create the same aversisn for them in the nation.

The king wrote theological treatises against Romanism, but displayed a liberality toward Romanists which was in marked contrast with his temper towards the Puritans. He declared that he would not "force the consciences" of the Papists, but he demanded entire submission as to their religion of the Presbyterians, though ever so unwilling—an inconsistency which did not escape notice. Prince Henry, the heir apparent, an amiable and wise prince, had little sympathy with his father's errors, and was disliked by the king and greatly loved by the nation. Dying young, the

bitterness of the people was illustrated in the shocking charge that his father had him poisoned, to open the succession of Prince Charles, whose views on matters civil and religious were more in accord with those of James. Having now an heir apparent who suited him, the king began to make it the most important of all possible affairs of state as to whom the young man should marry. The Protestant princess of Europe being inferior in grandeur and power to the Roman Catholic potentates were ignored now by James, and, heedless of the temper of England and Scotland towards Rome, he sought a Romish princess to be the wife of an English king and the mother of future English princes. Turning to Spain, he proposed to marry Charles to the Spanish infanta, and there followed a most humiliating story to Englishmen. With grief and rage they beheld the King of Spain persecuting and seeking to exterminate their Protestant brethren on the continent, who cried in vain to them for aid, whilst the hope of marriage of the infanta to Prince Charles was held out to King James. They saw the Pope and the Spanish King amusing themselves with James, procrastinating action, and ever inventing fresh reasons for delay, and while England was idle Spanish troops over-ran the Palatinate and chased from his dominions the elector Palatine, a Protestant prince whose wife was King James' daughter. They saw their king failing to help promptly and effectively the Protestants in the critical and terrible thirty years war whilst parlying over the Spanish marriage and agreeing to proposed Romish practices in the royal family; and they saw all these things with ever growing indignation. And when at last the project was abandoned and Charles married a French princess who came with her priests and Romish followers to England, this too, failed to please the Puritans, who felt that Protestantism was still fighting for its life against Rome.

Another source of discontent lay in the favor shown

Arminianism by the court. Looking to the Bible directly for their theology, the early Protestants of Britain were naturally Calvinistic, and it must be confessed they had little toleration for Arminianism when it appeared in England. But it met with general favor amongst the extreme Prelatists and the court party—and indeed the term Puritan was primarily used by De Dominio to describe the Anti-Arminians.

The king's "Book of Sports" and the liberal views of Sabbath observance and worldly amusements advocated by him and his bishops, likewise made him to be out of harmony with his people. The progress of stricter views amongst the people was illustrated in 1617 when the king's carriages, starting on a journey on the Sabbath day, were halted by the mayor of London when they sought to pass through the city, and only released upon the arrival of a direct command from the king. Another source of increasing irritation was the growing power of Buckingham, who was himself practically of no religious faith and of most dissolute life, whilst his mother, a most zealous Papist, had great influence over him, and encouraged by them the Romanists in great numbers flocked to England, not even the Guy Fawke's plot having availed to diminish the king's partiality for them. James did indeed, in 1620, remonstrate with Louis XIII, against the persecution of the Huguenots, and Buckingham led a futile expedition to the aid of Rochelle, the last stronghold of the Huguenots in France. But the miserable end of the English expeditions and the general belief that Geo. Villiers made England war with France as a result of the quarrel arising from his astonishing attempt to make the French queen his mistress, caused this tardy movement to win but little favor for King James among his people. The king through years humbled and oppressed Puritanism in England, but was sorely vexed by Presbyterian Scotland, being always too much occupied elsewhere and too timid in nature ever to attempt to carry

out the schemes he formed from time to time for crushing out Puritanism there. The reign of James was marked by struggles betwixt him and the parliaments the need of money forced him from time to time to convene. The parliament represented the people, and though he could make bishops and judges his creatures he could not control these men always, as the people had a voice in their selection. Parliament was ready to give him money when it was to be rightly used, but again and again protested against the despotic usurpations of the king, in language growing always plainer and clearer. Indignant, the king would arbitrarily dissolve parliament, only to be driven in time by the want of money to convene another. The battle was at last openly drawn in the parliament of 1621—that which has been disguised in language at least, now being clearly recognized. The immediate result of this was the organization of the Whig and Tory parties which endure to this day ; the first standing for the rights of the people and progress ; the latter rather for the rights of the king and old institutions. This parliament, in effect, wanted the king to take sides with the Protestants in the thirty years war then in progress. This suggests to us the facts that Puritans, in the religious sense being the most determined and systematic opponents of the king's usurpations, were the leaders in this parliament. And now are to be added to the ranks of the "Church Puritans" great numbers of "State Puritans"—men not always of great religious zeal, but opponents of the king's increasing tyranny as patriots, or through alarm as to the safety of themselves and their prophets, as the rights of Englishmen were yearly diminished. The folly of the king and his favorites drove these men over to the Puritan camp to follow religious leaders, and of these leaders the chief were Presbyterians—the heart and brain of the British revolt against the Stuarts being Presbyterian. The king's following embraced many kinds of people, but the historian tells us that the Papists

and Arminians all sided with the king against the parliament. King James died in March, 1625, having reigned twenty-three years, and has an appropriate epitaph in the statement of the sagacious French historian, Rapin:

"England never flourished less than under James I." Charles II., who succeeded his father, was a man of whom it may emphatically be said that nothing in life so became him as the manner of his leaving it. After doing to death most unjustly, in prison, in banishment, and on the scaffold, some of the best of his subjects, he was finally beheaded by the existing government in front of his own palace of Whitehall. He met death in so Christian a temper and displayed such courage and royal dignity at his trial, that it did much to efface the bitterness engendered by his treacherous and tyrannical career. But his life was not such as to warrant his present glorification in some quarters as a blessed martyr. Superior to his father in dignity of appearance and character, in courage and some other traits, he was, if possible, more imbued with the idea that the king was the State, the Lord and Master Supreme, of the property, lives and consciences of his subjects. The terrible despotism which Richelieu and Mazarin succeeded in producing in France, he desired for England, and employing cruelty and deceit alike in the effort he lost his head as the final result, well nigh destroying entirely also the monarchical system in the state and the Prelatical system in the church, to both of which he was so sincerely attached. That's the story of "the royal martyr!" The Duke of Buckingham was accused by public fame of having poisoned King James, to prevent his being cut out by the old favorite Carr, Earl of Somerset, who, released from prison where he had been confined for murder, was again attracting the favor of James. King Charles evidently attached no value to this story, for Buckingham was more the royal favorite and the nation's master than ever, after Charles' ascension to the throne. But the people feared and hated

him. Assassinated by Felton, his death was a misfortune to Charles, as it showed the true responsibility for his course to rest with himself, and that it was the king, and not his ministers or favorites, who was the soul of the effort to absolutely enslave the British people. Charles early sought the church in carrying out his schemes. And from a thousand pulpits the doctrines of extreme royal power as ordained by God, and the religious duty of the people to bow to the king as God's direct representative, were preached to the exclusion of the gospel. The Puritans are justly condemned for the extent to which they carried political preaching, but the Royalist began it and drove them to it at first. In 1626 Charles forbade pulpit discussion of Arminianism, but it was noticed that only those who preached against it were severely punished, whilst those who advocated it with strong sermons were let off with light fines and speedily promoted to fat livings or important Episcopal sees. And to be a bishop now meant something, for under James and Charles the bishops ever grew more and more powerful, and it may be remarked that they were wonderfully distinguished for the energy with which they fought the Presbyterians. In this they pleased the authorities, for the "king and his whole court (says Rapin) mortally hated the Presbyterians." And this was for three reasons: 1st, The Presbyterians were against the hierarchy—opposing Prelacy; 2d, They were against the king in his effort to stretch his authority and prerogative; 3rd, They were Calvinists and the court was Arminian. But their opposition to the increase of royal privilege and power ever increased their following in the nation, whose best citizens everywhere viewed with increasing alarm the course of Charles. The effort of the king and his ministers, and in Strafford and Laud he had more dangerous servants than Buckingham, was to vest the king with arbitrary power and to set him above all laws. This involved reducing the authority of parliament to a nullity,

and this Charles deliberately undertook to do—a thing unheard of heretofore. Henry VIII. was a tyrant, but it was through parliaments always that he exercised his tyranny, while Charles tried to set them aside.

One after another successive parliaments were dissolved because of their effort to take part in the government and their disposition to question the king before voting taxes to furnish him with money, instead of meekly voting subsidies and then, leaving the government entirely to the king, returning home as he wished them to do. At last Charles undertook to do without them entirely, and for a number of years no parliament was called and the people saw themselves calmly ignored as a factor in the government. To get money Charles adopted various expedients. He exacted forced loans, revived an obsolete custom in the form of the hated ship money tax ; arrested, imprisoned, and in effect murdered, in some instances, his subjects when they refused to pay these illegal taxes, and imposed unjust and enormous fines for free speech, practically confiscating the offenders' possessions. Furthermore, he deprived the writ of habeas corpus of its venerable authority, and through the Star Chamber Court, and the Court of High Commission, (a great pet with his worthy father) he practically deprived his subjects of the right of public jury trial, which had been secured to them by Magna Charter itself. The man who in the pulpit or through the press denounced these things, was liable to prompt prosecution as a libeller, and then without constitutional judicial process he was punished—it might be by a fine which beggared him, or by having his ears cut off, his tongue slit and his cheeks branded with a red hot iron, or perchance he would be delivered by death alone from the foul vapours of a pestilential dungeon. And when in most loyal and respectful language the representatives of the people presented their grievances in "The Petition of Right,s" that great document was utterly without effect, for when remonstrated with by his people,

Charles ever did one of two things: he either ignored it as rebellious impertinence or promised faithfully to reform every abuse complained of and then broke his promises so regularly that in time he had the misfortune to have his subjects cease to put any faith in his word. 'Tis a pity to say it, but "the blessed martyr" was a prevaricator whom no oath or pledge could bind. Undoubtedly he would have kept his head on his shoulders at least if he had not repeatedly added treachery to tyranny.

Under the circumstances described, the unhappy Englishmen saw themselves deprived of liberties enjoyed unquestioned for ages. They could look for no help from Charles' two ministers. Thos. Wentworth, once of the people's party, had turned traitor to them, and now as Earl of Strafford was the king's tool, arrogant and cruel to the people and obsequious to the king, whom he labored to aggrandize. He was not a whit more hated and feared than his able coadjutor, Bishop Laud. Laud introduced extreme ritualism, copying Romish ideas, encouraged Sabbath sports and Popish ideas of piety; expelled Oxford divines who preached against Arminianism, and persecuted the Puritans. In common with the court he favored two classes, Papists and Arminians, and his special fight through life was against Presbyterianism. And so it came to pass that the English in their extremity turned to the Presbyterians for leadership in resisting the systematic effort they believed to be on foot to rob them of civil liberty and a Bible religion. And so about the year 1630, just when Laud's fight against it is hottest, we see a remarkable growth of Presbyterianism in England proper, until the historians tell us that standing as Presbyterianism did for civil liberty as well as Bible religion, almost all England grew to be Presbyterian, in the court sense of the word. Heedless of this fact, Charles and Laud entered upon the task of substituting the Episcopal church for the Presbyterian in Scotland. The work was vigorously prosecuted,

but the resistance was even more vigorous. Scotland in righteous wrath hurled a stool at the head of the man who would "say mass in her lug," and then over the graves of her dead signed her name in letters of blood to a solemn league and covenant to hold to a pure gospel and keep alive the true Apostolic Church as the Kirk of Scotland. The attempt to force uniformity in Scotland in short produced a great national uprising against it, and the resultant conflict between the king and the Scotch passed through various stages. After much discussion, Charles conceded the rights of the General Assembly, established since 1580, and in 1638 a General Assembly was called to consider the matter at issue. The king tried to secure one elected by ministers only objecting to ruling elders voting for commissioners, because he fancied he could through offers of fat benefices, etc., more easily control the preachers than he could the elders. But the Scotch outwitted him. The Marquis of Hamilton, the king's high commissioner, found the assembly staunch and clear for Simon-pure Presbyterianism and firm in their opposition to Bishop Laud and the King. He therefore on the seventh day declared the assembly to be dissolvent and ordered its members to go home, but the assembly went calmly on with its work, utterly ignoring his orders. By so doing they really began the revolution in Britain, for in repudiating the king's authority over their religion they inaugurated formal resistance to royal tyranny—their action being so far unparalleled.

The nation being with the General Assembly, Charles pronounced the rejection of Episcopacy alone, on the part of subjects otherwise most loyal, to be a sufficient *casus belli*, and declared war against Scotland. To secure men and money for the prosecution of the war, Charles in 1640 convened a parliament—the first in eleven years. But no sooner was it manifest that this parliament was in no haste to aid the king in attacking Scottish brethren whose

case was so like their own, but in great haste to investigate the grievances of England, than Charles angrily dissolved it as an insubordinate and rebellious body. Thereby he greatly enraged all England, and the general irritation was increased by the royal favor to Papists, talk of Popish plots and projected massacres, and also by the severe measures employed in pushing the odious ship money tax. To the funds thus raised were added the liberal contributions of the Papists and the Anglican clergy, and with these funds the king equipped an unwilling army and set out to invade Scotland. But the Scotch army, triumphant everywhere, invades England, driving Charles before it, and goes into camp at New Castle. The king having good reason to distrust the army which he has raised to fight the Scotch, in the face of the Scottish invasion is in despair, and in November, 1640, in answer to the royal summons, the famous "Long Parliament" convenes at Westminster. But this parliament, too, shows no haste in helping King Charles against the Scotch army which they are justly disposed to look upon rather as a friend than a foe. It addressed itself promptly, however, to a full ventilation of the nation's grievances. The great speech of the enlightened patriot, Pym, was a righteous arrangement of the king, and foreshadowed the subsequent history of Britain. In a short time the state of things was reversed and parliament had taken the reins and was executing justice on one hand and instituting reforms on the other. The Presbyterian party furnishing the ablest and the safest leaders in parliament and having the moral support of the Scotch army was in the ascendancy. In 1640 the Presbyterian form of worship was openly practiced in London, enormous crowds attending, and many remaining all day to successive services, whilst multitudes unable to get in hung about the windows and doors. Through 1641 parliament made rapid strides. Strafford was sent to the scaffold, whither Laud was to follow him in 1645, his royal

master through cowardice approving it. Many tyrannical measures were ended, whilst the king was respectfully but clearly told of the evils of his course. Affairs were further complicated by the Irish rebellion which was inaugurated by the massacre of the English in Ireland and of the Protestant Irish by the Papist Irish on October 23, 1641, when the number of the murdered was at the lowest estimate 40,000, whilst according to some it reached 200,000 persons, embracing all ages and both sexes. In savage excesses, pitilessness and strange brutality, this massacre far exceeds that of St. Bartholomew in France. The king called for help to put down the rebellion, but the parliament and the nation suspected him of complicity with the Irish, doubting his word when he denied the genuineness of the royal commission under which a savage Irish leader claimed to be acting.

Indignation against Rome intensified opposition to Prelacy, and mobs stormed through London crying, "No Bishops." They even invaded the courts of the royal palace, and the queen looking through the window lattice with her maids pointed to a young apprentice saying, "See that handsome young Roundhead," thereby creating the nickname which was to distinguish the short haired Puritan from the ringleted royalist for all time. The attempted arrest of the five members of Parliament by Charles in person, in violation of all law and precedent, greatly widened the breach between the king and parliament, and at length the king having his adherents in the Papists and Arminians, the Anglican clergy and the greater part of the nobility and a Conservative or Tory element in the nation, the matter came to the arbitrament of battle and the Civil War was inaugurated. It is not our province to follow its varying fortunes, but we may remark that though the flames of strife were fanned by the pulpit, this war was remarkable for the absence of treachery or cruelty, and the only excesses were committed by Royalist troops who in time

came to be dreaded by friend and foe alike, while the parliament's army was wonderful in its order and piety. The religious temper of this party was so marked that libertines and men of extreme worldly tastes adhered to the cause of the king with the nobles and Prelatists, but the people were for parliament, their unquestioned and uncriticized representatives. And the people showed their zeal by the enormous contributions of money and plate made to enable parliament to equip its armies, while the Puritans and Presbyterians were found to make soldiers whose superiors were never seen.

From the first of the war the king looked to Roman Catholic Ireland, and the parliament to Presbyterian Scotland, for aid, which further inclined the English to the Scottish faith, with whose adherents Charles I. always confounded all Puritans. The Presbyterians, seeing their religion at stake, were from the first the king's most active, intelligent and efficient opponents, and some historians think that for years they were working cautiously and persistently towards making Presbyterianism the established faith of Britain. The chief causes of the English revolution are by every historian of note admitted to be religious, and Charles I. was ruined mainly through his devotion to the hierarchy, while on the other hand England owed her deliverance from civil oppression to the revolting Presbyterians who become her leaders. And the revolution would have gone further had it stayed in their hands. As Goldsmith tells us, the Presbyterians were the conservatives of the peoples' party, who wanted a limited constitutional monarchy as the outcome of the struggle. On August 3, 1642, the Scotch commissioners at London memorialized parliament as to Scotland's wish for "religious uniformity and church union on a Bible basis." Early in 1643 a Presbyterian minister, Mr. Alex. Henderson, represented the parliament and people when he went to Oxford to treat with King Charles and seek to terminate the war, and was

amused at the confidence with which the Episcopal divines sought to convert him to Prelacy. But that vigorous effort at conversion was an illustration of the recognized weight of the Presbyterians now in national affairs. And so in June, 1643, the Westminster Assembly of Divines met, convened by that great parliament which had arrested the tyranny of the Stuart Kings and restored and extended liberties of Britons. England was free and England was Presbyterian.

It was in the midst of the great struggle for liberty, and at the time when the authority of the Bible was supreme, and England and Scotland were one great Bible class, and the Puritan was seeking to realize on earth the Holy Kingdom of Heaven, and when man demanded a "thus saith the Lord" as a settlement of every question, that these men gathered at Westminster to draw forth from the Word of God the true doctrine and polity of the visible church of the Lord Jesus Christ.

J. C. MALLOY.

Maysville, Ky.

V. SOME SALIENT FEATURES OF PRESBYTERIAN DOCTRINE.

We shall all agree that the great end to be aimed at by those connected with any branch of the church is to seek to be well instructed in the doctrines and practices of that branch of it with which they are identified. We may rightly assume that the church member who is most fully informed in regard to his own and other churches, is least likely to be bigoted and sectarian, and that he will be the readiest to acknowledge the good there is in other churches, and to rejoice at the same time in their prosperity. In like manner it may be safely said that he who is most intelligently devoted to his own church, and who does most for her best welfare will be found doing most in the long run to advance Christ's cause in the world. It is ignorance that begets sectarianism, and we may be sure that loose church relations mean little work for the Master. This being the case, we may rightly rejoice in every opportunity given us to understand more fully the doctrines and practices of the church with which we are identified.

The Reformed churches holding the Presbyterian system have a communing membership of nearly 5,000,000 which represents a population of about 25,000,000, scattered throughout the whole world. The history of these bodies is an honorable one, and their influence for good has ever been potent. In the sphere of education, in the matter of civil and religious liberty, in the work of Foreign Missions, and in the production of religious literature, these churches have a record of which they need not be ashamed.

But our present theme limits us to the doctrinal contents of our own beloved Presbyterian system, and engages our attention with some of its outstanding features, so that many

inviting and more popular aspects of our noble system must be passed by as we keep closely to our theme.

By Presbyterian doctrine is to be understood the general system of religious truth which is set forth in the Reformed or Calvinistic Creeds, as distinguished from the Romish, the Lutheran, and the Arminian schemes of doctrine. This general system is embodied, with more or less completeness, in many Confessions and Catechisms. It is represented by the Swiss, Dutch and French Reformed or Presbyterian systems. The Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Churches, with some slight exceptions, are Calvinistic. The Welsh Methodists are also Calvinistic, as their title, Calvinistic Methodists, indicates. The regular Baptists, especially in the South, are strongly Calvinistic in their views of Christian doctrine, and the Congregationalists, both in England and New England, were originally of the same well defined type of doctrine. But in none of the great creeds is this system so clearly and completely exhibited as in our own Confession of Faith and Catechisms, known as the Westminster Standards. It is the outline of this system, therefore, which we are now to have before us in our discussion.

The salient features of Presbyterian doctrine have often been identified with what are called the five points of Calvinism, which some people think are exceedingly sharp points. To refresh our memories, these five points may be briefly stated. The first is entire depravity, which means that man in his natural state is apostate, guilty, and wholly unable to save himself. The second is the unconditional election which teaches that God's choice of the heirs of life and salvation is not conditioned upon anything in them, but is of his good pleasure. The third is particular redemption, which implies that though certain general benefits come to all men through Christ, yet Christ obeyed and died specially to redeem particularly and completely all those given to him by the Father. The fourth is efficacious grace, which

holds that the special renewing grace of the Holy Spirit is operative in the regeneration of the elect. The fifth and last is final perseverance, which announces that all those who are elected, redeemed and regenerated, shall surely persevere unto life eternal.

It is admitted that this is a true delineation of the main features of the Calvinistic system, as they stand over against Arminianism, but the statement of the five points scarcely expresses the whole scope of the Calvinistic system, which is, as we hope to show in this address, exceedingly comprehensive. Moreover, these five points, on the negative side, ought rather to be called the five points of Arminianism, for they were really formulated by the Arminians of Holland, as a remonstrance against the doctrinal conclusions of the Synod of Dort, which were consistently Calvinistic. In addition, our Presbyterian Standards are not framed according to the plan of the five points, but are broader.

We have often thought, therefore, that it is a real pity that the debate between Calvinism and other systems has been cast along the lines marked out by these five points, for the reason mainly that the Calvinism of our Westminster Standard, in its maturity, symmetry and completeness is a distinct advance upon that of the Synod of Dort, in 1618-1619, A. D. This being the case, it may be better in this discussion not to follow the plan of the five points, though the doctrines implied in these points will at times be under consideration. We may gain in completeness of view and thoroughness of treatment if we mark out another line of discussion. In addition, if we were to follow the beaten track of the five points, we would almost surely project the discussion along the lines of burning controversy, which we do not think is desirable in an exposition such as we now desire to make. Hence, to secure completeness of treatment, and to avoid unnecessary controversy, we shall follow another plan in dealing with the

salient points of our Presbyterian doctrine. In following out this plan, we shall first call attention to some general aspects of our doctrinal system which are well defined; and secondly, we shall follow this up by a discussion of some special features of Presbyterian doctrine which are apt in some cases to be overlooked, but which constitute its peculiar excellency.

I. SOME GENERAL SALIENT ASPECTS OF PRESBYTERIAN DOCTRINE.

I. The very first of these is the remarkable scripturalness of our doctrine.

This is a striking feature of our creed when compared with almost any other, for in so many cases these other creeds err either by excess or defect. But our Standards, above all others, honor the Word of God. This appears in the fact that both the Confession and the Catechisms give the Holy Scriptures a first place in their plan. The first chapter in the Confession and the opening questions of both Catechisms speak of the inspired Word of God. Then our whole system of doctrine is drawn from this divine treasury of religious truth and teachings. The great doctrines are often expressed in our Standards in the very language of the Holy Scriptures, and all through they breathe the true spirit of the Word of God.

It is well to keep this fact in mind, for it is sometimes asserted that Presbyterian doctrine is speculative rather than scriptural in its nature. Such a judgment is, to say the least, hasty, and betrays a painful lack of knowledge concerning the way in which our system of doctrine was formulated, as well as of the actual contents of the system itself. A moment's reflection will show this, and at the same time will reveal the wonderful scripturalness of our whole system. When we go back to the Reformation we find that there was in it a breaking away from scholasticism, with its speculative theology, and a return to the direct

study of the Scriptures. Luther's great and abiding work was his translation of the Bible into the German tongue. Calvin in his great commentaries did little more than expound Holy Scripture, and his Institutes is as fine a specimen of biblical theology as we find anywhere. Knox in all his labors was constantly preaching and expounding the Holy Scriptures.

The history of the proceedings of the Westminster Assembly, which framed our Standard, with so much care, and the directions given to that body show plainly that the Assembly was to lay all human philosophy aside, and that they were either to directly deduce their doctrines from the Word of God, or to plainly prove them by that infallible rule. Nothing was allowed a place in our Standards which was not fully sustained by the Holy Scriptures. Hence we find that none of the philosophies of their own day, nor of the ancient times is to be discovered in our creed. It is orderly and systematic, one might say scientific, in its form, but the domination of no philosophy in any way appears in it. The authors of our Standards were bound by no human speculations, but they bowed reverently before the Word of God.

