This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

The Baptist quarterly review

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

BAPTIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOLUME XI.

1889.

EDITED BY

ROBERT S. MACARTHUR AND HENRY C. VEDDER.

NEW YORK:
THE BAPTIST REVIEW ASSOCIATION,
41 PARK ROW.

LONDON, TRÜBNER & CO.

Digitized by Google

COPYRIGHT, 1889, BY THE BAPTIST REVIEW ASSOCIATION.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

JANUARY.

PAGE

I.—THE CHRISTIAN CONSCIOUSNESS. By the Rev. George E. Horr, Jr. 1

II.—THE PREACHER AS PASTOR. By the Rev. J. H. Mason 17

III.—TENNYSON'S ART AND GENIUS. By Eugene Parsons..... 29

IV.—THE PEASANTS' WAR. By Professor Albert H. Newman 48

V.—SPIRIT-PERCEPTION—An Essay in Christian Psychology. By the Rev. Henry E. Robins, D.D. 66

VI.—EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.—Ordination Councils, p. 83; Church Attendance, p. 86; Necessary Reform in Political Methods, p. 90 83

VII.—HOMILETIC DEPARTMENT.—Keeping Near the Flock, by the Rev. C. R. Henderson, p. 96; Some Modern Preachers on the "Unpardonable Sin," by the Rev. J. C. Hiden, D.D., p. 99; Some Hints upon the Prayer Meeting, by the Rev. Frank Rogers Morse, D.D., p. 101; The Problem of Child Culture, by the Rev. George Whitman, p. 104; Comparative Efficiency of Large and Small Churches, by Professor A. S. Coats, p. 106; Preparation for the Sermon, p. 107; My Experiences with Prayer Meetings, by the Rev. A. S. Hobart, D.D..... 96

VIII.—REVIEW OF CURRENT LITERATURE.—By the Editors, with the co-operation of Rev. Drs. O. S. Stearns, W. N. Clarke, E. Dodge, G. W. Samson, Professor Ira M. Price, and the Rev. Frank S. Dobbins;—Cave's Inspiration of the Old Testament, Inductively considered, p. 112; Delitzsch's Prolegomena eines neuen Hebräisch-Aramäischen Wörterbuchs zum Alten Testament, p. 113; Bartlett's Letter and Spirit, p. 115; Bennett's Christian Archæology, p. 116; Schaff's History of the Christian Church, Vol. VI., p. 122; Strong's Philosophy and Religion, p. 127; Cook's Credentials of Science the Warrant of Faith, p. 128; Johnston's Report of the Centenary Conference on the Protestant Missions of the World, p. 132; Taylor's Leaves from an Egyptian Note-Book, p. 134..... 112

Digitized by Google

APRIL.

PAGE

I.—THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS IN THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By the Rev. Henry S. Burrage, D.D..... 135

II.—A STUDY OF THE AMERICAN NATION. By the Rev. Philip S. Moxom..... 153

III.—AN OUTLINE OF THE HISTORY OF PSALMODY. By David Chandler Gilmore..... 166

IV.—THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND; ITS PRESENT CONDITION AND PHASES OF ITS RECENT HISTORY. By Professor Benjamin O. True, D.D..... 178

V.—THEOLOGY AND SCIENCE. By President G. D. B. Pepper, D. D. 207

VI.—EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.—A New Article of Faith, p. 215; The Law of Marriage and Divorce, p. 218; A Christian Socialism, p. 223; Two Great Teachers, p. 226..... 215

VII.—HOMILETIC DEPARTMENT.—Christ Crucified, by the Rev. Kerr B. Tupper, D.D., p. 231; The Church, the Complement of Christ; An Exegesis of the Johns, by the Rev. J. H. Hughes, p. 237; The Natural History of Sin, by the Rev. Malcom MacGregor, p. 242..... 231

VIII.—REVIEW OF CURRENT LITERATURE.—By the Editors, with the cooperation of Drs. Howard Osgood, W. N. Clarke, Ira N. Price, and Norman Fox;—Greene's Hebrew Grammar, p. 245; Kennedy's Introduction to Biblical Hebrew, p. 245; Harper's Elements of Hebrew Syntax, by an Inductive Method, p. 245; Tiele's Babylonisch-Assyrische Geschichte, p. 247: Horton's Inspiration and the Bible, p. 248; Manly's Bible Doctrine of Inspiration Explained and Vindicated, p. 250; Hovey's Biblical Eschatology, p. 253; Conway's Omitted Chapters of History, p. 255; Morris's Diary and Letters of Gouverneur Morris, p. 257: The Nun of Kenmare, an Autobiography, p. 259; Tallack's Penological and Preventive Principles, p. 261..... 245

JULY.

I.—THE ANABAPTISTS IN SWITZERLAND. By the Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D..... 293

II.—PAST ATTEMPTS AT CHURCH UNION, ESPECIALLY ON THE CONTINENT. By the Rev. W. W. Everts, Jr..... 277

Digitized by Google

PAGE.

III.—Our Ethical Theories—What are They? By the Rev. J. R. Kendrick, D.D..... 292

IV.—The Lord's Prayer. By the late Rev. C. W. Currier..... 315

V.—The Man of Sin. By Professor Wm. Arnold Stevens..... 328

VI.—Editorial Department.—Growth in the Ministry, p. 361; That Perennial "Bible Question," p. 364; Revision of the Standards, p. 368; Educational Notes, p. 372..... 361

VII.—Homiletic Department.—The Minister's Relation to the Character of his People, by Rev. A. C. Peck, p. 378; The Prayer Meeting, by Rev. A. C. Dixon, p. 380; The Prayer-Meeting in the Smaller Churches, by Rev. E. W Stone, p. 382; Why I Preach and Whom I Preach, by Rev. R. B. Montgomery, p. 385; The Ideal and the Actual in the Prayer-Meeting, by Rev. R. Kerr Eccles, M.D., p. 387..... 378

VIII.—Review of Current Literature.—By the Editors and Professor Ira M. Price, Ph.D.—Bäthgen's Beitrage zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte, p. 392; Lichtenburger's History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century, p. 393; That Unknown Country, p. 395; Burrage's Baptist Hymn Writers and Their Hymns, p. 397; Duffield's English Hymns: Their Authors and History, p. 397; Parker's Psalmody of the Church, p. 398..... 392

OCTOBER.

I.—The Present Drift in Eschatology. By the Rev. H. O. Rowlands, D.D..... 403

II.—Browning on Immortality. By James W. White..... 417

III.—The Triple Ballot Essential to Representative Government. By the Rev. Principal Walter Scott..... 434

IV.—The General Synod of the Moravian Church. By the Rev. W. H. Vogler..... 445

V.—Psychical Influences in Conversion. By the Rev. Richard Montague, D.D..... 457

VI.—Fulfilled Prophecy—A Standing Miracle. By the Rev. O. P. Eaches, D.D..... 468

Digitized by Google

PAGE.

VII.—EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.—False Influences from a Baptist Principle, p. 483; Ecclesiastical Councils, p. 489; The Episcopal General Convention, 491 483

VIII.—HOMILETIC DEPARTMENT.—Pastoral Hints, by the Rev. Charles A. Reese, p. 495; The Prayer Meeting—Another "Experience," by the Rev. Benj. L. Herr, p. 497; The Second Coming of Jesus Christ, by the Rev. Wm. Hurlin, p. 500; Reading of Scripture and Hymns, by the Rev. Irving F. Davis, p. 502; Interest in Church Affairs, by the Rev. J. C. Burkett, p. 504....495

IX.—REVIEW OF CURRENT LITERATURE.—Joyce's The Hittites, p. 507; Littledale's The Petrine Claims, p. 508; Ward's William George Ward and the Oxford Movement, p. 511; Bourrienne's Memoirs of Napoleon Bonaparte, p. 517; Lodge's George Washington, p. 517; Moses's The Federal Government of Switzerland, p. 525 507

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

BX
6201
B52
v.11

THE

BAPTIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XI. JANUARY, 1889. NO. 41.

I.

THE CHRISTIAN CONSCIOUSNESS.

THERE is an affinity between the spiritual nature of man and spiritual truth. When this truth has been consciously accepted by the human soul, the agreement thus formed becomes a fact of consciousness—an inner consciousness of the truth. This is "the Christian consciousness." This phrase, derived from Schliermacher and extensively employed by Neander, has become the watchword of the modern destructive and reconstructive schools of Christian theology which have not yet broken with a belief in a true inspiration of the Scriptures.

In addition to this individual experience of the truth, there is the consciousness of the whole body of believers in the world at any given time, a devout Zeit-Geist. And in addition to the individual and generic consciousness, there is that of the church in all lands and ages, "the historic consciousness." The statement is often made that the doctrine of the Christian consciousness is Protestant individualism again run mad. But it should always be remembered that those who make the most of this doctrine insist that the consciousness of the individual should be corrected by the spiritual deliverances of the age and of the whole church.

Digitized by Google

And yet, on the other hand, it is difficult to see how the effect of these limitations, which were designed to correct the doctrine and free it from the taint of personal bias, is not really to impart to it an element of vagueness. Each man may be competent to report truthfully the deliverances of his own consciousness. But how are we to get at the generic Christian consciousness of our day? It is easy to mistake an eddy for the main current. The *Andover Review* is certain that it is an exponent of the Christian consciousness of the time. The *Presbyterian Quarterly* is equally sure that it is in the Gulf Stream. The fact is that no man, or review, or theological party is competent to tell us what the generic consciousness of our time reports. We are constantly mistaking the opinion of a clique for the true spirit of the age. The individual consciousness of a weak man is apt to be the reflection of the opinion of a clique, while a strong and independent thinker will not hesitate to array himself against the world.

When we seek to modify the individual by the historic consciousness, we find that it is as difficult to determine what the whole church has reported as it is in the Roman church to decide what "tradition" may teach. Since the Reformation eminent English and German theologians have been teaching that the historic Christian consciousness bore some resemblance to Augustinianism, but Professor A. V. G. Allen tells us that this is not so. If *The Continuity of Christian Thought* gives us a fair example of the success we may expect in ascertaining the historic Christian consciousness, we may as well abandon the attempt. *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, has always been a good watch-dog to scare undesirable strangers from the premises; it has never been a lamp to the feet or a light to the path. In the last analysis the Christian consciousness is the individual consciousness. The formula for the personal equation has not been made out.

Digitized by Google

And yet, with these serious limitations, the Christian consciousness performs important functions, and it is one of the best signs of our times that the insistant emphasis which a school of thinkers are placing upon it is bringing into bolder relief some of the adaptations of Christianity to man's spiritual necessities.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss some of the functions of the Christian consciousness, and then to consider its relation to the Scriptures, to theology, to ethics and to preaching.

I. In the first place, the Christian consciousness undoubtedly gives us a most valuable verification of the truths of Christianity. It is one of the leading sources of the Christian's certainty of the truth. In his introduction to his *System of Christian Doctrine*, Dr. Dorner, with characteristic German thoroughness, considers the various steps by which the human mind comes to certainty in religion. He points out that neither historic certainty as to the Scriptures nor logical certainty coming from a conformity of their ideals to a previously accepted just philosophical system are sufficient to give the human soul the assurance of the truth in which it can rest. It is only when the soul exercises faith, and the agreement between man's spiritual nature and the divine truth is formed, that there arises in consciousness the highest type of certainty. "There is heard in the heart," says Dr. Dorner, "a challenge to cherish both the religious and ethical impulse and to seek their satisfaction. Where that satisfaction is earnestly sought, a longing after the self-revealing God is awakened; and if that longing breaks conscientiously through all temptations, it finds what it needs in Christianity by the instrumentality of a higher form of faith than the *fides historica*, by evangelical saving faith."*

It is impossible for us to have the same conviction of the

* Dorner, *System of Christian Theology*, Vol. I., p. 158.

Digitized by Google

truth of a statement of history or of the truth of a philosophical system, on the ground of human testimony or logic, that we have of a truth which has been personally appropriated by the soul, and which, by its own self-evidencing power to the soul, has vindicated itself as divine. Thus the Christian consciousness certifies to the believer the truth of that which he has accepted by faith. It countersigns and authenticates the truth of the Scriptures by the evidence of experience. The Biblical doctrine of "the witness of the Spirit" is only another statement of this fact. A distinctive feature of the Protestant doctrine in the Reformation times was the emphasis placed upon the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti.* Passages could be culled in abundance from sermons and dissertations of Luther in which he places the utmost value upon the Christian consciousness as verification of the truth. Indeed, Luther failed, as many fail to-day, to distinguish between a verification of the truth and a test of the truth. Sometimes he went clean over to the position which the rationalist and the mystic hold in common, and made his Christian consciousness a final, positive test of truth. He did precisely this in repudiating the canonicity of the Epistle of St. James. Among the Protestants the Moravians and the followers of Wesley have most nearly approached the more conservative positions of Luther. And the dead orthodoxy which curses the Lutheran church to-day in Germany springs from two opposite causes. One party has substantially repudiated the Christian consciousness as a valid or necessary verification of Christian truth, and has substituted the *fides historica* for evangelical faith. The other party, through an undue exaltation of the Christian consciousness, has developed a one-sided subjectivity which, following certain tendencies in Luther's thought, swings clear of anchorage to an objective revelation in the Word of God.

The danger that threatens the adherents of the so-called

Digitized by Google

"New Theology" in the United States is in the latter direction. Few writers of this school speak as yet of the Christian consciousness as a final positive test of truth as unflinchingly as their brethren in Germany do. But they speak of the Christian consciousness as "a source of knowledge." This is precisely what it cannot be, and precisely what Schliermacher did not hold that it was. Instead of considering it a distinct source of truth, he primarily regarded it as an evidence to the truth created in the soul by the cordial acceptance of the truth. To him it was a source of feeling. It gives assurance, not knowledge. Christian consciousness is no more the source or a source of truth than the evidence which satisfied Rhoda that it was Peter who stood without the gate was the source of Peter.

The Christian consciousness does not originate truth; it is an evidence of the moral sensibilities to truth. Its value as a source of religious knowledge is zero; its value as evidence is enormous. If Dr. George R. Crooks had distinguished between knowledge and its evidence, he would not have asserted that because the Methodist sings "What we have felt and seen with confidence we tell," *therefore* the Christian consciousness is a source of knowledge.*

II. Another function of the Christian consciousness is to act as a negative test of truth, prohibitively rather than normatively. Within a certain well-defined realm it declares decisively and authoritatively what is not true. This function of the gracious consciousness is, of course, in one aspect the logical counterpart of its power of verifying the truth. The certainty which it gives the soul that what it has received by faith is true implies an equal certainty that what contradicts that faith is false.

"Apart from the evidences," says Canon Liddon, "which lead a man up to faith, there are two tests of a true revelation which can never be dispensed with. It must not con-

* *Homiletic Review*, Vol. XII., p. 99.

Digitized by Google

tradict the highest, purest, clearest voice of natural conscience; it must not contradict itself. Our sense of primary moral truth is just as much God's voice as his revelation of truth without us. He cannot unsay what he has already told us within. Our conscience, of course, may be misinformed. We must look to that; it is a grave matter. But if, for instance, it were true that the doctrine of the atonement contradicted the true idea of justice—not of justice between one creature and another creature, but of a very different thing, justice as between the creature and the Creator—then that would be a reason for rejecting the doctrine. And if we are told that a series of teachers who, unless history is worthless, contradict each other upon important points, that certainly is a reason for distrusting the system which makes the assertion. But beyond this, in the purely spiritual and supernatural sphere, we are not at all able to say beforehand what a religion coming from God ought to do, ought to teach, ought to be like. The finite cannot measure the Infinite or his work."*

We may press precisely these considerations in regard to the Christian consciousness as a test of truth. The Christian consciousness is a test of truth as against the logical contradictory to its deliverances. The truth which the soul has verified in its own experience is the center of further certainty, and is a norm by which statements of alleged truth contradictory to its deliverances are judged. No amount of authority can make an irrational statement credible—the intellect repudiates it; and no amount of authority for a religious doctrine which contradicts the testimony of the Christian consciousness can override that testimony.

But between what is irreconcilable with the deliverances of the Christian consciousness and what is contradictory to them there is a great gulf fixed. And this function of the Christian consciousness is only legitimately exercised

* Canon Liddon's Sermon on "Naaman's Expectations."

Digitized by Google

against its logical contradictory. For instance, the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the wicked seems to be irreconcilable with the deliverances of the Christian consciousness of many persons. They say that they cannot harmonize that doctrine with their conceptions of other Christian doctrines. Their Christian consciousness does not respond to it, and until it does, their belief in it cannot in the highest and noblest sense become faith; for, as Van Osterzee well says: "So long as I do not consciously accept a truth for myself, it remains a truth, external to and above me, but is not a truth for me, and in me."* But it would be exceedingly difficult to show that the doctrine of eternal penalty for sin contradicts the Christian consciousness. Those who upon the authority of the Christian consciousness, reject this doctrine, are entrusting to it a function which does not legitimately belong to it. It is precisely the same in regard to the Scriptural doctrine of the use of wine. The statement that Christ made wine by miracle for a wedding entertainment is not reconcilable with the testimony of the Christian consciousness of many excellent Christians. But he would be a bold man who should attempt to show that that statement logically contradicts any man's Christian consciousness; and he who erases that passage from the Scripture is entrusting to his Christian consciousness a usurped and perilous power.

It will neither do to follow in the steps of one division of German Lutheranism and value too highly a belief that has not become a conviction, nor will it do to follow the other division and discard beliefs because they have not yet become convictions. If human nature were unfallen, if the divine image in man had not been distorted by sin, we should be justified in making the Christian consciousness a positive test of truth, for the perfect but partial revelation of God within the human soul would exactly match any true

* Van Osterzee, *Christian Dogmatics*, Vol. I., p. 23.

Digitized by Google

objective revelation. But taking human nature as it is, we cannot assert that the most complete response of the soul to Christian truth furnishes a standard by which God's objective revelation of himself may be contravened. Of course the mystics who violently assume that the "new man" born in the heart upon the exercise of saving faith is the image of God in man perfectly restored, are logical enough in making the Christian consciousness a final test of truth. The adherents of the "New Theology" who make the largest claim for the Christian consciousness as a positive test of truth, disclose the weakness of their own position when they correct the witness of individual experience by the testimony of the age or Church.

This prohibitive function of the Christian consciousness resembles the sense of shame in a pure-minded man. There are certain sights, suggestions and associations from which, prompted by it, he will spontaneously turn. There are other sights, suggestions and associations to whose influence he will gladly open his heart. There will be many things concerning which this sense will make no deliverance until their character is more fully revealed. By virtue of the Christian consciousness the Christian may often pronounce decisively and authoritatively concerning a view of truth or a question of conduct, that it is un-Christian. Other views of truth and courses of conduct it gladly recognizes as Christian. But in the large realm between the positively Christian and the un-Christian it has no power of setting up its tests as final. It must wait for light. It must exercise its discrimination in absolute subordination to the Word of God.

III.—A third function of the Christian consciousness is the discovery of the truth. It has a prophetic power. It has its intuitions which God's Word and Providence verify. The cry of Peter's heart, "Bid me come out to Thee on the water," was prophetic of Jesus' command "Come." Just as Christ's physical presence prompted in Peter's heart the

Digitized by Google

desire which prophesied Christ's invitation, so Christ's spiritual presence in the heart, which has received him by faith, begets in the soul new desires and hints of truth and duty. Views of truth and of corresponding duties which have subsequently vindicated themselves to Christian minds as trustworthy, as a matter of fact, have seldom had their birth in the interpretation of the letter of Scripture. But in the Christian consciousness there has been an intuition of the truth which has been corroborated by the Word. "Bid me come out to Thee upon the waters" the Christian heart, trusting only in its intuitions, has cried out, and Christ has answered "Come." Luther's apprehension of the doctrine of justification by faith was not the result of his exegetical studies. The Christian heart of the man longed for that truth, and when Staupitz dropped in his ear the precious sentence, "The just shall live by faith," that was the "Come" of the Lord to his Peter's cry. William Carey was reading Cook's *Voyages* when the thought was born within him that he and all Christ's Church should preach the Gospel to the world. He turned to the Scripture and found, we may imagine to his amazement, that that was the precise duty our Lord had laid upon his disciples.

And these thoughts and desires which have sprung from the Christian consciousness have brought out the clear and impressive meanings of the Scriptures. With this illumination men have seen these meanings and wondered at their former blindness to them. There is more in Christianity than the Book we call "the Bible." There is more in Christianity than the church. There is in Christ's religion his living Spirit, which no man can limit or define, and from that Spirit come the best impulses of action and the best limits of the truth. And the point at which the Holy Spirit teaches men is the Christian consciousness. The touch is not mechanical but spiritual. He allies himself with the new life in the heart which manifests itself in that consciousness.

Digitized by Google

His operations are indistinguishable from its deliverances. All parties in the Christian church to-day are fond of quoting. with approval John Robinson's famous sentence, "The Lord hath yet more light and truth to break out of his Holy Word." But as a matter of fact many believe that this is not as true in 1888 as it was in 1620. A light and spacious mind, not closed against the intentions of men in whom is the Lord's spirit, is the need of those who would not withstand God's spiritual leadership to-day.

All through the history of the church the intuitions of Christian hearts have been in advance of the received doctrines of the church, but her ear has heard the Lord saying "Come" to those whose brave hearts have cried, "Bid me come out unto thee upon the waters." Of course not all the yearnings or speculations of devout hearts have been prophetic of fresh and deeper apprehension of the truth; though the Christian consciousness has had this holy power of discovering the truth, the tests of truth are not in her. But through the intuitions of the Christian consciousness the path of truth has been illuminated and the promise of Christ has been fulfilling that he will send the "Spirit of truth, he shall guide you into all the truth" (John 16: 13.)—a promise that according to the requirements of any fair exegesis can hardly be strictly limited to those to whom our Lord spoke.

Let us now pass to a consideration of some of the relations of the Christian consciousness.

I. What is its relation to the Scriptures? It is, perhaps, in answering this question that the so-called "New Theology" makes its distinctive departure. Professor Geo. T. Ladd, in his recent volume, *What is the Bible*, lays down these positions: "It is a matter of undoubted fact that the Bible was dependent upon the church for its existence; and that in the order of history the church existed before the Bible. All the separate books of the Bible are the pro-

Digitized by Google

ducts of the activity of members of the believing community. These books are also the product of the spirit of the church; the common spiritual life which animates the community has produced these books. So, also, is the Bible dependent upon the church for fixing its limits as a collection of canonical Scriptures." [p. 454.]

These words fairly represent the attitude of the advanced New Theologians toward the relation of the Scriptures to Christian consciousness. From the Christian consciousness of Apostles and Apostolic men came the Scriptures and the consciousness of the church accepted these writings. The Christian consciousness therefore holds a relation of priority in time and of logical precedence to the Bible. The ultimate inference, therefore, is inevitable that the faculty which produced the Scriptures and which accepted them when produced is competent to apply to them its own positive tests. Dr. Ladd's primal assumption that inspiration and the normal action of the Christian consciousness differ in degree, not in kind, is his fundamental error. If we sharply distinguish between inspiration and the action of the Christian consciousness we are not shut up to any such conclusion as that reached by Dr. Ladd; and if we distinguish between reason and the Christian consciousness we are not shut up to the conclusion that the authority of the Bible rests upon the antecedent authority of the church, which is the Roman Catholic doctrine masquerading in the garments of "advanced thought." The unwritten Word existed before the written Word and before the church, and the church accepted the written Word as authoritative not simply because the Christian consciousness accepted it, but upon the two-fold ground of internal and external evidence addressing itself to the human reason.* And this is not elevating the reason to the place we have just denied to the Christian consciousness, for in admitting that the Scriptures must

* Hodge's *Systematic Theology*, Vol. I., p. 129.