Further, all inspection of the Standards themselves shows very plainly that oftentimes the very form and phrase of Scripture is woven into the fabric of our system. Open the Confession at any chapter or the Catechisms at any question, and you will find this fact to be self-evident. Even at those places where we would naturally expect the flavor of speculation, we find that the Scriptures themselves often provide the form, and always the materials of the doctrinal statements which are made. Only a few examples can be cited to illustrate and confirm this fact. In the second chapter of the Confession which treats of God and the Trinity, the whole statements of the nature and attributes of God are just phrases from the Word of God. The proof texts make it very plain. So in the eighth chapter, which

has for its subject, Christ the Mediator, we find clause after clause taken almost directly from the Scriptures, and woven together with much skill. In the statement of Effectual Calling in the tenth chapter, the four factors of conviction, enlightenment, renewal and persuasion are all taken from the Word of God. The same is true in regard to justification, sanctification, faith and repentance. The language of our creed is cast again and again in the very form of Holy Scripture. This fact is one of the marked features of our system of doctrine. The result is that no branch of the Church has done more to honor and use the Word of God than the Presbyterian. Let no one, therefore, imagine the Presbyterian doctrine is not "founded on and agreeable to the Word of God." There is no creed more scriptural.

2. A second main salient feature of the Presbyterian system of doctrine is its comprehensiveness.

Our doctrines are sometimes said to be very rigid and narrow, and those who adhere to them are often called strict and stern. The strait-laced Presbyterian is almost a by-word, while it is really a compliment. So far as doctrinal statement is concerned, our system is definite, and gives forth no uncertain sound. And it is strict in the type of morality which it prescribes for the conduct of the Christian man. There is an ethical virility about our system which produces a healthy Puritanism in all the relations of life. But to assert that the type of Presbyterian doctrine found in our creed lacks in breadth of vision, or is narrow in the horizon of its outlook is as far from the reality as anything could well be.

The system of doctrine which we hold centers in, and radiates from, the eternal purpose of an omnipotent, omniscient and holy God. All things are from him, through him, and for him. He is the source and end of all there is, and such a doctrine cannot be narrow in its outlook. In a word, it is as comprehensive as the wide sweep of that

eternal purpose according to which all things come to pass.

Hence it is that our system is a sound philosophy, based on the Scriptures, of the origin and continued existence of the universe. God is its author and ruler. All the processes of nature are but the operation, through what we call second causes, of the wise agency of Almighty God. The laws of nature are but an expression of the presence and purpose of God. The discovery of these laws becomes the process of tracing out the thoughts and activity of God, for, according to our doctrine, God is in constant contact with all the complex movements of nature. Hence whenever modern science correctly unfolds and interprets the mysteries of the universe, it but reveals, to some extent, God's modes of working out, in this sphere, his all-embracing plan. And the more fully the unity and continuity of nature is exhibited by scientific inquiry the more plainly will it appear that Calvinism is the true philosophy of nature, and that it has nothing to fear from reverent scientific research. Calvinism is scientific and comprehensive in its views of nature.

The same is true of what our doctrine teaches concerning God's providential oversight of men, as it appears in human history. All through this history it discovers a moral purpose. It teaches that no event is entirely isolated, but has relation to some extent with all other events. It asserts that nothing happens by chance, and that everything is but the unfolding of an eternal plan which moves steadily towards the goal of its consummation. Efficiently or permissively God's purpose is held to have relation to every event which occurs in the history of mankind. Here again the broad reach of our doctrine is evident.

But further, our doctrine is not only the philosophy of the universe, and of human history, it is also the complete philosophy of redemption, resting on the basis of God's Word.. Over against sin which was foreseen and yet permitted by God, and at the same time is bounded and con-

trolled by him, the plan of redemption was provided. In the eternal purpose of God this purpose or plan was made ; it is wrought out in the progress of time, and it shall in due season be fully consummated. Sin was not an incident which took the Almighty by surprise ; nor is the gospel remedy for sin a mere after-thought of God, to which he was driven by the unexpected machinations of Satan. According to our doctrine, the purpose of God in its far-reaching sweep includes all that has been done, all that is now in progress, and all that shall yet be brought to pass in the unfolding of the wonders of redeeming wisdom and saving grace. Who, then, shall say that our system of doctrine has a narrow outlook, or lacks in breadth of vision ? It puts the observer on a lofty mountain top, and enables him to command a wide view of the whole horizon of God's eternal purpose.

In addition, our doctrine presents a noble ideal of the individual Christian man. He is looked upon as an object of divine regard from all eternity, as the subject of saving grace in this life, and as an heir of glory in the world to come. It first makes him a free man in Christ in this life, and then it enables him more and more to attain unto the ideal of that character which requires the reproduction of the image of God. And not only for the individual, but also for the family, and for the State as well, our Calvinistic doctrine has its broad and elevating teaching. In a word, this doctrine is the true philosophy of man, redeemed man, in all the relations in which he is to stand. Its great principles, so clearly wrought out in American Presbyterianism, and nowhere more consistently held than in our branch of that great family, its great principles of a free Church in a free State, and of the rights of the individual conscience are of the utmost importance. To these principles, held by Presbyterians everywhere, the world owes a debt of lasting gratitude, for they are at once the watchword and the guarantee of civil and religious liberty among us.

Such then, in brief, is the comprehensiveness of our system. It is the profound philosophy of nature, of human history and of the individual man, in all his domestic, civil and religious relations.

3. A third general salient feature of our system is its Catholicity of spirit.

Our system is often charged with a narrow spirit, and with an unkindly temper. But a little consideration will reveal the true temper of our system to be generous and kindly to all men, specially towards all who are of the household of faith in the widest sense. This catholicity relates to that spirit of generous fellowship among all Christians which our system constantly inculcates. This catholic, or universal spirit of recognized brotherhood among all who love the Lord Jesus Christ is one of the noblest features of our system. This feature appears in the very terms of our creed, as, for example, in the definition of the visible Church, and in the description given of the communion of saints in the Confession of Faith. "The visible Church consists of all these, throughout the whole world who profess the true religion, together with their children."¹ "All saints, being united to Christ, are united to one another in love and have communion in each others' gifts and graces and are obliged to the performance of such duties, public and private, as do conduce to their mutual good."² And "this communion, as God offereth opportunity, is to be extended unto all those who, in every place, call upon the name of the Lord Jesus."³

These great statements of the Confession guide Presbyterians in all their relations with their brethren in other churches, and out of them grows that intelligent catholicity of spirit which appears among Presbyterians every-

¹Confession of Faith: Chapter xxv: 2.

²Ibid, Chapter xxvi: 1.

³Ibid, Chapter xxvi: 2.

where. We, consequently, hold no close communion views, and we exclude no one from Christian fellowship who is in good standing in any evangelical church. Further, we receive members from other churches on presentation of their credentials, and thereby recognize their ecclesiastical standing as complete. We also receive ministers from other evangelical churches without re-ordination, if they have the educational qualifications, and accept our system of doctrine, and in this way we recognize the validity of their orders. We can, with perfect consistency, unite in any proper inter-denominational movement, such as the work of the Bible Society, or the Young Men's Christian Association, and transgress no principle of our system. We even go so far as to invite to the Lord's Table all those who love the Lord Jesus Christ, who have made profession of faith in him, and who are in regular standing in their own churches. Surely these, and other facts which might be mentioned, amply reveal the broad and consistent catholicity of our doctrine and practice. We rightly maintain a healthy and vigorous denominationalism, yet we refuse to be dominated by any narrow sectarianism. Presbyterians have often been persecuted for Christ's sake, but they have seldom persecuted others.

In no spirit of boasting or self-praise it may be added that for all interdenominational and public educational and philanthropic schemes Presbyterians in this land, and in every land, give of time, and energy, and money more than their share. Moody is reported to have said that if he wanted \$100,000 for any good cause, he would expect to get about \$80,000 of it from the Presbyterians. This is just what we would expect from the practical effects of our doctrine of the visible church, and of the terms of communion which we hold. Hence, both doctrinally and practically, our Presbyterianism breathes no narrow spirit, but is as generous and catholic in its temper as is the love and mercy of God.

4. A fourth general salient feature of our system is its symmetry, or well balanced harmony of parts.

This is an exceedingly attractive feature of our doctrine, especially to thoughtful and logical minds. Some care is needed here to have a right understanding of our system, for it is sometimes charged that it is one-side and extreme, and needs some toning down. It is also hinted in certain quarters that our system gives undue emphasis to certain points, and these points are at best obscure or mysterious. Against all such allegations we are prepared to maintain that our system is wonderfully symmetrical, and possesses a harmonious balance in all its parts such as is to be found in no other system. There is nothing one-sided about it, and it puts the emphasis just where God has put it in His Word. It is this striking feature of our doctrine which has always made it attractive to the most thoughtful minds. The experience and testimony of Dr. Thornwell and Dr. Girardeau, neither of whom was reared a Presbyterian, but both of whom became devoted adherents of our system, as the result of their own investigations in their mature years, fully confirms the claim we are now making.

In this connection it should be carefully noted that the contrast between Calvinism and Arminianism is not always clearly conceived. It is sometimes said that Calvinism views the facts and doctrines of the scheme of grace from the divine side chiefly, and that Arminianism regards them mainly from the human point of view. Then it is hinted that both of these are defective, and that the truth lies somewhere between them. To this way of putting the contrast between typical Arminianism and generic Calvinism we cannot agree. Such a way of putting the contrast would be true only of Arminianism, and supralapsarian Calvinism. But this is not the Calvinism of our creed, nor was this type really held by Calvin, nor is it found in any of the Reformed or Calvinistic creeds. Only a few writers from time to time have been supralapsarians. Generic Cal-

vinism as represented by our Westminster Standards is a well balanced middle view, which avoids the extremes just stated, and relates the human and divine factors in the scheme of grace just as God has related them in His Word. In this way our doctrine balances the sovereignty of God and human freedom, and gives to each its proper sphere, only subordinating the human to the divine as the Scriptures teach, and as the relation between creator and creature demands.

If the Arminian so exalts human freedom as to limit God's sovereignty, and if the supralapsarian so emphasises divine sovereignty as to impair human freedom, our system gives both their proper place, and holds that human freedom is a fact, and yet God governs through that freedom. By the operation of efficacious grace the sinner is made able and willing to believe and obey the Gospel, and in this way all the conditions of human freedom are preserved. At the same time the operation of this grace is in accordance with God's eternal and sovereign purpose wrought out by the Holy Spirit, and thus all the requirements of divine sovereignty are secured. Moreover, we do not feel ourselves under any obligation to reconcile divine sovereignty and human freedom at all their points of contact. But we do feel bound to hold both together, because each is fully attested by its own unimpeachable evidence in experience and in Scripture. Most earnestly, therefore, do we claim for our system a symmetry and balanced consistency at this central point of view.

This same symmetry and cautious moderation appears at various crucial points in the details of our system. It does not commit us to positions of doubtful controversy, round which theologians have waged fierce warfare. The doctrines of the Trinity and of the Deity of Christ are stated in such a reserved and careful manner as to show but little trace of the burning controversies which have raged round these cardinal doctrines. In regard to the nature of man,

theologians have earnestly debated whether his constitution is dual or triple ; that is, whether man is made up of two essences, body and soul, or of three, body, soul and spirit. But our standards do not absolutely commit us to one or the other of these positions. The same is true in regard to the view taken of the connection between Adam and the human race, and especially in regard to the way in which the whole race has become sinful by reason of Adam's apostacy. Touching this point there has been endless, and often bitter, controversy, and perhaps the debate can never be finally settled. But our system takes a careful and consistent middle view here, and avoids extremes. The Pelagian, on the one hand, denies that there is any moral connection between Adam and the race in the matter of sin, and hence he can give no good account of universal sin among men. The realist, on the other hand, so merges the race in Adam in the matter of sin, that the basis of individual responsibility for each man is virtually destroyed. But our system, holding both the natural and federal headship of Adam, presents an admirable middle view, which fully accounts for the facts of sin, and does ample justice to the teachings of God's Word upon the matter of sin. In like manner our system teaches a symmetrical middle view in regard to that central doctrine known as the atonement. Upon this vital doctrine our system plainly teaches the vicarious and sacrificial nature of the obedience and death of Christ, by which an adequate moral equivalent for our sin was rendered to the law and justice of God. Thus the superficial extreme of the example and moral influence views of the atonement are avoided, and it equally guards against the other excessively literal view known as the commercial theory. At every point, therefore, our doctrine has moderation and symmetry. It is irenical on all points where extremes appear.

But nowhere does this moderation and symmetry appear more clearly than in the doctrine of the Church, and of her

government under Christ the head thereof. Here one of the great excellencies of our system appears. In our system we find the headship of Christ, the functions of the rulers in the Church, and the rights and privileges of the members of the Church all related to each other in the most harmonious and symmetrical way. The result is that the honor of Christ, the delegated authority of the rulers in the Church, and the rights and liberties of the people under their spiritual rule, are all finely balanced over against each other. In this way the centralization of all forms of Episcopacy, on the one hand, and the individualism of all types of Independency on the other, are happily escaped, by the fine balance which our system maintains between the corporate unity of the whole, and the individual liberty of the parts. Here order and freedom, rule and liberty, are finely blended.

But, further, this fine balance and symmetry of parts appear in the practical working of our system of polity, with its gradation of representative courts in the church. If, for example, any member feels that he did not get justice in a trial before the session of his local church, he can appeal to the Presbytery, and from the Presbytery to the Synod, and again from the Synod to the General Assembly. In this way he has every possible opportunity to secure an impartial hearing, and to obtain full justice at the hands of the courts of the Church, as, under Christ the Head, these courts represent the body of his people, and administer the power lodged primarily in that body. Surely Presbyterianism is symmetrical, and an eirenicon between Episcopacy and Independency. In it both Scripture and common sense are to be found.

Thus the four salient general features of our doctrinal system have been outlined. It has been seen that our system is Scriptural, comprehensive, catholic and symmetrical to a remarkable degree. Now for the rest of our time we shall give attention to some special salient features of our system.

II. SOME SPECIAL SALIENT FEATURES OF OUR SYSTEM.

Many of these special features might be selected, but time permits the consideration of only a few on this occasion. In making choice of certain features of our system, we shall be guided by two considerations. The one is the importance and value of the points themselves considered, and the other is the necessity of giving proper emphasis to certain features of our system which are sometimes partially obscured. By the guidance of these two considerations, we shall try to give a brief exhibit of some particular aspects of our doctrines, which may place them before our minds in their proper proportions.

1. First of all the Sovereignty of God is a special feature of our system which merits attention first of all. This sovereignty consists in the unerring oversight and almighty control of all things by the all-powerful and ever wise agency of the one living and true God. He is high over all blessed for evermore. He worketh all things according to the counsel of his own will. One doctrine puts us on our guard against narrow ways of thinking at this point. If we are not mistaken this tendency to narrowness of vision sometimes appears even among the adherents of Calvinism. We shall not be misunderstood when we say that we are inclined to think that the precious fact of election, or the choice of the heirs of salvation is sometimes so pushed into the foreground that at least a wrong angle of vision for the whole vista of God's sovereignty is obtained. Election is a vital and very precious component part of our system, but it is not the fundamental fact in the Reformed doctrine, as exhibited in our Standards.

The sovereignty of God is the basal fact and the structural principle of the entire system. That sovereignty exhibits itself in various ways in the carrying out of God's all-embracing purpose or plan, known as his decrees, according to which He foreordains whatsoever comes to pass. This sovereignty is operative in his rule over the various

activities of nature, where each form of existence is governed according to the nature, and in harmony with the laws which God has prescribed. It also emerges in his moral government over men and angels, even over fallen men and angels. It appears very definitely in the arena of redemption, where God's purpose to save by the appointed remedy the heirs of salvation, is properly termed election. The elect are chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, and were given to Christ by the Father to be His seed. In due time they are redeemed by him, and one by one they are effectually called by the Holy Spirit, and are thus brought into vital union with Christ. In this way they come into possession of the benefits of Christ's redemption, and in due time they are finally made meet for heaven. Thus the sovereignty of God is seen to be the central principle of our system, and that election is the application of this principle in the sphere of redemption.

Let it never be forgotten that the scope of this central principle of our system is very extensive. It embraces all nature, and extends along the entire current of human history. It includes the entire of the operation of God's redeeming grace among men, and it extends its wide sweep over all the institutions and activities of mankind. Almighty God, whose sovereignty is over all, is King of kings and Lord of lords, as well as King and Lawgiver in Zion. The powers that be in civil government are ordained of God, and the affairs of all the nations are under his providential control. In the Headship of Christ also over his Church, and over all other things in relation to and for the benefit of the Church, we have an important mediatorial aspect of this sovereignty. Such then is the basal fact in our system, the very core of our scheme of doctrine. Before a holy and mighty God, who is sovereign supreme and gracious, our system bids bow with profound reverence, godly fear and filial trust.

2. A second special salient feature of our system is the

large place it gives to the Person and work of the Holy Spirit.

This is one of the salient features of our system which is often obscured in its interpretation. When the proposal was made, by our sister church a few years ago, to revise the Confession of Faith, it was seriously proposed by some to add something more definite in regard to the Holy Spirit and his activity. Such a proposal betrayed ignorance of the fact that our Standards do lay great stress upon this very matter, for a little careful study will show that the agency of the Holy Spirit is assumed all through the Confession and Catechisms. Follow me for a little, in an attempt to lift this salient feature of our system into its proper place of honor in it.

First of all, the Holy Spirit is the divine originator of Holy Scripture by revelation and inspiration.¹ At the same time the full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority of the Word of God is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit.² And in addition the inward illumination of the same spirit is necessary for the saving understanding of what is revealed in the Scriptures.³ And, to crown all, the Supreme judge in matters of religion is the Holy Spirit speaking in the Word.⁴

Then in creation and providence the Holy Spirit has part with the Father and the Son.⁵ He is the Executive of the Godhead in these spheres. Under the Old Testament dispensation the operation of the Holy Spirit instructed and built up the elect in faith in the promised Messiah through whom they had salvation.⁶ Then in constituting the person of Christ as the God-man through the incarnation, the

¹Confession of Faith, Chapter I:2-3.

²Ibid, Chapter I:5.

³Ibid, Chapter I:6.

⁴Ibid, Chapter I:10.

⁵Ibid, Chapter IV:1.

⁶Ibid, Chapter VII:6.

Holy Spirit performed an exceedingly important part.¹ And then, all through our Lord's public ministry he was anointed with the Holy Spirit above measure.²

In like manner our system gives great prominence to the work of the Holy Spirit in connection with the way by which the benefits of Christ's redemption are applied to its subjects, at the very first stage, effectual calling, by which the elect are united to Christ, is by the Word and Spirit of Christ.³ And all subsequent quickening and spiritual removal are due to the working of the same spirit.⁴ Then Sanctification throughout is by means of the Word and Spirit of God dwelling in believers.⁵ And it is by the agency of the same Spirit that they are enabled to die into sin and to live unto righteousness.⁶ And not only so, but the exercise of saving faith is the result of the work of the Spirit in the hearts of those who believe.⁷ And repentance also is a saving grace wrought in the hearts of the elect by the Word and Spirit of God.⁸ And still more, good works are simply the fruits of the Spirit, who dwelling in believers, works in them both to will and to do of God's good pleasure, as they, in turn, strive to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling.⁹ Perseverance also is the result of the abiding of the Spirit and seed of God in the heirs of salvation.¹⁰ And assurance of salvation is the product of the Spirit of adoption, Who is the earnest of our inheritance, whereby we are sealed unto the day of redemption.¹¹ And, to crown all, the sacraments are made effectual, as a means of grace, and as channels of spiritual good, only by the

¹Ibid, Chapter VIII:2.

²Ibid, Chapter VIII:3.

³Ibid, Chapter X:1.

⁴Ibid, Chapter X:2.

⁵Ibid, Chapter XIII:1.

⁶Larger Catechism, Question 75.

⁷Confession of Faith, Chapter xiv: 1.

⁸Ibid, Chapter xv: 2.

⁹Ibid, Chapter xvi: 3.

¹⁰Ibid, Chapter xvii: 2.

¹¹Ibid, Chapter xviii: 2.

working of the Holy Spirit in the heart.¹ And the preaching of the word has efficacy unto salvation and edification, only as it is blessed to spiritual and saving results by the Holy Spirit.²

We may rightly conclude, therefore, that we do but simple justice to our standards when we recognize the place of honorable prominence which they give to the person and work of the Holy Spirit. We need no new doctrine upon this vital point. We only need in our thought and teaching to rise up to the lofty doctrine of our system in regard to the person and activity of the Holy Spirit.

3. A third special salient feature of our system is the profound view it gives of the unity of the human race, especially in its moral aspects and relations.

The moral unity of the human race as taught in our system gives the key to solve not a few problems in anthropology, and it affords the best philosophy of the race sin of mankind ever set forth. The pressing question of the ages and of every philosophy is the origin of sin. And a particular query under this great question is as to how the whole race seems to have fallen under its awful effects. The patent fact is that sin rests universally upon the race. All men seem to be born into the world with a moral history behind them, so that they, from the first lie under dire evils for which they are not directly responsible, and from which they are unable to set themselves free.

The question then is, how are these evils and man's sad state under them to be explained in harmony with the justice and goodness of God? This is the problem of every theodicy. Shall we with the Pelagian deny the reality of the apostasy of the race through the sin of Adam, and hold that each generation comes into the world practically in the same moral condition as Adam was when created? Or must we,

¹Confession of Faith, Chapter xxvii: 3.

²Ibid, Larger Catechism, Question 155.

with Origen and some others, suppose that men had a moral probation in a pre-existent state of some sort in which they failed to stand the conditions of that probation; and as a penal consequence for this failure they were condemned to be born into this world in that sinful and disabled condition in which they unhappily find themselves. Or shall we assert, with the Realist and others, that the individuals of the race are all so bound up together in one, and were so actually one in Adam as a single substance or as a unitary nature that they were really present and actually sinned in and with Adam, in such a way that when they come into the world they have a sinful moral history behind them, and the penalty of sin upon them.

Now a little reflection will serve to show that all these attempts to explain the problem are ineffectual, and are cumbered with various difficulties. The Pelagian not only ignores scripture but goes squarely in the face of the facts of human experience, when he asserts that men come into this world with no such moral disabilities as lead them invariably into sin. The pre-existence theory is a pure speculation, which has no Scripture to support it, and is ever hampered by the fact that no man has any memory of any such an important moral experience as this pre-existent probation implies. And the realistic theory in all its forms is at best quite vague, and is in danger of providing no proper basis for the personality and responsibility of individual men.

But what about our own system on this knotty point? Can it supply a better solution of this great question? We assert with a good deal of confidence that our system can give a better solution than any of these mentioned. Its answer does justice to the teachings of Scripture and to the facts of experience. It regards Adam as the natural root and federal head of the whole race. As the root of the race he is the source or fountain whence all the individuals of the race of mankind have come by natural descent. As the federal head of the race he acted as the representative

of the race which was regarded as a moral constitutive unity in him, in such a manner that the personality and responsibility of the individuals of the race are in no way impaired. Moreover, the natural rootship of Adam accounts for heredity depravity, and his federal headship lays the basis for imputed guilt. By this means all the facts of guilt and depravity, as they rest on the race, can be reasonably explained. Guilt is imputed as liability to penalty, so that the evils under which the race lies have a proper ethical basis given them. Depravity is inherited, and in this way all the facts of human experience which modern science is bringing out in regard to heredity in the moral sphere are accounted for. In addition, the very latest conclusions of sociological research which discovers a corporate unity and organic solidarity in the human race are in perfect harmony with our doctrine at this point. Hence in our doctrine here, which is an expression of Scripture teaching, we find that it is in full accord with the latest conclusions of reliable science.

Hence our doctrine of race unity in relation to Adam and of race sin by reason of his apostasy is only Scriptural and rational, but it harmonizes with the very latest results of modern science in regard to the inbeing of the race in Adam, and in regard to the racial basis for some of the profound features of original sin. Moreover, the stress which our system lays upon the heinousness of sin and of man's helplessness under it, but magnifies the glory of the wisdom and grace which delivers from its dreadful bondage, and cleanses from its debasing pollution.

4. A fourth striking special feature of our system is the large place it gives to the activity of Jesus Christ as the Mediator of the Covenant of Grace and the Redeemer of His people.

This mediatorial and redeeming activity of Christ in the world is the central fact of the gospel, and very diverse views are held as to its nature and scope. These views will largely determine the type of theology and of religious life

which appears in any branch of the church. Our system is exceedingly rich and complete in its teaching on this vital point, and we may be sure that so long as we remain true to this teaching we cannot but continue to be thoroughly evangelical.

According to our doctrine the redeeming activity of Jesus Christ, or of God through Christ, is exercised in three distinct yet closely related ways. Our system finds these three in the Scriptures, and it gives full scope to each of them, and yet blends them all harmoniously in Christ's mediatorial work as our divine Redeemer.

He is the prophet of the covenant of grace. In this capacity He is the teacher sent from God, and as such he makes known to men God's will for their salvation. In this aspect of his redeeming activity he is the revealer and the revelation of God in all the ages. During the Old Testament period and prior to his personal advent among men, He, through the prophets and institutions of the Old Testament, revealed the purposes and will of God. During his earthly career, especially in the period of his public ministry, he was the medium of the revelation of and from God. Then since his ascension to the right hand of the Father, all saving truth in all the ages has been, and is still mediated by Him. Thus our system lays great stress upon the revealing and teaching functions of Jesus Christ, and we go heartily with those who make a great deal of this aspect of his saving work.

Again, his redeeming activity appears in the fact that He is also the priest of the covenant. As such He offered up himself once for all a true sacrifice for our sins, and he continues, as our advocate with the Father, to make continual intercession for all those who look unto Him for salvation and hope. Here one of the cardinal aspects of Christ's redeeming activity appears. He saves men not merely as a divine prophet, or as a teacher sent from God, by means of the truth, or by his splendid example alone. As a true

priest and offering for sin, He saves us by atoning for the guilt of our sins, and by rendering such an advocacy on our behalf before God as we require. To this end he kept the law perfectly, and thus obtained righteousness for us; and He suffered under the law and thereby removed the penalty from us, and so laid the ground for the pardon and acceptance as righteous of all who come to God by Him. This priestly activity is sacrificial and vicarious in its nature, so that thereby God is rendered propitious, and our guilt is expiated. Then on the basis of this satisfaction, that aspect of his redeeming activity known as his intercession is conducted. According to our system this saving priestly activity of Jesus Christ is continually operative through all the ages. He is our great High Priest who has passed into the heavens, and He ever liveth to make intercession for us. This is a vital aspect of our doctrinal system, and is to be held fast.

Once more, Christ's redeeming activity is further exercised in the kingly rule which He maintains and administers over his church, and over all other things in relation to the church, and for its welfare. All power or authority is given unto Him in heaven and on earth; and in a manner which men are too slow fully to realize. He sits on the throne of mediatorial rule, and sways that sceptre of universal dominion, which shall eventually cause every knee to bow to him, and shall make even his enemies his footstool. His is a universal umpire, and it is destined to be world-wide in due season.

This then is the wide three-fold scope of the redeeming activity of Jesus Christ as set forth in our system. On the basis of the covenant, and for the sphere of redemption our system is Christo-centric, though its wider aspects are theocentric. Its salient feature here is that it exalts Christ. It may be safely said that no other system does such justice to the teaching of Scripture in reference to the redeeming activity of Jesus Christ among men. He is at once the prophet, the priest and the king of the covenant of grace,

and as its mediator He performs necessary redeeming services for all those who come to God by Him. As prophet He issues the Gospel message and makes known the terms of salvation, as priest He makes good the conditions of salvation, ratifying the covenant by His blood, and making intercession, and as king He dispenses and applies the benefits of the covenant by his Word and Spirit. And with wonderful adaptation to the needs of sinful men all of this activity is perfectly suited to meet that need. As prophet He instructs their ignorance, and gives them the knowledge of the way of life, as priest He atones for their sins and brings them acceptably to God, and as king He subdues them to himself, rules over them with a gentle sway and defends them with his almighty arm. Whatever may eventually be thought of Christ's threefold activity as redeemer, it is evident that no system that leaves any one of them out or fails to blend them together in its teaching can ever be scripturally complete, or suitably adapted to the needs of men, who need a Saviour from sin. We lay a great deal of stress upon this salient feature of our system.

5. A fifth notable salient feature of our doctrine is the unique place which it gives to the Spiritual Fatherhood of God, and the Spiritual Sonship of believers.

The doctrine of adoption contained in our system deserves special notice, for it is one of the salient features of our system which is in danger of being obscured at the present day. Indeed, there seems to be a good deal of confusion and some exaggeration among modern theologians in regard to the whole subject of the Fatherhood of God, the sonship of believers in Christ, and brotherhood of believers thereby. A clear understanding of the doctrine of our system on this point would remove the confusion, relieve the exaggeration, and give simple scriptural ideas upon the whole subject in its threefold aspects of Fatherhood, Sonship and Brotherhood.

In the Scriptures, according to our system, God is repre-

sented as Father in three distinct senses. First in a trinitarian sense He is the Father of his only begotten Son ; secondly, in a natural sense as the Father of all his creatures by creation; and, thirdly, in a spiritual sense as the Father of all those who truly believe upon his Son, Jesus Christ. Our doctrine clearly recognizes these three senses, and in doing so, gives a well defined place to spiritual Fatherhood and Sonship. To as many as believe upon his Son, Jesus Christ, God gives the right or authority to become the sons or children of God by that faith. They thereby receive the spirit of adoption whereby they are able to cry Abba, Father. Hence to confound this spiritual Fatherhood with mere natural fatherhood is to do serious injustice to the full teaching of Scripture, and to rob spiritual Fatherhood and Sonship of half its preciousness. On the other hand to confound spiritual sonship entirely with either justification or regeneration, both of which it certainly implies, is to introduce an element of confusion from another source. Our system, with its doctrine of adoption and spiritual sonship, strikes the happy medium here in an admirable way. It gives a separate place for the fact of spiritual sonship of all true believers. This it does on the firm basis of those Scriptures which speak of believers as Sons of God, as His children, and as being the heirs of an inheritance which is incorruptible, undefiled and unfading.

We lay special stress on this fact. It may be that some theologians have given reason for the emphasis which is given to the Fatherhood of God in recent theological thought, for they have not done justice to the doctrine of adoption. All that is needed is a fair and sympathetic interpretation of our own system at this point. Such an interpretation will bring out all the excellency of our doctrine, and will show that it needs really no new additions to do justice to the Fatherhood of God.

6. A sixth well marked feature of our system is the solid

basis which it provides for the entire security of all God's children, as members of the household of faith.

Few things in our noble system of doctrine are more valuable in themselves, or more cheering and comforting to believers than its teaching in regard to the assured and stable security of all those who have laid hold of the hope set before them in the Gospel. It teaches that all who are truly united with Christ, and really regenerated, shall certainly retain the seed of spiritual life in their souls, and that they may rest secure in the assurance that the work of grace will be carried on till complete. Or, to put it in another way, all those who by faith in Christ are justified, regenerated and adopted, are thereby placed in a relation of abiding favor and acceptance with God, through the merit and abiding mediation of Jesus Christ. Hence an abiding relation of favorable acceptance having been established in justification, and an assured state of grace having been originated in regeneration to be continued in sanctification, then neither shall that relation be ever broken or that state of grace ever be destroyed. Thus their security is complete, for the believer is surrounded by the munitions of the divine purpose, has his hope fixed on the merit of Christ, and enjoys at once the protections of God's providence, and the working of grace in his heart. The resources of almighty power and infinite grace are enlisted on his behalf. Christ's work for us, and the Spirit's work in us give ample guarantee of the believer's security. In our rich doctrine of justification, resting on the atoning work of Christ, and in our deep doctrine of regeneration, growing out of the renewing work of the Holy Spirit, we find the firm foundation which is solid rock upon which assured hope may rest.

No other system provides such a basis for the believers security. The mere moralist, professing to stand in his own moral strength on merely legal ground, may at any time fall, and consequently cannot have security, for he has no remedy

for his evil deeds. The Romanist even, trusting for life and salvation to the church cannot have an unfailing sense of security, for misgivings will ever arise as to whether the church really can and actually has so attended to matters that there will be no failures. An infallible God and his infallible Word are more reliable than a professedly infallible church of recent date. And the Arminian, who makes justification consist in pardon of sins only, and not also in acceptance as righteous also on the basis of Christ's righteousness imparted to us cannot provide abiding security for believers. He is liable at all times to the contingency of falling away from the state of grace. In fact, every time the believer sins he must have his justification renewed, and is always in a condition of unstable equilibrium. Hence, if the Arminian is to obtain security he must discover it on the believer's side alone, and this naturally leads to some form of perfectionism wherein believers shall not sin, and hence retain their sense of security and consequent assurance only because they do not fall into sin. It is thus evident that defective views of justification like the Arminian which makes it consist in pardon only, logically lead to falling from grace; and falling from grace renders security and accompanying assurance impossible save on the unscriptural hypothesis of entire sanctification or sinless perfection.

But our doctrine founds the believer's security, not on his character or deeds, but on the complete work of sanctification which Christ rendered and which is made good to him in justification, and on the renewing work of the Holy Spirit in the heart. Thereby his relation to God's law is fixed and secure in the divine favor, and the work of grace is pledged to go on, with all its fluctuations, till the believer is presented faultless and complete in Christ on that great final day. This is our doctrine of the believers security, which grounds his assurance of life and salvation, and pledges his perseverance to the end. We do well to hold fast and rejoice in our strong and comforting doctrine at this point.

7. A seventh salient feature of our system of a special nature is the special stress which it places in ethics, or the practical conduct of life.

We have seen that our system has a clear and comprehensive outline of the Christian doctrines, and we now turn to consider its ethical teaching. If its doctrines are clear cut, its ethical code is likewise quite rigid. This is a feature of our system not always rightly understood. The idea sometimes prevails that our system is hard, stiff doctrine without much reference to the practical conduct of life. That this is far from correct, everyone knows who has studied the exposition of the commandments given in our Catechisms. It is true that our doctrine gives no place to good works as the ground of our salvation, but it very strongly insists on the keeping of the moral law as the rule of conduct for the Christian man. The result of this position is the production of a strong, sturdy set of virtues on a true Gospel basis. The faith is shown by its works.

That this is true is fully confirmed by noting the type of men and women this system of teaching has produced. It makes men humble and tender, because it causes them to feel that their salvation is of God and purely of grace. It makes them strong and heroic, for it teaches them that God requires a perfect obedience in the life they are now living, and it assures them that He will grant grace even more fully to obey. It also makes them patient and persevering, for it tells them that God is working in them to will and to do of his good pleasure as they are working out their own salvation with fear and trembling. It has, as a matter of fact, made heroic martyrs and liberty-loving patriots. It has given men such a vivid sense of God's presence that they were inspired to noble deeds of self-sacrifice. It has engendered a spirit of patient submission and trust in the midst of trial, for it gives assurance that all things work together for good to them who love God and who are the called according to His purpose. Hence the ethical strict-

ness, and almost puritan rigor of our system is one of its features which is worthy of careful regard. We shall be wise not to depart from it.

8. The last salient feature of our system now to be noted is its admirable teaching regarding the Sacrament, especially the Lord's Supper.

In many respects this is one of the best features of our whole system of doctrine. We should always give due importance to the sacraments of our Church, and to all that they imply. In general we ought carefully to note the fact that our system gives a sacrament for each of the great sets of facts implied in the Gospel. What Christ has done for us is represented in a general way in the Lord's Supper, and what the Holy Spirit does in us is exhibited in the ordinance of baptism. This is the order and symmetry of our system compared with some others at this point.

Space compels us to pass by the ordinance of baptism with brief notice, though it would well repay us to consider the teaching of our system, both as regard to the mode and subjects of baptism. We can note only one thing, and that is the clear teaching of our system in regard to the covenant relative of the children of professed Christians. They are members of the Church by virtue of their birth, and on the basis of infant Church membership infant baptism securely rests. Both the doctrinal importance and the practical value of this aspect of our system can scarcely be overestimated. In no system is there such good teaching, for it avoids the errors of those who teach baptismal regeneration, and the mistakes of those who deny infant Church membership and baptism. Let us hold fast our good doctrine here.

We can do little more than mention a few things about the Lord's Supper. The doctrine of this ordinance stated in our standards is well worthy careful study, for it is truly scriptural and deeply spiritual in its nature. It sets forth a doctrine, which if correctly and intelligently held,

will forever guard us against all ritualism, formalism and sacramentarianism, and equally protect us from taking trivial or superficial views of this holy ordinance. It holds wise middle ground.

The doctrine of our system on this subject regards the Supper of our Lord, as a divinely appointed seal or pledge of the covenant of grace, and it therefore guarantees the bestowment of the benefits which that covenant provides and offers. It utterly rejects the notion of the real presence of the body, soul, blood and divinity of our Lord in the bread and wine of the ordinance, as transubstantiation teaches. Nor can it accept the magical presence of the humanity of Christ in, with and under the elements as consubstantiation maintains. Neither can it be entirely content with a merely symbolic or pictorial presence of our Lord in the Supper where the elements merely represent certain truths, as some assume. Our system rather maintains, with fine balance and profound insight, the truly spiritual presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to which Christ is present, with all his saving benefits, to the faith of the true believer, just as the bread and wine are present to the senses of the worthy partaker of the Holy Supper. According to our doctrine, further, the Holy Spirit renders the Lord's Supper a real means of spiritual good to the true believer, who rightly partakes of the emblems of Christ and his saving benefits. Thus in no ritualistic manner, but in a deeply spiritual way, the Lord's Supper becomes a means of grace and channel of spiritual good, by the blessing of Christ on it, the operation of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the observer, and the faith of the recipient of it. This in the briefest way is a statement of what may be regarded as one of the salient features of our system which gives it superiority over all others.

Four general, and eight special features of our Presbyterian doctrine have been hurriedly passed under review.

From what we have learned we shall surely be thankful for the splendid heritage which we have in our doctrinal system, and we shall also be ready to maintain it, in all its scriptural completeness in our own restless age. Whatever changes may be made in the historic doctrines of the Church, in the future, and however further the Church may, by the Holy Spirit in coming days, be led into the knowledge of God's will, as set forth in Holy Scripture, we are strongly inclined to believe that it must take its point of departure from our system, and build upon its strong foundations. Our system gathered up into itself all the streams which flowed along the channel of the Reformation, and is the most mature, and scriptural creed ever formed.

If there is to be any real doctrinal advance it must be, not by setting aside our system, but by setting out from it. In the meantime, we shall be wise always to seek to adapt our splendid system of doctrine to the pressing needs of our own changing times. Nor shall we forget our duty to set forth the strong, saving truths of our system to all men, as far as lies in our power.

Geneva! Holland! Scotland! The nurseries of this grand type of doctrine. John Calvin! William the Silent! John Knox, the noble exponents of it in these lands. Think what these have done! Geneva, the blazing light from which many a bright Reformation torch was kindled. Holland, whose sturdy patriots held in check for years the proud hosts of Spain, as her own dykes held back the rolling sea. Scotland, whose little sea-girt isle has made a deeper impression, for its size and its number of people, upon the civilization of the world than any other.

What might the world have been today but for these, and for God's power exercised through them. They, under God, made possible the Great Britain and America of today. And these have wrested the sceptre of the world's dominion from the Latin races and the Romish hierarchy, and

placed it in the hands of the Anglo Saxon and the Protestant. And by this agency civil and religious liberty has been established on a secure foundation, and the heralds of the cross have been sent into all lands.

May God make us more worthy of our noble heritage, and may it be ours, in some degree, to be faithful in our day and generation to all the responsibility which rests on us, as the heirs of so much that is at once humbling and inspiring.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Louisville, Ky.

VI. THE WOMAN QUESTION.

(WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE HOME AND CHURCH.)

In the April number of this magazine, of this year, will be found Article No. 1, upon this subject, by the present writer.

The object of that article was to lay the whole field bare before the reader, so that he could see what is called the "Woman Movement" in its whole dimensions, both as to extent and influence. He therefore did not confine himself to its phenomena and effects as found in the home and church alone, but he presents them, or samples of them rather, as found in all the spheres in which woman moves, in society and state as well as home and church. This comprehensiveness of treatment he believes to be necessary to an adequate idea of the movement either as a whole or in its parts. This survey of the whole field develops another most important fact, viz: that the movement wherever found, is one and the same movement, and that therefore it is impossible to ignore it and its manifestations in one or two spheres, and hope to treat it adequately in the others. This most pregnant fact will be taken up more fully further on.

The studied aim of the writer was to preserve a calm truth-loving, truth-seeking spirit, free from prejudice and partisanship. The issues are too momentous, the problem too profound, the crisis too grave, for any other temper. He desires to preserve the same spirit, in the inquiry before us. He repeats, therefore, the words of the other paper, viz: "If mistakes exist in any of the statements forth coming, he will be glad to have them corrected." His only object is to bring forth the truth.

The other article is made up mainly of a mass of facts; as any one can see by reference to it. Its aim is not so much to argue as to lay before the reader the facts, so that he may form his judgment for himself.

The facts accumulated therein are so abundant, so startling and so plain in their disclosure of the way things are tending, that it is impossible for a thoughtful reader not to see that nothing less than a revolution is upon us. This "Woman's Movement" is a revolution, radical in nature and influence, completely uprooting and destroying all the ideas, convictions, customs heretofore cherished by the Christian world as to woman's sphere, woman's training, woman's rights, and even woman's character and nature.

Nevertheless this mass of facts, great as it is, which the first article presents does not constitute one-tenth of the material on hand. They are but samples. Time, space and even propriety (on account of the character of some of them) forbade the mentioning of more. One object of the writer was (and is, in this paper also) to awaken interest; an interest that will lead to investigation, and finally to an arousing of our church as to what is threatening her. Necessity compelled a separation of the treatment of the subject into two articles, and a gap of six months in the publication thereof. The writer therefore, is at a disadvantage, for much of the force of the present paper depends upon its reader's knowledge of paper No. 1. For this reason he craves the privilege of referring all who read this article, to paper No. 1 in the April number, and to ask that they ponder well (if they have not already done so) the facts there marshalled.

This "Woman's Movement" or revolution has by no means spent its force. Recent comments in one or two of our church papers have said that it has, but they are mistaken. So far from having spent its force, it has gone on steadily and is still going on with ever increasing momentum. Facts in proof thereof are overwhelming. The writer has continued his habit of gathering data, and since the meeting of Synod, and even since the publication of his April article, he has accumulated the most abundant and convincing evidence that this revolution still goes on and still is growing.

It is going on in every sense of the word, and in every sphere of woman's activity, in society, in state, in home, and in church. It is going on everywhere; but what is still more to the purpose of this article, it has reached and is rapidly invading every corner of our own territory, the South. Changes affecting woman's social life, her manners, customs, pleasures, attitude and demeanor towards men, the treatment she receives from them; changes affecting her occupations, her industrial pursuits, her safety and shelter therein; changes affecting her domestic tastes, preferences and usefulness; changes affecting her progress and development in morals, religious faith, character and influence, and in the refinement of her better nature; changes affecting her civil and church life and status, influence and activities; all of these changes are silently but very swiftly going on amongst us, with a subtle stealth constantly and unconsciously, to them no doubt, stealing into the hearts and minds of our own maidens, wives, and even mothers, making different women of them day by day, giving them more and more the stamp this revolution gives women everywhere.

This inquiry into what the Bible says upon the subject has little or no data, from our own or any other ecclesiastical body to aid it. Not much indeed beyond brief deliverances. This is a strange fact. Not so strange, it is true, as to our own church, because with us it is just beginning to be a living question; but a strange fact as to the church bodies to the north of us. They all, or nearly all, seem to have fallen into line with the movement without one single earnest effort to search the Scriptures to see whether these things be true and right. I wrote to friends in the Northern Presbyterian church and to that church's Board of Publication, and the answer from all parties was the same, viz: No literature upon the subject. This is all the more remarkable when we consider that the whole mind of the church in all previous ages as to the features of this revolution affecting it has been uniformly one way, and that

against it. As the "Interior" of Chicago flippantly puts it in a sarcastic reply to one of our church papers, "as to our church deliverances brethren, we are all right," or words to that effect—the inference being that their "deliverances" were now of no force. Hence, in searching for Scriptural truth upon this subject I have confined myself almost literally to searching the Bible and the Bible alone.

Subject of our Inquiry—as given already (see introductory words).

(I.) Bible testimony as to woman's sphere and rights in the home and church.

(A) In the home.

(1st.) Sphere. The home itself is always presented in the Sacred Scriptures as pre-eminently the appropriate, the chief, the peculiar, the normal, the divinely ordered sphere for woman's life, true happiness, activity and usefulness. This is true, of all ages, of all the thousands of years covered by the Old and New Testaments. From Genesis to Revelation, amid all of the changes, numberless and oftentimes profound, that came upon the life, social and domestic, of God's people, we find the women moving about, as a rule, almost entirely within the sphere of the home. In this respect there is no change. The first women we read of, approved of God, are women of the home; so also the last. The first teachings as to woman and her sphere assign her to the home; likewise also the last. This fact is reinforced by numerous, almost numberless considerations. For instance the very first command put upon woman was, "be fruitful and multiply;" that is, have a family. The last commands thousands of years after are like unto it, "I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the household, give none occasion to the adversary to blaspheme." (I. Tim. 5: 14.) "Teach the young women to be sober-minded, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be keepers at home." (Titus 2:4.) Thus, the sphere of woman, from lid to lid of the Bible, is found unchanged.

And when we reflect that these words of Paul just quoted, were spoken to people just lifted up out of the reeking Roman social life already referred to, but still surrounded by it, that Roman society which the present state of things seems to be approximating, we can understand the emphasis of the reason added, viz: that they might "give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully;" and we can also see the fundamental nature of the truth, that woman's proper and chief sphere is the home.

Again. The object of woman's creation, viz: That she might be a "help meet," that is, a companion suitable for man, suitable to live with him and help him to attain the chief ends of his being, viz: to glorify God and enjoy Him forever; the divine instituting of marriage; that is, the fact that God did not leave man and woman to run together and mate at will, as the rest of the brute creation, but checks and limits them, puts a holy seal upon their sexual relation, and thereby shuts them up therein, to a monogamous home; the very nature of marriage, viz: the making of the two to be one; the object of marriage (so far as the Church is concerned) which is the giving birth to, the rearing and perpetuating of, a "godly seed;" the great fundamental and unchangable doctrine and fact of Scripture statement and Scripture history of all ages, viz: that the family is the very basis and unit of the Church of God; all of these considerations point to the Home as woman's proper and peculiar, chief and indeed, essential, sphere.

Again. The domestic virtues are the only feminine virtues which God in His Word singles out and exalts. Namely, the virtues of the wife and mother and maid servant, the performance of the duties of the household, etc., etc. For instance, "A virtuous woman is a crown to her husband," (Prov. 12:7)—"whoso findeth a wife findeth a good thing, and obtaineth favor of the Lord," (Prov. 18:22); "A prudent wife is from the Lord," (Prov. 19:14); and then that noble portraiture of the ideal woman, in Prov. 31:10-31,

too long to quote here, is the portraiture of the woman of the Home. "Who can find a virtuous woman? For her price is far above rubies. The heart of her husband doth safely trust in her—she will do him good and not evil all the days of her life. She looketh well to the ways of her household and eateth not the bread of idleness. She openeth her mouth with wisdom and in her tongue is the law of kindness. Her children arise up and call her blessed; her husband also and he praiseth her. Favor is deceitful and beauty is vain; but a woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised," etc., etc. When we turn to the New Testament we do not find the tone different, as indeed we have already seen.³ The Domestic Virtues are the only ones singled out and exalted. Love and obedience to the husband, love and faithfulness to children, the right ordering and ruling of the household, the cherishing of home's privacy, and like faithfulness as to other domestic duties, are the things specified and emphasized. Elizabeth, mother of John Baptist; Mary, mother of our Lord; Mary and Martha, the mother of Zebedee's children, the mother of James and Joses, Salome wife of Chuza, the widow of the widow's mite, Dorcas, Priscilla, Lois and Eunice and most of the women held up as approved of God, are domestic characters. Once more—the Bible throughout represents the ideal woman as constituted by nature and by destiny for the Home sphere. On her body, her temperament, her affections, her traits of character, her Maker has stamped the noble seal and mission of Motherhood. She is made for Motherhood. The Bible teaches this. "Adam called his wife Eve because she was the mother of all living." To protect her in this her essential mission, to ennoble it and sanctify it and make it honorable in her own sight, and a thing to be desired, God Himself instituted marriage, and said, "her desire shall be to her husband." To encourage to the bearing and rearing of children, He says to her, "the promise is to thee and thy children after thee." The

ideal women of Scripture are all represented as loving children, loving their husbands, accepting and looking forward to this divinely appointed mission of wifehood and motherhood, willingly and even joyfully. A special blessing is promised to the bearing of children. It is a significant fact that to this day the Jewish woman has this stamp, for in the terrible statistics of this land, showing the decline and perversion of marriage and disinclination to offspring and decrease thereof; the Jewish women are excepted.