Digitized by Google

make their ultimate appeal to the logical understanding we are not making the reason the source or the standard of the Scriptures. Rhoda, within the gate may be able to decide that it is Peter who stands without and upon that evidence, she is justified in opening the gates, but she may not therefore be competent to pass upon Peter's message. As Dr. E. D. Morris has well said, "The understanding and the reason, investigation and analysis, logic and demonstration, have their ordained place and value in the commendation of the truth of God to human faith, as truly as has the gracious consciousness whether of the individual believer or of the church. The ultimate standard of all doctrines, dogmas, opinions, hopes of men lies in the Divine Word itself, as carefully studied, analyzed, verified by the human mind—working according to its own legitimate and necessary laws."*

It is precisely at this point that Dr. Munger falls into error. He says, "If Christianity has any human basis it is its entire reasonableness. It must not only sit easily on the mind, but it mustally itself with it in all its normal action. If it chafes it, if it is aburden, if it antagonizes, it detracts from itself; the human mind cannot be detracted from. . . . . In the last analysis revelation—so far as its acceptance is concerned—rests on reason, and not reason on revelation."† In a sense this last sentence is profoundly true, because reason is that to which the Scriptures make their ultimate appeal. But this is not the sense which Dr. Munger would attach to his own language. He would say that the reason must pass upon the contents of revelation as well as upon the arguments by which the Scriptures are vindicated as a revelation. But Rhoda can identify Peter and admit him within the gate without being competent to pass upon Peter's message. Dr. Munger fails to distinguish between Rhoda's

* *Is There Probation After Death?* p. 209.

† *Freedom of Faith*, pp. 11, 12.

Digitized by Google

competency to identify Peter and her competency to pass upon his message.

Unless inspiration be regarded as a form of the action of the Christian consciousness, it cannot be considered either as the source of the Scriptures or a test of their truth. The fact is that inspiration belongs to the category of the supernatural; that the Scriptures are primarily accepted as from God upon the ground of evidence addressed to the reason; that the Christian consciousness adds indefinitely to the weight of this evidence, precisely as the trusses of a bridge add to the strength of its girders; that instead of the Christian consciousness being the source of the Scriptures, the exact contrary is true and the Scriptures are the source of this graciousness, consciousness, and the product of the Scriptures cannot in any just sense be their criterion.

II. But though the Christian consciousness is not a source or test of truth, it is a secondary and subsidiary source of Christian. It determines the environment in which theology grows. It gives it an atmosphere. It influences its method. A great deal incautious thinking and writing upon this subject arises from a failure to distinguish between truth and theology, between the Scriptures and a human philosophy of the Scriptures. The Scriptures are a permanent, theology is a variable. The Scriptures are today what they were in the first century, theology has been in a state of constant flux. Of course there must be a constant development in theology unless we are prepared to put the decisions of certain councils or the writings of certain men upon an equality with the Scriptures. This development, however, may be downward as well as upward. A true conception of development embraces the fact of decay as well as the fact of growth. It by no means follows from this recognition of development in theology, that the development is always towards a true philosophy of the Scriptures. We are forced to recognize this relation of in-

Digitized by Google

dividual experience and of a devout Zeit-Geist to theology. No reader of the Confessions of Augustine fails to mark the intimate connection between his personal experience and his theology. Men have never yet seen the Scriptures in Bacon's "clear, white light." There is "a personal equation in theology as well as in astronomy."

The fact of this relation is a warning to the theologian to make his consciousness tally with the Scriptures instead of reversing the process. It vitiates every attempt to place a human creed or the deliverances of any man or council, or the sentiments of any age on an equality with the Scriptures. A frank recognition of this relation is one of the most effective preventives to a one sided theology.

III. But the relation of the Christian consciousness to ethics is not of less importance. It is in this relation that with due subordination to the Scriptures it exercises most decisively what we have described as its function of discovering truth. The New Testament contains germinally a system of Christian ethics. The application of these principles to personal life, to the problems of sociology and government is the function of the Christian consciousness. What would Jesus Christ do, were he here in my place, with my limitations and environment? is the question that must be answered before the Christian can intelligently or in any deep and vital sense "follow" Christ. And that question is to be largely answered by each one of us from the centre of Christian consciousness. We have a certain state of feeling and judgment, the product of the response of our own souls to the revealed truth and will of Jesus. And just as we may say, "From my knowledge of my friend I am sure he would like that picture, he would not approve that course of action;" so we in our Christian consciousness, where the Scriptures are silent as to specific duty, have a guide to right moral action. It was her Christian consciousness, her sense of what was due Christ, that led Mary

Digitized by Google

to annoint our Saviour's feet at lavish cost. What lifts a deed to its highest level is obedience to the Spirit of Christ, an obedience which prompted by a loving intuition of his temper carries his principles into fresh and ingenious applications. The questions of our time which are agitating the minds of men as to temperance and prohibition, as to the relations of labor and capital, as to pauperism and prison reform, and the duty of the rich to the poor are not to be settled by an appeal to the *litera scripta* of the Bible, for the Bible is for the most part silent as to them, but by an appeal to the Christian consciousness, which will apply the great principles of the Scriptures to the solution of the specific exigent questions of our time.

IV. Of course, then, in view of this whole discussion the relation of the Christian consciousness to preaching is a vital one. It cannot be maintained that a preacher should only preach "level to his experience," but it is true that only those truths which have awakened the deepest response of his own soul, those doctrines which have taken a living root in his own heart can be proclaimed with the unction and vitality which alone meet the true idea of what preaching should be. The ideal preacher should certainly only preach level to his own experience. When one does thus speak from the centre of his own consciousness his sermon has something of the Apostolic swing and of the Apostolic inspiration. On his lips the word of God becomes living. The spirit in man speaks to the spirit in man, or rather we are conscious that the Spirit of God is addressing us through the human spirit. We are in the presence of a spiritual power that awes and hushes and melts us. In that presence doubts are dissolved, this world sinks to its true value and eternal things become real. Certainly he has no call to preach Christ's gospel who cannot proclaim it from the centre of the Christian consciousness, and to whom God has not given proof of its divinity which transcends any argument

Digitized by Google

addressed to the reason. And certainly the effectiveness of the Christian minister will not be in proportion to his learning, eloquence or gifts of persuasion, but it will be in direct proportion to the depth and scope of the response of his own soul to the gospel of Christ.

GEORGE E. HORR, JR.

Boston, Mass.

Digitized by Google

II.

THE PREACHER AS PASTOR.

DOES the church need greater preachers? No. Does she need better preachers? Yes. Does she need better pastors? Yes, decidedly. And in gaining the better pastors she will gain the better preachers. There is, it would seem, an increasing tendency in these latter days to undervalue the pastoral side of the preacher's work. Personal observation, the testimony direct and indirect of the religious press, and the condition of the modern church, all lead to this conclusion. The tendency to neglect these duties of the pastoral office bodes only evil to the church. Hence, it is time to consider the causes of neglect, the extent of the danger and the remedies available.

I.—WHAT ARE THE CAUSES OF NEGLECT.

One at least is to be found on the part of the pastor himself. The preachers of the present day (certainly those who hold positions of influence) are men of education. They must be that. We may well rejoice that it is so. They are supposed to have had a college training and a seminary training, many of them have enjoyed the advantages of a post-graduate course of study and not a few have spent years in foreign universities. It would be strange if minds thus trained for years in the schools should not have become studious in habit, and especially when their chosen lines of study have brought them face to face with the most fascinating and the most stupendous problems which have ever occupied the mind of man; and it would not be strange if men thus trained, looking out into endless vistas of attain-

Digitized by Google

ment before them, should find in themselves a strong disrelish for spending hours of every day amid untrained minds possessed only of sordid aims, or absorbed by the commonest of commonplace. What could seem more like waste of time and what could involve larger loss?

2. A second cause for the neglect spoken of, is to be found on the part of the church, though perhaps it has been thrust upon the church by the world. It is an increasing tendency on the part of the church to magnify the public work at the expense of the private work of the minister. The man is talked of among his own people as a preacher, spoken of by the newspapers as a preacher, and rated everywhere as a *preacher* rather than as a *minister*. Do we need any better evidence of this than that furnished by the candidating system of the present day? Churches seek for men who will draw the crowds. It is no secret. They want men who will work for the edification of a congregation, rather perhaps than for "the perfecting of the saints, the edifying of the body of Christ." The unconscious admissions of pulpit committees are painful in the extreme. And churches seeking for spiritual guides, often pass by the men who are known to have wrought noble Christian work for years, and select those who are unknown, or even those who are known to be dangerous guides, simply because they have flaunted a showy banner upon the platform for an hour. Those churches which demand simply preaching to-day, may come to demand simply lecturing to-morrow.

3. In our modern complex civilization may be found a third cause of the neglect which has been mentioned. The church though not of the world, is yet in the world, where she must be until the world is won. In the changing character of the ages, it is inevitable that she should be changed. The swirling tides of modern life touch the church and modify its life, of course—not necessarily for the worse—often for the better no doubt. But yet the multitude of diverse

Digitized by Google

interests, domestic, business, intellectual, social, are pressing so closely that hours of Christian devotion are hardly won. The seen and the temporal are all-absorbing; the unseen and the eternal are as if they were not. As a consequence the spiritual help of the pastor is not earnestly sought; perhaps it is not welcome, until one awakened by some rude shock from the dream which has held him, has come to see the reality of the unseen.

4. And in the same connection a fourth cause of neglect may be mentioned. There are at the present day, multitudes of Christian people and people not professedly Christian, who are engaged in noble works of philanthropy and reform, aside from the lines of distinctively church work. They are naturally anxious to enlist the services and the influence of the pastor; and what pastor would wish by refusal, to check in the slightest degree any worthy work for lost humanity? But these things take time and vital energy. The time and force thus expended must be saved elsewhere, and it is the pastoral work which in most cases will suffer thereby.

And so it may be said with certain limitations, that the modern minister's pastoral work receives too little attention, because modern ministerial culture is against it, modern church ambition is against it, modern civilization and social life is against it, and the activity of modern philanthropy is against it.

II.—WHAT ARE THE DANGERS OF NEGLECT?

The neglect spoken of is fraught with great danger, and if not attended to will result in great harm to the minister and to the church. And to the pastor there are dangers physical, intellectual, and most of all, spiritual. The physical danger is perhaps hardly worth mentioning, so overshadowed is it by the spiritual. And yet eminent medical authorities tell us that the minister's life furnishes almost

Digitized by Google

the ideal conditions of longevity, when it combines daily work in the study with daily visitation from home to home. The energies exhausted in the morning may be repaired in the afternoon, and fully restored at night; and intense brain labor may thus be prolonged for years without injury. But woe to him who tries to steal for study those hours which Nature demands for restoration. What a merciful provision is it that the minister's life furnishes the opportunity for constant ministry, and at the same time preserves the perfect equilibrium of his vital forces, and thus lengthens the duration of his ministry as well.

But intellectually too the preacher will suffer if he neglect his pastoral work, even though his people be rude and untrained in mind. There is nothing more healthful for the mind than rubbing against other minds. Those are the great minds which learn from all. One is often surprised by the knowledge of detail, revealed in some giant like Goethe. It is easily explained. He gathers from all sources. Such a mind gathers, perhaps, because it is great, but conversely, it is great because it has thus gathered.

Moreover, the preacher's rhetorical style is sure to suffer by isolation from the people whom he addresses. By the study of books he may become logical, and he may become possessed of a very elegant poetic style; but he will miss that grasp and strength of composition which seizes men and rouses them to action. The language of every-day life must be learned by mingling with every-day life. Literature cannot furnish it.

But the great peril of all, to the isolated preacher, is a spiritual peril. Let the preacher be a man of brain if he can, but most of all let him be a man of heart. There is danger that in our time the minister may forget his very mission—the errand on which he has been sent by the Most High. Can any calamity be greater than that? Strong, indeed, must he be who is proof against every subtle tempta-

Digitized by Google

tion of the day to lower his divine standard if not to change it for another. Thank God for every help by which the advanced schools of our time fit men for larger usefulness, but we ought daily to pray that in the very schools for the prophets and in the study of the minister, no one be allowed to forget what Neander has so finely said, that "the heart makes the theologian." The man who is by God's help to open the hearts of other men, must surely have his own heart open; and nothing will so quickly close the springs of that heart and stiffen its sympathies as the cutting the lines of constant communication between it and other hearts. Separate from them, the preacher will become morose and self-centered inevitably. In that hour he becomes unfit for a preacher of the living Gospel of Christ. In body, mind and spirit there is danger to the pastor.

But the dangers to the pastor are even less than the dangers to his church. The preacher's false estimation of the true proportions of his work, the regarding his preaching not simply as supreme, but as everything, may result in great additions to the membership of his church. But large and frequent additions to church membership are not always blessings. Rapid builders are not always safe builders. Great churches are not always strong churches. By and by may come a builder who shall say: "This church is like the Washington monument; we cannot build it higher until it has a new and deeper and broader foundation."

And again this false preparation leading to false preaching, may result in continued ill-health, or in starvation to the church. Who does not know churches which have been starved in spirit while their intellectual tastes have been cloyed with elaborately prepared delicacies and sweetmeats? Said a prominent member of a prominent city church which has long had what was termed the ablest preaching: "We've been starving for a pastor for years."

In these and in many ways there is great danger to those

Digitized by Google

churches which, by the preaching only, are held together—shall we not rather say held apart? The most conspicuous church in America recently furnished a sad illustration. It had one man to minister to its people personally in the most solemn and sacred hours of need, and another to preach. One knew the people's need but he might not preach to them; the other must preach to them, though he knew not their need. Is this then Christ's thought for his Church? Is it not possible that here in this separation from his people were born many of the vagaries and inconsistencies by which that mightily gifted man led his people into sorrowful uncertainty as to the meaning of life, death and judgment? Is it not possible that if that man had been called daily to the sick, the dying, the friends of the dead, the harassed, the harried, the faithless, the immoral, the immortal, and had put each face to face with God's truth, making him believe that it was for him and not merely for a conglomerate mass of three thousand hearers, he might have become an immeasurable, lasting spiritual power; and Plymouth Church might have been a *church* instead of, in the pathetic words of its late pastor, "*only a hotel?*"

Where in literature can be found a sadder lament than that of the Plymouth pastor at the annual meeting of his church four years ago: "The Friday night meetings have come to be simply lectures. There are only half a dozen brethren among us who are ready to arise and pray, and as to these it is probably the wish of all the others that they wouldn't. I have felt more and more as the years go by that I was losing my power in the church, and that my usefulness was rapidly giving out. Under the circumstances I could not help thinking what would become of Plymouth Church if I should die or go away. It would then be spoken of as the church that was. This has given me many discouraging thoughts. The idea of having to leave it to be dilapidated has been a constant trouble to me, and I

Digitized by Google

often pray to God to make it more cohesive before he calls me."

The pastor's calling is the most exalted calling known among men—the most exalted because the most sacred. By no very violent wrench of exegesis may the words of prophecy and of doom spoken by Zechariah be applied to any of us who, calling himself the shepherd of the flock, fails to give special care to the wounded or the straying—

> "Behold, I will raise up a shepherd in the land;
> Those which are perishing he will not visit;
> That which strayeth he will not seek;
> That which is wounded he will not heal;
> That which standeth he will not nourish.
> * * * * * * *
> "Woe to the worthless shepherd that leaveth the flock;
> The sword shall be upon his arm
> And upon his right eye;
> His arm shall be utterly palsied,
> And his right eye utterly darkened."
>
> Zech. xi. 16, 17 (Henderson's translation).

The country pastor in some hidden hamlet, with only a handful of believers, may have the strongest church. Far from the stir of city life, with its intellectual thrill and stimulus, going quietly here and there, feeding the little flock, seeking the straying, healing the wounded, he is following the true Shepherd who gave his life for the sheep. "Inasmuch as ye have done it to one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me."

III. WHAT ARE THE REMEDIES?

In the first place, it is undoubtedly necessary for many a minister to readjust his conceptions of his work. Perhaps, in most cases, more than a readjustment of existing conceptions is necessary. Comparatively few have deliberately entered the pulpit for the sake of a career. The number is larger, no doubt, of those who, sincere at first, have yet been ensnared by some of the subtle temptations which are

Digitized by Google

everywhere, and have become the victims of a narrow and shallow ambition for a far-reaching fame. Larger still the number of those who, by long years of familiarity with their work, are now making it a lifeless routine, and are weighing its discouragements, its profit and its loss, as men of other callings weigh theirs. But there is no perfect analogue to the heavenly calling among earthly callings. The preacher must remember that it is his mission to bring God's Word to *men*, and to win hard hearts to Christ. He must, as one has recently expressed it, "not only open the Word to the heart, but he must also open the heart to the Word." He must study, then, not simply the Word, but the heart. As he thinks upon it the magnitude of this mission will grow upon him. The fruits to be gathered, eternal fruits. Unseen forces to help him, it is true, but no unseen forces to do his part if neglected. He will see that the study of men and the study of the Truth revealed for men must go hand in hand. By the Truth he will learn to interpret man, by man he will learn to interpret the Truth. And if the *Word* to-day has wonders unsuspected before, has not the *heart?* Shall he pause by and by and say, "One hemisphere of my training is complete; I can now give myself wholly to the Word"? If it was a work of four thousand years to get fallen man ready for Christ's coming, and then a work of yet other years for Christ to prepare man to receive him, what a work yet remains for Christ's servants in getting men ready for him at the first, and in opening their understanding of his ways afterward!

If in an intellectual age the natural tendency is to intellectuality in preaching, and in a superficial age to superficiality in preaching, it is time to pause and to reflect that in every age the first thing is spirituality in preaching. Paul in Corinth was assailed on the one hand by the intellectual Greek, and on the other by the superficial Jew, but Paul went right on preaching Christ crucified—foolishness and a

Digitized by Google

stumbling block. Ezra was not only a ready scribe in the law of Moses, but he had prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord, and to do it and to teach in Israel. Luther said if he had only ten minutes in which to prepare an address, he would spend seven of the ten in waiting on God for power in which to speak. Andrew Fuller, addressing his church at Kettering twenty-two years after the beginning of his pastorate, says: "When I have been the most spiritually minded I have succeeded the best." This wrong idea of preaching righted, is well shown in the case of Dr. Chalmers, and in the contrast between his later and his earlier preaching, resulting from a new religious experience, resulting in totally new conceptions of the office of the preacher and a new division of his labor and time. If he was, as he has been called, the model preacher, it was not until he became the model pastor, and was known in the humble houses of Glasgow as familiarly as in that pulpit which shook all Scotland with its power. The Word of God became a new book to him when he read it in the light, or rather amid the darkness of human sorrow. He did not neglect to prepare for his pulpit in the study; neither did he neglect to prepare for it in the slums of that city.

But more specifically we may consider the benefits accruing to the minister *as a preacher* from his work *as a pastor*. To any honest mind the consideration of these advantages should furnish the remedy, if there be a growing tendency to neglect.

1. And first the minister will learn *men*, the importance of which we have already seen. Every day will bring its new revelation to astonish him. He will be amazed often to find the skepticism which exists in the very heart of his church, amazed at sight of the hollow ambitions and deadly motives by which human hearts are swayed. Nowhere but among men can he learn these things. We are not like the

Digitized by Google

Master, who needed not that any should testify of man, for he knew what was in man. It is all-important that the preacher should know human nature well, should know what problems are troubling his people, what temptations are grappling them; how, weary with the struggle of life, they are coming up to the house of the Lord for a word of cheer; and how they want *that*, and not some dissertation on the Mythical Theory, or on Nominalism and Realism. If we ask and receive not because we ask amiss, who doubts that we preach and succeed not because we preach amiss? Saurin was the most eloquent of all the Protestant preachers of France, but as a preacher *to men* he was a failure. The secret of Tholuck's power with his students in the class-room is said to be that he knows them intimately outside the class-room.

Every one knows that one secret of the amazing success of Paul *as a preacher* was his understanding of human nature. Where did he get such understanding? Everywhere. By talking with men, studying their ambitions, passions, hopes, despair. Gifted with keen insight, no doubt, but having that insight marvelously sharpened by his contact with men and by his sympathetic study of them, he brought the Law and the lawless face to face, and then suddenly lifted the Cross in the presence of despair. He knew how to preach, not only because he knew what the *Gospel* was, but because he knew what *man* was. What wonder that we hear this man saying, "I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue."

2. And then in learning men the preacher will learn to love them, and will gain that sympathy which is another of the rich qualifications of the true minister of Christ. The thrill which comes from looking into the faces of a thousand is not to be compared with that tender thrill of sympathy which comes from looking into a bleeding heart.

Digitized by Google

How a single glimpse of a soul in grief sometimes opens whole new areas of the possibilities of human suffering and of the blessed mission of the minister in relieving it. The experience of an hour may change the whole fibre of a man's preaching for life. The godly Robert McCheyne, whose panting soul too soon broke away from its frail body, finding little time for study amid the overwhelming demands of his great parish at Dundee, was yet accustomed to spend a portion of each Saturday afternoon with the sick, especially those who seemed near the point of death, that he might be stirred to a more direct application of the truth to his flock on the morrow, as dying men on the brink of eternity.

3. And further, in learning men the preacher will learn how to lead them, to warn, command, commend, condemn. He will learn their language and the doors of ingress to their hearts; that the most telling illustrations are not to be found in literature but in life. One might envy Jeremy Taylor many of his peculiar gifts, but he would hardly wish it to be said of him as it was said of Jeremy Taylor, "He is a preacher who comes in state to the soul." Better learn the answer to Dr. Emmons's interrogative maxim: "How can I make the people know what I know?"

4. From the other side large advantages too. The preacher is acquainted with his people; his people are acquainted with him. They are interested in him from the mere fact of knowing him in their own homes. They have a personal interest in the preacher for he is their pastor. He is not a mere travelling lecturer. He will have them to speak to when he preaches.

5. Pastoral faithfulness will also give cumulative power to his preaching, for his character (if he be a man), will give increasing weight and propulsion to his words. The unfolding and development of that character among his people is a projectile force which must not be disregarded.

6. Again pastoral faithfulness will be likely to result in

Digitized by Google

pastoral permanency, at least it will prolong the pastorate, a consummation devoutly to be wished in these degenerate days. It is easy to dismiss an employe; it is hard to lose a friend. The ties which bind preacher and congregation are largely mercenary, and are easily severed; the ties which bind pastor and people are ties of holy affection, and they are very strong.

Knowledge of men, a love for men, access to men's hearts, the awakening of men's interest in himself (and so in his message), the cumulative power of preaching by reason of his own character known to his people and by reason of a lengthening pastorate, these are some of the fruits of faithful pastoral work. For any man with true ideas of his mission, to face this array, will be to remedy the evil which robs him and his Master of these advantages.

As the modern ministry drifts toward formalism or professionalism, it will forget the mission on which it is sent. It is only by mingling constantly with men that it will feel the need of preaching the Gospel at all, and while it thus mingles with men its power will constantly grow.

We are forced to the conclusion that this pastoral office is not an artificial addition to the work of the preacher, which, in this hurrying age can easily be sloughed off, but we must conclude that under God, the pastor makes the preacher. The union is organic, not mechanical. It is of God, not of man.

J. H. MASON.

Brockport, N. Y.

Digitized by Google

III.

TENNYSON'S ART AND GENIUS.

I.

TENNYSON'S art is studied. Unlike Aeschylus, who was an artist without knowing it, Tennyson is conscious of using the principles of rhetoric and drawing in producing desired effects. Among literary artists who have a most acute perception of the beautiful with but little creative imagination, he must be ranked next to Virgil and Horace. Like them, he learns much from his predecessors, and depends for the most part on careful workmanship. Still he is a natural artist. Though a most industrious culler and arranger of fine words and phrases, similes and conceits, Tennyson possesses the artistic instinct, the faculty which is a law to itself, which judges swiftly and unerringly if a line or an expression be correct and fitting, if each part of a work be in harmony with the general design.

The difficulty of analyzing Tennyson's art, of saying exactly what constitutes its charm, is evidence of its originality. True he profits by the hints, and develops the ideas, of others; yet he furnishes something of his own, adding here and there a touch of beauty and throwing over all an indescribable witchery, and a subtle, vague suggestiveness which are the wonder and despair of lesser artists. No other English poet, except Milton, has reached his artistic perfection.

Tennyson sometimes uses literary art to make up for his inability to strike out for himself in new fields, yet art cannot account for all that is in some of his productions. No man who was simply a literary artist could write "Locksley

Digitized by Google

Hall," or " Maud,"—art and genius being so deftly joined in them that it is hard, if not impossible, to tell where one ends and the other begins. So far as possible, it is my purpose to point out the characteristics, excellences, and limitations of his art and genius as shown in the general conception of his works and in their perfect or imperfect execution.

Tennyson has gone to every available source for poetical materials. He has studied all literatures and assimilated something from every bard. He is fully acquainted with all the resources and devices of a modern poet. The effectiveness of repetitions and refrains, the secret of making curious and cunning combinations of words and sounds, whatever relates to meter, alliteration, assonance, harmony, melody, correspondence between ideas and verbal sounds, it is needless to say Tennyson has cultivated to the very limits of perfection. He employs the methods and artifices of the novelist. The fascination of mystery, the nameless charm of historical associations, the interest attaching to weird or romantic incidents and surroundings, these and other elements which enter largely into the construction of fiction are utilized by him in weaving the fabric of song and idyl.

Tennyson calls to his aid in description the skill of the painter. With an artist's fondness for the picturesque, he sees the beauty wrought by decay and ruin. He selects the striking features of a scene, and groups his figures with distinctness and consistency. He feels and expresses the wild grandeur of nature, but describes best the artful arrangement and loveliness of a park or garden

With a few strokes he paints a better word-picture than any other writer could make with any number of pictorial details. As a colorist Tennyson stands with Keats, alone and incomparable in all literature. Hamerton calls him the " prince of poet landscapists."

As a master of the art of poetic expression, Tennyson is almost without a rival. He is an expert in the practice of

Digitized by Google

"fitting aptest words to things." His diction is nothing less than a triumph of culture and ingenuity. His language is remarkable for purity, brilliancy, and especially for the abundance of short Saxon words. From first to last he has been as ardent an adjective hunter as Gautier. In style Tennyson has but few equals and perhaps no superiors, considering the wide range of his subjects and the variety of his metrical achievements. What other poet excels him in the ease with which he adapts himself to the requirements of his themes and changes at will from gay to grave, from the rich fulness and romantic tenderness of fictitious narrative to the terse precision and discriminative cast of metaphysical reasoning? Tennyson can employ at pleasure, as in "Dora," a style as bare and colorless as Wordsworth's, or the style of "The Princess," which is almost as gorgeous as Shelley's. Now it is the serio-comic vein of "Amphion," "Will Waterproof," and "The Vision of Sin;" now the reserved force and solemn stateliness of "Lucretius" and "Morte d'Arthur;" the subdued grandeur and cold elegance of "Ulysses" and "Tithonus;" the limpid loveliness of "The Brook;" the dignified earnestness and magnificent manner of "Locksley Hall;" the elaborate yet natural diffuseness of "The Talking Oak;" the classical severity and statuesque beauty of "Tiresias;" and by turns the warm glow and chastened splendor of "Idylls of the King." His power and versatility are shown alike in the exquisite refinement of his little melodies and in the thoughtful, argumentative, pointed style of "In Memoriam."

Where Tennyson fails is in the grand style, which Matthew Arnold describes as arising in poetry "when a noble nature, poetically gifted, treats with simplicity or with severity a serious subject." Tennyson is serious enough, but his manner of thought and expression is the very opposite of severe, an ornate sensuousness being one of the most marked qualities of his poems. And, according to Arnold, his style

Digitized by Google

is not naturally simple, but is characterized by "an extreme subtlety and curious elaborateness of expression." Between Virgil's simplicity and Tennyson's there is a great difference, the one being easy and natural, the other strained and affected.

If Tennyson's style is a part of himself, so is his versification. And both are studiously wrought out and highly polished. Except among his contemporaries and imitators, it would be hard to find a poet whose metrical forms are more intricate and various than Tennyson's. He instinctively selects the best meter for his subject, that furnishes his personal moods and poetical characteristics special opportunities for display. Though he excels in lyrical measures, his blank verse is the best that has been written since the time of Keats. While it is not so smooth as Pope's singsong heroics, its cadences are too regular and monotonous. "The principle of variety in uniformity," as Leigh Hunt calls it, has baffled every poet who has attempted this difficult meter since Milton. Still Tennyson's sounding lines in "Morte d' Arthur" seem to approach nearer to the stately march and rolling harmonies of Shakespeare and Milton than does the blank verse of any other poet, save Shelley, of this or the last century.

The state of mind which Tennyson's poems induce is one of admiration at the discovery of innumerable beauties. The reader continually feels like exclaiming, how fine! artistic! He is delighted, but the pleasure is that afforded by a felicitous expression, a superb metaphor, or a neat rounded bit of description. Save for these embellishments and a faultless, melodious, versification, much of Tennyson's poetry would not be worth reading. In his abhorrence of literary slovenliness, he sometimes sacrifices thought to diction, spontaneity to polish. His perfect finish and rich music do not atone for his want of elevation and energy. Stray gleams of grandeur and occasional exhibitions of force are lost sight

Digitized by Google

of in the excess of decorative touches and pretty trivialities. Effective as is Tennyson's handling of materials and presentation of details, his over-attention to mere form gives an air of artificiality to his methods. He does not hide the traces of his art so well as do Virgil and Pindar. This fault is especially noticeable in his later productions, which, like many of his earlier efforts, are studies in color and harmony rather than poems, though some of them evince extraordinary mastery of the subject and unusual self-restraint in manner.

II.

If culture, industry, leisure, susceptibility to beauty, and keen sympathetic observation of nature make a great poet then is Tennyson a great poet. But, however much these things may be of service, a poet's strength and originality depend more on the kind and amount of his imagination. This is the light of genius as passion is its fire. Without it there can be no poetic invention. Of course perception and reflection enter into every masterpiece of art. But, unless imagination permeate the work, it is only a lifeless, shapeless mass, superficial or inartistic.

Tennyson has a lively, fertile fancy, but a weak, meagre imagination; and neither is of the highest kind. Scattered through his works are thousands of beautiful fancies, as

> "With folded feet, in stoles of white,
> On sleeping wings they sail."

At times fancy is intermingled with imagination, almost indistinguishably, as in this passage:

> "And the wild team
> Which love thee, yearning for thy yoke, arise
> And shake the darkness from their loosen'd manes,
> And beat the twilight into flakes of fire."

Digitized by Google

But it is hard to find many instances of pure imagination, as

"So like a shatter'd column lay the King."

"Thy voice is on the rolling air;
I hear thee where the waters run;
Thou standest in the rising sun,
And in the setting thou art fair."

Here Tennyson, inspired by the spiritual presence of his lost friend, rises almost to sublimity. There is also another instance of strong vivid imagination in "The Eagle":

"He clasps the crag with hooked hands;
Close to the sun in lonely lands,
Ring'd with the azure world he stands.
The wrinkled sea beneath him crawls;
He watches from his mountain walls,
And like a thunderbolt he falls."

This splendid fragment is perfect so far as it goes. But why could Tennyson not remain longer, like Shelley, at that stupendous height? And why does he so seldom reach that elevation? Clearly Tennyson's is not the imagination that ventures with exulting delight into untried fields of the supersensual world. He is not at home in the sublime regions of "Prometheus Bound" or of "Paradise Lost." He is deficient in ideality, which can form a new world of its own, as in "Midsummer Night's Dream" or "Fairy Queen." Nature did not endow him with the pure, fresh, joyous imagination of Homer—the calm, brooding, radiant atmosphere through which the old bard saw so clearly and buoyantly. Tennyson's conceptions do not have the spirit and boldness, the freedom and distinctness of Collins' and Byron's, or of Wordsworth's and Coleridge's.

Penetrative imagination is the best gift of the poet. To this sovereign faculty is chiefly due the "interpretative power of poetry." Not possessing this power in a high degree Tennyson so far misses the pre-eminent glory of the poet. In this kind of imagination he is inferior to Scott, Byron,

Digitized by Google

and Wordsworth, though superior to them as a literary artist and word-painter. Tennyson falls far below Scott in his efforts to reproduce the past with historical accuracy and vividness—his representations not having the seeming reality of actual occurrences. Tennyson is far from equaling Byron's ability to look beyond appearances, his generalizing or reflective power; this might perhaps be better described as meditation mingled with imagination, since it sees the philosophical, as well as the poetical side of things and draws conclusions from isolated facts and unexplained phenomena. Also Tennyson has not Wordsworth's contemplative spirit, his depth of insight into nature and truth, his capacity of reading the lessons of life aright.

Creative imagination displays itself in two ways, in construction and characterization. Its shaping or "esemplastic power," as Coleridge calls it, is shown to excellent advantage in many of Tennyson's poems and best of all, perhaps, in the unity and symmetry of "In Memoriam;" but his fragmentary, incoherent treatment of "Idylls of the King" proves that he did not possess this combining or harmonizing faculty in the highest degree. He has a measure of constructive imagination—but not to him are given the boundless vision and universal sweep of Dante and Shakespeare; he lacks their structural inventiveness and striking variety.

Whatever gifts Tennyson may possess, that of characterization or dramatic imagination is not one of them. The characters he has attempted to portray in his dramas and idylls are none of them made of flesh and blood—natural, lifelike human beings. They have not full, rounded, distinct personalities, but are merely representations of particular moods and traits of Tennyson himself—intensely egoistic. Of all his so-called characters, Lancelot and Guinevere are drawn the best. He has made the one seem more heroic than the nobler Arthur, and the other more fascinating than

Digitized by Google

the sweeter Elaine. By refining away the ferocity of the chivalrous knight and by spiritualizing the voluptuous queen, Tennyson has idealized these wonderful creations of medieval romance and given them new characteristics and graces. This class of work may be considered as having in it at times an element of inventiveness, though it hardly deserves the name of originality. It is rather the result of a different kind of imaginative activity, which, by focusing its light on a single object, contemplates it in a new aspect.

While not highly gifted with penetrative or creative imagination, Tennyson is richly endowed with the contemplative or idealizing imagination. He understands to perfection the art of throwing glamour over ugliness, of softening repulsive features—the decorative art which adds a witchery of colors to plain surroundings and glorifies ordinary places and people.

With this kind of imagination in excess, a poet is apt to employ his powers on subjects of a trifling or transient nature, on matters of local or personal interest. Tennyson is unfortunate either in the choice or treatment of many of his themes. To use the words of Landor, "never will any be justly called a great poet, unless he has treated a great subject worthily." A single poem like Gray's "Elegy" counts for more than any number of sentimental commonplace or elaborate imitations like "The Beggar Maid," "Edward Gray," "Audley Court," or "Ænone." With all their brilliant jewelry and elegant word-painting, the most of Tennyson's short pieces and some of his larger works have not the gravity, the majesty which the highest imagination alone can confer.

III.

Tennyson lacks strength. We find in his works but few displays of that quality which is so marked a characteristic of Carlyle's lashing, rugged prose and of Byron's eloquent, passionate verse. His poetry does not reveal the hand and

Digitized by Google

sweep of a master. It has not the force and intensity of "The Ancient Mariner" or "Prometheus Unbound." It is the poetry of art, grace, and refinement.

Tennyson exhibits an abounding fertility, a prodigality, of a certain kind of poetical resources, but not a constancy of ardor, an exuberance of emotion. His poems do not thrill the soul to a pitch of ecstasy—they rather weigh it down with an opiate lanquor. He does not arouse enthusiasm in the reader, simply because he does not feel it himself. From his coldness alone we might almost infer that he is not a poet of great genius—and by a poet of great genius I mean one who is frequently visited with inspired moods when he conceives and writes swiftly and artistically.

In many of Tennyson's poems are short passages of genuine feeling, passages of quiet, finished beauty. But softness and sensuousness do not compensate for the lack of fire and vitality. How tame are the love scenes of Tristram and Isolt in the "Last Tournament," contrasted with the convulsive parting of Conrad and Medora in the "Corsair!" Compare any stanza of the "Charge of the Light Brigade" with one from Campbell's "Battle of the Baltic," and the difference is seen between simulated and real emotion.

Of subdued passion, or "repose of power," "The Two Sisters" is a nearly perfect example. To my notion "Fatima," charged as it is with consuming fire, hardly matches "Parisina." But in "The Two Sisters" and the following passage from "Elaine," Tennyson seems to outdo himself:

> "'Yea, lord,' she said,
> 'Your hopes are mine,' and saying that she choked,
> And sharply turned about to hide her face,
> Moved to her chamber, and there flung herself
> Down on the great king's couch, and writhed upon it,
> And shrieked out 'traitor' to the unhearing wall,
> Then flash'd into wild tears, and rose again,
> And moved about her palace, proud and pale."

Digitized by Google

This is powerful and dramatic, and yet more true to nature than the delirious passion of "Fatima."

In natural, spontaneous expression of sorrow and suffering, Tennyson is not so successful as Virgil or many a lesser poet. Occasionally he has a passage which warms the heart with pity or draws tears, but his is not the pathos of the rude, unconscious minstrel:

> "But think na ye my heart was sair,
> When I laid the mould on his yellow hair?
> Think na ye my heart was wae,
> When turned about, away to gae?"

Few are the words of grief or of any high-strung passion. And more feeling and heartbreaking anguish are condensed in the few stanzas of some old ballad than can be found in "Maud" or "Enoch Arden." Even in "Dora" and "Elaine," his tenderest poems, Tennyson not only appropriates from other writers sad and tragic incidents, but also paraphrases their language and sentiment.

The Laureate is unquestionably strong in his convictions and prejudices, in his seriousness and moral fibre, his good sense and general healthfulness. And he occasionally displays a rugged and manly vigor in denunciation—now of class distinctions and now of democratic progress. But he is essentially feminine in his mental make-up and his affectionate disposition, in his delicate susceptibility and sensitiveness of conscience. His genius does not seem to have enough vitality and independence; it gives the impression, at times, of weariness, if not of emptiness. At least he cannot work very long with freshness and vivacity of feeling.

It is to be said in Tennyson's defense that his quiet tone and restrained manner reflect the taste and temperament of a refined, humane age. And if he does not rouse us with a martial trumpet or send us into transports, he at least deserves the credit of being true to his better self in shunning the extremes of realism and sensationalism, in not disgusting

Digitized by Google

his readers with coarse and immoral phases of life or intoxicating them with morbid and unnatural excitement.

IV.

In some respects Tennyson is not a typical English writer. Able and scholarly Englishmen usually have something to say, and say it plainly and forcibly, if not artistically or brilliantly. Tennyson's faculty is rather of the imitative than the inventive order, the æsthetic sense being predominant. Though he seems to be often at loss for a message, he makes the most of one when found, if within the range of his limited powers. And yet Tennyson has manifested conspicuous intellectual ability, if not originality, as a philosophical and representative poet.

Versatile and learned as Tennyson unquestionably is, he can hardly be called a "myriad-minded man." He is an example of the ascendancy of facts over ideas, of knowledge over feeling. Culture has done more for him than nature.

Tennyson is not a profound metaphysician or an independent reasoner. He lags behind the great thinkers and investigators, picking up here and there the opinions and conclusions of his contemporaries. Tennyson muses rather than thinks; he studies and gleans rather than produces or discovers. He is not a miner, like Browning, for gold in the rough state; he prefers that already in circulation. But he ponders and perplexes himself over a fact or an idea till he sees it with unusual fulness and distinctness.

The Laureate has made a liberal use of physical and metaphysical phenomena as materials for poetry. He observes with the eye of a naturalist, and dissects mental and spiritual moods like a poet-psychologist. He clothes scientific and ethical truths in metrical language. But the facts and the theories of geology and philosophy seem out of place in a poem. Why should a poet try to dress up in

Digitized by Google

exquisite tropes and faultless rhymes information that is better suited for a text-book or a lecture? While something may be gained in terseness by putting such things in the form of verse, such an effort too often sinks into a labored, prosaic performance, tedious and unimaginative. It was too great a task for Lucretius and Pope; and in this kind of poetical work there is not at present much room for originality or majesty of ideas. Only a poet of transcendent genius can rise above the level of mediocrity.

Tennyson has at times admirably succeeded in transfusing the spirit of poetry into science, as in "The Two Voices," "In Memoriam," "The Princess," and in some of his short lyrics. The nameless but lovely fragment beginning—

> "Move eastward, happy earth, and leave
> Yon orange sunset waning slow,"

is unique in its felicitous union of poetry and science. Still, it is to be regretted that some of his finest poems are marred by scientific observations and allusions, as in the too literal description of a morning breeze in the best piece in "In Memoriam"—

> "And *sucked* from out the distant gloom,
> A breeze began to tremble o'er
> The large leaves of the sycamore,
> And fluctuate all the still perfume."

A few educated men may enjoy this, but it is above the average class of readers not familiar with scientific knowledge. A different kind of poetry is what they want and can appreciate.

The scientific spirit has made Tennyson at once more minute and varied, more definite and systematic; in consequence, he has become more observant, more graphic and faithful to nature. It has not only sharpened his power of perception but of introspection, and thus broadened the field of subjective experience. But while science has proved a help to him in certain directions as a student, it has in some

Digitized by Google

respects been a disadvantage to him as a poet. It has increased his stock of working ideas, but it has, to some extent, had an unfavorable effect on his mental habits, fostering an unpoetical, analytical mode of thinking, an accurate, matter-of-fact way of looking at things that too often stifles imaginative activity. The physicist's aims and methods being almost entirely at variance with the poet's, the gain in knowledge is accompanied by a loss of feeling and the sense of mystery.

If Tennyson's fame be enduring, it is not because of the scientific or metaphysical elements in his poetry—much as he owes especially to philosophical speculation—but because a part of his subject matter touches profoundly on human life, and appeals directly to the heart rather than to the intellect, or to both.

Tennyson is the exponent of the domestic and social life of the fashionable and middle classes, as Trollope was in fiction. But his poetry is not so much a mirror of the outward appearance and complexion of society as of its heart and its speculative, questioning moods. He has caught the intellectual and the æsthetic temper and habit of the Victorian reign; he has given form and currency to what was before more vague and potential. He has done his generation an inestimable service by gathering up much of the religious, scientific and philosophical thought of his time, and giving it a poetical dress, an artistic setting. In his poems we see reflected some of the salient features of the age, its complex and troublous character, its pessimistic trend, the war of clashing interests, the increase of knowledge, the weakening of orthodoxy and the spread of liberalism, accompanied by religious doubt and indifference.

In Tennyson we get the flavor of English high life, with its chivalric traditions, its lofty and refined ideals of manhood; also the critical, restless spirit of an unheroic age, in which fancy and sentiment, wonder and reverence, are on

Digitized by Google

the decline. But he is not an adequate representative of the progressive side of the nineteenth century, of its inventive genius pushing its way in every direction of possible improvement and discovery. Tennyson has not been stirred by its enthusiasms, or inspired to sing of the courage and endurance of the explorer, the energy and self-sacrifice of the missionary or philanthropist, though these fields offer the poet congenial themes.

In the poems of Tennyson's early manhood he voices the optimism of that time, as he has more recently voiced the sober unemotional pessimism of the present age. Excepting an occasional outburst of just indignation or peevish complaining, as in "Locksley Hall," at social inequalities and infelicities, his poems are, for the most part, pervaded by a spirit of hopefulness. But in "Locksley Hall Sixty Years After" the mild pessimism of the earlier poem has become pronounced and rabid. He seems to have lost all patience with a generation now passed beyond his teachings and sympathies.

Tennyson is far from being in accord with the unfeeling radicalism and the daring iconoclasm of our times, which attempt to tear down the old and make havoc of time-honored beliefs and theories. This spirit was felt and illustrated much more by Shelley and Byron. It is well for Tennyson that this side of the age has been but faintly shadowed forth in his writings. By yielding to such moods and influences he would suffer loss as a poet and teacher. And so we may say of Tennyson's failure to reflect other aspects of his age. It is well for him that he has not more of the scientific and materialistic spirit of the nineteenth century, unless he were also possessed of greater genius, of more intellectual ability and independence.

Unlike Shelley and Wordsworth, who were in some respects ahead of their time, Tennyson shows himself to be behind his age in seeking his themes in the dead and barren

Digitized by Google

past, in delineating feudalism instead of republicanism. Since the publication of his later Idylls, about 1870, it may be said that Tennyson's mark and pressure on the age have not been so distinctly felt. As a conservative and aristocrat, it was not to be expected that he would play the rôle of an innovator or a leader in revolutionary movements. But it is not to his credit that he takes so little interest in matters of vital importance to his countrymen and humanity. During a long life of selfish, isolated ease, Tennyson has never laid aside his pen, like Morris, to engage in enterprises to uplift the struggling masses. His heart has not, apparently, been touched by the wrongs and sufferings of the poor, as was Dickens', Hood's, and Mrs. Browning's. While keeping an eye on the controversies of philosophers and scientists, theologians and social reformers, Tennyson has taken no prominent part himself. Some of his telling lines and expressive phrases have done effective service as catch-words and mottoes, so often have they been used. Within the limits he has marked out for himself, Tennyson has been and is a potent factor in influencing public opinion; but, in the main, he prefers to watch from afar rather than enter the strife, to analyze and interpret more than to encourage the skeptical or the progressive tendencies of a transitional epoch.

The period to which Tennyson belongs is not an age calculated to foster in a high degree poetic greatness. It has been pre-eminently an age of scientific achievement and mechanical invention, of commercial activity and material development. Its currents of thought and action run in various and multitudinous directions. Tennyson has not displayed the ability or disposition to dominate its conflicting tendencies. He has moulded, to a certain extent, its thought and taste. He does not, however, tower, as Milton did, triumphantly above his age. Tennyson has not done for poetry what Wagner did for music, Darwin for science, Ruskin for art-literature, or Buckle and Guizot for history.

Digitized by Google

V.

It may seem strange that Tennyson has written no prose. Like Lowell and other intellectual bards of the nineteenth century, he might have found it a vehicle for many unpoetic thoughts. He would not then have been tempted to versify what might better appear in an essay or a sketch. And doubtless the prose style of so consummate an artist would be highly polished, nervous and sinewy. And yet, he has surely served his fame better by devoting himself wholly to poetry. Knowing the limits of his art and his abilities, he has acted with a wise instinct and a true artist's judgment in writing only verse. Here, as we have elsewhere noticed, Tennyson's æsthetic faculty has kept him clear of pitfalls that would wreck a less skillful and gifted artist or a more bold and vigorous thinker.

Tennyson has essayed almost everything within his reach—the poetry of action, thought, passion, description—and has happily mingled these various elements in many a poem. He is a poet of nature, reflection, sentiment, and, above all, of beauty. Although he does not stand supreme in any one field, he has fairly succeeded in nearly all the species of poety, his versatility being simply remarkable; and yet, some of the requisite qualities of a poet are noticeably absent in him.