All of this holds forth the Home, as the chief, the peculiar, the essential sphere of woman.

Of course, if these considerations have any weight, that weight applies with as much force as ever, to woman now. To say otherwise would be to say, that the Bible is no longer binding, has been superseded by something else as an infallible rule of faith and practice, and would make the study of its pages an absurdity and waste of time.

There is a seeming defect in this argument for the Home as woman's chief and proper sphere, but on investigation this difficulty is seen to disappear. For instance, it might be said that it proves too much.

It is indeed claimed, I believe, that if the duty and the destiny of marriage prove home to be the proper and essential sphere for woman so likewise does it prove home to be the proper sphere for man, and the theory therefore proves too much. The answer is, the premise is correct in one sense, but the conclusion does not follow. The Bible does represent the Home as in a very important sense, the proper and essential sphere for much of the life of man also, as well as for the woman. But not as regards the peculiar obligations and prerogatives which distinguish the domestic sphere. There is a division of labor, for instance, as to the sexes. In the Scriptures, the man is the outside worker, the woman is the inside worker; the man is the money-maker, the woman is the home-maker. It is

precisely here that her work as "helpmeet" is seen. Man is no more fitted for the inside work than woman for the outside work. Without her he cannot truly have a home! And without the home, society and the church become chaos. Abundant proofs of this are seen in Scripture. It is Adam, we see, tilling the ground in the garden of Eden. In the curse even it is Adam who is to earn his bread from the ground "by the sweat of his brow," while the curse upon the woman points her to the privacy of home. In all the scenes that pass before us from earliest times to latest, it is the men who are the farmers, shepherds, vinedressers, warriors, politicians, statesmen, public officials of religion, etc., etc., in other words the outside workers. The earliest proofs of this are no stronger than the latest. For instance, in one of the last books added to the Scripture canon, viz: First Timothy, it is expressly said, "if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own household, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." (1 Tim. 5: 8.) That these words are spoken to the man is evident from the context, if from nothing else. They teach that not only is man by divine arrangement the bread-winner and supporter of the family, in other words the outside worker, but that it is a religious duty of the highest kind for him to fill this sphere, and the neglect of it a great sin in the sight of God. When we reflect that there are about 14,000,000 young men in this country between the ages of 14 and 24, and that a most alarming proportion of them are doing nothing as can be seen by the armies of tramps, crowds of idlers on the streets of every village, town and city in the land, and that on the other hand, women by the millions, mothers, widows, wives and maids, are flocking into the places these young men ought to be filling, in other words, supporting them instead of being supported by them, becoming the bread-winners as well as the bread-makers, doing the outside work and the inside work as well, we then can have some idea of the practical bearing of this point, and of the great crime

that (according to this text) is being committed in the sight of God against the women of our land, in taking them out of the home.

There are exceptions to this position, that the Bible presents the home as woman's essential and peculiar sphere, and there are difficulties in the way of applying it to the facts of present times.

As to the exceptions, a study of them seems to show that their fewness and their nature both, serve rather to strengthen the home theory than weaken it. For instance, they can be counted on the fingers of your hands—or less.

In all the long stretch of thousands of years, covered by the Old and New Testaments, we have but a very scant sprinkling of exceptions to the doctrine that woman's essential sphere is the home. Ruth gleaning in the fields of Boaz, Deborah leading an army, or publicly prophesying, Lydia merchandising in purple dye or stuff, Philip's daughters who prophesied, and a few more, are all we can find. And now, as to the nature of these exceptions. The cases of the "prophetess" will be examined further on. Ruth's working in the harvest field with the other maidens cannot be denied, yet the passage shows no necessary approval of it, only (1) that it was a custom in crude and lawless times, the times of the Judges; (2) that Ruth felt forced to it by stress of special circumstances; (3) that Boaz was careful to throw around her while doing so special protection. (Ruth 2: 1-23), and (4) that the danger and objectionableness of it were freely felt. Deborah's case also shows that she felt herself out of place in leading an army, for she reproaches Barak thus: "I will surely go with thee, notwithstanding the journey that thou takest shall not be for thine honor, for the Lord shall sell Sisera into the hands of a woman." (Judges 4: 9.) Lydia as a merchant is as yet but an unconverted heathen woman, not yet under the influences of the gospel, and therefore no true exception, a product and proof indeed of the loose Roman society of the

day in which the presence of women in public and masculine pursuits was a marked feature; the very type of society to which things now seen tending. These seeming "exceptions," therefore, are found to be no exceptions at all. The "difficulties" in the way of making the home the chief and proper sphere of woman "in these days" are admitted and must be noticed. But the best place to notice them is after considering woman's rights in the home; and in truth, the consideration of the home rights of woman will do away with some of these objections. Yet before we proceed to that point one reminder just here is pertinent. Let it be noted that these "difficulties of the present day" are the fruit in good part of this very "Woman Movement."

2. Woman's Rights in the Home.

1st. The "right" to a Monogamous Marriage.

(a) Woman has a right to marriage. The Scriptures teach the duty, the necessity, the blessedness and the destiny of marriage, as we have seen; and doing so, they clearly show it forth as "woman's right."

Nor ought this simple statement to be put away by the breath of ridicule or levity, for grave facts already do, to some extent, make it one of the living questions of the day. Disinclination to marriage is becoming more and more prevalent, as we have seen. "Forbidding to marry" is one of the marks of the "perilous times" of the "last days," and that can be done and is being done to-day, in many ways, and one way is through the spread and imbibing of false and perverting ideas about marriage among the young of both sexes. Mischievous mistakes too are inculcated. For instance, that there are so many more women than men in the land. The truth is, the last census (1890) shows there are over 1,500,000 more men than women in the United States, and that for twenty years or more they had been steadily getting more and more numerous than women. This "right" to marriage is, indeed, the great safe-guard to woman's virtue, and also to her highest and best earthly happiness

and usefulness, yet it is practically being taken away every day by the perverted and perverting ideas about marriage which are getting so common.

(b) This right is of course to a monogamous marriage. The nature of true marriage as a union between one man and one woman and the repudiation of polygamy by our Saviour suffice to show this.

2nd. Mistresship of the home is another woman's "right" therein.

This is taught plainly in both the Old and New Testaments of the woman as wife and mother. For instance, in that beautiful Old Testament picture of the ideal woman in Proverbs 31, we have the "mistress of the house" before us, guiding the affairs thereof, recognized and honored as such by husband and friends, looked up to and loved by children and handmaids. And then in the New Testament (I Tim. 5: 14.) the same thing, "guiding" or ruling the household," *οικοδεσποτεῖν* Paul puts as one of the prerogatives of woman in the home.

3d. An honored and honorable and voluntary subordination as wife to her husband's headship.

This subordination as taught in Scripture is an honored and honorable and voluntary one. It does not imply inferiority. On the contrary, woman was formed in the first place, not from an inferior being, but from man himself, and her marriage to him is said to be "the two becoming one" again. Man is told to love her and to honor her as his own self. Her relation as wife to man is likened to that of the Church to Christ. Indeed she is declared to be "bone of man's bone and flesh of his flesh." This subordination is moreover a voluntary one. It is not a thing of constraint, not a thing dependent on force. Her "desire" shall be to her husband, and he shall rule over her. (Gen. 3: 16.) And this is in accordance with her nature. God has not only written it in Holy Scripture, but stamped it on and in her heart. All the facts of life in every happy marriage and

happy home attest it. And herein lies one great safe-guard to woman's welfare, and as a consequence, to the welfare of the family and the home. Not in teaching the socialistic doctrines of equality and individualism, but that the family is the true unit of society, and therefore, that the husband of necessity is the head. Not in teaching that the husband's headship is that of a brute or tyrant, the right of the strong over the weak; but that it is the prerogative of love, as much for the welfare of the woman as the man, the true exercise of which will meet the very demands of the true nature of woman herself. For there can be no doubt that God has not only printed in His Word, but printed it also on woman's own heart that "her desire shall be to her husband."

Nevertheless it is a true subordination. Among the very first words spoken to woman, after the fall, are these, "Thy husband shall rule over thee" (Gen. 3:16). And among the last instructions given to the Church, there are none more solemn, more emphatic, more fundamental, than those bearing on this same point. "The husband is head of the wife, even as Christ is the Head of the Church." "Therefore as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing" (Eph. 5:22-24). "Teach the young women to be obedient unto their own husbands, that the Word of God be not blasphemed" (Titus 2:4). "Likewise ye wives be in subjection to your own husbands, in order that if any obey not the Word, they also may without the Word, be won by the conversation of the wives." "For after this manner, in the old time, the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands, even as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him Lord; whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well and are not afraid with any amazement" (I Peter 3:1, 2, 5, 6).

4th. Again. Marital fidelity on the part of the husband is a woman's "right."

5th. A Scriptural divorce, that is the right on the one

hand not to be put away by a husband except for Scriptural grounds, viz : proved adultery and abandonment, and on the other hand the right to have such divorce for herself if such charges against her husband can be proven.

6th. Again, the right as parent or mistress to honor and obedience from children and servants; and (7) the right as maid servant to all proper respect, kindness and justice belonging to her position in the home.

8th. The precious and peculiar prerogative of fostering religion in the home; of winning or encouraging the husband and other adult males thereto by her "chaste conversation and life" therein, and of training her children therein. The effect on this most sacred right, of her going out into public life, can hardly be estimated, either as regards her influence over her husband and other men of her house or over her children. In the one case there can hardly be any doubt that it is the shelter of the home which has preserved and fostered the religious nature of woman and made her more religious than man, and therefore if she goes out into public life we have no reason to say that she will not be injured by it religiously, just as truly as are the men. As a matter of fact this is precisely the effect public life is having on women now. It is the woman at home that makes home what it is to the man, makes it the haven of rest and the sweet antidote to the wicked, outward world, that it is. As for the children, of course her religious training of them is bound eventually to cease. She will have neither time nor fitness nor inclination for such prerogative. This too is being only too plainly and increasingly verified, as can be seen from the mass of appalling facts gathered as samples in the article in the April number of this *QUARTERLY*.

9th. A right to love, honor, respect and support as wife and mother from husband and sons, and

10th. Finally, a right to the protection and privacy of the home.

All of these last points, thus rapidly cited, without Scrip-

ture comment, need no proof, I suppose, before the readers of this QUARTERLY. I feel sure that they all will be recognized as Scriptural "rights" of women in the home. Let me however, single out the two last "rights" as worthy of special consideration just at this time, viz: the "right to support" from her husband and her sons, and the "right to the protection and privacy of the home."

First then, as to "the right to support from husband and sons." Take the text already quoted in another connection, I Tim. 5:8, "If any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house" (*οὐκείων*, "kindred," "lineage") "he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel" or "unbeliever." The reference here is plainly to support, and the duty as a duty of religion is plainly put upon the man; and the most striking feature about the duty is that it is not merely limited to one person, as a wife for instance, but it is a duty owed his whole household.

In this particular case it was some widowed kinswoman, as the context shows. If then the right to support is, in the sight of God, due the widow, in the home, how much more the wife? Notice that this text is in the New Testament. In this respect it does not seem to be the will of God for His people in these New Testament times to differ from those of the old. In Isaiah 58:7, we find God denouncing His people because they hid "themselves from their own flesh," i. e. turned their back upon their poorer kindred. So in Neh. 5th chapter, and in other places, the same thing is rebuked. But how much more must it outrage God to look down and see wives and mothers and daughters not merely receiving no support from husbands, fathers and sons, but the very reverse: actually forced to go out of the God-given protection of the home into the innumerable perils of public life to do man's work in order to earn support for their ignoble men? The Scriptures plainly teach that this is mischievous and sinful. The woman, whether wife, mother or maid has a God-given right to support from the stronger sex.

Note now the practical bearing of the fact that she has a right to the protection and privacy of the home. We do not understand by this that she is constantly to be shut up in the home. The Scriptures while teaching that the home is her essential and peculiar sphere of activity and usefulness, yet represent her as enjoying freely a suitable social liberty. The Old and New Testaments are alike in this. We see, for instance, in Old Testament pictures Miriam and her maidens, Jephtha's daughter and her companions, the women in David's time at the restoration of the ark, coming forth with songs and dances to greet the men of Israel in their hour of triumph; we see in New Testament pictures women present as guests or attendants at social gatherings, such as the marriage feast at Cana (John 2) or at the supper given to Jesus at the house of Lazarus where Martha and Mary were present. (John 12.) There is a significance in this fact of which we will speak hereafter. But note now, that this social liberty while all that was desirable, still had its limits. And those limits were precisely those which you might expect where the home is woman's essential and peculiar sphere, viz: the preservation of woman's modesty and reserve. One exception only have I found to this, but it is one so absolutely unique, that I am sure all will agree that as an exception it has no force. I refer to the women who followed the Saviour from Galilee, and indeed in His other journeys. For women to follow a religious teacher from place to place in these days, would be, we all feel, most improper. But we all see also the difference. These women of the gospel saw in the religious teacher they were following their adorable Messiah, Saviour and Lord; their conduct was not only therefore excusable, it was in the highest degree indicative of faith and duty. The limit, therefore, was not really transgressed. The limit to social liberty, viz: the preservation of their modesty and reserve, is illustrated in the case of Vashti, queen of Ahasuerus, as told in Esther 1:10. Her husband at the height of a great revel

and orgy, when his heart was merry with wine, commanded Vashti, his queen, to be brought into the banquet hall to "show the people and the princes her beauty;" and Vashti refused to appear. She declined to exhibit herself. The lesson it teaches, it seems to me is, the right to the privacy and protection of her home; in other words, the right to the preservation of her modesty and reserve which the shelter of her home secures.

This, I am persuaded, is one of woman's highest, most priceless, "rights." Vashti's lord declared it to be a denial and rebellion against his headship over her. But a man's headship over a woman does not supercede the woman's right to the preservation of her modesty and reserve. It is an abuse of his headship to demand such a thing. For a Colorado husband, for instance, to order his wife to ride a horse "a straddle," as is now so commonly done there, or for him to order his wife to go to the polls and vote, or to run for a political office, would be an abuse of his headship. It is a violation of another and equally, if not more priceless right, the right of the woman to the preservation of her modesty and reserve.

There is another aspect of this matter.

This right of a woman to the protection and privacy of her home is assailed from another direction. It seems to be a two-fold direction, but it is in reality one. A new test is put to woman's conscience, these days, a new standard for measuring her zeal and fidelity to duty. It is the test of taking up public work. This test comes to her in both church and state. A new strain is put upon the consciences of our women. In the state, a ceaseless assault is kept up upon our women's modesty and reserve, to come forth from the home and vote, hold office, enter the lists with men in the strife for equal work, etc. It is put upon the ground of duty. A burden is put upon their conscience. So too, in the ecclesiastical sphere, our women are appealed to constantly and in various ways to take part, take leadership in

the Church's public exercises. And it is put upon the ground of duty. A burden is put upon the conscience. And the burden is felt. Vividly does there come before me a case of a mother of eight children, a typical Presbyterian lady, intelligent and godly, training up her children on the catechism in the home, whose conscience got perplexed upon this point. My answer was that she was filling the highest church duty that could fall upon a woman, in training those children at home for Christ and his Church. In truth the question is pertinent, is this new test, this new standard that is being applied in state and church to woman's conscience, is it a lawful test, a right test, a Scriptural test? The answer seems to be that if home is the woman's essential and proper sphere, and if her rights therein are such as have been described, especially the right just mentioned, viz: the right to the protection and privacy of the home as a safe-guard for the preservation of her modesty and reserve, if these things are true, then this new test is a false test, this new standard a false standard, and this new strain on our women's consciences is one not put there by God. It is a strain, that not only were their mothers never able to bear, but one their mothers were never called upon to bear. But more, it is an invasion of a "right;" a right that is theirs, a right impregnably entrenched in Scripture, a fundamental right, and that is the right to the protection of private home life. "A man's house is his castle," according to human law. So is a woman's house her castle, and according to divine law. She has a right to be protected, it seems to me, against these attempts to force her from the retirement of her home.

This whole statement of the Bible view of woman's sphere and rights, and especially these last two rights of women in the home sphere, viz: the right to support from the man, and the right to protection and privacy, show the vast difference there is between woman's sphere and rights, as taught in the Bible, and woman's sphere and rights as found

in Oriental lands. The Bible home is not a harem; the Bible woman does not come before us always veiled; she is not shut up in her home, nor shut off from the gaze of other men, she is not a beast of burden as Oriental women often are; she is not scorned and abused by husband, father and son, as Eastern women are; on the contrary, she is a helpmeet, a companion to her husband; she enjoys a legitimate social liberty, she is revered and obeyed by her sons, loved, honored, rejoiced in by her husband, and her support, by her male kindred, is expected and exacted, in the strongest and most solemn language.*

So too, on the other hand, the ideal woman of the Bible is far different, as to sphere and right, from the woman the Bible found everywhere in the heathen Roman world, at the beginning of Christianity. As has been said already, the woman of the heathen Roman world had broken forth from the home into the chiefest avenues of public life; she was found in politics, business, on the stage, in the priestess' office. The "home and marriage were almost gone, divorce reigned supreme, also infanticide, and unnameable crimes, secret and open, abounded in every social rank. But the woman of the Bible is pre-eminently the woman of the home, called back there from all this heathen publicity and license, by a divine voice, sheltered and safeguarded therein by needful and wise restrictions, virtuous and happy there, with "rights" suitable and abundant, clearly outlined and recognized, just and true, fitted to her nature, and ministering to her highest usefulness and happiness and to her noblest progress."

I. (B) Let us now come to Woman's Sphere and Rights in the Church Organization.

1. And first, as to her Sphere :—

* Few facts, indeed, pertaining to the Bible, are more remarkable and significant than this. The Bible is an oriental book, coming out of the heart of the East, yet in every age the ideal women of the Bible have been as different from all other oriental women as is day from night! The reason is, the Bible is Divine, springing from woman's best friend, her God; it is a World Book, a book for every clime and for all time.

The Scriptures teach quite plainly that woman's proper sphere in the organized Church of God also, is subordinate and retiring.

1. All that has been said indeed, as to home being woman's essential and distinctive sphere, and as to her position there, carries along with it, with irresistible force, the conviction that if so, then her position in the church must also, of necessity, be in conformity with it ; i. e., subordinate and retiring. For it can hardly be believed, unless indeed the evidence for it in Scripture is clear, conspicuous and conclusive, that God would give the lead in his organized church to one whom for the most of her life and work, he has remanded to the privacy of the home ; especially as he has designed his church to be the most aggressive, most active, the most prominent of the outside public forces of human society. His church's work indeed is ceaseless, her mission practically endless, and the demands she makes upon heart and brain and body, upon time and energies, are such as to exhaust the stoutest men. How then can the women of the home be other than subordinate and retiring in the church as to position and work ? Called upon to do what she can, 'tis true, but not expected by the Divine Head to take the lead, and blamed only when she does so. Especially strange would it be for her to be otherwise, when we reflect that here is man her companion, put by God out into the world as the outside worker ; put here as her head and leader, framed physically, mentally and spiritually for work in the outside world in which the church must figure ! And stranger still would it appear for her to take the lead in the public matters of a public institution like the Church, when she is undeniably subordinate in the private circles of her own particular sphere, the home ! If subordinate and retiring in the home, how much more is she likely to be in the church ?

Unless indeed, as has been said, there is clear, conspicuous and conclusive evidence that in the church her subor-

dination and retiracy cease. But investigation shows that there is no such evidence. A few passages indeed, found here and there over the vast field of the Bible seem to give some support to this idea, but even they, on examination give little satisfaction, and their very fewness makes them of no force. Whilst on the other hand, the whole force of the abundant Bible references to woman's position in the church, corroborates with overwhelming power the natural expectation that woman in the church is no different from woman in the home; shows, in other words that her position is subordinate and retiring. This argument, drawn from Woman's position in the Home, is in itself, it seems to me, conclusive. For my own part, I am unable to evade its force. We will take up in a moment, the specific Scripture references confirming it, but suffer me again to bid you keep this point in mind and weigh its force.

Permit, right here, a brief notice of one or two practical considerations.

It is claimed that nowadays, a woman has time to do the home work and the Church's work too.

If not called nor fitted for it, even having ample leisure would hardly justify her taking it out of the hands of the men. But are we sure that even in these days, women are justified in having ample time upon their hands? In view of the almost universal difficulties of domestic service, difficulties which are multiplying every day instead of diminishing; in view of the constant and increasing testimony to the almost universal decay of family religion, home training of children and Sabbath desecration, is it not to be feared, that the "ample time" claimed here can only be gained by the neglect of these other most vital matters?

Again, it is claimed, that there are thousands of single women, to whom the argument from the home does not apply.

Waiving again, the fact that if not called nor fitted for it, they ought not to take the church work from the men, the

question comes, are not single women as a rule, daughters and sisters ? And is it not to be feared, that many a sister or daughter, goes off, for instance to Young People's Societies and other church gatherings, on journeys, sometimes long and involving several days, to take a leading part therein, and has left work at home which she ought to do, upon the already burdened shoulders of the mother ? Is it not to be feared that there is a growing defect in female education ; that like as with young men, the tendency of the education of the day, seems to be to create a dislike and contempt for labor ; and that just as young men seem more and more to be avoiding work, and flocking to the cities to escape it, just so the young women are more and more restive under domestic work, and are tempted more and more to despise it and ignore it. And yet, all honest necessary labor is in reality not only noble but ennobling ; not only that outside the home, but that within the home. The girl who cooks the meal, washes the dishes, sweeps the house and thereby saves her overburdened mother ; the girl who stays at home and sweetens life by ministering to her father ; the girl who strives to make her home attractive to her brother, is really serving God, doing religious work and rounding out a noble Christian character and career. This is the spirit of Scripture wisdom and Scripture teaching.

We come now to the direct question as to the Bible testimony on the sphere of woman in the church. And at the outset, it will be well to remember that the mere fact of a few passages being found here and there in the Sacred Scriptures that seem to favor women preaching or otherwise leading in the public functions or work of the church, is of no weight when carefully considered. The Bible is a "great big book" and can be and has been made to teach almost anything by those who wish to make it do so. The few expressions that seem to favor these new notions about women are ambiguous, and not for one moment to be compared with

the clear cut, unmistakable, and abundant teachings, to the contrary. The sound laws of interpretation always held hitherto by evangelical churches easily explain these ambiguous passages.

Let us begin by taking up these expressions that seem to favor the "new woman," and giving them all due consideration.

For instance, "prophetesses" are pointed out to us, in the Old and New Testament as examples, justifying women of to-day holding public office and exercising public functions thereof in the church, viz: Miriam, Deborah, Huldah, etc., in the O. T. and Anna, and the four daughters of Philip, the evangelist, in the New. Again, certain other statements of Scripture, are claimed, such as, Ps. 68: 11, "The Lord giveth the word, the women that publish the tidings are a great host." Revised version. Gal. 3: 28, "In Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female." Acts 2: 17-18, the apostle Peter's use of the prophecy of Joel, "I will pour out of my spirit on your daughters and handmaidens, and they shall prophesy," etc. John 4: 28-39. The woman of Samaria who spake of Christ to the men of the city, many of whom believed because of her saying. Philip 4: 3, "Help those women who labored with me in the Gospel." Rom. 16: 1. Phebe, a "deacon of the church."

Some of our brethren, while admitting that these passages do not teach nor authorize the ordination of women to the Gospel ministry, or to the ruling eldership, are yet disposed to think that they authorize a larger liberty to woman, outside the ministry and eldership, and prove woman's right to "address" mixed audiences, as for example, a returned woman missionary on invitation of a pastor or session. No one sympathizes more than I do with the spirit these brethren are showing. They wish to avoid, if possible, an unjust and unwise suppression of a practice which is growing and threatening to be formidable, and which is "in keeping with the spirit of the times;" a practice which is the expression

of innocent and ardent zeal, and indulged in by some of our noblest and purest women. I feel the power of the pressure upon their hearts, and all the chivalry in our natures rises up when our ladies appeal for aid. But the objections to their views, seem to me, insurmountable, and our chivalry, on inspection is found on the wrong side. For first, the fatal difficulty with their position is that the passages they quote prove too much. If they authorize women to speak before mixed audiences at all, they unquestionably authorize them to preach. For a prophet, both in the Old Testament and New Testament is not only a recognized officer in the church but an officer who takes precedence even of the preacher and ruling elder. "And he gave some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the work of the ministry, etc. (Eph. 4: 11-12.) The distinction made, therefore, is a distinction that cannot stand. If these texts about prophesying put our ladies to talking "outside the limits of the ministry and eldership," as is claimed, it puts them to talking inside the limits of the ministry and eldership. This is evidently the way they are understood by our missionary ladies themselves, who speak in public, for while at home they may merely make "addresses" before mixed audiences, yet when they are abroad, in their field, I understand that they "preach." I do not mention this for censure. I state it merely to show the difficulty our ladies have in standing on this distinction.

Again, a second fatal difficulty with this theory is that it puts our ladies to exercising a "prophetical gift" that has long since been withdrawn from the church.

It may be urged that while they have no right to invade the prophetical office, it is their privilege to exercise the "prophetical gift or function" i. e. "speak for God." The best way to answer this is to take up the texts on "prophesy" in turn, which have been cited, and examine them in their connection.

The character of Miriam's prophesying is easily seen; also

Deborah's, Huldah's, and indeed all of the Old Testament prophetesses. The context shows in each case, that these women were raised up in exceptional and extraordinary emergencies and were endowed with exceptional and extraordinary prophetic gifts for a special and temporary purpose. No one will deny this, I suppose. As to Anna, the prophetess, in the New Testament, who with Simeon met the infant Jesus, her words bear on their very face the fact that she was specially and supernaturally inspired to "speak for God" on that occasion. How else could she have recognized in that little unknown peasant babe her divine and adorable Redeemer? Would her words have any authority without it? She spake as she was moved by the Holy Ghost.

The case of Philip's four daughters, can hardly be different. If their "prophesying" was mere preaching, mere public speaking in God's cause, why should it be so singled out from their father Philip's, for he was a public speaker also. Why indeed, except to show theirs was not mere preaching. Nay, they "prophesied." They were specially favored of God with a separate supernatural endowment that no longer exists in the church, characterized by a distinct function, distinctly mentioned in Scripture and called "the prophetic gift." This is why the language is so singular and significant. "And the same man had four daughters, which did prophesy." (Acts 21:9.) What this "prophetic gift" was can be seen from the cases already mentioned; from the cases of Elizabeth, mother of John Baptist, and Mary, mother of our Lord, whose sublime outbursts of song and thanksgiving are called prophesying; from Zacharias also, father of John, and to go on farther, from the I Cor. 14th chapter, where in the list of special supernatural gifts of the Holy Ghost, we find "prophesying." And likewise, the "prophesying of daughters and handmaidens." Peter quotes from Joel, on the day of Pentecost. Peter also explains. His very explanation of the extraordinary super-

natural manifestation of the Holy Gost, and the extraordinary exercise of gifts by the disciples in consequence, enlightens us.

This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: "I will pour out of my Spirit on all flesh, and—your daughters—and your hand-maidens—shall prophesy." (Acts 2:14-8). And notice too, that there was "preaching" on the occasion, but it came after all "the prophesying," viz.: when Peter himself preached.

The claim then, from these texts, that women, altho' not invading the prophetical office, are yet privileged to exercise the "prophetical gift" or "function," can hardly stand, because the "prophetical gift" was an extraordinary and temporary endowment from the Holy Ghost, peculiar to the early Church, and has long since passed away. Unless our ladies can show these signs of the Spirit's supernatural indwelling, our brethren can derive no support for them from these texts. The truth as to Bible "prophets" and "prophesying" seems to be, briefly, this:

The word "prophesy" is used in two or three senses in Scripture.

1st. Its primary meaning both in the Hebrew and Greek is "one who speaks for another," and in religious use, "one who speaks for God," or "declares the will of God." In this simple sense, the Old Testament priests were "prophets." That is, they "spoke for" or "declared the will of God." They did so both symbolically and orally. They were the preachers or religious teachers of their day. (See Malachi 2:7; Nehemiah 8:7, 8, etc., and other places). So too as the centuries passed, and the priesthood became corrupted, Samuel raised up another order of men called "prophets" who were trained to "declare" or "reveal the will of God." We can trace these men in "companies" or "schools of the prophets" from Samuel's day on down to Amos's day, and perhaps later, in Old Testament times.

They did not supersede the priesthood but rather supplemented them in their work as religious teachers.

But now note,

1st. Not one woman can be found among these men, in any age, either in the priesthood or in the "schools of the prophets!"

2nd. The word "prophet," in this simple sense of "speaking for" or "declaring the will of God," can not be found in the New Testament Scriptures!

Preachers are not called "prophets" in the New Testament. They "declare the will of God," it is true, but the term "prophet" is not applied to them, because it is not used in that simple sense in the New Testament.

2. And this brings us to the second and chief and current meaning, in the Bible, of the word "prophesy."

Namely, to "declare the will of God" in an inspired and miraculous way; i. e., under the direct supernatural influences of the Holy Ghost!

This, it is to be noted, is the current, the characteristic sense of the word throughout all Scripture, and especially, in the New Testament. This is the sense in which Abraham, Moses, Samuel, Isaiah, David, Daniel and all the writers of Old Testament prophecies were prophets; and this is the sense in which the Lord Jesus himself, in which John the Baptist, Zechariah, Ananias the High Priest, Agabus, those spoken of in I. Cor. 14th chap., and all who "prophesied" in the apostolic times were "prophets."

It is in this sense, this special supernatural sense, that the few women spoken of in the Old and New Testaments "prophesied." Of course the exercise of this "prophetical gift" by these women, under such extraordinary circumstances can not truthfully nor wisely be used as a justification for women preaching now.

The other texts mentioned are, it seems to me, also otherwise adequately explained.

The "women who published the Word of the Lord were

a great host," in Ps. 68, were the women who published it by songs and dances at the return of the Ark from the Philistines. The psalm is the psalm that was written at the return of the Ark. The fact that the woman of Samaria said to the men, "Come see a man which told me all that ever I did," on her return from the well, does not prove that she said any more, or indeed did any more than simply say this to them as she went along the road, much less make any "address." She had no time to make any public address. Besides, it is the mere statement of a fact without any word added, approving or condemning. The "there is neither male nor female" in Galatians 3:28, refers simply to salvation; a blessed truth, but not pertinent here; the "godly women" who labored with Paul, in the Gospel in Phil. 4:3, no doubt labored with him, just as tens of thousands of our godly labor now and have been for years laboring with their pastors in the Gospel; that is, in the quiet, retiring but most effective and much valued ways which have not and do not transgress her own express and solemn injunctions. As for "Phebe the deaconess," of Rom. 16:1, it can never be proven that she was a deaconess. The claim stands entirely unsupported by any prop, either for the context or elsewhere. And the evidences that she was not a "deaconess," i. e., a church officer, are powerful. And if she was, that would not call for her to make public addresses. Thus we have gone over these texts put forth to uphold the claim, that while women may not preach, hold office in the house of God, yet they can make addresses before mixed audiences, and we find their support unfounded. But there is another consideration which, to my mind, is the most powerful of all, and that is, that this custom does not comport with that temper and attitude of retiracy, or privacy, as to public matters and of subordination, which we have seen the Bible so plainly enjoins. These two principles are the key notes, the great central thoughts of the mind of God upon this subject. The mighty movement now coming

down upon the South, like a great land slide, is in reality one; in the Church and out of the Church it is the same thing, viz : the forcing our women out of the sphere of unobtrusive, sheltered, private life and effort out into the untried and forbidden perils and paths of public life and leadership divinely assigned to man. It is impossible for me not to see that the movement is one. And when I reflect that God's gospel found the Gentile heathen world with pretty much the same type of society as this movement is now moulding; when I reflect that the sweet, gentle, yet strong and noble type of maidenhood and womanhood, that once characterized the ideal Southern woman, but now is in such danger of passing away, is what it is and has been, solely because made so by Bible influence; when I reflect that this position of an honored and honorable yet voluntary retiracy and subordination is presented in the Bible as a safeguard not a cross, a safeguard of woman's highest and best interests; when I consider that it is not necessary, in order to "labor in the gospel," for women to thrust herself forth to these public performances, but that on the contrary, the whole drift of testimony goes to show that she, by so doing, will lose her influence and usefulness in the highest and best sense of the word; when these things, I say, come to my mind I am compelled to the conviction that not only are these innovations a mistake, but a grievous mistake; a mistake fraught with peril to the woman herself, to the home and to the church.

And now let us take up the normal teaching of the Sacred Scriptures as to the Sphere of Woman in the Church of God. We will find it to be overwhelmingly against the innovations of the "Woman Movement."

For instance, in the Old Testament. In the patriarchal age, the offices of religion are all performed by men; in the Mosaic age, it is the same way, the priests, the elders, the Levites, are all by explicit statute and in actual fact, in every generation, found to be men; in after years when modifica-

tions came in, when for instance prophets and then scribes appear upon the scene and exercising the function of religious teacher, we find them with the exception of three or four prophetesses, to be men; in the tremendous disorders and demoralization caused so often by great national calamities, such as the secession of the ten tribes, the seventy years captivity in Babylon, the conquests of the land by successive nations afterwards, although other profound changes occur, there is no change in this; in all the thousands of years down to Malachi, it is the same. Four thousand years elapse of blank silence, and then Jesus comes, and we find it still the same. Woman's position in the church is as subordinate and retiring in His day as ever. Her every place in the temple worship and in the synagogues shows this; in the temple she could not even enter where the officers of religion performed their duties; in the synagogues she was even separated by a vail or screen from the men.

The spirit and words of the New Testament are no different. This is worthy of careful notice. Indeed, the New Testament is more pronounced, if anything, than the Old. Note well this fact. This may be because the New Testament church was thrown in contact with the looser Gentile world and was preparing to embrace it. However that may be, it is certain that the New Testament is even more outspoken than the Old. The testimony of the Old Testament, though powerful, is yet mainly negative, whereas that of the New Testament is not only negative but most positive. It explicitly prohibits women from leadership in God's house in distinct and emphatic terms, and explicitly assigns her to a retiring and subordinate position. Not only does it present all church officials, with but two or three exceptions, as men, Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets, Pastors or Teachers, Elders, Deacons, but it expressly raises the question, and then in terms of express prohibition pronounces upon the status of woman. Thus: "Let the women 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." (I Tim. 2: 11-14.) Now consider, (1) this occurs in Timothy, an epistle written especially for instruction and guidance about preachers; (2) it occurs in connection (to see the full force of this, read without regard to the division of chapters) with the giving the qualifications of preachers the terms of which qualifications limit the office necessarily to men. (I Tim. 3: 1-7.) Once more I Cor. 14: 33-37 (I give part) "God is not the author of confusion but of peace, as in all churches of the saints. 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. It is a shame for women to speak in the church. What! Came the Word of God out from you, or came it to you, only? If any man think himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." Note these last words. The apostle solemnly invokes the authority of God to invest these his commands and declares that if any of the Corinthians claims to be a prophet or spiritual, i. e. claims to have power to discern spiritual things, the test of his claim is this, viz: "Let him acknowledge that the things I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." Consider the force of the whole passage. (1) These words occur in an epistle written expressly to correct disorders in the church; (2) and in a chapter written to correct disorders in church worship. Two are particularly mentioned. First, there was a confused and fanatical use of the extraordinary spiritual gifts bestowed upon them, some singing, some praying, some "interpreting," some "speaking with tongues," some "prophesying," etc. (See V. 26-32.) And secondly, there was woman speaking. And now note well, the reasons for the prohibition. "God is not the author of confusion but of peace;" "women are commanded to be under obedience;" "it is a

shame for woman to speak in the church." The matter is presented as a matter vital to the order and welfare of the church. The prohibition is of the most positive and even vehement character, and in no question in the whole Bible is the authority of God invoked with more explicitness, solemnity and sternness than in this matter. Two other considerations occur here. 1. The force of this passage is such that it seems impossible for one, who accepts the unity of Scripture, to believe that they teach elsewhere, the contrary. And second, a full understanding of its force can only be had by keeping in memory that these people belonged to that corrupt heathen society whose women had the freedom Paul is condemning. Paul is correcting the looseness to which they had been more or less accustomed, and is bringing to bear upon them the stricter and more conservative notions of the gospel. Such then is the true significance of these, his teachings, here about women.

Again. As in the Old Testament, so in the New, the laws concerning church officials are such as to shut the offices and functions up to males. Just as with the Levites, whose males alone were set apart to public church functions, so with the officers of the New Testament Church, especially the permanent officers, the Elders and the Deacons. (I. Tim. 3: 1, etc.)—their functions are limited to males.

Once more. The Scripture doctrine of Marriage is irreconcilable with woman's occupying any other than a retiring and subordinate sphere in the Church. As we have seen, the headship of the man belongs to the very nature and essence of the institution! The illustration Scripture uses is absolutely overpowering in its convincing force. "The husband is head of the wife even as Christ is Head of the church." If then, this is so in the home, how much more so, is it so in the church? The contrary view and practice will utterly unfit our women for marriage and lead to its perversion, as indeed, facts only too abundantly testify.

The words of I. Cor. 11: 1-16, are also strong and positive.

It is true, that this passage speaks in one place of women "praying," and the connection makes the language somewhat ambiguous; but careful investigation shows that the praying alluded to does not mean "praying in public" as now practiced and advocated.

For, first, such praying by women, is explicitly prohibited in this same epistle only a chapter or so beyond, (I. Cor. 14.) It is not wise nor reverent to make the Holy Spirit contradict himself. In this 11th chapter, we have simply an allusion to a custom current in the Church. What that custom was exactly, can not now be ascertained. In the 14th chapter, however, we have a distinct prohibition of woman's praying in public, and of her assuming the leadership and prominence of any kind. There is also this consideration; the "praying" alluded to seems to have been that "praying with tongues," i. e., in an unknown tongue, which was one of the extraordinary and temporary gifts of the Holy Ghost, bestowed upon the New Testament Church at the outset of its career. If so, it affords no example for present custom, any more than does the possession and exercise then, of the other such gifts, for they have long since been withdrawn. The coupling the "praying" here, in this passage, with "prophesying," another of these extraordinary gifts, favors this idea; but in addition, Paul in I. Cor. 14: 14 makes distinct mention of the "praying," then alluded to "praying in an unknown tongue."

But the rest of the passage is conclusive. It is too long to quote in full. The following, however, will suffice; "I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ and the head of every woman is the man." "The man is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man." "The man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man." "Neither was the man created for the woman,

but the woman for the man." Such language cannot be explained away. It is overpowering.

Other considerations are at hand to show that woman's sphere in the church is, as woman's sphere in the home, an honorable, honoring and voluntary subordination and retiracy; but this paper threatens to be too long and we must pass on.

I. (B) (2) The "Rights" of Women in the Church of God are still to be considered. But the ground has been so completely covered in amplifying the sphere of woman in the home and church, and the rights of woman in the church are so much the same as the rights of woman in the home, already considered, that there remains for us at this point little more than a mere mention of these items.

The "rights" then of woman in the church, as set forth in Scripture, are briefly these :

(1) A monogamous marriage; (2) A Scriptural divorce, i. e., only for cause of proved adultery and abandonment; (3) An equal right as church member to all the ordinances and sacraments of the church; (4) Suffrage, or the right to vote for officers and on other church questions; (5) The special prerogative of teaching the young in a private sphere, both in the home and in the Sabbath school; (6) church work in other ways consistent with the position in the church, such as work in the choir, the ladies' societies, ladies' prayer meetings, etc.

We have now to consider the second division of this subject.

II. The bearing of the current movement on Woman in the Home and Church. It is not deemed advisable to treat this point formally here, as the ground was gone over thoroughly in Paper No. 1 (April QUARTERLY).

There are some vital considerations, however, well worth adding.

Let me endeavor to define more fully the rationale of the two Scripture principles, which settle woman's sphere and

rights in the home and church, viz : The principles of subordination and retiracy.

(1) This view is not that of Orientalism, either ancient or modern.

This has been already pointed out fully enough, but I wish to repeat and emphasize it. Woman in the Bible and in Christian lands, for instance in our own South, is as far removed from an Oriental woman as the poles from each other. The Bible home is not a harem, the Bible woman is not a slave nor a beast of burden; she is a companion, a loved and honored wife, mother, sister, daughter, the subject and object of man's shielding and protection, man's support and toil; the salt and savor of man's home, yea of man himself; for both in God's economy and man's experience it has been proven that, next to the preached Word, the chief agency of man's salvation has been the mother and the wife of his home. But to continue so she must continue in the home.

(2) Again, this retiring and subordinate attitude is not a sign of inferiority. This, too, has been already said. Woman is from the man himself, bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. Nevertheless, she is from the man, and not the man from her. "Adam was first formed, then Eve." She was created for the man, and not the man for her. It is a matter of vital order and welfare, as truly for her true good, true happiness and true dignity as for the man's.

(3) It is a memento of woman's sin in the fall. "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in transgression." It was woman's first venture into leadership, and fatally did it terminate! "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children!" And can we doubt for a moment that one great bar to woman's going forth in public life, either in or out of the Church, is furnished by the pains, the sorrows, the inconveniences of motherhood?

(4.) Again. It is an indispensable safeguard of woman;

of woman's finer nature, true influence, true rights, true happiness and true progress. The curse upon woman, like as the curse upon man, has been turned into a blessing. It remanded her to a private sphere, and therein is her salvation. It is the safe-guard of her finer nature. Proof of this is multiplying daily, all the time. Women are becoming more and more masculine, masculine in dress, in manners, in morals, and more still, more masculine in skepticism.

There can be no doubt that this change has been caused by women's breaking forth into public life, both in the church and out of the church, and taking man's place. For it is precisely in that part of our country where this is done that women are becoming more and more masculine. It is seen in dress, manners, morals and religion; a grave charge I know, but the proofs are graver, far graver. Modesty and reserve are passing away, and women on the platform and even in the pulpit, handle themes which would have brought the blush not only to our mothers' cheeks but to our fathers' also. This safe-guard I am speaking of is a safe-guard also of woman's true influence. Say what you will, a woman's modesty and reserve are the key-note of her true influence; say what you will, she can best influence men in religion, not from the platform but in the home. Her mounting the platform, in church work, will not only tend to give men an excuse to get down from it but leave her bear the burden of the church work. And that suggests the third fact, viz: that this position God has placed her in is a safe-guard of her true rights. True rights, both in the church and out of the church. If this movement of the publicising of our women (if I may be permitted to coin a word); if this movement goes on, it will make our women the burden bearer, both outside and inside the home. And here is where our chivalry should come in. Her going into politics, her going into business life, her going on the platform, what does it mean? What is the fact even now? The fact is this, she is becoming more and more the supporter of the man. The

more she crowds man out of his place the more must she meet the responsibilities of the place; and so, instead of the man supporting her, she is daily becoming more and more the supporter of the man. Now may God forbid our having anything but sympathy, respect, admiration, pity, for the woman, the maid, wife, mother, who, from bitter necessity, goes out into the world to earn her bread; but, is it a thing to be encouraged as good? Is it not a thing to be deplored; is it not an evil; is it not a thing to be opposed and rectified? But the present movement makes it worse and worse, and to-day, millions of women are supporting millions of men. And can we expect it will be different in the church? Does not every pastor know how hard it is to get work out of the men? Why? Business! But suppose the women do their own work in the church and the men's work too. Nay, suppose the women do the men's work both out of the church and in the church? What then? The church will no doubt take on for a time a great boom of prosperity, but—the women, how about the women. The women will be the burden-bearers inside the church as well as outside. And it will be a grievous burden, more than they can bear.

This is no fancy sketch. I wish it were. It is based on simple, solid, stubborn facts.

This is an age of "reforms." A reform most sorely needed, is to re-form once more upon that fundamental factor in the Bible doctrine of the home, viz.: the headship of the man, and his consequent responsibility for the support and protection of the woman! This is the root of "chivalry," the sine qua non of the preservation of woman's modesty and reserve. This should be taught our boys; the sons, brothers, husbands of our women; taught them for their own sakes, to make them manly men, taught them for our women's sake, to keep them womanly women.

II. (B) The effects of the current revolution on women in society and the State, can not be separated from the effects on women in the home and Church.

Imagine a young woman making all the advances to a young man; "calling" on him, inviting him to the theatre and other public entertainments and even virtually making the marriage proposition (as is being done these days); or, a wife or mother supporting the men of her household, or spending a good part of her time in "club life," or in running over the country, on "business," or "politics," or voting against her husband, or running for office against him, (all of which is now being done); imagine such women bowing to the Saviour's words, "the husband is head of the wife, even as Christ is head of the Church," or willing to heed the injunction, "let the women keep silence in the churches."

Per contra, how can we dismiss the fear that the mounting the platform, the assuming the other public functions, the running around to Church conventions here and there, etc., is nothing more nor less than training for political publicity and the other concomitants of Woman Suffrage?

(C) Woman's work in the home is the work of women, that is of fundamental importance and dignity and influence. To remove her, is to remove the foundations; the foundations not merely of the home, but the foundations of society, of the state and of the church. No one else can take her place. Mark it well. No one else can take her place! To remove her, means total ruin, anarchy, chaos. The noble "Pastoral Letter" of our Assembly of '98, finely says: "The centres of most powerful influence are the homes of the world. Let Christian women set the homes right, and there will no longer be in the church and state, the great evils of which they now complain."

And yet, one of the great dangers of the day is the "passing of the home," the Christian home. Of all the venerable institutions so cherished by the Church, none has against it at this day, so many and such deadly assaults. Decay of family worship, family government and training, decay of a holy "home Sabbath," decay of Chris-

tian marriage, the fearful strides of divorce, the increase of adultery; all these and more are assaulting now, the Christian home!

And they are all summed up in this "Woman Movement!" It only remains for me now to make an application closer home.

IV. This revolution is rapidly invading the South, i. e., our own territory, Church and homes.

(A) The South has problems enough of her own without this; problems grave and menacing. They are grave and menacing enough now; but the coming of this one on her will make them all the more so.

What, for instance, will be the effect of the maturing of the "Woman Movement," among us, on the "Negro Question"? What effect will it have upon the Negro women?

There is no reason to suppose that they will remain influenced by it. They are an imitative race; they watch closely and quickly catch up every new thing adopted by the whites. The negro women of the South will do, as to this matter, just what the negro women of the North are doing now, viz: fall in with the movement in all of its advanced and notorious features. In the North they have their negro women clubs, their negro women congresses, their negro women platform speakers, preachers, political and reform agitators; why not expect them in the coming years among us also? All the baneful effects already described as coming upon the social life, the homes, the industrial, the civic, the church life of the whites, will come much more upon the blacks. It will work among them like a rapid rot. If the marriage bond is loosening among the whites; if adultery and divorce are running rampant; if the women are becoming more the supporters and burden-bearers of the men, much more will it be so among the blacks. If the ballot given to the white women seems fraught with havoc to the home and to all things most dear, as we have seen, what will be the effect of the ballot given

to the negro women of the South? What effect upon them; what effect upon home and church and state; and what effect upon the ever-menacing, ever-growing incubus called the "Race Issue?"

We have no right to say these can never be living questions. The negroes number millions: they are a vast black, undigested mass, lying unassimilated in the stomach of the body politic, a source of chronic and increasing fever and decay, yet—they cannot be expelled. They will be here when we—are dust; here, facing our children and our children's children. We ourselves may not see the questions above cited, become living issues, but our children may. And if "Womanism" matures among us, they probably will. And if the Negro Question remains an open sore in the side of the South, the climax of the Woman Movement in her midst will be like the climax of all evils.

(b) The South cannot afford to take on this problem also, nor need she.