For the higher walks of poetry it is necessary to have greater genius than Tennyson's. To succeed in the epic or drama the story-telling gift is indispensable, also insight into character, constructive power—in fact, the fullest and strongest mental equipment, the freest and richest development. To produce an "Antigone" or a "Hamlet" a higher kind of imagination is required than for a collection of lyrics. Right here Tennyson is found wanting. Occasionally he strikes a note of genius, a grand strain, but he does not overflow with songfulness. His is not the productiveness of Wagner, whose

Digitized by Google

inner impulse to compose was so great that he began, as he says, two works the same day. What is Tennyson's fertility compared with Milton's or Scott's? Even the lyrical fountain within him gushes not up so spontaneously and copiously as in Burns and Shelley.

Tennyson has not the intellectuality of Browning, the depth of Wordsworth, the kindliness of Scott, the fiery passion of Byron, the swift flight of Shelley, the genial, sympathetic magnetism of Burns, the cogent brevity and brilliancy of Pope, the massiveness and sublimity of Milton, the fancifulness of Spencer, the penetration of Shakespeare, or the sparkling humor and buoyancy of Chaucer. Excepting, perhaps, Pope and Browning, he fails to equal these poets, chiefly for his lack of imagination, though none of them excels him in the art of beautiful and harmonious expression. In universality of talents and attainments Tennyson has few equals; but, wanting in strength and originality, he is hardly entitled to a place in the second class of English poets, with Marlowe, Byron, and others of great eminence and genius.

VI.

A poet may fail in the epic and drama, and still find ample scope for the exercise of his powers in the lighter play of the feelings. It is a part of the bard's mission to sing of humble action and household affairs as well as of war and stormy passion; to show to mortals less gifted in sensibility and expression the ministry of affection and sympathy, of pleasure and sorrow. In this sense Tennyson is a true poet. He has a poet's susceptibilities and a sovereign command of language and rhythm. The heart has the same longings in all ages, and that poet pleases the masses best who voices the sentiments and impulses of humanity sympathetically and artistically. If he catches the popular heart and fancy, it shows that he has something human about him, that he is more than a recluse or a pedant.

Digitized by Google

Tennyson is loved for his chaste and fitting expression of noble ideas and innocent feelings, for his tributes to manliness and womanliness. He has taught men to realize the value of friendship and sincerity, to reverence the spiritual and the sacred. He touches chords which are echoed in every breast in solemn or gladsome moods. He paints life on its better side, represents youths and maidens in tender or romantic guise, men and women in devotional or heroic attitudes. Life seems grander on this old planet transformed and brightened by the idealizing power of his imagination. He also gives us glimpses of a supersensual world and another life.

Here is the secret of Tennyson's popularity. He furnishes something for all; he appeals to a wide and varied class of readers. His commonplace ideas and images are easily grasped by schoolgirls, while his pensive seriousness pleases older readers. Perhaps he is most powerful in pathos, which moves the hearts of all alike, Shelley's line being peculiarly true of Tennyson's poetry—

"Our sweetest songs are those which tell of saddest thought."

And his felicitous style fascinates all, his scholarly taste being especially admired by the critical and learned. The growing appreciation of the beautiful in our age finds satisfaction in Tennyson, who seems to be the highest product of this artistic tendency in literature.

Tennyson does not exhilarate us with impetuous bursts of elevated poetry, as the great singers do. It is a lovely, a subtle charm which keeps us reading page after page, admiring the beauty and appropriateness of his words and thoughts. One does not go to him for a tonic or a stimulant, and yet there is much in Tennyson of substantial, proud English manhood back of all the artificial brilliancy. His best poetry has a deep and living interest. If some of his

Digitized by Google

pieces lose their freshness and attraction on re-reading, others do not. We often return to them—

> "Perchance to lull the throbs of pain,
> Perchance to charm a vacant brain."

The most characteristic quality in them is, perhaps, their power to retain somehow a precious place in our affections and memories. This potency to inspire brighter hopes, purer desires and happier lives is Tennyson's crowning excellence, as it is also Longfellow's. But Tennyson has rendered a deeper and higher service than Longfellow; his harsher and sadder experiences made his music sweeter, his songs more spiritual. The strength of Tennyson's genius, or his charm, to use Wordsworth's expressive lines, lies—

> "In the soothing thoughts that spring
> Out of human suffering,
> In the faith that looks through death,
> In years that bring the philosophic mind."

EUGENE PARSONS.

Chicago, Ill.

Digitized by Google

IV.

THE PEASANTS' WAR.

LEONARD FRIES, who at the time of the Peasants' War was Secretary of the city of Wirzburg, and who, with commendable industry, compiled a documentary history of the movement which has only recently seen the light, forcibly characterizes the great popular uprising as a deluge. "The terrible deluge," writes he, in the spirit of his time, "which astronomers and astrologers foretold long before it occurred —a woeful and lamentable deluge, not of water, as the astronomers and astrologers supposed, but a deluge of blood." "For," he proceeds, "in the German nation alone more than 100,000 men were overwhelmed and perished in this deluge in less than ten weeks."

It is scarcely necessary that I should say one word by way of justifying my choice of a theme. The great popular uprising of the sixteenth century is so closely allied to the movement commonly known as the Protestant Reformation, but which I prefer to designate the Protestant Revolution, and has so many points of contact with the earlier social, political and religious history of Europe, as well as with the democratic and socialistic movements of later times, that the subject bears its justification on its very face. If it fails to interest, rest assured that the fault is not in the subject, which is one of the richest in modern history, and one on which the most abundant materials have been brought within our reach by recent German scholars, but rather in him who may have failed to avail himself of the interesting features of the subject, or to have utilized the rich stores of information that lay upon his table.

Digitized by Google

The Peasants' War of 1524–25 was not the first of its kind. Throughout the later Middle Ages, and in almost every part of Europe, peasant uprisings of greater or less magnitude had taken place. The great mass of the Germanic peoples, who had from the earliest times been noted for their force of character and their love of liberty, had, as a result of the feudal system, been reduced to a state of serfdom. Captives of war doubtless formed the basis of serfdom; poverty and debt brought multitudes of free men into the same condition. It would be tedious to enumerate the various stages or degrees of dependence that found place under the feudal system. It is needless to say that in some regions and at certain periods the condition of the peasants was worse than in other places and at other times. It is equally obvious to say that in the same country and at the same time the condition of the people varied according to the humanity or the inhumanity of their lords.

The feudal laws, as might be supposed, were strongly favorable to the proprietors of the soil. The peasant had few rights that the nobility were bound to respect. In many cases the peasantry were regarded as an inherent part of the property, and were bought and sold with the land. Of course, under such circumstances, they were incapable of changing their habitations. They must follow the lord in his war-like enterprises. The proprietor could impose any rents or taxes he might see fit. He could take the peasant's possessions without his consent, destroy his crops by riding over them with hunting parties without compensation. He could imprison, shoot or hang him at his own sweet will. Cases are on record, apparently pretty well authenticated, of noblemen on hunting excursions killing their serfs in order that they might warm their feet in their opened bodies. There is, I believe, one code of feudal laws in which this right is expressly recognized, but the number of serfs that may be thus used on any given excursion is limited. A

Digitized by Google

story is told of a nobleman who wished to cross a swollen stream, and could think of no more feasible way of doing it than to force a large number of serfs into the flood, and to pass over on their struggling bodies as they drifted to destruction. It was the prerogative of the lords, very commonly exercised, to withhold from the peasant the right to fish in the streams, to shoot or entrap game, to cut wood or timber for fuel and building, to possess guns or cross-bows, or to marry whom he chose. One of the most unreasonable and unjust laws was the law of heriot, in accordance with which the lord had the right, on the death of one of his serfs, to go upon the premises and take the first or most valuable chattel he could lay hands upon. It was a poor comfort to the bereaved wife and children to have their sole milk cow, or something equally necessary, taken ruthlessly away. The theory doubtless was that the lord thus secured a certain compensation for the loss sustained in the death of his serf. A like basis doubtless had the law by virtue of which the lord could claim the entire property of a suicide. Most peasants would have been quite content to pay a large proportion of the grain produce as rent, but to be obliged to tithe the fowls, calves, lambs, hay, vegetables, etc., was highly vexatious and oppressive. The ecclesiastical lords were little more considerate of the interests or the comfort of the peasants than the lay. In fact, some of the worst instances of oppression are furnished by the church. Most of the bishops, archbishops and abbots were members of titled families, and their motives, in many cases, were purely secular. They usually had to pay a high price for their appointment, and it was natural that they should seek to recoup themselves by fleecing the peasants.

The history of earlier struggles for freedom on the part of the peasants may be briefly summed up: Burdens too grievous to be borne; a more or less distinct hope of successful resistance, usually engendered or fostered by some

Digitized by Google

sort of religious awakening, or by some enthusiastic individual or individuals who succeeded in catching the ear of the people, ready to listen to anything that promised relief from the galling yoke of serfdom; a fitful struggle for freedom; some deeds of outlawry on the part of the desperate peasants; a merciless massacre; the imposition of still more grievous burdens upon the survivors.

Yet the failure of the peasants in their struggles for freedom had by no means been universal or complete. In the Rhætian Alps and in the Swiss cantons rebellion had resulted in glorious freedom. In France serfdom had come to an end from a combination of circumstances. It seems never to have existed in the Netherlands. The region in which serfdom still reigned supreme at the beginning of the sixteenth century was Germany, and it was in Franconia, Elsass and Swabia that it had assumed its most aggravated forms. If you will recall the geography of this region you will observe its contiguity to those countries in which liberty had made the greatest strides. The intercourse between the peasantry of Elsass, Franconia and Swabia with that of Switzerland on the one side, and that of the Netherlands on the other, was of the most intimate kind.

Let us look a little more particularly at the antecedents of the Peasants' War on the territory in which it arose and in which it raged most fiercely. It was in Franconia and Swabia that the rumblings of discontent first became distinctly audible and that the first revolutionary deeds were perpetrated. Here the hardships of the peasants were peculiarly great. The lives of the clergy were shamelessly corrupt, and the princely style of living the prelates affected made it necessary to wring from the peasantry the last particle of marketable substance. The Hussite wars had drained the country of its resources. The bishop, John Bruno, is said to have lived, nevertheless, like an Oriental prince in Solomonic splendor. While the people starved

Digitized by Google

and sighed, the court, which was a collection of flatterers and favorites, of mistresses and their children, upon whom he lavished most recklessly the income from the land, was a scene of feasting and revelry. His successor exhausted the impoverished people still more. The next bishop in order was a member of the archducal house of Saxony, and was devoted to the sacred office by his father and brothers, as was well understood at the time, if not frankly avowed, "because of the feebleness and the unsoundness of his mind." "Through bad government, through manifold taxes, imposts, feuds, enmities, wars, conflagrations, murders, imprisonments and the like, land and people had already, in 1443, come into so great misery," relates an almost contemporary manuscript, "that nobody could either himself use for proper purposes what the Almighty vouchsafes to him, nor yet bestow anything suitably upon others. And the prospect of amelioration was exceedingly remote, for warring, burning, robbing, throttling, imprisoning, putting in stocks, pinioning, fining, were becoming worse and more violent than they had been before."

Religious influences were at work side by side with social and political. The contempt of the clergy, fully justified by what we have seen of their unworthiness, opened the hearts of the people to something better. It was precisely in this region that the old evangelical party of the later Middle Ages achieved its greatest success. If time permitted, I could show you from authentic documents that this entire region was covered with evangelizing influences during the latter half of the fifteenth century and earlier. The printing presses of the great commercial centres of this region—Bamberg, Augsburg, Nürenberg, Strassburg, Basle, etc.—sent forth, from 1466 to 1518, not fewer (probably far more) than fourteen complete editions of the German Bible, together with multitudes of editions of Bible portions. The Waldenses were noted for their study of the Bible, and there

Digitized by Google

can be little doubt but that the teachers of this party distributed these Bibles freely among the peasants, whom they taught to read and interpret them. There can be no greater mistake than to suppose that Luther was in any sense the originator of modern popular Bible study. Apart from the sound evangelizing influences just mentioned, extreme and fanatical types of religious life appeared here, as they are sure to occur in times of dire oppression. The case of Hans Boeheim is one out of many. In 1476 this young cowherd appeared as preacher and prophet. He had been notoriously irreligious and much given to the playing of the fife and other instruments for dancing parties, etc. The Virgin, in a vision, commanded him to burn his instrument, which he straightway did in the presence of the people. Under like supposed inspiration he began to proclaim the setting up of a new kingdom of God. The Virgin prompted him to require the putting aside of all finery. Vast multitudes thronged his ministry, thirty or forty thousand having sometimes heard him on a single day. At length the Virgin revealed to him that there should be no emperor, no prince, no pope, no secular or spiritual magistracy. Instead, every man was to be brother to every other man, win his bread with his own hands, and no one was to have more than another. This, of course, involved the abolition of all property in land. Crowds of pilgrims came from all parts of the country and from the neighboring countries to hear this comforting doctrine, which claimed to come direct from the Mother of God. After some months of such fanatical preaching Boeheim made up his mind that the time had come to reduce preaching to practice. He gave an invitation to all the males among his followers to meet him, armed for conflict, on a certain day. The bishop got wind of the revolutionary scheme. Boeheim was burned to ashes, and a vast number of peasants were slaughtered.

This same territory was covered by the great Bundschuh

Digitized by Google

movement, 1499 to 1514. This was a vast secret organization, which derived its name from the peasant's clog adopted as a symbol. A well concerted scheme for a simultaneous strike for liberty throughout an extended territory was rendered futile by the treachery of some member. Swift vengeance came upon the ringleaders, as was to have been expected. The free Switzers had aided and abetted the rebellion to such an extent as to exasperate the nobles. An attack on the Swiss resulted in the defeat of the troops of the nobles, and in the burning of many castles by the peasants. To give a history of the work of the Bundschuh from 1499 to 1514, under the leadership first of Jacob Wimpeling, who has been fittingly called a German Tiberius Gracchus, then of Joss Fritz if possible a still more intrepid commander, and of Poor Cuntz of Wurtemburg who fought a good fight against great odds, would require more time than I can devote to my entire subject. Truth and righteousness were crushed to earth, to be sure, but they were destined to rise again, and that with increased energy in the not very distant future.

The platform of the Bundschuh may be briefly stated as follows: Recognition of no other lord than God, the emperor and the pope (the pope is omitted from one copy); abolition of all judicial tribunals except local courts—a protest against being dragged from their homes on vague charges and tried before unsympathizing judges; the limitation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction to spiritual things; abolition of all tithes, except such as are recognized by the Word of God; freedom of fishing, game, wood, forest, etc.; limitation of clergy to one benefice; reduction of the numbers of monasteries and like foundations and the use of the confiscated funds for the military purposes of the Bundschuh; the abolition of all obnoxious imposts and duties; the establishment of peace throughout Christendom, those who must fight being sent to fight the Turks; protection of all members of

Digitized by Google

the Bundschuh and punishment of all who oppose its work; the acquisition of a good city as headquarters; members of the Bundschuh to appropriate their means for its purposes.

They succeeded in gaining the alliance of many of the gentry and of some of the nobility. Claiming as did the leaders that they were able to prove every demand both Scriptural and reasonable, they gained multitudes of adherents. Yet the extreme poverty of the Bundschuh is shown by the difficulty with which funds could be secured for a banner, which was regarded as indispensable. The organization extended from Hungary to France, and from Switzerland to Saxony or beyond. The result was disastrous to the peasantry, but the spirit of freedom was not extinguished as we shall soon have occasion to see.

The period from 1514 to 1524 was not one in which revolutionary zeal once kindled was likely to die out. Three years after the crushing of the Bundschuh the great Wittemberg monk attacked indulgences, and a little later (especially in 1519 and 1520) he stood forth as the champion of Christian liberty and equality. In his address to the emperor, nobles and people of Germany, Luther struck at the root of sacerdotalism and privileged classes. The unlettered peasant who has the spirit of God is a better interpreter of Scripture than pope or scholar who has not. An honest reader consulting his Bible can be impeached by no power below the sun. The Christian cobbler and the Christian king he puts upon an equality. Each has functions to perform—the one to rule for the benefit of others, the other to make shoes for the same purpose. All believers are alike priests of God, and therefore equally exalted. All sorts of luxury and extravagance are denounced in a style that would go straight to the heart of the common man.

In his treatise on the Liberty of a Christian Man, he gave utterance to as noble Christian sentiments as can be found in literature. "Every man is a free and fully competent judge of

Digitized by Google

all those who will teach him, and is inwardly taught by God alone." He insisted that every one—man, woman, scholar, illiterate, man-servant, maid-servant—may and must attain to absolute certainty as to what is true Christian doctrine and what is heresy, by interpreting the Scriptures according to the light given by the Spirit of God. To the sheep, not to the preachers, does judgment belong. He would put the Bible into the hands of everyone and say, "There now, let each one make a creed for himself."

In 1522, in a sermon against Carlstadt, he said: "I will preach, I will talk, I will write, but I will force and constrain no man with violence; for faith is by nature voluntary and uncompelled. Even as late as 1524, in a letter to the princes of Saxony, he wrote: "Your princely graces should not restrain the office of the Word. Men should be allowed confidently and freshly to preach what they can and against whom they will, for, as I have said, there must be sects, and the Word of God must lie afield and fight. . . . If their spirit is right, it will not be afraid of us and will stand its ground. Is ours right, it will not be afraid of them nor of any. We should let the spirits have free course." Brave words are these, truly. We shall see hereafter how far he lived up to them.

The peasants of Germany, who had been for so long struggling against civil and ecclesiastical despotism, hailed the advent of this great son of a peasant as of one who combined thorough sympathy for the oppressed with learning, position and influence; and as one under whose banner they might march on to victory. As I have already said the peasants of Germany were not indebted to any very large extent to Luther for evangelical teaching or impulse. It was only as his teaching corresponded with the Biblical views they had imbibed from less influential teachers that they rejoiced in his work. It has been proved beyond question that from 1517 to 1522 Luther's doctrinal views were almost

Digitized by Google

identical with the old evangelical views with which the peasants had long been familiar, and that after the latter date a marked change for the worse appears in his teachings. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the bold evangelical utterances of Luther during these years constitute an important factor among the influences that led to the great peasants' revolt.

The influence of the advanced democratic views of such knights as Ulrich von Hutten and Franz von Sickingen was likewise very considerable, but we cannot stay to analyze it.

The moderately revolutionary preaching and writings of Carlstadt, and the violently insurrectionary preaching and prophesying of Thomas Münzer, one of the worst fanatics of the age, and a worthy successor along certain lines of Hans Boeheim, doubtless influenced the peasants in a considerable measure. But it would be doing grave injustice to the spirit of this great struggle for civil and religious liberty to suppose that it had the millenarian expectations of Münzer for its mainspring. The influence of Münzer, so far as it did extend, was wholly baneful and destructive.

It is remarkable that in proportion as the spirit of liberty was increasing through such influences as those I have mentioned, the hardships of the peasants were becoming more and more unendurable. A number of instances of revolting cruelty occurred about this time. I must omit the particulars. A certain nobleman compelled his subordinate to drive away two peasants and their families because they had refused to give him their hens. Another nobleman procured the execution of a peasant for the crime of catching crabs out of a brook.

The peasants of the Count of Lippen complained that they were allowed no rest, but were compelled by the Countess to hunt for snail-shells, wind yarn, gather strawberries, cherries and sloes, and do other such like things on holidays; that they had to work for their lords and ladies

Digitized by Google

in fine weather and for themselves in the rain. Moreover, huntsmen and their hounds ran about without regarding the damage they did.

The pestilence had a few years before destroyed vast numbers of the peasants, and many of the noblemen were inclined to compel the survivors to do the work of the dead, as well as their own.

In some cases the rents and taxes are said to have been increased twenty fold. Waste land that had formerly been exempted was now taxed to the utmost. Tithing had been extended to include almost every imaginable article of produce. The freedom to go on journeys and to meet in large numbers which had formerly been accorded to the peasants, had been withdrawn in consequence of the recent Bundschuh uprising.

Thus we see that, whether the immediate occasion of the outbreak was the exasperation of the peasants at being compelled to gather snail-shells and cherries on holidays, or the shooting of some peasants for poaching, or the merciless exaction of rent in Lipheim when the harvest had almost completely failed, all the conditions existed for the spread of the conflagration throughout Germany when once it had been kindled.

It would be a mistake to suppose that the nobles were uniformly cruel and unreasonable. A few instances are recorded of those who were noble not in name only, but in deed. Frederick the Wise, of Saxony, was a man of heart and conscience. A nobleman whose conscience was troubling him as to whether he ought to keep his peasants in bondage, wrote again and again to Luther for spiritual direction. The same Luther who could write the passionate pleas for liberty and equality, full of inconsistencies as he ever was, used all the influence and the sophistry he could command to induce his correspondent to keep the peasants in bondage and to quench the Spirit of God that was, we

Digitized by Google

may suppose, prompting the man through his conscience to loose the bonds of his subjects. "The common man," he wrote, "must be laden with burdens, otherwise he will become too wanton." When, after all Luther's advice, the man's conscience continued to trouble him, he was taught to ascribe the compunction to satanic influence. Is not this a clear case of sinning against the Holy Ghost?

It was in the territory of the Count of Lippen, where the peasants were compelled to gather snail shells, that the peasants first rose in rebellion in 1524. Hans Müller, an experienced warrior and popular orator led one thousand two hundred peasants to Waldshut on August 24th. Here they made common cause with the citizens, who under the preaching of the great reformer, Bathasar Hübmeyer (soon to be known to the world as a great Baptist leader), and from close contact with the free institutions of Switzerland, had become strongly democratic in sentiment. A union was formed under the name of the "Evangelical Brotherhood." They were resolved to obey no other lord the the emperor, and to destroy all castles, monasteries, and everything ecclesiastical. They knew full well that castles were a perpetual menace to liberty, and that monasteries could be maintained only at the expense of the tillers of the soil. They were thoroughly convinced that they could expect only taxation and oppression from the clergy. The Evangelical Brotherhood thus constituted formed a regular propaganda. Enthusiastic emissaries were sent at the common expense far and wide to organize the peasants in every locality. The aim was to bring about a state of society in every respect righteous and consonant with the spirit of the Gospel. The Swabian League, organized for the suppression of insurrection, was soon in a position to cope with the insurgents, but not until the movement had made great headway and almost the whole peasant population of Europe was in arms.

Digitized by Google

Let us look for a moment at the twelve articles of the peasants, which exhibit the spirit of the movement better than any words of mine can do.

The first article insists upon the right of the people to appoint and remove pastors, and to demand simple and clear preaching of the Gospel without human additions. "Unless God's grace is formed in us we remain simply flesh and blood, which is of no use, for only through faith can we come to God and only through His mercy can we attain to blessedness." Is there any heresy or fanaticism here?

In the second article the matter of tithes is discussed. While the peasants hold that tithes are an Old Testament institution fulfilled in the New, they yet agree to continue paying grain tithes. These, however, are to be employed for the suitable maintenance of pastors of their own choice and for assisting the poor under the direction of the Church. They object to the minor tithes that had of late years been extorted from them as unjust and not even in accord with the Old Testament. This is sound Baptist teaching, is it not?

The third article repudiates the idea that the peasants are the property of their lords; for Christ has redeemed and purchased all alike, high and low, with his precious blood. Yet magistracy is an ordinance of God, and it is the duty of peasants to bear themselves in humility, not simply towards the magistracy, but towards all men. They are resolved in all things Christian to be obedient to the legally constituted magistracy. I think you will pronounce the teaching of this article above criticism, whether on religious or political grounds.

In the fourth article the peasants express the conviction that it is unseemly and unbrotherly, selfish, and contrary to the Word of God, that no poor man should be allowed to kill game in the forests, or catch fish in the streams; and they demand that what God has made for the use of man be left free. This is a demand persistently made through-

Digitized by Google

out the entire course of peasant agitation, and one that commends itself to the Christian consciousness as eminently just and reasonable.

In the fifth article objection is made to the appropriation of the forests by the lords, and it is demanded that the poor man be accorded the privilege of getting firewood and timber.

In the sixth article the peasants complain that the labor required of them is becoming greater from day to day, and ask that their burdens be alleviated according to the Word of God.

Articles 7-10 deal with mutual obligations of lords and peasants in the matters of wages, tenure of land, etc. I am of opinion that the keenest scrutiny would fail to discover an unjust or un-Christian demand in them.

In the eleventh article they demand the utter abolition of the heriot or death-gift. The wonder is that such a heartless practice should ever have been instituted, or should have been tolerated by the public opinion of any age.

In the twelfth article they make what seems to me an eminently fair proposition. If any of the foregoing articles is not according to the Word of God, they promise to withdraw it so soon as the fact shall have been pointed out.

I think it was Thomas Carlyle who pronounced these articles worthy of a Solon. An able German historian says: "It was a man of heart and intellect who composed or revised the articles, one who was familiar with the oppressions practised by the nobility and sympathized deeply with the people, one who aimed at no violent revolution and laid no claim to liberty in the sense of equality, but who aimed to provide a touchstone for lords and subjects drawn straight from Holy Scripture and capable of being applied with safety and comfort."

With thorough organization and such a document as the basis of their demands, the peasants during the first quarter

Digitized by Google

of 1525 swept everything before them. The cities and towns which had much to complain of in the conduct of lords, lay and ecclesiastical, and the artisan class, which had for generations been permeated with evangelical and democratic sentiments, usually received the peasant hosts with open arms. Castles, monasteries, and other religious houses in large numbers were stormed, sacked and burned. The lords were in many cases obliged to accept the terms of the peasants or to expect the worst. In some instances the peasants went too far in imitation of the lords and wreaked bloody vengeance on such as rendered themselves peculiarly obnoxious to them. Those of the peasants who were under the direct influence of the fanatical Münzer, were too much inclined to obey his hysterical exhortation to rush upon the enemies of the Lord, to slay, slay, and tire not. He claimed that the sword of Gideon was in his hand and that he would lead them on to victory. "On, on, on," shrieked he, "never mind the wail of the godless. Though they beg in friendly tones, though they cry and whimper like children, pity not." Was it thus that God commanded his people to slay the Canaanites? "On, on, while the fire is hot. Down with the castles and their inmates. God is with you, on, on." The nobility were dazed for a time by the magnitude of the insurrection. They scarcely knew which way to turn, or whom to trust. For many of the soldiers had come from the ranks of the peasantry and sympathized with their cause.

The Swabian League soon had a strong force in the field, under one of the ablest and cruelest generals of the age. The tide soon turned. When disaster began it swept over the entire field as rapidly as victory had done before. Münzer, in his part of the field, proved a complete failure. He had provided himself with guns but had neglected a supply of ammunition. He wrought the poor peasants up into a state of frenzy, and led them to expect miraculous divine interposition. They were slaughtered like sheep.

Digitized by Google

The rest of the peasants' armies were attacked in detail and overcome one by one. About one hundred thousand of the miserable people were butchered by the troops of the League.

Martin Luther, who had at the beginning of the war counselled compromise, and who had urged the peasants to desist from their undertaking, soon began to rage against them with such fury as to bring upon himself the sharp rebuke of some of the nobles. The bloodthirstiness of his exhortations would lead one to suppose that he was as crazy as Münzer. His language as has been well said, was more despotic than that of the despots themselves. He wrote against "the murderous and pillaging bands of the peasants." He urged that they be "crushed, strangled and stabbed, privately and publicly, by whomsoever can do it, just as one would beat to death a mad dog." "The magistracy," he added, "that falters, commits sin; since it does not satisfy the peasants to belong to the devil themselves, but they constrain many pious people to their wickedness and damnation. Therefore, dear sirs, fire here, save here, stab, smite, strangle them, whoever can. If your death result, very well, you can never attain to a more blessed death."

It is needless to say that there were plenty of the nobles ready to carry out to the letter the exhortations of this great saint and reformer.

What were the causes of the failure of this organized and well-concerted struggle for civil and religious liberty? it may well be asked.

I answer, first, that the twelve articles were too far in advance of the age. The social and political ideas of the author of the articles were just as far beyond the dominant social and political ideas of the age as were the religious and ecclesiastical ideas of the Baptists of that time in advance of those that prevailed among Roman Catholics and Protestants. The evangelical social reformers and the evangelical religious re-

Digitized by Google

formers both did a noble work during this generation; both alike had brilliant though brief careers; both alike drew to themselves the masses of the people who were longing for deliverance from social and ecclesiastical bondage. They failed at the time because the great weight of public sentiment was against them; because they contended against vast vested interests that had their roots deeply implanted in the soil of Europe; because they stood up against the wealth, the learning and the organized power of the world.

But this is not all. The bane of the peasants' movement, just as a little later it became the bane of the Baptist movement of the sixteenth century, and just as I verily believe it will prove to be the bane of any movement into which it may enter, was millenarianism. I am as profoundly convinced that no Christian or Christian body can entertain carnal expectations with reference to the setting up of the kingdom of God on earth without serious harm as I am that Christianity is essentially a spiritual religion, and that progress is from spiritual to more spiritual, rather than from spiritual to carnal. Alas for the Church of Christ if it should ever come to look upon the sword of Gideon as a fit instrument for the setting up of the kingdom of God, or to conceive of the Christ of God as leading a carnal host to the slaughter of the ungodly! Such thoughts are unspeakably revolting, I believe, to the rightly instructed Christian consciousness, and the fact that they are entertained by earnest and zealous men does not change my attitude towards them one iota. Hans Boeheim was earnest and was fairly consumed with zeal; Thomas Münzer was one of the most self-sacrificing and zealous of men. These and multitudes of others I might name have held to much of precious truth along with their errors, and have had many admirable elements in their characters. And yet their work was vitiated by false and carnal views of Christ and his kingdom.

The peasants' movement failed at the time for the reasons

Digitized by Google

I have named among others; but the great truths that were embodied in this movement, and in the closely allied Baptist movement, did not perish. The faith of Hübmeyer, the great leader of the Baptist movement and possibly the author of the twelve articles, in the immortality of the truth has been abundantly justified by history. The principles contended for by the leaders of these two movements have gone on and on from victory to victory, until most of them are now regarded as commonplaces. The public sentiment of Christendom to-day would accept the peasants' articles as reasonable and just in their demands. The few principles contended for by the evangelical, social and religious reformers of the sixteenth century that are not yet universally accepted are still on the way of conquest. May God help us rightly to appreciate the rich heritage of the past contained in the lives, the martyr deaths, the oral and written teachings, and the impulses communicated to their generation and so handed down to us, of the evangelical, social and religious reformers of the sixteenth century, and each of us according to our opportunity to press forward the dissemination of the principles for which they joyfully gave up their lives.

ALBERT H. NEWMAN.

Toronto Baptist College.

Digitized by Google

V.

SPIRIT-PERCEPTION.

AN ESSAY IN CHRISTIAN PSYCHOLOGY.

THIS paper is entitled an essay in *Christian* psychology, because, in the course of the discussion, appeal is made to facts for the knowledge of which we are dependent upon the Christian Scriptures and upon Christian consciousness. By Christians, the validity of this appeal to the Christian Scriptures will be at once admitted, for to them the clear testimony of the Word of God is above controversy. Equally valid among them is an appeal to the Christian consciousness; not, indeed, as a primary and immediate, but as a secondary and mediate source of knowledge. If any question the legitimacy, in a scientific essay, of this appeal to the Christian consciousness, because, as the limiting term imports, it is restricted to a part only of the race, we submit the following suggestions:

1. The common consciousness of mankind is nothing more than the personal consciousness of each man, attested by the consciousness of other men. We have no record of the testimony of the consciousness of every human being; this is manifestly impracticable. Having, however, the agreeing testimony of a large number of persons, and no controverting testimony of any considerable number, we are warranted in the induction that, the conditions being the same, the testimony of the entire race would, if known, be in accord with that which has been ascertained. Hence,

2. There is no ground for rejecting the testimony of consciousness of any number of persons competent to testify, unless that testimony is appealed to to substantiate alleged

Digitized by Google

facts that either cannot in their nature fall within the sphere of consciousness, or are inconsistent with the normal operations of the human soul. Moreover,

3. Certain classes of psychical facts are known only in certain relations. For example, the symptoms of disease, so far as these are subjective to the patients, are, in the very nature of the case, matters of consciousness only to the sufferers. Nevertheless, they are made the basis of the science of diagnosis. Indeed, in the last analysis, all the facts upon which physical science, in all its departments, is built up, are nothing more than facts of the scientific consciousness, or the consciousness of a comparatively small body of physical scientists. These men, while pursuing their investigations, become conscious of certain spiritual phenomena which depend upon the peculiar relations of the observers to the material world. To these phenomena they testify, under the form of the objective material causes, and their testimony is accepted, without question, as possessing scientific value. Upon precisely similar grounds do we insist upon the strictly scientific value of the facts given in the Christian consciousness. If these are rejected, because restricted to a portion only of the human race, by parity of reasoning must the facts of the scientific consciousness be rejected. Still further let it be observed:

4. The character of the persons who testify to the facts of the Christian consciousness is such that it is irrational to reject their testimony. They are persons of sound mind. In all the practical relations of life, their judgment is relied upon. They are persons of undoubted integrity. Many have given the strongest possible proof of sincerity by the sacrifice of property, liberty, social position, and even life itself. Certainly, it should seem that the time has come when Christian thinkers must refuse to derive their science and their philosophy from pagan sources alone; when they are bound to maintain, with due humility, yet firmly and

Digitized by Google

unashamed, that in departments of research where the facts derived from the word of God and the Christian consciousness are essential to correct conclusions, any investigation which ignores them is, on this account, imperfect and so far unscientific.

If now the legitimacy of our appeal to facts derived from the sources mentioned be granted, we may next vindicate our choice of the term Spirit-Perception. It is chosen, first, because it suggests a dual mode of knowing analogous to sense-perception; *i. e.*, at once direct and inferential; secondly, to distinguish this mode of knowing from that of the reason, as having an intuition of first truths, as cause, design, a personal God, etc.; and thirdly, to distinguish this mode of knowing, as respects our knowledge of God, from the mystic, transcendental, face to face, vision of Deity.

In support of the view that we have a direct knowledge of spirit in a way analogous to our knowledge of matter in sense-perception, we beg to submit the following proposition:

Man, as a person known to science, is the actual synthesis of matter and spirit. He is, in this manner, fitted to perceive matter, on one side, and spirit on the other. He is himself, in his own person, the mediator between the two poles of being in the universe; he himself bridges the gulf between them; he touches matter on one side, and spirit on the other, in the single act of consciousness. By this statement, we do not mean that the two elements are so united as to be confounded as to substance, but, rather, that their relation to each other is so intimate that consciousness covers, in part, the activities of both, and thus testifies to the real existence of both.

In explication of this statement, it is necessary to inquire, first, what is spirit, and how is it known? and, second, what is matter, and how is it known?

In reply to the first question, we say that spirit is known

Digitized by Google

directly in consciousness as face to face with itself; *i. e.*, as self-conscious. It is thus known, to speak in particulars, 1. As substance. 2. As putting forth the threefold activity of feeling, knowing and willing. 3. As acting in space, but as having no relations of extension. We predicate of spirit a threefold activity of feeling, knowing and willing, because these are not to be conceived as put forth separately by the acting substance, but rather in combination, although one form of the threefold activity may, at a given moment, be predominant in consciousness. We predicate substantial existence of spirit, because, reflecting upon the facts of consciousness, we discriminate between the activities and the actor, between the *ego* and its phenomena. This discrimination is given implicitly in the deliverance of consciousness, I feel, I think, I will. Here are given two elements, with equal distinctness and certainty, the *ego* and its activities. It has, indeed, been urged that we are conscious of the *ego* only when it acts, that the *ego is*, in fact, only when it acts, so that when we think away its acts, zero only remains, a mathematical point, as it were, without content. We should say, therefore, it thinks, it feels, it wills, just as we say, it rains, predicating the raining of nothing, and, accordingly, predicating the thinking of nothing. To this it is a sufficient reply, that consciousness testifies just as certainly to the substantive existence of the actor as to its activities, and as distinct from the activities. The *ego* abides, like a rock, amid the ever-varying, ever-flowing stream of its phenomena; it is linked to the past by memory and to the future by expectation. Against this testimony of consciousness, no *a priori* objections are of any weight.

We are not at liberty, let it be repeated, to say beforehand what consciousness *can* testify to, but are to inquire what it does in fact say. We have, in this consciousness of spirit as substance, the beginning and foundation of all science and philosophy, the first certainty; for, if we have no

Digitized by Google

certain knowledge of the observer, nothing can be observed. Hence, as a matter of history, whoever obscures or rejects this testimony of consciousness to the substantive existence of spirit, puts himself upon a pathway that can have no other end than universal nescience. It matters not what such a one says, for there is no one to say it. The late Prof. Henry, of the Smithsonian Institute, whose authority as a scientific observer no one will dispute, affirms: "It is one of the truths best established by experience, in my own mind, that I have a thinking, feeling and willing principle within me, capable of intellectual activity and moral feeling."

Inasmuch, then, as it is our contention that the self-conscious spirit knows spirit other than itself directly, after the analogy of sense-perception, we must answer our second question, What is the matter, and how is it known?

We answer that in the experience of sensation, we are conscious of an experience which differs from the pain, for example, which is ours on hearing of the death of a friend, in that it is known to be not of the pure *ego*, but of the *ego* as consciously animating an extended substance. This extended substance is in this manner directly perceived by the *ego* as without itself, and yet as in immediate relation to itself, and of which, as directly perceived, we are conscious. This extended substance of which we are conscious in the experience of direct perception, we term, matter. That matter *is*, then, we are conscious, in that it is directly perceived as in immediate relation to the perceiving *ego*. The spirit looks directly, through feeling, upon its immediate environment, and cognizes something differing in substance from itself. The assumption, therefore, old as Plato and Aristotle, which has fatally vitiated philosophy, ancient and modern, that "like only can know like," must, in the light of modern scientific method, be pronounced unscientific. There is no warrant for postulating, *a priori*, what spirit can know; we are, rather, to inquire what it actually does know. When

Digitized by Google

the idealist says, "Try for an instant to imagine a substance such as matter, reflecting itself in or acting upon another substance, having no one property in common with it. You cannot. Nor is this all: you cannot even imagine two substances so distinct as matter and spirit are defined to be,"— we answer, here is no case of the imagination, that faculty acts only as it combines the objects of thought and perception, but here we have precisely the same ground for predicating the real existence of matter as we have for predicating the real existence of spirit, that is, direct cognition of both.

We here take another step in answer to the second question raised. While we know *that* matter is, are certain of the existence of matter, by direct perception, we come to know *what form* of matter we may, at any time, be in relation with, inferentially, by the discursive reason. Thus we know a tree, a house, a landscape, by combining the various percepts, which we have when we are affected by these objects, under the relations of causation, time and space, substance and attribute into the ideas of a tree or a house or a landscape. Sense-perception, then, is not only a two-fold process in that it has the two elements of sensation and perception, but, also, in that it is both direct and inferential.

We have now cleared the way for a statement of our doctrine of spirit-perception.

We are self-conscious spirits, having substantial existence, and possessing, by original endowment, powers of perception. In sense-perception, the organs of perception, it is important, in this connection, to observe, are instruments only of the percipient soul. Perception is predicated of the soul only.

We are in relation to other spirits having substantial existence, and similarly endowed.

Now, the problem is, can, does, spirit communicate directly with spirit? Our answer is in the affirmative. To make our answer clear let it be observed:

Digitized by Google

1. That spirit is substance, the first substance known to us, and known not simply as putting forth intellectual activity, but acting, also, as sensibility and will; intellect, sensibility and will acting in unity. If, then, spirit is to affect spirit, it must affect it not merely as thought, but as a thinking substance.

2. Matter affects the soul primarily through the sensibility. The material of thought is in sense-perception furnished by the sensibility. So, by analogy, we should expect that spirit would affect spirit primarily through the sensibility. We believe that, in fact, spirit does stand to spirit in a relation of feeling; that so attention is arrested and thought awakened.

3. Our environment of spiritual beings differs from our material environment in that as spiritual it is not an unvarying cause of experiences in us, but, rather, a variable cause, being under the control of will, the centre of personality; that is, it may be known to be present in varying degrees of vividness, according to the purpose to be known on the part of the spirit with which we may, at any moment, be in relation, and according to our own disposition, including in disposition the state of the affections and the will, to know. Matter, destitute of purpose, presses upon us blindly, and without cessation; but spirit intermittingly, in pursuance of purpose.

Our position, then, is that, when we are in relation to spirit seeking to make itself known, we are conscious of experiences which we know, also, are not self-caused, and which, therefore, under the relation of causation, we refer to a *non-ego* spiritual of which we are conscious through direct perception of it. Perceiving that spiritual being other than our own is, exists, by being thus brought face to face with it, we go on to discover what are the distinguishing characteristics of the personal being with whom we are, at any moment, in conscious relation by a process of the discursive reason.

Digitized by Google

Spirit-perception, then, like sense-perception, has in it the two elements of direct and influential knowing. By the first, we know that spirit other than our own is; by the second, who or, what, the spirit is which at a given time is presented to us.

Now, whether this be a correct reading of the testimony of consciousness must be determined by every reflecting man for himself. But certain considerations may be urged which seem to verify it as correct.

1. The universal belief in spiritual beings other than ourselves. The belief in spirit is as general as the belief in matter. No nation or tribe exists, or can be shown to have existed, destitute of this belief. A vast array of proofs of this position is given in a work entitled, *Primitive Culture*, by Edward B. Tylor. He gives the name "Animism" to this belief. He says, "It is desirable to take our basis of inquiry in observation, rather than from speculation. Here, so far as I can judge from the immense mass of accessible evidence, we have to admit that the belief in spiritual beings appears among all low races with whom we attained to a thoroughly intimate acquaintance." (Vol. 1 : 425.)

It is, to say the least, probable that the universality of this belief is due to direct perception. Here, we think, is man's knowledge of God reduced to its lowest terms.

2. God is, in fact, our spiritual environment: not only as immanent in the material universe, but as transcending it. He is omnipresent in the things he has made, as the human soul is omnipresent in the body; and not only so, but he approaches us directly, without the intervention of material forms.

"We live, move and exist in him." (Acts 17 : 28.) The Greek here expresses the idea of rest, in the midst of, contact with, a relation so necessary to our existence and activity, and so intimate, that total ignorance of him is im-

Digitized by Google

possible. This knowledge of God, present in the common consciousness of the race, men, blinded by sin, hold down, suppress, by unrighteous courses of thought and action. (Rom. 1 : 18.) A more intensive idea of intimacy is expressed in John's Gospel: "Jesus answered and said unto him, 'If a man love me, he will keep my word; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.'" (Jno. 14: 23.) Here, too, the Greek expresses the idea of rest, a position by the side of. The Christian consciousness both confirms and interprets this testimony of our Lord. The indwelling God is directly perceived.

3. The testimony of Christians as to their peculiar social experiences is to the same effect. They affirm that, in their meetings for conference and prayer, they "feel God's pressence," and are thus assured of it. There are seasons when God draws specially near his people, so as to leave no doubt that he is with them of a truth. Compare 1 Cor. 14: 25.

4. Prayer is an empty form, if it be not conscious, direct, communion with God as a personal spirit, who assures the suppliant of his presence as hearing prayer. The believer in Christ has come to know by experience that God is "not far from each one of us," (Acts 17 : 27), and so his prayers have the reality of personal intercourse. Were it not for this, men would cease to pray; and, in fact, they do not habitually pray where the consciousness of God's immediate presence becomes dim, or disappears.

> "I see thee not, I hear thee not,
> Yet art thou oft with me;
> And earth has ne'er so dear a spot,
> As where I met with thee."*

It is to be observed that our Lord's prayers carry with them the irresistible impression of a face to face relation to the Father; and this relation was on one occasion, for the

* Ray Palmer.

Digitized by Google

benefit of his disciples, attested by a voice from heaven. (John 12: 27-30.)

5. The fact of regeneration is possible, because God acts immediately upon the human spirit.

6. The fact of inspiration is possible, because God acts immediately upon the human spirit, controlling its action, and communicating thought.

7. The leading of the Spirit (Rom. 8: 14), the bringing forth the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5: 22), indeed, the distinguishing peculiarities of the Christian life are possible because God acts immediately upon the human spirit.

8. The conviction and feeling of obligation testify to an immediate perception of spirit. Obligation is a relation between persons, and is impossible except as between persons whose existence is known.

It is urged, indeed, that man is his own law-giver; that even if it be admitted that obligation implies a relation of persons, man may be conceived as holding this relation to himself; that he obliges himself. This is true, in the sense that the moral law is inseparable from man's constitution; is in the language of the Bible, "written in his heart;" so that although he may deny all external authority, he is under moral constraint; but, while this is so, the presence of the law in his constitution implies the Law-giver in his Creator, and finds its justification and authority alone in him. Indeed, the conviction and feeling of obligation are explicable only on the ground of the fact of our conscious relation to a personal spirit other than ourselves. It seems to be primarily a *feeling;* viz., of the *constraint of a personal will affecting* the *sensibility*, in which affection of the sensibility the intellect finds the material of the *idea* of obligation, the element of feeling logically preceding and conditioning the intellectual element in the complex experience of the conviction of obligation. We seem to have a "sense of obligation," the phrase expressing the fact that the element of

Digitized by Google

feeling is more prominent than the element of cognition, though they are in fact chronologically one. We should never lose sight of the fact that the relation which we are discussing is a relation of persons; and that essential to personality are intellect, sensibility and will conceived as acting not separately, but as a self-conscious unity. Hence, the power of one person over another is through the threefold unity of the actor upon the threefold unity of the person acted upon. In a word, when a person perceives a person, intellect, sensibility and will act upon intellect, sensibility and will, conceived as constituting the unity acting and acted upon.

Here it is in place to remark, as has before been suggested, that, in this conception of spirit as personal, we find the ground of the difference between the perception of matter and the perception of spirit. Matter, as inert, is perceived without volition on its part. Holding relation to us not by will, the force of the perceptive act depends wholly upon the perceiving agent, his equipment and the vigor of his action. Spirit, on the other hand, holds relation to us by will, and so the force of the perceptive act depends not merely upon the perceiving agent, but may be more or less according to the degree in which the spirit perceived seeks, wills, to make itself known to, or seeks to impress itself upon, the spirit perceiving. The omnipresent Spirit of God, always willing to make itself known to the human spirit, and constituting its ever-present environment, as really as matter, is perceived, with greater or less distinctness, by every man. Finite spirits, however, are perceived only upon occasion of their presence.

9. The law of God, which requires supreme love to him, implies, as a *sine qua non*, a direct knowledge of him as a person. Love is a personal relation, like obligation, and cannot exist except in that relation. A being who is only inferentially known can never be an object of the soul's deep-

Digitized by Google

est affection. Doubt necessarily attaches, more or less, to all purely inferential knowledge, and so, if our knowledge of God were wholly inferential, the heart's love would be chilled at its fountain. In order to supreme love, there must be no more room for doubt of his existence than of our own: they must both be certified in precisely the same way; viz.: by immediate knowledge.