There are two encouraging facts about the South.

1. She is still, for the most part, an agricultural section, and the growth of all innovations is in an agricultural section, for several reasons, slow. Especially one, like "Womanism."

2. She has still, as a rule, the old fashioned ideas and customs concerning "the home."

3. And third, she has as a section, her old fashioned faith in and reverence for the Bible as God's Word.

These three things ought to enable her to resist the tide that's on her, flood-tide though it be; or, if it passes over her, remain unscathed, unharmed, unshaken and unchanged, lifting her head high above the muddy and receding waves.

One lesson from Church History it is timely to remember now. It is, that in testing times such as is the present, the temptation of temptations that comes to the church is to "adapt," under pressure, our interpretation of God's Word, to "the demands of modern civilization."

That was the snare that trapped Jewish scholarship before Christ's day, when it came in contact with Grecian thought; "trying to connect Greek Philosophers with the Bible," "finding a deeper meaning beneath the letter of Scripture, which would accord with philosophic truth."

That was the snare which beset Melancthon after the rock he leaned on, Luther, left him, and the result was Synergism, i. e., compromise of God's truth. That was the snare for Cranmer and the other English reformers, and the result was a Church half reformed.

So now, as to this great, this vital, this fundamental question, this is the temptation of temptations before our Church to-day.

P. D. STEPHENSON.

Woodstock, Va.

EDITORIAL.

RECORD AND REVIEW.

THE PRESBYTERIAN COUNCIL.

To those who attended the Nashville and Charlotte Assemblies of the Southern Church the Pan-Presbyterian meeting was at first a disappointment. Geographical lines rather than ability or reputation are the necessary determinations in the selection of delegates. But when the great idea of the Council is considered and the work it has done in bringing together the insignificant and unknown members of the Presbyterian family, it is well worth a long trip to see and to hear.

Dr. DeWitt's opening sermon was strong and fearless in its stand for the integrity of the Word of God. It especially gratified the Southern delegation. It was an open challenge to the radical criticism. Dr. J. Marshall Lang, of Glasgow, Scotland, President of the Council, followed with an address upon the Permanent and the Progressive in Doctrine and Ministry. He trode difficult ground with a pretty firm tread, though some of his admissions as to the creeds of the Church need not have been made. The reception at the White House closed the first day's proceedings. The Cabinet officers were all there besides a large number of prominent people who were invited to the reception.

The report of Dr. Matthews, Secretary of the Alliance, and his paper on the history of the Alliance during the first quarter century were both of exceeding interest. Dr. Matthews is of giant frame, most pleasing voice and manner, and to him more than to anyone is due the success of the Alliance. It is interesting to know that out of the 5,000,000 communicants of Presbyterian Churches, 4,000,000 are of the English-speaking races and the other 1,000,000 on

the European Continent. Dr. Matthews linked Presbyterian progress with Anglo-Saxon destiny in fitting terms.

He referred to the work of the Alliance in making Presbyterianism one. As an illustration he gave an English expert's opinion to the effect that up to the war the United States was merely a Federation of States. After the war it became a nation. So, argued Dr. Matthews, Presbyterianism is a unit through the work of the Alliance in finding and consolidating the different churches of the system.

There is a tendency to Organic Union which the Alliance has developed. This work has been accomplished already in some churches, kindred in faith and geographically near together. In November, 1900, in all probability, the Free Church of Scotland and the United Church will become one organization.

Dr. Strickler's address was, to quote from a Scotch delegate, "like a demonstration from Euclid." There are elders in the New Testament as in the Old Testament Church. These elders are rulers. They are the only rulers. They are associated together in government. Hence the Presbyterian system is Scriptural. Another interesting paper was that by Samuel Smith, M. P., on Sacerdotalism in England. Mr. Smith looks like the typical Kansas Senator, with whiskers flowing to the breeze. But he is a good speaker and his vigorous stand for Protestantism was warmly commended and applauded by the Alliance. He referred to the Jesuitical teachings of Pusey and Newman and their corrupting influence. For example, Pusey taught that a priest need not reveal the secrets of the confessional on the witness stand because he was ignorant as a man of what he learned as the representative of God. He said that the hope of England was in the Parliament, whose ministry elected the rulers of the Anglican Church. That the Church had recently taken the position that the Parliament had no right to concern itself with religious questions and that the result must be the separation of church and state in England.

Mr. R. R. Simpson, of Edinburg, an elder, spoke on the Diaconate and urged the employment of Deaconesses as a scriptural arm of the Church's work. This address was followed up by a lively discussion, all tending in the Deaconess direction. It was closed by a dignified address by the venerable Moderator of the Reformed Church of America, who gave in brief his Church's doctrine as to the Diaconate, which is also the exact doctrine of the Southern Presbyterian Church.

The pulpit of the New York Avenue Church is a spread-eagle. One of the best addresses of the Council was delivered by Principal Salmond, of Aberdeen, Scotland, on the Influence of Calvinism in the Formation of the National Character of Britain. It was a great subject and ably handled. He was followed by Dr. William H. Roberts, the gist of whose address was the fact that American character under the same Calvinistic influences had gloriously defeated the British during the Revolution. Frankly, the address was an exhibition of bad manners, unless the English and Scotch visitors enjoy the story of their defeat. As Americans we felt a little ashamed of the setting forth of the American Revolution as a religious war against British intolerance and persecution. Moreover even that treatment of the subject was defective. Dr. Roberts is a good encyclopedia but he ought to get a historian to arrange his facts for him.

But the spread-eagle met his match at last. Dr. Thomson, the able and efficient Secretary of Home Missions for the Northern Church, spoke on Tuesday night of the great work the Northern Assembly is doing. It is a magnificent work and the temptation was a great one to make as fine a display as possible before the visitors from abroad as well as those from the South. But Canada's turn came next and Canada was represented by a tall, black-bearded, clear-voiced speaker, full of native eloquence and loyal to his Church. Somehow as he proceeded the Home Mission

work just before mentioned grew smaller and smaller until it became insignificant. It was the most complete triumph of the Council and when Dr. Johnson sat down the Canadian Church had taken the position as the model home mission Church, and the spread-eagle, before alluded to, as it heard the closing periods of the address, quietly and despairingly folded its wings.

Dr. W. McF. Alexander, of New Orleans, had a thoughtful paper on the Reflex Influence of Missions. He was only permitted to read for fifteen minutes when he had prepared a paper for twenty-five. And that was short enough for a man to come half way across the continent to read.

But Dr. Alexander served as a martyr for the rest of the speakers and they were allowed twenty-five minutes. We believe that it would be still better to have subjects requiring a treatment of forty-five minutes and to select the ablest possible speakers, while cutting down somewhat the number. The speaker before Dr. Alexander, Dr. Buchanan, of Edinburgh, had referred to the institution of human slavery in the United States in terms of unqualified condemnation. It is perhaps just as well that Dr. Alexander was not allowed to finish, as he had a closing paragraph setting forth the extraordinary missionary results of Southern slavery, whereby some 6,000,000 of degraded and cannibal heathen were brought into a condition of at least semi-Christianity—more than the missionary societies of all the world have accomplished in a hundred years. Our British brethren have taken a one-sided view of the slavery question. If they will compare the record of the Southern States with that of the West Indies under British control in the simple matter of humanity to the slaves and their vital statistics, they will praise instead of blame the South.

And if they will compare the system abolished here with that existing in India to-day under British rule they will have nothing to say. Moreover as long as the Sultan of Sulu is allowed to maintain slavery under the United

States' flag there would seem to be some work for abolition other than self-glorification for the past. Why can we not all recognize that slavery in some form is the tutelage through which the inferior races must come in their progress from childhood to manhood?

One of the encouraging aspects of Protestant work in Europe, according to a statement made by Dr. Matthews, is the movement of the priests away from Rome. This remark was confirmed by one of the delegates, who has traveled much on the Continent. He said that if there was a movement towards Rome among the English High Churchmen, there was a vastly greater exodus from Rome on the Continent. This is especially true of France and Austria. In French Switzerland the churches, already in full sympathy with us, are gradually changing from the consistorial to the sessional form of worship. Several speakers urged American Christians to attend the native Protestant churches and not the Romish cathedrals, when they were traveling on the Continent, and especially were they besought not to break down the respect for the Sabbath which the Protestant pastors were trying to inculcate.

Dr. Bannerman, of Perth, made an excellent showing of the work done for English-speaking peoples on the Continent. There is a religious paper, *The Continental Presbyterian*, edited in Scotland, for the especial benefit of this large and influential class. Dr. Bannerman gave special praise to the Scotch servant-women who were the life and support of these churches in many instances, and to the generosity of the American travelers whose gifts were most acceptable in maintaining the work of providing English services for English-speaking people.

One of the Hungarian delegates, Mr. Kalassay, made an address that carried one back to the old days of persecution for conscience sake. Presbyterianism is still obnoxious to tyranny and our representative government is looked upon with disfavor. For example, the King of

Hungary sends a delegate to their General Synod to represent the throne and all of the Synod's laws must receive the royal sanction.

The General Synod of the Hungarian Church is composed of 116 delegates and meets but once in ten years. The inferior courts are the classis, answering to our Presbytery and the Congregational Presbytery or Session.

Dr. Teofilo Gay, of Naples, is an orator of the fiery type and received an ovation for himself and the Waldensian Church which he ably represented. He opened his address by remarking that the word Council did not have the most pleasant associations for him. But that we had redeemed the word. It meant now a gathering not for innovating but for conserving, not for inventing something new but for holding on to what was old. Almost the only Latin in attendance, he congratulated the Council on being sufficiently latinized to adhere to the teachings of that distinguished Latin, John Calvin. He declared that his fathers were Presbyterians long before Columbus discovered America or Luther discovered the Bible. In passing he paid a tribute to Napoleon Bonaparte, who was so much impressed with the Waldensian work as it was then, that he gave to the pastors a thousand francs annually, on their salaries. He intimated that they were not receiving quite as good a stipend now.

During their fifty years of religious liberty, the work of the Waldensians has been marvelous. Their presence in the kingdom was the occasion of the granting of religious liberty in Italy. And now they have established fifty new churches and have received as many converts from Romanism as there were Waldensian members fifty years ago, namely, twenty-five thousand souls.

Such has been the influence of the Waldensian missionaries in disseminating Bible truth that even the Pope has been forced to commend its study to the faithful. A recent edition of the Bible has been published by the Catho-

lic authorities containing the preface, 'The Holy Father grants forty years of indulgence for every quarter of an hour spent in the study of the Bible.'

A feature of the work in Italy not often thought of is the influence of the Italian immigrants who become converted to Protestantism during their exile and return to Italy to preach and teach the Gospel. Recently a Calabrian family, converted by the work of the Protestant Missionaries in Brazil, returned to Naples, joined the Church there and began at once to work. Another family from South America who settled in Lisbon, have gathered a congregation of 500 in sympathy with Protestant doctrine and are waiting to be taken under the care of some Protestant church—preferably the Presbyterian Church.

A resolution which stirred the Council to its depth was offered by Dr. Cyrus Cort of the Northern Presbyterian Church. It was preceded by two whereases, one setting forth the fact that at the last Council arbitration between Britain and the United States had been commended, and the other mentioning the Hague Conference as endorsing the principles set forth by the Council. The resolution read :

"Resolved, By this Council of Reformed Churches throughout the world, assembled October, 1899, at the city of Washington, D. C., that in the name and interests of the Prince of Peace Himself we earnestly deplore and deprecate any resort to the terrible arbitrament of war in the settlement of pending difficulties between the governments of Great Britain and of the Transvaal Republic, and implore both parties to seek more earnestly a solution of the questions at issue by recourse to methods of international arbitration so recently recognized and commended by representatives of all civilized governments on the face of the earth."

Instantly Dr. Lang was on his feet protesting against the adoption of the resolution and asking the substitution of a general reference to arbitration. Dr. Meiring from Johannesburg, a loyal Afrikaner, demanded its passage, as general principles were of no avail unless applied to particular cases. Dr. Johnson of Canada held that there was nothing political in the resolution. But Dr. Matthews, the Secretary, asserted that the political question was in the very heart of the

resolution, since this was not a conflict between two governments, the Transvaal being a part of the British Empire. To which Dr. Meiring retorted that "the Transvaal is an independent Republic." The issue was clear enough. The political question was apparent.

What to do with it was the next question. A motion was made to refer it to the business committee. Another motion was made to postpone the resolution, as the subject of arbitration was to come up in another form. Eighty delegates voted to refer and eighty to postpone. Dr. Radcliffe, pastor of the church in which the Council met, failed to vote and asked to be recorded in favor of the resolution to refer. The request was denied. Dr. Hamlin, as Chairman, broke the tie by voting to postpone, which was recognized as the effective mode of killing the resolution. But this seemed to favor the view that the Transvaal was a part of the British Empire and therefore arbitration as between nations was impossible. So Dr. Bosman of South Africa left for home and Dr. Meiring wrote a letter asking that his name be stricken from the rolls of the Council. Then a Southern Presbyterian, Dr. Kerr, of Richmond, affected a compromise between the two parties just in time to prevent secession, and the Council unanimously passed the resolution offered by Dr. Kerr, that "in the distressing crisis now existing between Great Britain and the Transvaal the Council expresses its earnest hope and prayer that a peaceful solution of present difficulties may be reached."

And so the Alliance of Reformed Churches Holding the Presbyterian System has practically endorsed the position of the Southern Presbyterian Church that the Church should handle nothing political. The first resolution assumed the truth of one side of the very question at issue. The Council is not a legislative body and hence the results could not have been very serious. Yet if the resolution had carried, the British delegates would probably have left the Council while its postponement offended the Afrikaners. The

simple principle is that the Church has a higher mission than that of deciding questions on which men honestly and conscientiously differ, and by offending those against whom she decides she loses the opportunity of reaching them with her distinctive work.

In 1861 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States met in Philadelphia. A political question as old as the Government itself and one that had been debated on the stump and in political platforms and in the halls of Congress, was agitating the country, whether the allegiance of American citizens was due to the State or to the Nation, whether a State could retire from the Federation it had entered, or the Union were indissoluble. Men honestly and conscientiously differed on the question, and the student of history knows that it was never settled, and never could have been settled without the appeal to the sword.

But this Court of the Lord Jesus Christ undertook to say that the allegiance of the citizen was due to the General Government. There were those present who believed otherwise and the decree of the Assembly was as the stone in mid stream over which the torrent rushes with undiminished force. These formed the Southern Presbyterian Church and their children form it to-day. By force of circumstances in its own history, this Church has stood for liberty of opinion in all matters not within the sphere of revealed truth. By the conviction that its war record was an honorable one, that it accomplished something for the preservation of the Union, and perhaps for consistency's sake, the Northern Church has felt bound to make political deliverances wherever it imagined that a moral question was involved. The Southern Church feels more and more the need of standing for the principle which it calls the Crown Rights of Jesus Christ.

That the Southern position is by far the broader and the only possible basis of union is clear enough. There is a

moral element in every political question. There is no reason, logically, why there should not be Gold Presbyterians and Silver Presbyterians, High Tariff Presbyterians and Free Trade Presbyterians, Imperialistic and Anti-Imperialistic Presbyterians. It is only necessary for one party or the other in the Assembly to offer a resolution condemning the political principles of the other, and to get it carried or defeated. Then the minority can set up for themselves. For political questions are divisive and when they are solemnly settled by a church court, separation is the only way of peace.

The little breeze in the Council would seem to indicate that there was still some necessity for the Southern Church's existence and for its adherence to its distinctive principle. And we trust that, as the exhibition of wounded feelings was made by other than Southern delegates, the lesson may not be lost upon the noble body of Christians which we call the Northern Presbyterian Church. There is an infinitely higher work for the Church of Christ to do than the settling of these little issues. Its work is the salvation and sanctification of men; and the renovation of society and the purification of government will follow the faithful adherence of the Church to its divine mission far more certainly and far more speedily than by the entrance of the Church into the sphere of partisan politics, helping to inflame the passions of men, and, even when in the right, arousing the opposition of those condemned, and thus effectively blocking the way of influence for eternal good.

A delegate from the French Reformed Church spoke of their holding to the exact form of Government established in the days of Calvin. There are 600,000 Protestants in France. And the nation is looking to Protestantism for the principles of truth and justice, so conspicuously absent from the Dreyfus trial. In spite of the verdict, the Rennes trial was a defeat for the Catholic party. All conscientious Frenchmen know that Protestantism is on the side of truth and will suffer and die for it if necessary.

The favor of the French people is shown by the fact that city halls and other public places are frequently offered to Protestants for holding church services. The work is growing rapidly in spite of opposition. The speaker brought down the house when he said that they had no time for Higher Criticism. It was not a suitable time to pick one's gun to pieces when in conflict with the enemy.

One of the most pleasant incidents of the Council was the introduction of Dr. Newman, delegate from the International Council that recently met in Boston. His address, bearing the greetings of the Council, was a model expression of sincere Christian fellowship. Dr. Lang replied in fitting and eloquent terms, bringing to mind the common glorious achievements of Presbyterians and Congregationalists and the bond of sympathy that had always united the two bodies in the cause of Christian progress and human freedom. Dr. Lang is a typical Scot, tall, big-jointed, large-featured, with blue eyes, sandy hair and beard and awkward limbs, but with the impression of giant strength held lazily in reserve.

Dr. Sanders, the Negro President of Biddle University, Charlotte, made a fine address in which he took occasion to mention the friendly feeling of the Southern Church for the negro race as well as the fact that Presbyterianism is doing more for the education of the Negro than all other agencies combined.

Dr. Coe, of New York, read a thoughtful paper on Christianity and Socialism. A discussion ensued, participated in by Mr. Smith, M. P., Dr. Ross, of Newcastle, and Dr. Sample, the Moderator of the Northern Assembly, who made an earnest plea for the preaching of the old-fashioned gospel as the remedy for all social problems, reaching the masses through the individual.

Dr. Cunningham, of Edinburgh, read a paper full of interesting facts with regard to the continental movement in favor of the Sabbath. It is about time for Americans to stop talking patronizingly about the "Continental Sunday"

and to see to it that the "American Sabbath" is kept better than it is. There is an International Congress for promoting the Sabbath as a day of rest and worship. Through the work of the Congress 80,000 Belgian workmen were released from Sabbath work. Through the suppression of Sunday freight trains (goods' trains, as he called them) 50,000 railroad hands are allowed their Sabbath, while Denmark's law against Sunday factories has released 100,000 workmen from Sabbath toil. Even in France freight trains are stopped after ten o'clock Sunday morning.

We have often thought that this was the true method of Sabbath reform. Let the workingmen understand that they have a right to one day in seven, let the law protect them in the exercise of that right by forbidding all unnecessary labor and then let the churches visit the people and persuade them to come within their walls for worship, and the present condition of things will be vastly improved.

Mr. Charles Guthrie, Q. C., son of the famous Dr. Guthrie, of Scotland, made an admirable address on Christian Morality in its Application to Business. He began, contrary to the usual apologetic custom, by saying that he regarded himself as peculiarly fitted for the task before him. In the first place he was a lawyer, and it was generally understood that the lawyer saw all sides of life.

Nevertheless, the speaker continued, the law has its great rewards only for those who believe in Christian morality. The last five occupants of the woolsack, the ambition of all young lawyers, have been eminent Christian men.

The second qualification, said Mr. Guthrie, was his having been brought up in a manse. He referred to his famous father in thrilling words. The children knew of his eloquence in the pulpit, and saw the admiration of men for his qualities; but they were influenced chiefly by "the abiding eloquence of his Christian life."

Christian morality is not always the morality of Christians. The Dreyfus conviction was justifiable on grounds

of expediency. Yet it has been condemned by the world. The man who obtains charity on false pretences should be hanged higher than Haman because he not only deceived and defrauded his fellows but—quoting from Dr. Guthrie—“he poisoned the springs of charity.” The law of truth and honor are obligatory on Christians. Sir Walter Scott might have been legally relieved of his debts but he preferred to toil the remaining years of his life until he had paid them all. So the American humorist, Mark Twain, when he might easily have compromised with his creditors, began life anew with nothing and has labored until his obligations have been met. Balfour, who will be Prime Minister some day, is called by his Irish opponents, Prince Arthur, for his chivalry and generosity. Dr. Temple, now Archbishop of Canterbury, when a master of a school had this compliment paid him: “Temple,” said a schoolboy writing home, “is a beast. But he is a just beast.”

Mr. Guthrie then referred to the ethics of the sermon on the Mount and closed with this fine paragraph: “As we pass from the crowded peaks of the written law to the solitary summits of the unwritten law, as we ascend from justice to generosity, we may see yet beyond and above us the path untrodden save by the pierced feet of the Son of God.”

These few extracts from the proceedings may serve to give some idea of what was said and done in Washington at this session of the Council.

The Council elected Principal Caven, of Canada, next President, chose Liverpool as the place of next meeting and adjourned Friday evening, October 6th.

I. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

THE PRACTICAL PHILOSOPHY. Being the Philosophy of the Feelings, of the Will, and of the Conscience, with the Ascertainment of Particular Rights and Duties. *By R. L. Dabney, D.D., L. L.D.,* late Professor of Systematic and Practical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in Virginia. Crescent Book House, Mexico, Mo.

This work has already been intelligently reviewed in the *PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY*, and yet it may not be amiss to give it another examination somewhat more critical than it has yet received. It is the last and possibly the greatest work of its distinguished author, and is unfortunately a posthumous publication.

It is to be lamented that the book should have been manufactured by an inexperienced house in a small town; as it is marred by typographical errors. More than this, the editorial supervision was not well done, as may be seen throughout the volume, sometimes to the confusion of the meaning. The title page shows inaccuracy. Is Union Seminary the property of the Presbyterian Church in Virginia? It is just, however, to say that the book is as well made up as could be expected from the conditions of its publication.

Dr. Dabney calls this treatise on ethics "The Practical Philosophy." The Greeks divided human knowledge into theoretical and practical. The practical was subdivided into the practical proper and the poetic. The distinction between the practical and poetic is that indicated by the words. The practical embrace those arts which involve action and nothing more: while the poetic include those whose action results in making or producing something. Thus Ethics, Politics, Economics, Music, and Dancing are practical, while Oratory, Poetry, Painting, and Sculpture are poetic. We thus see that ethics was by them considered practical, both in the generic and specific senses. Ethics, however, was not "The Practical Philosophy," the only, the generic, or even the specific Practical Philosophy; it was regarded simply as one of the practical studies. Kant has perhaps justified this limitation of practical philosophy to ethics.

While this book is Dr. Dabney's contribution to ethics, it is more than that. It is his Psychology of what Stewart calls the Active Powers, embracing both the Sensibility and the Will; in other words, it is his discussion of all the mental faculties, except the intellect. The question arises, why dissociate the intellect from the other powers as not practical in its nature and relations? Dr. Dabney not only admits but asserts that the intellect is active, as truly so as the feelings and will. Moreover, he affirms the practical nature of the intellect in his argument for our responsibility for belief. It seems an error and an important one, to treat ethics as not concerned with the intellect as vitally as with the other

powers; inasmuch as the intellect largely influences and determines the affections, desires and volitions.

The treatise has four chief divisions: I. Psychology of the Feelings. II. The Theory of Volitions. III. Ethical Theory. IV. Applied Ethics.

Dr. Dabney seems to use the word Philosophy, not only in the title of the work, but also in the book itself, as the equivalent of Psychology. This is allowed by popular but not by scientific usage. Philosophy is concerned with the entire universe of being. There is, however, a recognized department of Philosophy, Epistemology, which is concerned with the origin and extent of human knowledge.

His analysis of the intellect, Dr. Dabney gives us in the first paragraph of the book; it is virtually the same as Hamilton's, and has similar defects. It omits the powers of expression, conception, and invention. He probably makes generalization include conception; there are, however, two kinds of concepts, which are not produced by generalization. There is the complex individual concept; for example, the idea of a man, some particular man, tree, horse, etc. We do not perceive John Jones, we perceive each separate quality of John Jones, and by conception combine these into the complex idea of John Jones. There is also the collective concept, as forest, army, etc. This concept is not generic but individual, and is formed by combining the individuals of the mass into a collection.

The inventive power he would probably place, as is frequently done, under his representative imagination. But the inventive power is quite distinct from this. The representative imagination simply pictures to the mind some object of past knowledge. The inventive power is that which creates a new object of knowledge by a combination hitherto unmade, the invention of the telegraph or the making of a poem. The representative imagination is a low power of the mind, possessed in vigor sometimes by feeble intellects; the inventive, creative power is that which shows the intellect to be most like God.