10. The direct perception of spirit is probable, at least, if we consider that the senses of the body are but instruments by, or through, which the percipient powers of the soul act. The soul alone is the perceiving agent. Now, in spirit-perception, the intervening medium which is essential in sense-perception is absent, so that the perceiving soul is in immediate relation with that which is of its own nature. If the soul can perceive, through the senses, matter, which is not of its own nature, as all dualists admit, it should seem certain that it can perceive spirit, also, which is of its own nature.

11. In the ordinary intercourse of life, man with man, spirit affects spirit by communication of thought committed to the uttered word: why, then, should it be deemed incredible that the Infinite Spirit of God, to maintain no more, may make himself known by direct communication of thought to the finite spirit without the intervention of the material vehicle? If it be admitted that such communication of thought by the Infinite to the finite is possible, then it follows that the Infinite in this manner makes himself perceptible by the finite.

12. The direct perception of spirit is probable, if we consider that there is an influence of one human person over another, which is over and above the power of any words, or any material form of expression. We sometimes call it "the influence of one's personality." It is this subtle, indefinite, yet most potent, effluence which constitutes the charm of social intercourse, the secret of the orator's power, transcend-

Digitized by Google

ing utterly any force of mere speech, and the sacred enchantment of family life. Spirit breaks through, and overflows with its mysterious energy, the rigid channels of intractable matter, and utters itself in a language of its own; spirit communes directly with spirit. It is so, and not otherwise, that a child knows its mother. Say, "There is mother," as you lead the wondering child into the darkened chamber where lies the dead body of her whom it has called mother. You point to the icy, expressionless features in vain. The sad-eyed child will turn away; and looking inquiringly at you, will say in reply, "Mother is not there." The child is right. It was with the spirit that the child communed. The spirit having departed, the mother is no longer there.

We have to this point attempted to show that we have direct perception of personal spirits in relation to ourselves. It remains to be considered how we discriminate personal spirits one from another.

Let our inquiry be restricted, in the first place, to our knowledge of God. How do we discriminate him?

As has been observed, he alone of personal spirits is our ever-present environment. As omnipresent, he alone is always presented to us for perception. Finite spirits, of whatever class they may be, can be perceived only on occasion of their presence. When, therefore, consciousness testifies to a perception of an ever-present *non-ego spiritual*, it in fact testifies to the substantive existence of a personal God, not necessarily known indeed as God, but simply as an ever-present personal spirit. Upon the basis of this direct and primary knowledge the discursive reason, by various processes, clothes the personal spirit thus cognized with the attributes of Deity. The process here, as in sense-perception, is so rapid as to be beyond exact scrutiny. Indeed, this secondary knowledge, for the very reason that it is an attainment of the discursive reason, varies among men both in its elements and in degree of clearness and

Digitized by Google

vividness. In this respect spirit-perception is the counterpart of sense-perception. The knowledge of any material object which any two persons may have is never exactly the same either in its elements or in degree of clearness and vividness. We may, however, say in general that man, as constitutionally fitted to know God, receives this knowledge through every avenue of his being.

God is known first, perhaps, by inference, as holy. Confronted with a personal Being ever around him, besetting him behind and before and laying his hand upon him, whose sway over him in the form of moral obligation he directly cognizes, he is compelled to infer the holiness of that Being from the character of his law. The inference is so necessary and so immediate that the knowledge so gained partakes very closely of the nature of intuitive knowledge. It is not far from the truth to say that man stands in face to face relation with a holy Law-giver. But the rational process cannot stop here. The Author of this law, who by it holds all finite spirits in subjection to himself, must be Omniscient to apply it and Omnipotent to enforce it. Not only so, but since the law has the well-being of those who are subject to it as its end, its Author must be benevolent. The intuition of the infinite and the absolute is at hand at every step of this reasoning, so that, as the final outcome of the course of thought, we stand in the presence of the personal God. Supplementing this conclusion and confirming it are all the further implications of the anthropological argument, of which the moral argument, strictly so-called, is a part. Then follow in the same service the cosmological argument, the teleological argument and the ontological argument. As a crowning point in the interpretation of our direct perception of personal spirit is the rational intuition of God. This intuition, although the presupposition of all thought, is, as to the distinct knowledge of it, the last attainment of cultured intellect. It is not necessary to our present purpose to ex-

Digitized by Google

pand these several evidences of God's presence in the universe. It is to be observed, however, that the position which we defend in this paper does by no means supersede them or render them useless; it requires rather a different application of them, viz., as instruments of the discursive reason in discovering *who* that Being is whom we directly cognize as personal spirit, in clothing that spirit with the attributes of Deity.

Our next inquiry is: How do we discriminate finite spirits?

It is to be remembered that such spirits are perceived by us only on occasion of being presented to us to be known, and that in this respect they are distinguished from the Omnipresent Spirit.

Of these spirits known to be at times presented to us are the spirits of our fellow-men embodied. We exclude from consideration the spirits of the departed on the ground that the evidence that they are ever presented to us to be known is, to us, insufficient. Of the spirits of the living we obtain knowledge just as we obtain our knowledge of God. In the first instance this knowledge is not inferential, but immediate, and so certain. As beings of intellect, sensibility and will, we are conscious of being in direct relation to other beings of the same constitution. This impression we receive primarily through the sensibility. We have a "sense," wholly spiritual, of the presence of beings like ourselves—a sense so peculiarly human that it is never experienced in the presence of the brute creation. An effluence indefinable, but not the less real, flows out from them to us and from us to them, which is independent on any material medium, sometimes independent on any known bodily presence, and which awakens thought, stirs emotion and moves the will. This influence varies in degree of potency according to the strength of the personalities which are in relation to each other. Upon this direct knowledge

Digitized by Google

we build up further knowledge by inference from words and actions of those with whom we are in relation, and attribute to them certain qualities of mind and heart and will by which one is distinguished from another.

That we are brought into relation to evil spirits disembodied is, to those who receive the testimony of the Word of God, beyond controversy. The Scriptures make known to us the temptation of the Son of Man as typical of the temptations of those whom he came to save. They declare to us also the temptations of some of his immediate disciples, as of Peter. They present for our horrified vision men possessed of demons. They assert that a kingdom of evil spirits contends for the mastery of our race. It is unnecessary here to unfold the scriptural evidence of the fact. The evidence, however, is not wholly scriptural. The experience of men, from age to age, confirms it. Irruptions of evil suggestions, blasphemies, dark imaginations, unholy thoughts, and indefinable but powerful impulses to sin by which individuals and masses of men are sometimes borne on as by a sweeping tempest—these malign influences, having their origin manifestly not within man, but coming in upon him from without, assure us that "our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places." (Eph. 6: 11, 12.)

We have attempted in this paper to state in outline our position and the proofs of it that psychology should complete its doctrine of perception by teaching spirit-perception as the counterpart of sense-perception. So only, we believe, can it give an exhibition of all the facts to which consciousness testifies. While probably no error in our psychology can shake the confidence of men generally in the being and presence of God, since intuitive evidence remains and convinces, whether we declare it or not, it would nevertheless

Digitized by Google

be a great advance in scientific theology if it should appear that the existence and presence of the Omnipresent Spirit are as infallibly certain as our own existence and the existence of matter.

HENRY E. ROBINS.

Rochester, N. Y.

Digitized by Google

VI.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

ORDINATION COUNCILS.

A change in our methods of calling and conducting councils to advise with churches as to the ordination of brethren to the Gospel ministry, is now greatly needed. Often such councils are meaningless; sometimes they are positively farcical. They are often powerless for good; sometimes they are powerful for evil. The importance of doing something to remedy an evil which confessedly exists is realized now by large numbers of laymen and pastors. Whoever can contribute any suggestion which may help to make such councils better conserve the purpose for which they are supposed to be called, will be doing a good work. With that desire we refer to the subject here.

As a rule all the churches in the association, to which the church calling the council belongs, should be invited. There must be a limit to the invitations, and perhaps the associational limit is as fitting as any other. There will often be personal and denominational reasons for going beyond that limit; but it would be difficult to give a good reason for not coming up to that limit. Cases have often occurred in which a few churches have met to ordain or to do some other important work; leading chuches have been omitted, and the impression is almost unavoidable that the omission was made in order that a few churches might secure an end which the presence of a larger number would prevent. Such a proceeding is unworthy of our denominational position, and is openly disloyal to our Lord and Master.

Letters missive should be sent out at least one month before the date fixed for the meeting of the council. Many reasons suggest themselves to justify this course. Most churches do not hold church meetings oftener than once a month; no church ought to hold them, as a rule, oftener. Many church meetings are a device of the common

Digitized by Google

enemy of Christ and the church. If a call for council comes after the monthly meeting has been held, a special meeting must be called or the church cannot appoint its delegates. Another, and perhaps stronger, reason is that churches ought to have time and opportunity to make careful inquiries regarding the character and attainments of the brother who asks for ordination. Often this brother is a comparative stranger to nearly all the members of the council; sometimes he is an entire stranger to all but the delegates from the church calling the council. The church, as all of us sadly know, may be quite mistaken as to his worthiness. A month is little enough time to intervene between the issuance of the call and the assembling of the council.

Another point is that examinations by councils ought to be much more thorough. As now conducted they mean almost nothing. Some brethren are so impressed with this fact that they dislike to be members of such councils. In this day it is certain that such examinations should be exhaustive. Of course the first thing is that the council should be fully satisfied as to the spotlessness of the brother's character, and the certainty of his call to the ministry. But in order to judge of his call regard must be had to the thoroughness of his training. If he be a graduate of a reputable college and theological seminary it is fair to assume that he knows something of general literature, of the Word of God, and of the history of Christianity. But even in such cases careful inquiry should be made touching these matters. If he be not a graduate of such institutions there is the greater need of a thorough examination. The standard for a candidate for ordination who is not a graduate ought not to be the same as for one who is; but when a reasonable standard is fixed, it ought to be seen that he is able to come up to that. Does he know the Word of God? Is he familiar, to a reasonable degree at least, with the history of doctrine? Does he know what are the main facts in the history of the church universal? Is he reasonably familiar with the history and polity of Baptist churches? Has he a fair knowledge of the English language, and of English literature? Can he preach effectively? To all these questions an examining committee ought to be able to give affirmative answers. But how shall the council know what a brother's attainments are in these respects? Certainly there is no opportunity to get this knowledge in councils as they are ordinarily held. They are in

Digitized by Google

session for two or three hours, and most of the time is occupied in hearing the statements of the candidate regarding his conversion and call to the ministry and his views of doctrine. Delegates are usually busy men; they are in a hurry to get away; they are often impatient of the delays of our present councils. The result is that, as before stated, councils can give no intelligent counsel. Unworthy and unfit men creep into the ministry, and the cause of Christ is injured in the house of its friends. Ordination is and should be made a profoundly solemn event.

This is not the time to give young men encouragement to make "a short cut" into the ministry. Never were the demands upon the ministry greater than they are to-day; never were college graduates so numerous in little churches in country villages; never were skilled skeptics more numerous on purely mission fields; never was consecrated scholarship more needed along the whole line of Church work. The Church needs all her sons as workers—but not as ordained preachers. Many a man who could have done admirable service as a layman has become a perfect failure as an ordained preacher. We want fewer men in our seminaries who are not graduates of colleges. We know perfectly well all that may be said of the noble work performed by men who did not have the advantages of the schools. We admit it all; but if these men could have had these advantages and were too lazy to accept them, or had so low an opinion of the work of the ministry as not to desire them, then these men would deserve neither our respect nor confidence. But the men who have not enjoyed these advantages and have yet succeeded are men who would have availed themselves of them if they could. They have succeeded not because of, but in spite of, their disadvantages. Now, we suggest that churches calling a council to advise as to ordination should invite a few competent brethren carefully to examine the candidate along the lines indicated, and report to the council the results of such examination. Sometimes it might be best to report to the church before the council is called and thus prevent the calling of the council, if in their opinion the brother is not prepared for ordination. Or, after the council has heard the candidate's account of his conversion, call to the ministry and views of doctrine, the council could appoint this committee with power to recommend the church to ordain, or at least with power again to convene the council. Matters of detail can readily be arranged according to the facts in each

Digitized by Google

case; but the end which this committee should secure is so important as to deserve the immediate and solemn attention of all councils. Indeed, the whole matter of the candidate's fitness, as to character and competency, should come under the careful consideration of some committee outside of the candidate's own church.

Another point is important: No arrangements for the ordination should be made until the council recommends the church to ordain. As a matter of fact churches ordinarily make all their arrangements long before, selecting the preacher and all the other brethren who are to participate. Such a course makes the deliberations of the council farcical. Why call a council at all? Does the church desire the recommendation of the council? The reasons which may be urged for the practice which is here condemned are familiar, but they ought not to be authoritative. Councils should counsel. If they mean nothing, let us say so; if they mean much, let us act consistently. Brethren in considerable numbers could be gotten together a second time for the services of ordination. It is certainly worth the while of the church calling the council, and the brethren comprising it to make great sacrifices in order to secure results so important in themselves and so vitally affecting the welfare of our churches. We shall be glad to hear from other brethren who may be able to point out "a more excellent way" to remove the objections, which all thoughtful brethren clearly see, to our present methods of calling and conducting ordaining councils. The subject is worthy of the best thought of our wisest brethren. "The meeting is now open."

CHURCH ATTENDANCE.

The recent Conference of the New York branch of the Evangelical Alliance which was held in Chickering Hall has attracted much attention. The topics discussed were important in themselves, and especially important in their relation to church life and work. Men prominent both as laymen and pastors participated in the reading of papers, in the delivery of addresses, and in the discussion of the various topics. Dr. Josiah Strong has labored hard to give the Alliance definite aims, and to inspire it to labor for practical results.

One of the subjects earnestly discussed was the falling off in attend-

Digitized by Google

ance upon the churches. It was stated that while the population of the city is steadily increasing, the number of Protestant churches has been relatively decreasing; that while in 1840 there was a Protestant church to every two thousand people, in 1880 there was but one to every three thousand, and in 1887 but one to every four thousand. This is a startling statement. Our city is increasing at the rate of about fifty thousand each year. There ought to be at least fifty new churches organized each year simply to keep pace with our rapidly growing population. The problem of church growth in this city is difficult in the extreme. At this moment committees of the Evangelical Alliance are meeting weekly to lay plans for resisting the dangerous tendencies of the times, and for establishing missions and churches as sources of religious life and power. Some of the reasons for the falling off in attendance upon our churches are not difficult to discover.

One of these reasons is the immigration of foreigners who bring with them the nonchurch-going habits of their own countries. The worst elements of immigration remain in New York; the better go West or to other parts of our great country. Few persons appreciate the difficulties which churches on Manhattan Island meet, growing out of this immigrant population. They fill our jails, our almshouses, and our reformatories of all kinds; many of them speak only the language of their own country; many of them are the victims of gross religious superstition and priestcraft. It may be necessary for us eventually to put limits upon immigration into our country. It would be better had these limits been put at Castle Garden than at the Golden Gate; more danger far is likely to come to us from the immigrants from Romish and Nihilistic countries, than from the "Heathen Chinee." Nevertheless we ought not to despair. We send missionaries to labor among these people in their own land; it is tenfold more our duty to convert them here. God sends them to us that we may labor among them in our land. Perhaps we ought to welcome their coming as a providential opportunity to reach them with the Gospel of Christ; certainly so long as the law permits them to come the spirit of the Gospel impels us to instruct them in its principles and if possible to lead them to its Lord.

Another reason is the habit of taking Sunday newspapers. To this general subject we referred in the last number of this QUARTERLY; to

Digitized by Google

it we cannot too often turn. We do not say that the Sunday newspaper necessitates more labor on the Lord's day in its preparation than does the Monday paper. We are willing to admit that most of the work done in preparing the Sunday paper is performed on Saturday, and that most of the work in preparing the Monday paper is performed on Sunday. We believe that Monday papers could be prepared on Saturday nights and Monday mornings; but the circulation of the paper on Sunday necessitates the labor of a large number of men, women, and children. The chief objection to it, however, is that it secularizes the day, robbing it of its sanctity as a day of worship and of its helpfulness as a day of rest. These papers keep the minds of business men in the ruts in which they have been running during the week. It is impossible unduly to emphasize the deadening and secularizing influence of the Sunday paper; it keeps thousands of people at home who otherwise might attend the house of God. Often, as is admitted by some of those who read these papers, their contents are degrading to an unusual degree; in order to make them attractive editors cater to the lowest tastes of the worst people. Of course, if it can be shown that the Sunday newspaper has come to stay, it is better that attention should be given to its improvement, that it should be made as instructive in its literary qualities, and as spiritual in its religious tendencies as possible. But we are by no means ready to admit that it has come to stay; it is quite certain that its presence is not necessary to the business interests or the social life of our city and country. We hope that the war that is now waging against it may be successful, and that the time will come when the Sunday newspaper "must go."

But there is another reason for the falling off in attendance upon the churches; it is that so many church members themselves neglect the services of God's house. The obligation of the church rests very lightly upon many "who profess and call themselves Christians." Slight excuses in family life are sufficient to keep them at home. Church attendance is, with many church members, largely a matter of convenience and option. This is especially true of the second service of the day whether in the afternoon or the evening. Churches in this city could be named whose meetings scores of church members never attend except at the morning services. Their conduct is influencing

Digitized by Google

their families to neglect the house of God; it is hurtful to the community at large; it is doing much to train up a generation of young people to be neglectors of God's house and day. Their disregard of their duty to their church and their Lord is unspeakably cruel to their pastors.

Church members who neglect the second service still hold the pastor responsible for the attendance on that service. If the attendance falls off they blame him severely; if he makes extra efforts by the use of cards or by announcing striking topics to secure attendance, he is unkindly criticized for his sensationalism. He is compelled to make bricks without clay, straw, or any other material; and if the conventional tale of bricks be not furnished he is condemned. What can be thought of the religion of men and women whose spirit and conduct are thus truly characterized? Their conduct is injurious to their own souls, is hurtful to the church, is deadly in its influence upon the unconverted and unchurched, and is openly disloyal to their Lord. It is unspeakably sad that in this respect Christians should be upon the side of the ungodly and the unchurched in our communities. It is impossible to induce the great masses of the people to attend the house of God so long as Christian men and women who have taken upon themselves the vows of the church, neglect its solemn obligations. If the professedly righteous fail so constantly, what can be expected of the ungodly and the wicked? The reform must begin at the house of God; our covenant obligations ought either not to be taken, or be loyally kept. Pastors must speak plainly to their people on this point. It is known that in absenting themselves from the house of God church members are in danger of spending their time in social frivolity or at least in negative religiousness. Already it is known that numbers of church members do not hesitate to drive in the park, and to make social visits on the Lord's day. Seated on Sunday evenings about their tables or in their parlors, they occasionally ask a question, half pitiful and half amusing, as to how the pastor is "making it go" in the evening service. There are pastors who have already hardened themselves into indifference as to whether they have an evening congregation or not; the omnibus, as one of them recently said, goes from one end to the other of its route whether or not any passengers are on board. Such indifference as this is to be deeply lamented. Others keenly feel this neglect of duty on the part of their members who ought to be their

Digitized by Google

constant helpers. They are in a strait betwixt open rebellion and sullen acquiescence. In the meantime, all the interests of Christ's cause suffer; children are growing up to neglect God's house, and the unchurched are daily increasing their numbers and becoming confirmed in their attitude. May God help church members to do their duty to a lost world, to a struggling church, and to their living Lord.

NECESSARY REFORM IN POLITICAL METHODS.

THE late elections were in many respects an improvement upon those of preceding years. There was much less slander of men and much more discussion of principles than it has been our fortune as a people to experience for a good while past. It was, in fact, almost the first presidential canvass since the issues of the civil war were settled in which the two chief parties divided on a sharply defined issue of political principle and administrative policy. For nearly twenty years the politics of the United States have largely consisted of a struggle of the "ins" to keep in and of the "outs" to get in. This can never be an inspiring spectacle.

A struggle for the offices is not one that can make great demands upon the patriotism of American citizens or promote a healthful development of genuine party enthusiasm. When the contention is simply for office and its spoils the pretended issue must be more or less artificial, and the contest must partake of the nature of a personal struggle rather than of a battle of parties honestly differing with regard to great questions of finance or administration. In the late campaign there was a very genuine development of party enthusiasm. A question, not perhaps of the highest moment, nor one fitted to stir the deepest emotions of human nature—for a debate about dollars can never do that—but still a question of fundamental importance in the carrying on of government, was presented in the platforms of the two parties, and by the attitude of their candidates, to the voters of the country for their decision. For the first time in a generation there was a real debate regarding political principles—a debate that, in the nature of things, must have had a powerful educative effect upon the young men of the country especially, to whom the question as to high or low tariff, protection or free trade, was comparatively novel. The result of the discussion,

Digitized by Google

as shown in the election, was that many States hitherto counted safe for one party or the other must hereafter be reckoned as doubtful on a similar issue, and to render it extremely probable that four years hence if a tariff question or any similar issue be the main feature of the campaign the States will be divided on other than sectional lines. This would be to eliminate the Southern question from politics and to end the day of sectionalism—a change in the political situation that cannot too soon occur.

But while there were these favorable features in the campaign, there were other features by no means a subject for congratulation. The defeat of Warner Miller in this State by the efforts of the saloon keepers of both parties is a menace to the well-being of the community that it is difficult to over-estimate. This defeat, it is well understood, was mainly brought about by the expenditure of immense sums of money. It is believed that the liquor interest furnished larger contributions and spent them more lavishly for the corruption of voters than any other party or clique in the field. This question is, therefore, closely allied to another that has been pressed home on the attention of all thoughtful men by the political methods employed in the late campaign, to-wit: the almost universal prevalence of corrupt and unworthy methods of influencing voters. In this guilt the leaders of both parties share about equally. We may perhaps discount very considerably the newspaper gossip in circulation on this subject, but it is believed by everybody, and it is perhaps true, that there never was so large an expenditure of money in a political campaign as in that of last fall. In the last weeks of the campaign private circulars sent out by one of the parties made frantic appeals for large contributions at a time when the real work of the campaign had all been finished, and when there was no legitimate use for considerable sums. Without question both parties collected every dollar they could secure, and spent every dollar they collected. Each accuses the other of corrupt practices, and no doubt each is justified in so doing. The party organization has fallen under the control in both parties of men who are not too scrupulous in their use of means, and who are prepared to win by fair means or foul. The good men of both parties recognize and deplore this fact, and this is really the hopeful feature of the situation. And yet there is a great

Digitized by Google

deal of moral callousness about the turpitude of bribery among men who might be expected to have stricter notions.

Of course, we all know the ground on which men who are honest in other pursuits justify this dishonesty in politics. They say, "There is a certain percentage of the voters who will sell their votes anyhow. If we don't buy them, the other side will. Part of them naturally belong to us, but will not vote our ticket unless they are paid for it. We must fight the devil with fire. We must beat those bad fellows in the other party by bribing the voters whom otherwise they would bribe." This specious plea, while it may avail to silence a troublesome conscience, cannot really impose on any one. The alleged necessity does not exist. If each party did not believe with good reason that its opponent was preparing to corrupt voters, there would be no such condition of things as the argument assumes. In other words, to make bribery necessary there must first be bribery, and neither party can throw the responsibility for the present condition of things upon the other. Both have contributed to the utmost of their ability to the making of the present situation.

But what is the remedy? It is beautifully simple, not only in theory but in practice. It involves three reforms in the present political methods.

1. The assumption by the State of the duty of printing and distributing ballots. This would be a much less expensive way than the present, for it would then be necessary only to print sufficient ballots to furnish each voter with one. Now each party prints ballots enough to furnish every voter with several copies, and, as a matter of fact, nearly every voter, in the cities, at least, does receive, several days before the election, from one to five complete sets of ballots from each party. This is a very unnecessary waste, and in the aggregate imposes a heavy tax. The proposed plan will involve a small tax, and would be assessed upon the whole community, every citizen paying his due proportion as he should. This reform would entirely do away with the present gangs of "heelers" and "boys" who are employed by the party leaders to distribute tickets at the polls. A great deal of the present bribery is done under the form of employing men to "work" for their party at the polls. Some men still have enough remnants of self-respect to feel squeamish about taking five dollars or even fifty

Digitized by Google

dollars for their vote when the thing is put in that bald way. But they can be hired for five dollars or fifty dollars to work for their party, their work consisting mainly, if not exclusively, in depositing their ballots and perhaps hanging about the polling place for a short time. Comparatively respectable men are not above being bribed in this indirect way. All this, of course, would be completely destroyed were officials appointed by the State and paid by them to issue the ballots to the voters. The ward politician would find his occupation gone. The "boys" would soon become politically extinct.

2. A secret ballot. This provision of an electoral law is necessary to prevent both intimidation and bribery. Wherever it has been tried it has been found to be absolutely destructive to both. It is evident that intimidation cannot be practiced where employers cannot tell how their employes vote. It is equally evident that bribery will not be practised when bribers are unable to tell whether the bribed vote as they promise. A man who will accept a bribe has already proved himself to be a scoundrel. If he will sell his birthright as a free citizen for money, he will lie. No confidence can be placed in him, and no one can feel sure after paying him for his vote that he does not go off and vote for the other candidate. This being the case, there is no encouragement to spend money for the corruption of voters. Nobody is going to contribute money for the buying of votes when he is all the time uncertain whether he gets anything for his money or not. In Australia and in England, where the secret ballot has been tried, corruption has almost entirely died out. It requires no stretch of faith to believe that such would be the case anywhere.

3. A legal limit fixed for the expenditure of money for campaign purposes, and the requirement of sworn returns accompanied by vouchers to be made at the end of the campaign by the authorized agents of each party. Nothing has so conduced to the reform of English election methods as this requirement. The amount which the candidate for Parliament may spend is rigorously limited by statute. The objects for which the money may be expended are likewise limited, being for such purposes as the hiring of halls for political meetings, the printing of placards and circulation of political literature, and other strictly legitimate campaign expenditures. A candidate can have but one agent, and all funds expended must pass through his hands, and at the con-

Digitized by Google

clusion of the campaign he must render a sworn statement of his expenditures, filing therewith vouchers, and is of course punishable for perjury if his statements are untrue. Our political system so differs in its features from the English that the law would necessarily be much modified in this country, but the essential principle is of easy application. The national, State, and local committees of each party could be required to preserve books and vouchers showing all moneys received and for what they were expended, and the statute could designate the kinds of expenditure which alone would be considered legal, such as, for instance, the hiring of halls, the payment of speakers (including their traveling expenses), advertising in the newspapers, the printing and circulation of speeches and other political documents, and anything else that might be thought to come fairly within the scope of legitimate campaign expenses. If then each committee were obliged to file in some public office sworn statements of its expenditures under these heads, it would be very certain that none of the money that passed through these channels would be used for purposes of corruption. Any corruption funds would necessarily have to be placed in private and irresponsible hands. It would be difficult to draw a statute that would successfully prevent this, but it may be doubted whether any astute political leaders would consider it worth while to employ corrupt means under conditions so hampering.

The first two of these measures outlined have become a law recently in Massachusetts. They were embodied in what has been known as the Saxton Electoral Bill, which last year was passed by the legislature of the State of New York, but failed to become a law because of the veto of its Governor. There is a better prospect this year than ever before that laws of this nature may be passed in many of the States. The carrying of elections by bribery is already felt by the men who must contribute the money to be not merely immoral but unduly burdensome. Those who accept bribes are each year becoming more importunate in their demands. Those whose price was $2 or $5 a few years ago now expect $10 or $20, and those who accepted $10 formerly now demand $25, and so it grows. If it is an understood thing that elections are to be bought the price will be higher with every successive campaign. It is too costly as well as too uncertain a system to meet with continued favor, even from those who have hitherto practiced it and furnished the sinews of

Digitized by Google

war. Besides, the open and undisguised use of money in the last campaign has aroused a good deal of healthy indignation. Now is the time when Christian men can use their influence to promote healthful legislation with a certainty that their influence will be felt. The public mind is in a state to be easily moved, and efforts put forth now will be twice as fruitful of results as the same efforts would have been a few months ago or will be a year hence. The time to strike is when the iron is hot.

Digitized by Google

VII.

HOMILETIC DEPARTMENT.

KEEPING NEAR THE FLOCK.

Mr. Editor must bear the blame for calling out these hints from a young worker. Yet old truths need new clothes, "for I forget so soon."

A universally known and generally neglected law of teaching is that we should adapt truths to the learner's stage of growth. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." So the Great Teacher thought and taught. His chief interpreter, Paul, talks of milk for babes and meat for men. The minister who is scholar and teacher may overlook the young, while the ranting "worker" forgets to supply meat for the mature.

It is important to observe this law in selecting topics of sermons, not only titles and texts, but the innumerable special topics which should come into discussion. Sunday night, after service, many of us feel bankrupt of ideas; a symptom of exhausted nerves, not a sign of an empty Bible and universe. We turn to actual human life, with spiritual needs ever recurring like hunger and thirst, and topics force themselves upon us; while if we look at the bale of manuscripts we almost fancy all is said. Alexander wept for more worlds to conquer because he was ignorant of geography. Several tribes over the hill had never heard of him. Touch human life so multiform, with ten angry heads glaring when one is cut off, and the soul leaps again for its sword.

In pastoral work touch is vital. The minister is heaven's lightning conductor, and he stops the current if his heart is a cold insulator. Fishers of men cannot sit on the banks of Paradise above and angle in our waters. Jesus taught that Christians are leaven. Now, yeast might as well be in Saturn as in a jar separated an inch from the dough. Christians are the salt of the world, and they must mix in the world to save it. "These are in the world." Even celestial light must condescend to become terrestrial before it helps men. Christ's spiritual guidance is not "A dark lanthorn of the spirit, which none see but those who bear it." It is a lamp on a stand, even a high light-house beaming far.

The importance of real contact with men being admitted, the question of method arises. Those who have a genius for sympathy do not need teaching; but the ninety-and-nine ordinary preachers, who

Digitized by Google

simply propose to do their duty, can learn, even if slowly. They must learn.

In the books on homiletics are many valuable laws about making sermons. We cannot afford to ignore any of them. Dr. Hoge, of Richmond, has many sermons growing at the same time, a whole incubator full. This should be set over against the example of Mr. Beecher, who could dare to wait until Sunday morning for his text. With most men a sermon is an organic product, and needs time for germination and growth. Other methods are fruitful, as a series of expositions, social topics, newspaper hints, the last book read, doctrinal themes; but one very helpful and wise way to get a theme is to take up actual questions of habitual hearers.

How often the evangelists say, "And Jesus answered and said." Sometimes the question was audible, sometimes implicit; but always Jesus spoke to a known state of mind. It arouses all of a preacher's faculties to feel that he is treating a living issue. All the problems are settled—in the books; but they are born again with every child. Greatheart conducts one set of pilgrims to heaven, and goes back, again and again, for a new company.

How shall we draw out questions? Ask for them from the pulpit, in church papers, in conversation. Take note of the troubles of inquirers; the trouble of one is the stumbling-block of many.

To encourage people to ask questions we must treat them with absolute courtesy, dignity, fairness and gentleness. When we answer we must convince and persuade, not crush and grind to death. Hold up one timid learner to ridicule before the congregation, and the others will hide in their reticence like cray-fishes in their holes or a terrapin in his shell. Better gently encourage the doubting disciple. Measles and scarlet fever can be cured if they blossom out, but they kill if they strike in. The "after meeting" will often show where to strike the next blow.

Pastoral visiting is necessary for many reasons. It is especially necessary for preparation to preach. We should select topics as a general chooses his field of battle. Demosthenes declined to accept Æschines' order of discussion, and chose his own. Dr. Cuyler tells us we must nail the boys' ears to the pulpit by interesting them; but that means that we must find out the style of nails chosen by the boys.

On the day of Pentecost every man heard the Gospel in his mother tongue. Heralds of the Gospel must talk vernacular. So Paul speaks of a trumpet call to war as having an "uncertain voice." "So also ye, unless ye utter by the tongue speech easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye will be speaking into the air." The uncertain voice here is not that of the trimming, liberal preacher,

Digitized by Google

but of the speaker who talks with his head in a cloud and with his mouth full of foreign jargon.

Does not the Bible tell us what to preach? Sin, salvation, Christ crucified and duty. These are Biblical themes for all times; but this statement, though true, is not adequate. The variety of the Bible must be fitted to the variety of human life. The Bible itself shows us the right way. It is gorgeous with local and temporal color. Moses preaches to Pharaoh, and urges Israel to cross the Red Sea. Joshua says nothing of the Red Sea, but exhorts to the capture of Jericho. Elijah aims at Ahab and Baal. Isaiah's sermon-dates are fixed by allusions to Rezin, Ahaz, and the kings of Assyria and Egypt. Paul's first and second letters to the Corinthians are as varied as their immediate aims.

Makers of stone pavements analyze God's rocks, and then make syntheses of his materials and suit them to the shape required. The preacher must find his materials in the Bible, and then adapt them to immediate human uses. This is the *raison d'être* of a living ministry. We need never become mere phonographs unless we forget our function.

Is not contact with the world dangerous to the preacher? Yes. A charged electric wire is a deadly weapon, but its power to kill is its power to light dark ways. A locomotive boiler with one hundred and sixty pounds of steam is a constant menace to the engineer's life; but speed and power demand high pressure, with a hand on the lever a few inches from the volcanic interior. Contact with rude people may tend to spoil your elegant English style. Sympathy with an audience of boys will break up a quotation from Gibbon, or Robert Hall, or Storrs, into phrases from Robinson Crusoe. There is even danger of taking contagious diseases of the body. Death lurks in poverty-cursed homes. Missionaries say they come home from pagan lands not only for physical health, but even to escape the benumbing moral atmosphere of heathenism. But it would be our duty to try to go to heaven in company if we could know in advance that we must go through purgatory and hell with Dante, or past lions, castles of despair, vales of shade and Vanity Fair, with Bunyan's Christian pilgrim. Dangers should warn us to take sword and shield, but should not deter us from duty. Listening patiently to a heretic's objections imperils our orthodoxy, but it is an essential preparation for saving his soul from error.

C. R. HENDERSON.

Detroit, Mich.

Digitized by Google

SOME MODERN PREACHERS ON "THE UNPARDONABLE SIN."

In one of our secular papers we find quite an elaborate report of some utterances of the Rev. Mr. Harrison, the "Boy Preacher," on the unpardonable sin. Mr. Harrison seems to follow pretty closely the line of thought set forth in the sermon preached and published by the Rev. A. B. Earle, on the same subject. We do not intend to suggest any charge of plagiarism; for we doubt if Mr. Harrison ever heard of Mr. Earle's sermon; but still, the general drift of the two preachers is substantially the same.

Indeed, "the unpardonable sin" seems to be a favorite subject with quite a number of our modern evangelists; and, so far as our observation goes, they seem very generally to take much the same view of this awful theme. Such of their discourses as have come in our way have all been marked by a conspicuous absence of any exposition of the passages of Scripture that bear upon the subject, and, indeed, by an almost equally conspicuous absence of all Scripture exposition whatever. Dr. Alexander's famous hymn seems to be regarded by these preachers as a satisfactory authority; and Matthew, Mark and Luke are either ignored or but very slightly attended to.

As Mr. Harrison quotes this hymn, and as Mr. Earle and divers other preachers of this class evidently present the view set forth in it, we think proper to give it here as a pointer to some remarks which we desire to present:

"There is a time, we know not when,
A point, we know not where,
That marks the destiny of men
To glory or despair.

There is a line, by us unseen,
That crosses every path;
The hidden boundary between
God's patience and his wrath.

To pass that line it is to die,
To die as if by stealth;
It does not quench the beaming eye,
Nor pale the glow of health.

The conscience may be still at ease,
The spirit light and gay;
That which is pleasing still may please,
And care be thrust away.

Digitized by Google

O where is this mysterious bourne
By which our path is crossed?
Beyond which God himself hath sworn
That he who goes is lost.

How far may we go on in sin?
How long will God forbear?
Where does hope end? and where begin
The confines of despair."

Now the doctrine taught in this hymn is the very commonly received view of "sinning away the day of grace"—*i. e.*, of sinning so long, and so much, as to wear out the patience of Almighty God—in a word, the doctrine of an unpardonable *amount* of sin.

But whatever may be thought of this view in a general way, and upon its own merits, it is certainly *not* the view set forth by Christ when he warned men against the danger of committing the unpardonable sin.

For one, I do not believe that the Scriptures teach that there is any such thing as an unpardonable *aggregate* of sin, made up of transgressions, which, taken individually, would have been pardonable. On the contrary, "The blood of Jesus Christ his son cleanseth us from all sin." 1 John 1:7. And in Matt. 12:13, and Mark 3:28, we are told by Christ that there is one specific sin, and only one, which puts a soul beyond the reach of the pardoning mercy of God.

As this whole question is one whose solution—if there be one—depends entirely upon the exposition of those Scriptures which bear upon it, we will quote them in full. Presuming that no respectable modern exegete would for a moment suppose that Gen. 6:3 ("My Spirit shall not always strive with man,") has any bearing upon the matter in hand, we turn to Matt. 12:31, 32, where the Saviour is thus reported: "Wherefore I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come."

In Mark 3:28, 29, Christ says: "Verily I say unto you, all sin shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme: but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation."

Luke 12:10 is of the same tenor. It reads: "And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven."

The mysterious and difficult passage in 1 John 5:16, whether it does

Digitized by Google

or does not refer to the same sin, still speaks of a single, specific transaction, and gives no hint of an unpardonable *aggregate* of sins. It says: "There is a sin unto death;" and the apostle intimates that it is useless to pray for any soul that has committed *that* sin.

Now every one of these Scriptures evidently points to a particular, individual transgression. It is *one* sin, and not an aggregate of sins. Whether that sin is even committed in our day, or whether it was confined to the time of Christ's personal presence on earth, or to "the days of miracles," are questions upon which exegetes are divided; but that any intelligent and careful expositor, with those passages before him, can suppose for a moment that they can be made to mean an unpardonable *amount* of sins, or that they hint at anything else than a specific, individual transgression, is to me utterly inexplicable.

J. C. HIDEN.

New Bedford, Mass.

SOME HINTS UPON THE PRAYER MEETING.

The prayer meeting is an important part of the enginery of the church. As a means of grace it holds a vital relation to the development and application of its spiritual forces and the culture and exercise of its gifts. Its utility therefore is not questioned. But it is or must be confessed that in all our churches it might be made a greater power for good. It should be to the life of the Christian what showers and sunshine are to plantal and floral growths. It should be a source of soul-quickening to him—a season for the marshalling of new strength and courage for the battle of life. There is instruction and inspiration in the sermon. Bible study and closet-communion have their advantages, and these must not be neglected, but we must look to the prayer meeting for the means of exciting spiritual enthusiasm and for supplying those helps needed to do Christian duty in the world, and to encounter the protean tactics of the adversary. How can the prayer meeting service become more fruitful in results and so answer to its God-ordained purpose? How can God's people use it so that it shall not fail of its high function? Often the pastor asks these questions with a solicitude that is only known to himself and his Lord. How to make it the channel of the Spirit's power, and to secure through it the edification of his people and the salvation of sinners is one of the pressing anxieties of his life, and costs him many a wakeful night. His studies and pulpit efforts and pastoral work do not impose so heavy a tax upon his nerve-force as the leading of his weekly prayer service. We venture a few hints without claiming to be wise enough to tell our co-laborer just how a prayer meeting should be conducted, or just what

Digitized by Google

methods should be adopted to increase its effectiveness. The writer, too, does not indulge the vanity that he is able to say or suggest anything new or original upon the general subject of the prayer meeting. He can only re-affirm and emphasize old thoughts. It is always to be understood that no religious meeting can be of real advantage to those who attend it without the presence and help of the Holy Spirit. He must pervade and operate through the service, otherwise it will be barren of good. But the Holy Spirit works with common sense, sound judgment, and legitimate methods. He honors intelligence, order, consistency and honest endeavor. Looking then at the prayer meeting on the human side we seem to see certain things that are essential to render it interesting, effective, and spiritually profitable.

I. *Its object should be understood.* What is the weekly meeting of the church for? Should not every Christian think before he starts what he is going to prayer meeting for, and prepare himself as best he may by self-meditation and prayer? It is plain that the prayer meeting service is not for sermonettes, or exegesis, or formal statement of doctrine, or close analyzing of Scripture texts, or talks about disputed theological questions, or long exhortations to the "brethren." The prayer meeting is not to be a place for "cranks and bores" to ventilate their vagaries, or "peculiar views," or hurl their invectives at the church. It is not to be a place for wailing, or grumbling, or lecturing, or criticising. It should be a place of sunshine and good cheer to those who come to it tired in body and mind, and who need to be nerved afresh for the temptations and perplexities that beset them in a sinful world. When God's children have their weekly family gathering, the purpose of each should be to contribute something towards making the exercises spirited, helpful and enriching, by heartily joining in the hymns sung, or by praying, or by repeating a Bible promise, or by giving a bit of experience, or by testifying to the goodness of God. No prayer meeting need be "dull" or "dry" or unattractive to young people or discouraging to Christians, if there is put into it the measure of energy and heart-glow that men enlist in their worldly business. And why should not Christians bring into such a service the very best they have—heart, alertness, intelligence, devotion, sympathy, thought, and earnest witnessing to the truth? Thus it would become a fountain of spiritual refreshment, and speak to the unbelieving world with an eloquence that would be overmastering.

II. *Much depends upon the leadership.* The pastor who has rare pulpit power may not know how to conduct a prayer meeting. If he ever needs *great* grace and much earnest thought it is in his preparation for this service. He needs to know men. He needs to be wise in selecting the Scripture lesson, in stating what he wants to say so as not to consume too much time which lawfully belongs to his members; tact-

Digitized by Google

ful in dealing with those who do not repress their peculiarities, and often "tire" their brethren by long speeches and who mistake scolding for testimony; patience towards such as are weak and require "nursing" at the hands of the strong; and prompt in seizing upon methods to prevent any meeting from becoming tedious or shorn of liveliness. But without the co-operation of the people no leadership can make a successful prayer meeting. Church members must do their part. They must be ready to engage in prayer, help in the singing, and give the word of testimony simply and earnestly. They must not seek to be profound or try to preach, but to tell in lucid language what Jesus has done for them. They must imitate the leader in being brief and pointed in their remarks, and short and natural in their prayers. Some people get up too high when they pray. They soar so far away that they lose sight of common wants. "Pray for one another."

III. *Things to be avoided.* It often takes but a little thing to defeat or waste a good prayer meeting. Coming in late and diverting attention may do it. An attempt of a brother to introduce irrelevant subjects, or to raise a hobby, or to utter critical thoughts of others, or lack of arrangement, or one long-winded exhortation, or the doleful tone of a dyspeptic, or the long-drawn-out whine of a backslider, may do it. All these things should be avoided. Those only should take part that can sing and pray and speak out of a full, warm heart. Often *one* prayer meeting is used by the Lord to lift a church out of discouragement and start it on a career of success. So there should be brought to it only what edifies, stimulates and builds.

IV. *Things to be remembered.* If it is worth while to think of and plan for the lecture, why not for the prayer meeting? If one is desirous to be early at the concert in order to secure a good seat, why not be present before the social worship begins? If the owner of a ticket to the literary or musical entertainment cannot afford to lose the pleasure he seeks by attending them, how can a Christian miss the delight and profit gained by meeting with his brothers and sisters for the worship of God? We should remember that Christian obligations are the highest. We have covenanted together not to forget or "forsake the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is." Experience has proved how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity; and an apostle has given this specific direction: "Teaching and admonishing one another." To meet together and remember and do these things is to realize what Jesus intended when he made the prayer meeting service.

FRANK ROGERS MORSE.

New York.

Digitized by Google

THE PROBLEM OF CHILD CULTURE.

Our public schools are neither religious nor irreligious. They are far from being "godless schools," and, even without the Bible and prayer, may be more godly than those religious institutions in which are taught the formalities and superstitions of Romanism. Godliness consists in conformity to the will of God as expressed in nature and in his Word. It does not lie in forms, but in principles and laws. And hence the godliness or godlessness of a school is to be determined, not by the cross over the door, but by the character of the teachers. If the teacher has a Christian heart, his teaching will be Christian, and cannot be other. Every teacher puts himself into his teaching, and whether he teach arithmetic, or history, or philosophy, it is the teacher's self that is taught as much as the text-book. In this sense our public schools are far from being "godless," for the majority of our teachers are among the most conscientious Christians in the land.

But our public schools are secular—that is, it is not their province to teach religion. Morals they may teach and do teach. They inculcate the idea of God; they teach our obligations to Deity, and that our ideas of morality are derived from the Bible, which is his Word. But it is not the province of our public schools to teach systems of doctrine or to determine forms of worship. To attempt such a work as this would be to sound the death-knell of the public school. It is evident, therefore, that if we are to continue our system of popular instruction, the public school must stick to the secular sphere.

The Christian, however, will not be satisfied to give his children an exclusively secular education. He feels that secular and religious education are a unit, and there must be no unnatural divorce between them. There is as much bigotry in an exclusively secular education as in an exclusively religious education. The two go hand in hand, and each is necessary to the other to preserve a proper balance.

How, then, shall we train the children religiously? We have colleges, academies and institutes, under denominational control, for the culture of our larger boys and girls. But the greater problem is, how to train the young children, who are of that age when the mind is most susceptible to religious ideas? It is true that this work is done in part in our Christian homes, and, normally, the home is the place where it ought to be done. But only a bare fraction of our homes are Christian. If the home is to supply the proper instruction, then the masses of children must go uninstructed. It is the duty of our Christian churches to take up this work, and as we have made some little attempt in this direction through the Sabbath Bible schools, we must carry the same idea further and furnish a religious week-day instruction. That is to say, at least a part of some day of each week must be given by the

Digitized by Google

Church to the training of the children which come under its influence. This idea is not Utopian, for it has been tried in several quarters and with unvarying success. The writer of this has taught a class of over one hundred children for nearly two years, and his experience leads him to believe that every pastor could start a class of a somewhat similar character and find it a means of the highest profit. This will add to his burdens somewhat, but he will find the highest compensation in the favor he receives from the parents, in the closeness of his affiliation with the children, and, above all, in the consciousness that he is moulding the generation that shall ere long govern both the Church and the State. The class just referred to holds its sessions one hour each week, on Friday afternoons at four o'clock. The pastor is the teacher of this class, and he is assisted by two lady helpers. A topic is assigned for every week, and the children are expected to answer three questions and recite a verse of Scripture. These topics cover a wide range of Bible history and doctrine, beginning with "God, the Creator," and closing with "the Ascension," and include Jewish history, bibliology, the life of Jesus, the doctrines of the Atonement, Faith, etc. The object is to cover the fundamental facts and doctrines of our religion in a year's study. The mention of some of these topics will awaken the incredulity of some of our dear brethren, who suppose that theology is to be confined to the class-room and to the study-room. But the fundamentals of Christian doctrine are as simple as the principles of arithmetic, or any other science, and can be taught as readily. Theology is not all dry bones, and experience will show that the children have an adaptation for the "meat of the Word" as much (at least) as the older folks. Indeed, they have a better digestion for such food, for their stomachs are not impaired by the dyspepsia of unbelief and irreligious conceit. We need not teach the hard and dry statements of the catechism, but from the teachings of the children's Friend we may gather doctrines and illustrations that every child can understand and will appreciate. Experience has shown to the writer the marvellous willingness and adaptation of the chilren to learn religious truth.