There is no recognition of the power of expression; in this, he has the company of others. It is strange that psychologists have overlooked this power. Every human being has it, even the infant, more or less developed. It is a power of the mind, not of the body. It is true that the mind uses the body as the instrument of expression. Just as the mind uses the eye to see with, so it uses the mouth to express its thoughts and feelings. It is an intellectual power, it is intelligence making itself known.

Dr. Dabney also omits instinct as one of the powers of the intellect and puts it among the feelings. It is indeed both; we have some instinctive knowledge, as well as some instinctive feelings. In man the intellectual instincts are limited to knowledge necessary for the perpetuation of life.

In his nomenclature Feeling is a generic term embracing all the mental powers, or capacities, except the intellect and will. He thus adopts that analysis of the faculties whose excellence has given it credit over the eminent authority of Aristotle's dichotomy, continued down to Reid

and Stewart as Understanding and Will, and Kant's proposed trichotomy into Intellect, Feeling, and Conation.

Feeling includes sensations, simple emotions, affections, desires, and hopes. He subdivides these into two distinct classes: 1. Sensibilities, or the passive feelings; and second, Conations, or Desires, or Appetencies, the active feelings. This distinction is just. Objection may be made, however, to the distinguishing terms, active and passive. There are, rightly considered, no passive powers of the mind; the terms indeed are contradictory; for a power cannot exert itself when it is passive, it must act when it is in exercise. What is true is that these so-called passive powers do not originate action, they never act until they are first acted upon. They are objective in origin, while the active was subjective. The true basis for the radical division of the feelings is their simplicity; they are either simple, mere modifications of pleasure and pain, or they are complex, combining other feelings with these agreeable or disagreeable emotions. The complex feelings are the affections, desires, and hopes.

Dr. Dabney places the sensations of sight, hearing, etc., among the sensibilities. This accords with the general view. It is however not true. Baldwin is right in declaring that sensation, as distinct from perception, is purely physical; it is merely the nervous condition of perception. All mental feelings are modes of pleasure and pain, but the sensations may be perfect without any consciousness of either. I see the paper on which I write without the experience of the least pleasure or pain.

Dr. Dabney places the Affections among the mere sensibilities; they properly form a sub-class of the complex emotions. They contain two elements: 1. The generic feeling of pleasure or pain. 2. That peculiar feeling which every mind recognizes as love or hate.

It is also noticeable that there is no recognition of the Hopes in the Table of Feelings and Appetencies. The complex feelings embrace the Affections, which are pleasures or pain plus love or hate; the Desires, which are pleasures, loves, and craving; and the Hopes, which are pleasures, loves, cravings, and degrees of expectation.

He subsequently mentions Fear and Hope, and says that they are not original, but derivative feelings. They are as original as any of our affections or desires. They are not simple, neither the affections and desires; but they are *sui generis* and cannot be resolved into anything else than themselves. They have elements in common with other feelings, but they have that which is their *proprium*, and is not found in any other class of feelings.

One of the most interesting and important points in the entire discussion is found on page 14, where it is held that our sensibilities are non-moral; that, as we are passive in them, we are not responsible for them; that our responsibility is limited to our appetencies or desires, in which alone the soul is active. If this distinction be correct and the loves, as Dr. Dabney states, are mere sensibilities, then they are without moral char-

acter. Again Dr. Dabney puts "inordinate self-will" among the sensibilities, p. 39, and must consistently hold that it has no moral coloring. Dr. Dabney is therefore surely mistaken either in making the sensibilities non-moral or else in putting the social affections and inordinate self-will among them; he may be wrong in both.

He seems to err here in what he considers an important discovery of his, our lack of responsibility for our sensibilities. The mind moves, as Dr. Dabney allows, in this order: First, thoughts, then sensibilities, then appetencies, then volitions. We are responsible for our thoughts as found in our opinions and beliefs, as Dr. Dabney distinctly teaches. We are also responsible for our appetencies and volitions, the sensibilities are thus left as the only mental exercises of an irresponsible character. It is strange that what precedes and what follows are moral, and that the intermediate link is not. It is also strange that man is responsible for all his mental acts except his sensibilities.

On what ground does he exempt them? It is because the mind is passive in them. This, however, is not true. A power may be latent, dormant, non-acting at any particular moment, though this is doubted by some thinkers. But it is incredible that a power can be in exercise and yet be passive. Take for instance what he calls "the ethical sensibility, resentment;" is the mind passive when it is exercising the feeling of resentment? Surely not; it is active in resentment and may be intensely so. What is true is not that mental powers are ever passive in their movements, but that their action is not primary but secondary, their action is a reaction. Resentment is never a primary movement of mind, it is its response to some action by others.

Are we responsible for our secondary as well as for our primary actions; for our reactions upon the influences exerted upon us by others? This depends upon whether they are our acts; if so, we are responsible for all in them that is ours. Our sensibilities are as truly our own as are our appetencies, and we are therefore as surely responsible for them.

Dr. Dabney's reasoning in this reminds us of his defence of American slavery. He not only admits but asserts that the origin of this relationship was wrong; that the African slave trade was evil, not only in the horrors attending it but also in the act itself. If it was wrong to bring the negro into slavery, how could it be right to keep him in that state? So if the appetencies are moral, how is it that the sensibilities which give rise to them are non-moral?

Dr. Dabney declares, p. 28, that "all activities of our natural powers involve some degree of pain or pleasure." This is surely not true, as he himself calls to our attention "the action of those powers of whose presence we are only conscious by the pain they cause us." The perfectly healthy man knows by consciousness nothing of his nervous system; it gives him neither pain nor pleasure in its normal working. Moreover, there are thousands of perceptions every day, sights and sounds, which are absolutely neutral to us so far as any pain or pleasure is experienced in them.

P. 89, Love is limited in its objects to "human, or at least rational beings." So others teach. This seems contrary to experience. Horses, dogs, cats, birds and other pets are objects of affection. So are flowers, our home, our country. Dr. Noah Davis says that we do not love our homes, but the people of our homes. This is seen to be untrue in the case of the hermit, whose attachment to his hut cannot be doubted. In this connection, we note that Dr. Dabney, like many other psychologists, does not believe that the lower animals have rationality. This position can not be maintained in view of many facts. Even the careless observer cannot fail to note instances of comparison and judgment in the acts of the domestic animals. Time and again, cats can be observed to stop suddenly as they are walking along, apparently deliberate, and then either proceed, turn back, or aside, as they seem to decide. Moreover, it is thought to be orthodox to deny real mindhood to the lower animals; on the contrary, materialism results, if it be true that mere matter can do all that we see in the brutes.

P. 92, there is inaccuracy in discriminating the love of complacency and the love of benevolence. It is said that the mother "loves a reprobate son in spite of his ill-desert," and that this is the love of benevolence. No, this is the love of complacency, as truly as her love for the obedient son; because it is due, as Dr. Dabney says, to the fact that "he is her son and she recollects many natural graces of body and wit which once pleased her." The love of complacency is based on the desert of its object; the love of benevolence on the need of its object. The mother loves her truant boy benevolently not in spite of his ill desert, but because of his ill desert. In his fallen, depraved condition, he needs her love and she gives it to him without stint.

It is strange that, in giving the various kinds of love, enumerating philanthropy, patriotism, friendship, conjugal, parental, fraternal, and filial love, he omits any mention of love to God. We have already noted that he denies man's love for the irrational world; he seems to have forgotten in his discussion of love the highest of its objects and to limit it to the human. We may observe that our love for God is mainly that of complacency; in a sense, it is exclusively so. God deserves our highest, supremest complacent love. He does not need our love of benevolence; and yet he desires it towards his people, his cause, his church, as his representatives and the agents of his declarative glory.

Dr. Dabney teaches that the mind has a moral faculty, and indeed this is palpably true in a certain sense, for the mind must have a faculty for doing what it actually does. But when we ask. Has the mind a special moral faculty, distinct from all other faculties, the question is different. By the law of parsimony, if the other recognized faculties are capable of doing all that is attributed to this alleged moral faculty, why multiply the mental powers? The truth is, that the mind has no special moral faculty, but rather a moral nature, by virtue of which any of its faculties may exercise themselves on moral objects. Thus we have moral intuitions, moral judgments, moral reasonings, moral feelings, and moral volitions. The same is true of the alleged aesthetic faculty.

Page 268, approbation is declared to be a feeling. This is not true; approbation is an act of judgment. There is a feeling which accompanies this act of judgment, which is sometimes called the feeling of approbation, because it springs from the judgment of approval.

Page 312, all but the first four lines belongs to "(B) From Analogy," on the preceding page. This is probably the fault of the printer who made up the forms.

Page 323, there is a heading to a section, "The 'Golden Rule,' Rationally Interpreted, is the Principle of All Duties between Man and Man." The Golden Rule is probably the most lauded moral maxim that human literature contains. It is found in the writings of Aristotle, Isocrates, Confucius, Buddha, and Mohammed in a variety of forms. It is first seen, so far as this writer knows, in Levit. 19:18. It received the approval of our Divine Lord; it is therefore good. It is however not a perfect rule, nor did our Master declare it to be. He simply quotes it from "the law and the prophets." It is a law probably higher and better than are the actions of any man that ever lived; still it is an imperfect law, because it sets up for us a fallible, human standard; we are called upon by it to love our neighbor as we love ourselves. We may and often do love ourselves unwisely, inordinately. The Great Teacher supplanted this rule with another, which He calls the New Commandment; Jno. 13:34, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another." He makes His love for us the standard of our love for others. It is unaccountable that this new commandment is so generally overlooked.

Page 346, it is asserted that the angels are "single integers; they do not multiply themselves." Do we know this to be true? The Mormons teach it, as a revelation to them. On it they base their assertion that the angels are inferior to man. If it be true, it is contrary to analogy; for all the higher forms of creatures within our observation can and do multiply themselves. Man, the glory of terrestrial creation, multiplies himself, body and soul, either efficiently or instrumentally. Dr. Dabney may have based his opinion on the Master's statement, that "in heaven they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven." This may or may not imply it.

In an argument against an opponent, where authorities are appealed to, exact reference should be made to the place where the authoritative statement may be found. This is not done on pp. 355 and 357.

Page 357, it is said that God made of Israel "a federal republic of eleven cantons." Dr. Dabney seems to think that because Levi was not a separate canton but was scattered among the other tribe, therefore there were but eleven. He forgets that Joseph was divided into two tribes, each of which was as separate from the other as were any of the tribes.

There is an unwise arrangement of the material in the 4th chapter of the 4th book. He first states and expounds the Social Contract Theory; then after discussing at length the Theistic Divine Right Theories, he

returns to the refutation of the Social Contract view. It would have been better to put the refutation along with the exposition.

It is to be deplored that reference is made to wine, p. 478, as though it were an entirely proper object for use as a beverage. Any other article of domestic consumption would have served the purpose of example as well as wine. There are many wise and good people who conscientiously believe that wine is not now a proper beverage. Dr. Dabney suddenly offends these, and gives the weight of his great name to the encouragement of young men, in a book prepared for them on practical morals, to drink wine.

Dr. Dabney contrary to the practically unanimous judgment of scientific economists, favors the enactment and enforcement of usury laws. When money was loaned, as it was until modern times, almost exclusively for unproductive consumption and to men in distress, there was some propriety in this legal interference with the right of private contract. But now, when 99 per cent. of the loans are for productive consumption, there is neither justice in it nor necessity for it. It has been often shown that it is as much to the interest of the borrower as of the lender that money, like everything else, should be free.

There are 201 pages devoted to Applied Ethics, of which barely seven are given to our "Duties Relating to God," and not a chapter, nor a section, nor a paragraph that discusses our practical duties to ourselves. He confines himself virtually to social ethics, ignores personal ethics, and dismisses theistic ethics with a word.

The style is clear and vigorous. In exposition, he rarely fails to be luminous. In an argument, he is strong, if not always convincing. The discussion would be improved by toning down or removing its superlatives, its adjectives, its sectionalism and partisan expressions.

We have yet to present the most important criticism on the book as a whole. All things considered, Alexander's *Moral Science* is one of the strangest volumes ever issued from a Christian press. It is a discussion of man's duty, theoretical and practical, by a pious and learned Christian divine, in which the Bible and Christianity are ignored; it could have been written by a sober, virtuous and intelligent pagan. A similar though not so severe a criticism can be passed upon Dr. Dabney's *Practical Philosophy*. While the Bible is often mentioned, and Christ occasionally, and always with respectful deference, the entire discussion, theoretical and practical, expository and argumentative, is conducted upon the basis of natural reason. The Bible is used merely to confirm the facts or conclusions of rational inquiry. Not a truth is presented nor a duty urged that does not appear to the natural man. The body of the volume could have been written by a heathen, and would contain every truth that it now holds; a few Christian illustrations and confirmations have been added.

Against this treatment of Ethics, we earnestly protest. If Christianity be true, if it be an infallible revelation from God as to our faith and practice, then its voice is authoritative within the domain of duty. We

believe that Christianity is dumb as to science, as to politics; we believe that it speaks with a "categorical imperative" as to Ethics, as an inherent and essential part of Redemption. I am writing now with the aid of electric light; when I was a boy I studied with the help of the dim flicker of a tallow candle. We live now in the perfect light of divinely revealed truth; shall we ignore this, and grope our way along the path of right and duty with the uncertain and feeble rushlight of natural reason? Let us have a distinctively Christian system of Ethics.

This review of the *Practical Philosophy* has so far repeated little or nothing contained in the notices of it already published. The impression forced itself on this writer that some of them were written by those who had not read the book. Whether right or wrong, an effort has been made in this notice to call attention to those features of the work which are of a doubtful character.

It may be thought, if these criticisms are just, that the book is full of error and imperfection. This writer does not think so, for he has used it two years as a text book with his classes. He expects to continue to use it, as upon the whole the best treatise on Ethics that he knows. The last criticism he regards as by far the most vital, and he deeply regrets that Dr. Dabney did not unfold and elaborate the principles of right and the rule of duty as they are found in the teachings of Him, who is "the way, the truth, and the life."

JAS. A. QUARLES.

Lexington, Va.

A SYSTEM OF ETHICS. *By Friedrich Paulsen.* Professor of Philosophy in the University of Berlin. Edited and Translated with the Author's Sanction from the Fourth Revised and Enlarged Edition, by Frank Thilly, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Missouri, New York. Chas. Scribner's Sons. 1899. [All rights reserved.] 8 vo. Pp. 723.

The Scribners are the leading publishers of philosophical literature in this country. Their imprimatur guarantees a superior book. Having a high standard of excellence in their selection, they are careful and intelligent in the mechanical manufacture of their publications.

Paulsen discusses Ethics under four general heads: I. Outline of a History of the Conceptions of Life and Moral Philosophy. II. Fundamental Concepts and Questions of Principle. III. The Doctrine of Virtues and Duties. IV. Forms of Social Life. The historical portion presents the Greek, Christian, Medieval and Modern Conceptions of Life; a chapter on the Conversion of the Old World to Christianity, and another on Medieval and Modern Moral Philosophy.

Book I is his Theoretical Ethics, and discusses Good and Bad, Teleological and Formalistic Conceptions; the Highest Good; Hedonistic and Energistic Conceptions; Pessimism; the Evil, the Bad, and Theodicy; Duty and Conscience; Egoism and Altruism; Virtue and Happiness; Relation of Morality to Religion; and the Freedom of the Will.

Practical Ethics, in Book III, has eleven chapters, treating succes-

sively Virtues and Vices in General; the Education of the Will and the Discipline of the Feelings, or Self-Control; Bodily Life; Economic Life; Spiritual Life and Culture; Honor and the Love of Honor; Suicide; Compassion and Benevolence; Justice; Love of Neighbor, and Veracity. The translator has omitted his discussion of the Duel from the sixth chapter. The work has been criticised for giving a disproportionate attention to these practical questions, but Paulsen defends and justifies himself for doing so. Nevertheless the topics discussed are far from exhaustive, allowing that he should confine himself to the most important. Personal duties owing to one's self, are fairly full in their treatment; but social are quite meager, and theistic are entirely neglected.

Book IV, sociological and political, is not included in this volume.

The treatise is well written to interest the general reader. The author says that it was not prepared for philosophers, but for the intelligent public. The translation is the work of a master, and confirms the reputation made by Prof. Thilly's earlier success in giving English readers valuable German discussions.

Among the important views held and taught by Prof. Paulsen are these: that Ethics is a practical rather than theoretical, empirical rather than rationalistic science; that the will is superior to the intellect and has an independent freedom; that ethical laws are natural as the physical are; that perfection is the highest good; that there is no universal concrete morality; that the Christian conception of life is not natural but supernatural; that Christianity condemns the virtues and goods of this world; that the gospels are not historical but poetical; that pessimism is not true; that evil has no existence but as the foil for good; that duty and inclination are normally the same; that conscience is the consciousness of customs; that pure egoism and pure altruism are both false; that miracles are incredible; that religion helps but is not necessary to morality; and that the lie of necessity is proper.

His system he calls Teleologic Energism. By Teleologic he means that the right is not an original, simple element of moral action intuitively known; but depends upon the end in view, the consequences of the action; that is, he is a utilitarian empiricist. By Energism he means that he is not a hedonist, does not believe that virtue is pleasure but is action.

A more interesting, and at the same time more harmful book is not likely to come into our college halls to poison the minds of our young people.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

Lexington, Va.

THE CONVERSION OF THE MAORIS. *By Rev. Donald McDougall, B. D.* pp. 216, price \$1.25, net. Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia, Pa.

One of the most thrilling romances of missions is found in the work of the Gospel among the heathen Maories.

The picture of these cannibals is one of the most awful in missionary

annals, and the heart grows sick, as one reads of their revolting deeds, eating flesh and revelling in blood.

The author draws the picture from life, the real being sufficiently awful, without aid from coloring, and then he describes the steady conflict between light and darkness, Christ and Belial, the struggles of the Christian, not only with the enemies without, but also with friends within, the petty denominational differences, small enough at best, but in the mission field contemptible. When one gazes upon the picture he paints of this man-eating savage and then compares it with the Maoris of to-day, he begins to realize that the gospel is indeed turning the world upside down. Every pastor who can afford it, ought to collect a missionary library. This is a book that ought to be there. J. R. BRIDGES.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AND SOCIAL PROGRESS. *By Rev. James S. Dennis, D. D.* Volume II. Fleming H. Revell Company, Chicago. pp. 486, price \$2.50.

Every student of the great Missionary movement of the present century will greet with pleasure another volume of this gifted author.

The mechanical work reflects credit upon the publishing house of the Revell Company. The paper is good and the type is clear, and the illustrations are abundant and fine. Without making any invidious comparisons we may say that no work on Missions heretofore published can compare with this in scope and thoroughness of treatment. Some years ago an Episcopal brother remarked to the writer, when he heard that he had monthly lectures on Missions, that he wondered where he found his material.

If he could only see this volume, and glance over the wealth of material, he would now wonder when a man would stop, when he had once begun.

The very title of the book shows a new idea on the subject of Missions. Heretofore the success of Missions has been measured by the number of converts and the general change in the country; but now the whole social life with its many ramifications is held up to view, and the influence of Missions upon it is brought forward as a witness in favor of this great work. The world is filled with social reforms. In Germany and even in Chicago, they meet and preach their doctrines, but beyond talk they never go.

Here we have the wonderful exploits of a few thousand missionaries and a few hundred medical missionaries, insignificant at best, yet they have done a work before which we stand in amazement. Perhaps we could do no better than to give in as short space as possible the plan of the book. Passing by the usual idea of Missions, he shows that there has been a steady advance according to a well defined plan whereby the Church of God in foreign lands has left its impress upon the heathen world along the line of social life.

Missionaries may have done nothing, as is charged, yet under their

influence there has arisen a new type of individual character in these lands, as evidenced by the changed lives.

Then the old ideas have been overthrown, and a new public opinion has been created, by means of which there has been a reversal in the usual idea of the education of the masses.

Again if we measure the value of Missions by its literary contributions to the intellectual life of the non Christian races, it becomes more imposing in our eyes—for there is scarcely a known branch of learning that has not been either inaugurated or stimulated among these people by the work and presence of the Missionary. Another test of the far reaching influence of Missions is seen in the awakening among men of the philanthropic spirit. When we compare the princely sums contributed by the Christian world to-day with the thirteen pounds, two shillings and sixpence the twelve Baptist Missionaries in the Widow Wallis' house at Kettering contributed to the evangelization of the world, we catch some glimpse of the all pervading influence of Missions, but what shall we say when this mysterious power even affects the newly converted heathen themselves, and out of their poverty they give?

Even the national life of these people is affected also, and through the work of the Missionary there are enkindled new national aspirations, and a higher conception of government. Thus the writer follows the work of the Missionary in its influences along every line of social life, and in support of his views he accumulates data that will be of inestimable value to every student of Missions. There are some books that are indispensable. This is one that no lover of Missionary work can do without. J. R. B.

THE SHRINE OF LOVE AND OTHER POEMS. *By Lucien V. Rule.*
Printed Under the Direction of Herbert S. Stone & Company.
Chicago and New York. MDCCCXCVIII.

This little volume is noticed because of its being mainly a collection of Sonnets by a Southern writer. There are one hundred and sixty of them under the several titles of *The Shrine of Love*, *The Greek Crisis*, *The Cause of Cuba*, *America's Answer*, *On Reported French Enmity to America*, and *Why Should She Now Be Spared*. Mr. Rule is a Kentuckian.

He is a successful maker of verse; the rhythm, meter, and rime being almost universally correct. There is a strange irregularity in one of the Sonnets of the *Shrine of Love*, where he has, probably unconsciously, inserted an extra line in the octave. He does not always observe in the octave the rime order *abba abba*, but frequently changes it to *abba acca*.

There are two themes for his muse, Love and Liberty, upon both of which he writes passionately. His Love Sonnets are pure, without being Platonic, or spiritual. They are redolent of a fondness for nature as she shows herself to the senses. They are faulty in their egotism and vindictiveness.

In *America's Answer*, addressed to Alfred Austin, he indelicately refers to our war with England. He excites but does not win us.

Lexington, Va.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

SONNETS OF JOSE MARIA DE HEREDIA. Done into English *By Edward Robeson Taylor*. San Francisco: William Doxey, at the Sign of the Lark. MDCCCXCVIII.

Gosse has declared de Heredia to be "a great poetic artist, and probably the most remarkable now alive in Europe." These Sonnets are from the principal part of *Les Trophies*, which secured for him membership among the immortal of the Academy. De Heredia is a Cuban by birth, of mixed French and Spanish blood.

The translator, Dr. E. R. Taylor, is a native of Tennessee, who spent his early life in Missouri, but has lived now for many years in San Francisco. He was first a physician and attained distinction in that profession, but turned from it in middle life to the law, which has brought him fame and fortune. He is now Dean of the Hastings College of Law.

The Sonnets, one hundred and eighteen in number, are divided into five groups: Greece and Sicily, Rome and the Barbarians, The Middle Age and the Renaissance, The Orient and the Tropics, and Nature and Dream. Mr. Gosse has well expressed the poet's design to be "a rapid descent of the ages, with here and there a momentary revelation of some highly suggestive and entertaining scene, or incident, or personage." The Sonnets together form a gallery of paintings intended to represent what is most interesting in myth and man and nature. His conception and that of Col. Wm. Preston Johnston are alike, though they differ widely in the selections they have each made. There is a minimum of the real in de Heredia, his eyes see the imaginary, the mythical, the ideal. The heroes and the sages of the race are by him unnoticed as subjects for his Sonnets.

G. H. Lewes "protests against the adequacy of all translation of poetry. In its happiest efforts, translation is but approximation." This difficulty is at its maximum when the effort is to reproduce in a different language not only the idea but the form also of the original. Dr. Taylor's task was of this kind. The sonnet itself is exacting as to its forms: there must be just fourteen lines, with ten syllables in a line. and with rimes that for the octave must obey narrow rules. Moreover, the French has the Alexandrian as its sonnet measure, giving to each line two syllables more than the English pentameter. It is considered a more condensed language than ours. Dr. Taylor undertook to reproduce de Heredia's rimes in the same order, and to compress the French sonnet of one hundred and sixty-eight syllables into the one hundred and forty of the English.

His success is attested by the fact that his work passed to a second edition in a year, and has received the commendation of such competent judges as Prof. Gosse, *The Manchester* (England) *Guardian* and *The Nation*. The English paper says: "Wonderfully marvelous, his work must be confessed to be. * * * The work is a landmark in the production of such translations, being done during the life of the original

poet. That it has been done quite successfully we cannot say. But it is a work that will take rank with the best of its kind."

All three of these volumes of *Southern Sonnets*, Col. Johnston's, Mr. Rules, and Dr. Taylor's, have one thing in common, it is the use of the Sonnet as a minor section of a larger poem. This is an innovation. It has been hitherto used as a separate and complete poem; as such it has been styled. "A little picture painted well." To be degraded from this royal position to that of a plebeian stanza is indeed a grievous fall. Is the sonnet suited for such a purpose? We think not, except within narrow limits. A pair of sonnets may be suitable companions; we can conceive of a cluster that might properly embrace as many as a dozen. But when we are called upon to read over a hundred on the same subject, we protest that it is too much of a good thing. Think of a hundred and eighteen little pictures side by side, all painted well, if you please; but every one of exactly the same size, with all the parts similarly arranged, and all intended to portray different phases of the same thing!

This weariness in number is not peculiar to the sonnet, it is true of all the stanzaed verse. The *Fairie Queen* is intolerably tiresome, because of this practically endless repetition of the same mechanical conditions. Take any of the new French forms, the model, modean, triolet, and string out scores of them on the same topic, and every one would be wearied. No, the stanza should be confined to short poems. The sonnet should be a poem of itself. For continuous poems, let us use the paragraph, as in prose.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

Lexington, Va.

SOUTHERN SONNETS—SEEKERS AFTER GOD. Sonnets by *Wm. Preston Johnston*. Louisville, Ky.: John P. Morton & Company. 1898.

The author of these verses has lately died in the home of his son-in-law, Prof. H. St. Geo. Tucker, at Lexington, Va. It was interesting that he breathed his last in the room where his wife had died, the guest of Judge Lea, and in the bed on which he was born. His last and most distinguished service was as the genial and cultured President of Tulane University at New Orleans.

As verse these sonnets are marked by the freedom and variety of their rhythm and rime and meter. Most of them are in the prescribed and practically universal iambic pentameter; a few, however, have the anapestic tetrameter as their metrical scheme; and in one it seems hard to decide whether the movement is anapestic or dactylic.

The utmost liberty is used in the rimes. There is hardly a sonnet which has the conventional rime arrangement for the octave, abbaabba. What is perhaps a more daring innovation is that occasionally the rimes of the octave are carried on into the septette. There is one sonnet with only three rimes in its fourteen lines. There are some feminine rimes. Like most verse-makers he likes to close the sonnet with a ruined couplet.

Part II is not in sonnet form, but in continuous anapestic tetrameter,

without rime. This is also exceptional, as most blank verse is iambic pentameter.

The rhythm is generally smooth and pleasant, but not always perfect.

The idea underlying this collection of sonnets is to present distinguished representatives of different beliefs who have seriously and more or less successfully sought to know and worship God. It is thus an assemblage of portraits, as it were, of the heroes of religious belief.

The book is divided into two parts, of which the first is composed of fifty sonnets, preceded by one of dedication to the poet's sister. They are arranged under five heads. The first three constitute the Prologue; the next five give us the Windows of Heaven, Reason, Obedience, Faith, the Law, and Inspiration. Then follow ten, which present the heathen sages and heroes as "At the Barriers." The succeeding eleven are devoted to the Disciples of the Lord, who are distinguished as having "The Eyes Unsealed." The final collection of twenty-one sonnets sing the virtues of the "Pilgrims of the Cross."

The broad-mindedness of Col. Johnston is shown in placing not only Socrates and Seneca but also Cicero and Cæsar among the Seekers After God at the Barriers, and is perhaps even more plainly revealed in his reckoning Jas. Martineau among the Pilgrims of the Cross.

Part II is not in sonnets but in two sections of continuous verse. He calls it, "The Absolute, The Cry of Faith." It is doubtless meant as the confession of his own creed. It is reverential and devout, and recognizes "The Saviour who ransoms and rescues the vanquished." The volume from first to last breathes a pure, pious, generous, hopeful spirit, and contains gems of thought happily expressed.

Lexington, Va.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

MONTAIGUE'S EDUCATION OF CHILDREN. Selected, Translated and Annotated. *By L. E. Rector.*

This is one of the volumes of the International Educational Series, edited by the United States Commissioner of Education, W. T. Harris, and published by D. Appleton & Co., New York. To many Montaigne in his educational views is less known than either Pestalozzi or Froebel, yet in many respects he is original in his views, and was the forerunner of many of the methods of the present day. The key note of his whole system was that emphasis should be placed upon fitness for practical life and to teach the pupil to use his own judgment.

Some of us can remember when the school room was one of the most unattractive of all places, yet years before Montaigne had taught that children should find their duty where they found their pleasure.

He believed that children should be trained to sift all things, and to take nothing on trust; that they should be taught to argue, yet to argue fairly; and above all things to acknowledge frankly their errors.

Those interested in the education of the young, both parents and teachers will find in this book much to instruct.

TROOPER 3,809. A Private Soldier of the Third Republic. *By Lionel Declé.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Price, \$1.25.

Ordinarily this book would not attract attention except among students of military affairs, but coming out just at a time when the eyes of the world were upon the French Army, it has excited interest such as few books have done.

According to the French law every man is liable to military service for 25 years of his life.

In times of peace it is divided as follows: Three years of active service, ten years in the reserve of the standing army, six years in the territorial army, and six years in the territorial reserves.

In times of peace young men who have obtained the degree of B. A. or B. S. in government Universities, and who pay to the government £60 can serve for one year.

These men are called *Volontaires*, and such M. Declé became. His book is not one of abuse, but a calm recital of his own experience, showing the awful results of a vicious system, and thus incidentally explaining the actions of the army in the Dreyfus case.

We venture to say that on no plantation, under the care of the most brutal overseer, were slaves treated as the French soldier is, according to this book.

We furthermore venture the prediction that no army can fight when it is composed of men trained under such system. During the American-Spanish war foreigners who studied the movements of our army were particularly impressed with the ability shown by our soldiers in taking the initiative. The French soldier is a machine, and a brutal, unprincipled one at that, and the brutality runs from the lowest to the highest rank.

The recent exhibition of the French Army so shocking to the world is the natural fruit of the system described in this book.

THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIOLOGY. An Analysis of the Phenomena of Association and of Social Organization. *By Franklin Henry Giddings, M. A.* Professor of Sociology in Columbia University in the City of New York. 1754-1894. Columbia University Press. New York. The Macmillan Company. London. Macmillan & Co., L't'd. 1896. All rights reserved.

The author says that the time has not come for an exhaustive treatise on Sociology; nevertheless he gives us a comprehensive, compact discussion of 422 octavo pages, followed by a bibliography of 20 pages. It is introduced by an excellent table of contents and concluded with a no less excellent index. Mechanically, literarily and scientifically, it is creditable to American progress. The discussion is divided into four books. The first treats The Elements of Social Theory in four chapters: The Sociological Idea; The Province of Sociology; The Methods of Sociology; and The Problems of Sociology. The doctrine is advanced "that Sociology is a psychological science, and that the description of

society in biological terms is a mistake." The essential of Sociology is not impression nor is it imitation, as taught by Durkheim and Tarde, but is objectively the equilibration of energy, and subjectively the consciousness of kind.

In the second chapter, he discusses the relation of Sociology to the sciences; especially to psychology and the special social sciences. He lets us know that he believes psychology to be the science of the association of ideas, as Sociology is of the association of minds. He makes a classification of the sciences into abstract and concrete. The abstract are concerned with relations and properties, and only incidentally with aggregates, their names all ending in—*ico*. They are mathematics, physics, economics, ethics and politics. The concrete deal chiefly with aggregates, and their names end in—*y*. They are chemistry, astronomy, geology, biology, psychology, and Sociology.

The methods of Sociology are both inductive and deductive; including inductive guessing, deducing conclusions and verification by wide observation.

The primary problems of Sociology are descriptive, and to these he devotes his second book; and historical, presented in the third book. The secondary are problems of social process, law and cause, to which the fourth book is given.

Book II is headed *The Elements and Structure of Society*, and treats in successive chapters the Social Population, the Social Mind, the Social Composition, and the Social Constitution. This book is an abstract discussion of the forces, mainly psychic, which bring men together, and of the concrete forms which their association assumes. He is disappointingly brief in his treatment of the social organizations; there are only four pages on the State, and fourteen on all the voluntary societies, political, juristic, economic and cultural; with somewhat more than a page on the church, and a brief paragraph on the school.

Book III is *Historical*, and presents the author's conceptions of the Evolution of Society. He is, of course, an evolutionist, but believes that there have been two parallel processes, the physical and the psychical. He emphasizes the psychic, though he takes care to disclaim any intention of assuming philosophic dualism, and strangely, for an associationist, intimates a leaning towards idealism. This process of Social Evolution has been four-fold: Zoogenic Association, Anthropogenic, Ethnogenic and Demogenic. He asserts that animal and human society were continuous; that there is no evidence of a single pair as the progenitors of the human race as a whole or of its varieties; that the patriarchal theory of man's primitive social state has thoroughly broken down; and that no existing society among the most degraded races is as low as was man's primeval condition. He holds that speech differentiates man from the brute. Zoogenic Association presents man's social state as an animal; Anthropogenic gives us his generic social state as man; the Ethnogenic treats of the grouping into families, hordes, clans and tribes; the Demogenic presents his most advanced state, and discusses his pro-

gress in civilization. This progress has been in three stages: Military—Religious, Liberal—Legal, and Economic—Ethical.

He believes in the Malthusian law, to which he gives the interpretation that man's ability and tendency to multiply is greater than his ability to secure for himself not a bare subsistence but the increased comforts of a growing civilization. The costs of progress are degeneration, suicide, insanity, vagabondage, and vice.

Book IV is abstract, like the second, and presents Social Process, Law, and Cause. The discussion is in four chapters: The Physical Social process; the Psychical Social process; Social Law and Cause; and the Nature and End of Society. It may be accidental, but it is noticeable, the author has four books and four chapters in each book. It is interesting to observe how strong minds are sometimes dominated by trivial considerations. Kaut's double series of four classes of categories, with three in each class, and Hegel's fascination for threes are noted examples. Giddings was probably born at the fourth hour of the fourth day of the fourth month of the fourth year of the fourth decade of the century.

The last book does not seem to add much to the general treatment, but is chiefly a restatement of what is found on the earlier pages. The final idea is that society is an organization for the development of humanity.

The entire volume impresses one with the fact that the author is both a student and a thinker, who expresses himself with clearness and force. The Christian theist lays it down with admiration for the writer's intellectuality and sorrow that he seems like Laplace to have no need for the hypothesis of a God.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

Lexington, Va.

JESUS CHRIST DURING HIS MINISTRY. *By Edmond Stapfer.* Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. XXXIV., 265.

This is the second volume of the work entitled: *Jesus Christ: His Person—His Authority—His Work*, by Dr. Edmond Stapfer, Professor in the Faculty of Protestant Theology at Paris. The volume which preceded this one was: *Jesus Christ Before His Ministry*, and the one which follows is: *The Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ*.

It represents the rationalistic view of Jesus. The author thinks that the Gospels must be reconstructed by the critic, whose work is to eliminate suspicious traditions and doctrinal tendencies, and to determine the oldest and most authentic account, when the Gospels differ. He accepts the fourth Gospel as Johannine, and of great historic value, but says that it "abounds in theological deductions which can be nothing other than the evangelist's own reflections and not the authentic words of Jesus." He does not discuss the text or the interpretation of what he considers controverted passages. He makes use of facts that he considers certain and sayings of Jesus that he considers perfectly authentic, with the purpose of drawing from them what took place in the soul of Jesus. He does not seek to set forth a history of the ministry of Jesus.

but Jesus himself during his ministry, especially the history of his thought and development of his soul. As he leaves out of consideration all events and sayings that have been controverted or considered by him for any reason as not authentic, very much is left out which, if admitted, would modify very greatly his conclusions. He thus arrives at conclusions very different from those warranted by the complete evangelical narrative as it has been handed down to us. We have, then, in this volume, not a representation of Jesus as he appeared to the Apostles, but a history of the evolution of his thought and development of his soul as imagined by Professor Stapfer. He says in his preface: "I judge it to be needless to repeat what the Gospels say: I shall particularly seek for what they have not said, but in this search I take as point of departure certain data given by the Gospels themselves." We must keep this in mind as we read, for the author sets forth his conjectures as if they were facts, and we must remember that they are conjectures from data so reconstructed and modified as to make them no more valuable than fiction.

He imagines Jesus to be simply a man of his time, whose ideas were constantly being modified by circumstances, and who believed and taught one thing during the early part of His ministry and another and quite different thing during the latter part of his ministry. "His thought was on the march, and every day some new horizon would open before him, and he would better understand the Father's will," p. 6. "An itinerant Essene in his manners, a liberal Pharisee in his ideas—such Jesus appears to us all through this first period of his activity. * * * He firmly hoped to be recognized and hailed as Messiah by the people; and, above all, by their leaders, the Pharisees," p. 11. "He was certain of only one thing—final success. He would have his day of glory, and he expected it on earth, in a future which could not be very far distant," p. 65. "There were many years before him, as he hoped. We know that it was not to be so—that, contrary to his expectation, he was not to succeed," p. 64. "There was never any thought in these early teachings of a possible violent death in the future, by which Jesus purposed to accomplish salvation. He simply preached a new relation between God and man. The way of salvation which he opened and offered was the Father's forgiveness. And the Father forgives those who forgive," p. 56.

Luther lost all his illusions at Rome. In the same way Jesus learned much from his visits to Jerusalem. His rupture with the temple preceded his rupture with the Pharisees. Up to this time he had been a Jewish reformer, henceforth he was to be the destroyer of Judaism. The latter, under its sacerdotal form, inspired in him a repugnance with which its Pharisaic form was shortly also to inspire him. It was necessary that the sacrifices should be abolished," p. 140 f.

"Up to this time, Jesus had remained in the great current of the best Pharisaic ideas' * * * believing himself to be faithful to the true spirit of the religion of his people. * * * From this time he perceived that the spirit which animated him and the reform which he de-

sired were not in the least conformable to the hopes of his people, and especially of those who led them, the Pharisees," p. 145 f.

"He not only separated himself from the Judaism of his time, but from the ancient law, the Torah itself," p. 150. Seeing the opposition against him Jesus surmised the result—failure, defeat, and death. "First, the possibility, then the extreme probability, and finally the certainty of a violent and approaching death—such was the new element which was about to enter into his previsions of the future. * * * He began to conceive of a Messiah who might be persecuted and put to death, and, consequently, who might disappear before the advent of the kingdom," p. 157. "At the same time Jesus became unsectarian. Before this he had been a Jewish reformer; now his ideal became that of universality," pp. 174-183.

Having such an opinion of Jesus, believing that he was simply a man of his time, and that his ideas and teachings changed with circumstances, of course, our author cannot value the teachings as believers have been accustomed to do. He looks upon Jesus as a Doctor of the Law (in his early ministry) sometimes agreeing with Shammai, oftener agreeing with Hillel, and sometimes reproducing the Old Testament teachings which Prof. Stapfer says, "it must not be forgotten, he read through the medium of the theology of his time," p. 45. He holds that the religious beliefs of Jesus contained imperishable and eternal verities but included, also, outworn elements which were doomed to disappear," p. 249.

"At the present time" he says, "among Christians, no one believes precisely like Jesus. Jesus adopted many of the opinions of his time, and these opinions are not always ours," p. 245. "Jesus, then, was a man of his time, and he shared the beliefs of his time concerning angels, demons, the authenticity of the law," p. 251. He finds that the beliefs of Jesus about God, sin, and holiness contain outworn elements, that is, the beliefs of Jesus do not agree with the teachings of modern thought on these subjects, and so must be placed among antiquated opinions. Notwithstanding all this, our author claims to believe in Jesus, but he says that when Jesus asks men to believe in him, he does not mean that they are to believe in what he thinks about himself," p. 257. "Each Christian who has faith appropriates the Christ to himself, and should remain faithful to him, however much his dogmatic conceptions may become modified. Hence it results that faith in Jesus Christ may live, develop, and triumph, whatever may be the believer's dogmatic notions," p. 255. All of which amounts to this, that, in the opinion of our author, Jesus is not capable of revealing either himself or the Father to us, but we must form our own opinions in spite of what Jesus thought and taught. It is evident that the Christ of the rationalists is not the Christ of the apostles—not the Christ as the apostles saw him, preached him, and wrote him in gospels, in epistles, in apocalypse—not the Christ who has satisfied the deepest longings of believers in all ages. If we accepted their Christ, we should have no sacrifice for sin, no trustworthy guide into the truth, no Saviour worthy the name. If one wishes to know the truth, he must accept the Christ of the Apostles, the real Christ.

All the imaginations of the rationalists are demolished by the teachings of the Apostle John, and hence they are in mortal antagonism to him. John himself has given us a test by which we can very easily detect false teachers. "We are of God," he says, (I John iv: 6), "he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of the truth, and the spirit of error." So we know when to place those who do not accept the teachings of the apostles, and especially the teachings of John's gospel.

The book before us represents a school of thought which seems to be growing, and those who wish to know how that school treats Christ may find out by reading this work of Prof. Stapfer.

J. W. LAFFERTY.

THE LEGIONARIES. By *Henry Scott Clark*. Pp. 385. Price \$1.50. The Bowen-Merrill Co., Indianapolis.

These are the days of many novels, some poor and some very good, and a man who attempts to read them all, will do little else.

The best one can do is to read a few, and then learn from his friends and the reviewers about the others.

Occasionally, however, one appears that no one ought to fail to read, and such is the novel whose name is given at the head of this article.

It is a novel that will make more than a passing impression for several reasons. In the first place it is one of the best novels bearing upon our Civil War that has appeared, and then in addition to that fact, it shows decided literary merit. The author is unknown, but he is said to be a prominent judge of Indiana, which makes the book all the more remarkable, for though written by a Western man, it is an impartial story of the Southern side of the great struggle in its connection with Morgan's raid. A young Virginian moves with his father to southern Indiana just before the Civil War, and receives his education in France at one of the military schools. He returns at the beginning of the war, and though his mother refuses to leave his father's grave, who has died while he is absent, he enters the Confederate army and becomes one of Morgan's men.

He follows him on his wonderful raid, but being captured he drops from the command and returns on a parole to his home. The book throws light on what is known as the "Copperhead Movement," explaining their motives, and relieving them from the charge of treason to the government. It also does full justice to Morgan, and must compel even his enemies to admire his boundless resources, his cheerful and undaunted courage, and the skill with which he led three thousand men over 500 miles through a hostile country, followed by generals and soldiers and opposed at every step by the aroused Home Guards, and only surrendering when the three thousand had dwindled to three hundred.

The veterans of that war are passing away, but they owe it to their children to give them books that will teach them that the cause for which the South fought was a just one, and that the world's history has never

yet produced a superior to the "man in gray," whether he trudged along the dusty roads of Virginia's great Valley, following Jackson, or rode gaily with plume and sabre following John Morgan to an unsung death.

Gather up such books as these, and then in coming years the South will be justified of her children. J. R. B.

MY LIFE AND TIMES. 1810-1899. *John B. Adger, D. D.* Presbyterian Committee of Publication. P. 681. Price, \$3.00.

Looked upon merely as a product of the bookmaker's art, this volume reflects great credit upon our Committee, for the binding is heavy and solid; the type is clear; and the paper, while heavy and white, is free from that peculiar glaze that plays havoc with weak eyes.

It is, however, not so much of the book that we are speaking, as of the man portrayed in the book, a man who lived for eighty-nine years, and whose long life was as beautiful as a summer's day, and as pure as a mountain stream. Some may think that the writer is not the man to review such a book, yet a moment's thought ought to show that there is a peculiar fitness in it. If an old acquaintance were to undertake it, he might be accused of partiality, and thus his opinion would be impugned; but when a stranger to the man, the institution where he labored, and the very Synod where he spent his life, is moved to say that in all his reading he has never seen a pen-picture of a more beautiful life, these very facts add to the strength of his testimony. Sidney Smith claimed that he always reviewed a book first and read it afterward lest his judgment should be biased. In like manner the writer brings to the task no personal acquaintance whatever. To him this life is a sealed book, which he took up with no particular interest, but which grew on him rapidly, till he found himself reading into the small hours of the night, forgetful of time, and only thinking of the sincere and honest old gentleman of the Old School, whose life spanned nearly a century, and witnessed ecclesiastical controversies, wars and the founding a Church, that now covers the South, and has a large representation in the foreign field.

The ancestry of Dr. J. B. Adger was Irish, and as he draws the character of his father, we cease to wonder at the character of the son.

His earliest recollections begin with the war of 1812, or rather with its close, and taking that as a starting point, in a most delightfully natural way, he weaves together the gossip of his time and the experience of school boy days, till one almost imagines he is hearing some old man bringing up the past, with its old-time school-masters and its old-time customs. After a thorough training in the Charleston schools, he went North to school, and afterward to Union College, which was then presided over by Dr. Nott.

While at college he was converted, and after leaving school he decided to prepare himself for the ministry. To that end he entered Princeton Seminary, where he was brought under the renewed influences of the Spirit. If he had received this blessing fifty or sixty years later,

among the latter day saints, he might have been tempted to think he had received "the Second Blessing," but he merely looked upon it as it really was, as a renewed manifestation of the same Spirit that first brought him out of darkness into light.

His pen pictures of the Princeton men are very graphic. There were only three then, Dr. Alexander, Dr. Miller and Dr. Charles Hodge.

What a distinctively college flavor that joke has in which he reports Dr. Alexander excusing himself for not taking exercise by saying, "Bodily exercise profiteth little."

After leaving the Seminary he went to Armenia as a missionary, where he remained about thirteen years, doing excellent work as a translator during that time.

As the slavery agitation and the extreme views of the Abolitionists began to effect the receipts of the Missionary Board, they gave the slave-holding missionaries to understand that their presence might endanger the contributions, so Dr. Adger concluded to devote himself to work among the slaves in his own land.

What seems to us the right and Christian thing to do, met at first with great opposition in Charleston, owing to the fears of a negro insurrection and their former experiences of an attempted one, that it was hatched in a negro church.

The Episcopal Church began a similar movement at the same time, but they met with little opposition.

Before Dr. Adger could carry out his scheme, a mob threatened the building where it was proposed to hold services, and a public meeting was held where its feasibility was discussed. He carried his point finally, and for five years he gave his splendid abilities to the work, and when he laid it down Dr. Girardeau took it up.

His war reminiscences are very interesting, though in places sad, and if any worshipper of the "Boys in Blue" does not wish his idols to be shattered, he would do well to skip this portion of the book. In a few pages, from his own personal observation, he gives descriptions of the pension drawers that place them among "Kirk's lambs." To the future historian and those who would know through what struggles our Church has passed, the chapters on "The Controversies" will be of great interest.

He devotes much space to the Evolution Controversy, and upholds Dr. Woodrow in his position.

Beginning the book as a stranger, we put it down with a feeling of regret that we did not know him in the flesh.

When we think of Dabney, Witherspoon, Plumer, Hoge, Adger, Girardeau, and that host of mighty dead, we hear ringing in our ears the words of the old prophet, "Your fathers, where are they? and the prophets, do they live forever?"

J. R. B.

UNION

Theological Seminary,

RICHMOND VIRGINIA.

SESSION OPENS LAST WEDNESDAY IN SEPTEMBER.

SESSION CLOSES LAST WEDNESDAY IN MAY.

FACULTY.

THE REV. WALTER W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D.,
Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature.

THE REV. CHARLES C. HERSMAN, D. D., LL. D.,
Prof. of Biblical Literature and the Interpretation of the Testament.

THE REV. THOMAS C. JOHNSON, D. D., LL. D.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Polity.

THE REV. THOMAS R. ENGLISH, D. D.,
Professor of the English Bible and Pastoral Theology.

THE REV. GIVENS B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology.

For catalogue, or other information as to course of study, rooms, etc.,
apply to—

Dr. ENGLISH,
Clerk of Faculty and Intendant,
Richmond, Va.