There is a growing interest in this problem of child culture among our evangelical denominations. As Baptists we have an especial duty to the children, since it is so often charged that we discard the family and disown our little ones. There is a grand opportunity for Baptists to lead off in this matter of child culture as we did in the work of modern missions. Let us show our interest in the children by the establishment in our churches of schools for their religious training.

GEORGE WHITMAN.

Buffalo, N. Y., May 18, 1888.

Digitized by Google

COMPARATIVE EFFICIENCY OF LARGE AND SMALL CHURCHES.

The students of the Rochester Theological Seminary have been discussing the comparative cost and efficiency of large and small churches. One of their number, Mr. Amos Naylor, of the Senior class, has studied the subject by the help of statistics. He has kindly submitted the result of his studies to me, and I, in turn, will lay them before the readers of the REVIEW.

The time covered by the following statistics is the ten years ending with 1887. Four churches in a certain city in the State of New York first claim our attention. Two of these, during these ten years, have had an average membership of 640, the other two an average member ship of 380. The average yearly baptisms in the larger churches were 25⅔, and in the smaller 27⅝. The average yearly expenses of the larger churches were $5,500, and of the smaller $2,816. The yearly interest on the money invested in the property of the larger churches was $5,625, and of the smaller $1,422. The average amount of money expended (including interest on investment) to each baptism in the larger churches was $428; in the smaller $103. The average number of members in the larger churches whose united labors may be supposed to have led to each conversion was 25; in the smaller 13¾.

Thus we see that, so far as visible results that can be measured in conversions and baptisms are concerned, the smaller churches make in every way the better showing. The efficiency of the smaller churches per member was nearly twice as great as that of the larger, while the outlay to each conversion in the larger churches was more than three times as great as that in the smaller. Comparing the most costly of these churches with the least expensive, we find that the $142,000 invested in church property on a field which in ten years has yielded 273 additions to the church by baptisms would have yielded, had the same ratio of expense to conversion been maintained, 950 additions by baptisms in the least costly of these churches. Or, better, had the most costly of these churches divided itself up into four churches, they could all have been sustained on such fields as that occupied by the least expensive with the money it has cost to sustain the one (including interest on investment); and taking the average yearly increase of the smallest church as the basis, the number of additions by baptisms to the four churches would have been over four times as many as took place in the undivided church. It may be stated further that the church in question is situated in the business portion of the city, making its site very valuable, and that many hundreds of dollars are expended every year by its members in paying street-car fare in order to attend its appointments. Indeed, it is safe to say that enough is thus spent to support a smaller and more efficient church near the homes of the people.

Digitized by Google

But we observe that none of the four churches thus far brought under review can be called "small" in numbers.

Let us, therefore, take six of the larger churches of a certain Association in this State, whose average membership is 451, and compare them with seventeen of the smaller churches of the same Association, whose average membership is 107. Here the statistics of the last eleven years yield us the following results:

In the six larger churches we have one baptism yearly to 18¾ members; in the seventeen smaller churches one to 18½ members. The money expended in the former to each baptism is $261; in the latter $181. These figures are not so striking as those above, still they are of a nature to encourage our smaller country churches in holding on their way with rejoicing. They are doing their work at a far less expenditure of money upon themselves. The seventeen under consideration maintained their services year by year at a total expense of $17,711, while the six expended yearly $37,886. And their efficiency, member by member, was, considering the number of baptisms as a standard, slightly greater than that obtaining in the larger churches.

Possibly these figures may yield a grain of comfort to pastors of small churches. Would that they might quicken the spirit of colonization in some of our overgrown city churches.

A. S. COATS.

Rochester Theological Seminary.

PREPARATION FOR THE SERMON.

We have many words written and spoken to us about the preparation of the sermon. Suffer a word of exhortation from me about the preparation for the sermon. I deem the preparation of the heart of the first importance. "The preparation of the heart in man and the answer of the tongue is from the Lord."

If I read the great commission correctly, we are sent as ambassadors and not as inventors; we are sent to preach the Gospel of Christ, and not to discourse about it; to bear witness of Christ, not to prove him true; to testify the Gospel of the grace of God, not to "orate" about it. While I believe that careful, honest and thorough preparation is indispensable to the qualification for the Gospel minister; while I believe in the apostolic injunction to Timothy, "Give heed to reading, to exhortation, to teaching. . . . Neglect not the gift that is in thee. . . . Be diligent in these things. . . . Give thyself wholly to them"; I do not forget that "My speech and my preaching is not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power."

Digitized by Google

Deep piety in a minister is essential to his usefulness. Without this all the learning and knowledge in the world, united to the most brilliant talents, will avail nothing. Austin Phelps has well said: "A zealous rather than a profound pulpit is the need of the hour." There is a style of cold declamation which we often hear called pulpit eloquence, but which touches no heart because there is no heart in it. "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass or tinkling cymbal." Some thoughtful observer has made the remark: "It makes a great difference in the force of any sentence to know who is behind it." The man whose life backs up his words will be eloquent in the highest sense of the term.

Paul, in writing to the young pastor Timothy, condenses a whole homiletic treatise into the words, "Take heed to thyself." He also has the same thing in mind when exhorting Timothy to continue in the things which he has learned. "Knowing," he adds, "of whom thou hast learned them." The character of the teacher is appealed to as a guarantee for the value of the teaching.

The character enforces or neutralizes the teaching. "What you are," says Emerson, "sounds so loud that I cannot hear what you say." What we want is the sermon in the soul and the soul in the preaching. Says Paul again, "I labored more abundantly than they all, yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me." "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."

It cannot be too often nor too earnestly impressed upon our minds that in order to do good we must be good. All assumed fervor, all profession of piety, all *ex officio* religion, all pathos of tone and weeping of the voice when the heart does not weep, is worse than nothing. It only hardens sinners and exposes the pulpit to the scoffs of infidel men. "But that holy earnestness which blazed in the eye of a Paul or flashed out in the tones of a Whitefield makes men feel as if eternal things were descending upon their view."

I am convinced that the great want of the ministry in the present day is increased holiness of heart and life, and so I write these words. Fervent piety and constant communion with God will make a minister speak and act like one dealing with awful realities. Massillon says: "If a pastor is not more holy than his people he dishonors the ministry." Flavel says: "By steeping the holy seed in prayer we shall prepare it for a fruitful harvest." Again he says: "Those are the best sermons that are obtained by prayer. Some ministers have studied on their knees."

When the late Dr. Reid, of London, visited this country he went to see Payson's church. Concerning his visit he says: "On going through the church to look at the sacred spot where Payson, with seraphic ardor, had prayed as well as preached, one of the elders attend-

Digitized by Google

ing me said, emphatically, while pointing to the pulpit, 'That is the place, sir, where Payson prayed.' I had thought that, whatever might be his power as a preacher, it was greatest in prayer. I was now sure of it." What we want, my brother, as a preparation for the sermon, both to produce it and to deliver it, is much prayer. "Ye shall have power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you."*

MY EXPERIENCES WITH PRAYER MEETINGS.

A considerable section of my ministry is wrapped in unpleasant memories of prayer meeting experiences. During those years the coming of that awful night brought—the weekly prayer, "If it be possible let this cup pass from me." It almost killed my confidence in the sincerity of professed Christians. "My feet had well nigh slipped" out of the churches.

If, as I trust, the grace of God has lifted me out of the icy fog of those years, it has not yet enabled me to recall them with anything but pain.

Much of the trouble was due to my own misapprehension of things related to prayer meetings. I went to them with little sense of the leadership of the Holy Spirit. My idea was that the meeting depended chiefly on me. If the right words could be spoken, if the leader could properly touch the harp strings, then song and prayer and address would be forthcoming. As it usually happened the strings did not respond, and the leader went home compelled either to admit his own inefficiency or to question other's sincerity.

There came a change, I said, "henceforth faithful preparation shall be made for the meeting, both in myself and among the people; the best wisdom I have will be used in leading, and then as my sermons are left with God after being uttered, so the prayer-meeting shall be left." This put me in a peaceful frame of mind. It was faith in Christ applied to the fires of prayer meetings' torments, and it quenched them.

Since then my life has been blessed by the prayer meetings, and I have been able to study the matters belonging to them in an equable frame of mind.

The ideal prayer-meeting is a meeting of the church where all classes have freedom and willingness to speak or pray. The steady hope of the old; the tempered zeal of the middle aged; the exuberant confidence

* The name and address of the author of the article on Preparation for the Sermon have unfortunately been lost with the letter accompanying the MS. We take this occasion to suggest to all our friends that a contribution should always contain the name and address of the writer. These may be placed at the end, or, better still, in the upper left-hand corner of the first sheet. A separate letter will sometimes, in spite of all an editor's care, be mislaid or lost.—EDS. REVIEW.

Digitized by Google

of the young; the doctrinal or practical views of men; the intuitive directness and buoyant trustfulness of women; the chosen speech of the cultured; and the plain sometimes crude expressions of the unlettered, but not unsanctified, these all unite to meet the varied wants of the souls. Nothing short of that is the ideal; always presupposing the unction of the Holy Spirit.

How is the ideal to be attained?

1. The preaching is at the root of the prayer meeting. A poorly fed people, say the political economists, are inefficient laborers. So a people not well fed on Sunday will be inefficient Wednesday night. Evangelical preaching does not do the best for the prayer meeting. The truths of the Gospel which are only for the Christians; the great privileges and honors, the dignities and duties, joyfully and intelligently presented, furnish nourishment to the prayer meeting. If one had a weak and sickly prayer-meeting let him begin with constitutional treatment. Feed the beef and iron, the corn and oil of the Gospel, and he will by and by see his patients cheeks redden, the eyes brighten—and then will come the desire for exercise.

2. Personal preparation. The leader of a meeting ought to have something well prepared. The Scripture lesson studied into his mind until he feels its thought tingling to his finger tips. Then arrange two, possibly three, central suggestions, around which others can gather thoughts. Never be exhaustive.

Prayer which attunes to the heart to worship and gives him joy in the service and prayer for God, to use the service for the good of the people. These are essential to leadership.

3. Possibly topics preassigned. These have value as intermediate steps. My own experience has not been very satisfactory with them. Better results have been attained by taking consecutive Scripture, *e.g.*, the Epistle of Peter or James, or Galatians, and thus combine systematic instruction with that wonderful variety which the Scripture furnishes. A meeting ought to furnish opportunity for the saints to bring their tithes into the store house. They have been receiving the good of the land, and they ought to bring a tithe of their experiences for the spiritual support of the family. The habit of watching our life and selecting from our mercies those which we will put into the treasury of the prayer meeting is helpful in every way.

4. Seek the Spirit's guidance. We have a right to encourage all to follow the impulses of the Spirit, and quench no one. Philips daughters are great friends of mine because they prophesied, I spend more time with them than with the Corinthian sisters who were advised to keep silence. Of course if there are any Corinthian sisters in the church they are justified in heeding the injunctions sent to them. But let the daughters of Philip speak. *Despise not prophesying.*

Digitized by Google

5. *The machinery.* The less the better. But some things need to be done outside the meeting. Many people desire to contribute to the meeting, but they are timid and hesitating. Others think they are not needed. Others have not considered their obligation. I have found the best success in talking with these privately. If I can encourage and bring out one new voice each week it secures many in a year. This I would do in a general way, leaving as much as possible to voluntary choice of time and topic, but kindly pressing upon their attentions the privilege and duty of that kind of service. Some of the most helpful meetings I have seen secured by assigning a passage of Scripture for the topic and then giving one or two persons special parts of it for their study. I recall one now in which the Scripture, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit whereby we are sealed unto the day of redemption," was given. In this I asked one to speak of the redemption, another of the sealing, and left the grieving for voluntary remarks.

Prayer meetings must have an element of instruction in them, do all unto edification.

I never succeed very well by urging people to "take the time," I prefer silence to that kind of exercise which comes from urging. A prayer meeting must flow from a higher level—like an artesian well. And yet in all these things the motto forced upon us by our experience is "not as though I was already perfect" but we press toward the mark.

A. S. HOBART.

Yonkers, N. Y.

Digitized by Google

VIII.

REVIEW OF CURRENT LITERATURE.

A. THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

1. EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

The Inspiration of the Old Testament Inductively Considered. By ALFRED CAVE, B. A., Principal of Hackney College. 8vo, pp. 456. London: Congregational Union of England and Wales. 1888.

Professor Cave is well known as the author of *The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice*, *An Introduction to Theology*, many review articles on the newer criticism, and as one of the translators of Dorner's *System of Christian Doctrine*. The Academy rather patronizingly says of him that he "is evidently a trained Biblical scholar, strong in his grasp of the progressive teaching of revelation." His style is lucid and vigorous, his learning affluent, his mental movement logical, his spirit conservative and Christian. In this book, which discusses one of the most stirring and difficult themes of the day, he gives his reader the benefit of his entire equipment. He is full of zeal, but it is not zeal without knowledge.

Is the Old Testament a Divine revelation? The school of Kuenen denies. Moderate conservatives modify. Conservatives affirm. Those who affirm have chiefly relied upon the endorsement of the Old Testament by Christ and his apostles, their use of it being considered as equivalent to the affirmation of God himself. This method of reasoning is satisfactory to many, perhaps to most evangelical theologians, and to the Christian church generally. It is like reasoning from the conclusion of a sermon, when conclusions were in vogue, to the body of the sermon, inferring the authorship and purpose of the sermon from its application. It reads the Bible backwards. It asks the Apocalypse for the teachings of Genesis. The results of this method may not be harmful to a reverent mind, but the critical student of the Old Testament, applying the principles of historical criticism as he must, to be honest with himself and his work, is perpetually pressed with the query whether or not the books of the Old Testament, examined separately or in groups, when put to the test, give the same favorable answer.

It is this question Professor Cave undertakes to grapple with. His method is the inductive. Assuming the general accuracy of the Hebrew text, and a common consensus as to the general meaning of the text, or what are called textual and exegetical criticism, he confines himself to "the historical contents" and "the literary phenomena" peculiar to the general scope of the text. "Two questions," he says, "are to be discussed in these lectures, namely: On the one hand, the

Digitized by Google

DATA, and *on the other hand*, the DOCTRINE of the *inspiration* of the Old Testament" (p. 15). For the data he appeals to the contents of the Old Testament, with the purpose of proving their veracity. From their proved veracity he defends their inspiration mainly from their own statements. In Genesis, *e. g.*, to which he wisely devotes three lectures, the documents of which it is composed are compared with other documents on the same topic, giving the preference for exact truthfulness to the canonical book, inferring its Mosaic age and its inspiration from its own declarations. The other books of the Pentateuch, the prophets and the Hagiographa are treated in the same manner. He rightly puts his best work into the Pentateuch. It is the key which locks or unlocks. He deems the Elohistic document in Genesis to be the older and the Jehovistic the younger and emphatically Mosaic. Throughout the discussion the school of Wellhausen and Kuenen is kept constantly in mind, and is treated critically and candidly. There is not a sneer. His conclusion is that the books of the Old Testament are a Divine revelation.

Singularly, the inquiry as to the possibility of a Divine revelation is deferred to the last lecture, when considering the inspiration of the Hagiographa. This is rather tantalizing to the reader, because it is the most vital question of all; but his purpose evidently is to obviate the difficulty by first establishing the evidence for the fact.

The book covers a great deal of ground and provokes a great many queries. The reader will margin it with many interrogation points. It will arouse criticism, but it is an index finger to the truth. It is stimulating, suggestive, healthy, bracing.

O. S. STEARNS.

Prolegomena eines neuen Hebräisch-Aramäischen Wörterbuchs zum Alten Testament, von DR. FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH, Professor für Assyriologie und Semitesche Sprachen an der Universität Leipzig. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1886.

This is the eighth work, including different editions, of which Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch is the author. Aside from his own works, he has been a constant contributor to various Oriental journals, and has written appendices to several treatises and books on Assyriological subjects. In the productiveness of his pen he is following close in the footsteps of his noble father, Franz Delitzsch.

In the preface he acknowledges his inclination toward Old Testament exegesis; and says that in his study of the various books of the Old Testament, he has prepared a special dictionary for each book. In his preparation of his Assyrian Dictionary, he keeps in view constantly that of the Hebrew; discovering in a word frequently used in Assyrian the meaning of an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον in the Old Testament; or a new shade of meaning for a little-used Hebrew word. Thus the Hebrew is reaping a wealth of meaning out of Assyrian. According to stems or roots Prof. Delitzsch expects to arrange his words, and separate the "notes" from the main body of the work. He will put in separate form the Aramaic words, also the proper names.

In Chapter II. "Hebrew in relation to the other Semitic languages" is discussed. A comparison is made of the meaning of the same roots

Digitized by Google

in Hebrew and Arabic, in Hebrew and Aramic, in Hebrew and Assyrian. The result shows that, of the three, Assyrian is by far the most important Semitic language for the correct understanding of the Hebrew.

The most important part of the work is found in Chapter III. It discusses the significance of the Assyrian for the investigation of Hebrew words. It is a somewhat more extended treatise than "The Hebrew Language Viewed in the Light of Assyrian Research" (London, 1884.) Some Hebrew words occurring but once, or but few times, find an appropriate and sense-giving meaning in Assyrian. Names of animals, plants and stones are also explained and often cleared up by the lists of these objects found in the inscriptions. But one of the chief advantages of the use of Assyrian is found in the fact that it often gives us the fundamental meaning of Hebrew roots. This light is thrown as well on some roots of the other Semitic languages. There are also many nouns in Hebrew whose original roots are not known. In Assyrian we find the same word, and also often its root (or verb) in frequent use in the historical inscriptions. From this we can determine the meaning of the word, often adding to it new life from this new shade of meaning. Another very important service which the Assyrian renders in the study of the Old Testament, is the explanation of the Babylonian-Assyrian proper names, persons, places and dieties. It is in this study that we find a large number of Hebrew words borrowed directly from the Assyrian, and whose exact meaning can be ascertained only by the study of the Assyrian.

Chapter IV. deals with the phonetic laws observed in the relations of the Semitic languages.

Chapter V. discusses the root theory, its worthlessness and its dangers. By some lexicographers, most roots are reduced to a biliteral form. This reduction while valuable in many ways, is a dangerous road to travel. Almost every one who has travelled it has fallen into error. There are four common errors which every student of lexicography ought constantly to keep before him: (1.) Roots with the same consonants, but with entirely different meanings cannot always be reduced to the same original stem. (2.) The confusion as to the different original meanings of a given root has taken the edge off of the nicety of meaning in its derivative forms. (3.) The entanglement in the development of the meaning of many Hebrew stems is in consequence of this perverse light—this confusion of original stems. (4.) The attempt to reduce to a root a word whose verbal root nowhere occurs.

In Chapter VI. the Hebrew proper names are treated. They may be divided into two great classes: (1.) Those which do not contain the name of a god. (2.) Those which are compounded of the name of a god and one other element. This is an exceedingly interesting chapter, and explains many hitherto strange names.

The work is replete with Assyrian references and etymologies. It gives to Assyrian, in some cases, larger credit than most scholars would be willing to allow. But we are sure, at Prof. Delitzsch's hands, to receive all the light that this indefatigable toiler can bring forth out of things new and old to aid in a better understanding of the Old Testament.

IRA M. PRICE.

Digitized by Google

The Letter and the Spirit. The Bampton Lectures for 1888. By ROBERT EDWARD BARTLETT, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Oxford. New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co.

If the Rev. John Bampton desired his lectureship always to speak with the voice of its founder's age, he would disapprove of these lectures if he knew them; but if, as is more probable, he was wise enough to wish his lecturers to do each the work of his own time, this volume would satisfy him well. The book is a child of the present. It could never have been written until now, and it represents the earnest effort of one man to speak a word in season for the guidance of Christianity through the questions and changes of the time.

The lecturer takes for his theme Paul's distinction and contrast between the Letter and the Spirit, which he first unfolds exegetically, and traces down the line of development far enough to find its two terms meaning "respectively the outward and the inward, the form and the essence, the visible and tangible, and the invisible and impalpable part of a command or an institution or an ordinance. He further defines his antithesis by saying, "At such a time it is necessary to distinguish very carefully between that which is permanent and essential and that which is temporary and accidental in our religious systems." Elsewhere he finds the letter illustrated in "the fixed, rigid, unchangeable code which was the basis of the Jewish polity," and speaks of the spirit as "that living force which is the ever-present inspiration of the Christian life." This distinction, defined perhaps as closely as is possible, and sufficiently freed from obscurity in the treatment, he proceeds to trace in the facts regarding Scripture exegesis, in the doctrine of the Church, in the sacraments, in creeds and confessions of faith, and in various facts of Christian worship and life: and he concludes with an attempt at forecasting the Church of the future.

His general position is that "that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual;" that in the inevitable order the letter precedes: that the letter has its value, and is indeed indispensable to the preparing of the way of the spirit; that the letter, however, naturally tends to remain too long, the means being taken for the end, and is in danger of obstructing the way of the spirit, which it should only have prepared. This grouping and tendency of facts he finds in all the regions of doctrine and practice that have just been mentioned. He traces the progress, past and present, from the formal to the vital, from the multiform to the simple, from the rigid to the free. In this progress he glories—not in the spirit of a despiser of the past, but with the heart of a lover of the future, with its simpler forces and its more vital ardors. The Church of the future will not find the center of its unity, he thinks, in unity of doctrinal belief, or in uniformity of organization: he rather expects it to bear the likeness of the primitive church, and have its power from being a beneficent society devoted to all forms of love and Christian service to mankind.

This brief statement sufficiently indicates the drift of the book, which is earnestly religious in tone, and by no means destructive in spirit, while it is hopeful and progressive and somewhat revolutionary. It is alive with generous recognition of good in all forms of Christian statement and organization, though it will readily be seen that the

Digitized by Google

author regards much of the good as partial and temporary, included in the realm of the letter and destined to be absorbed into the larger good of the spirit which is to follow. It is a fresh and stimulating book, which moves in the direction in which God is leading his kingdom. Almost any reader would dissent from it somewhere, but its message will not be uttered in vain.

W. N. CLARKE.

II. HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

Christian Archæology. By CHARLES W. BENNETT, D.D., Professor of Historical Theology in Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. 8vo. New York: Phillips & Hunt.

This work is the fourth volume in the "Library of Biblical and Theological Literature" edited by Drs. Crooks and Hurst. It thus has the general endorsement of these scholars. The author has had exceptional facilities in the preparation of his Archæology. He has crossed the Atlantic several times in the interest of his subject; and has personally studied the monuments found in southern Europe. He was also the pupil of Dr. Piper, Professor of Christian Archæology in the University of Berlin.

The work is comprehensive, embracing the archæology of Christian art, of the constitution and government of the Christian church, of Christian worship and rites, and of Christian life. We believe it would have been a great gain for Christian students if the author had given to the world two volumes, and confined himself in the first one to the narrower conception of archæology, namely, to an exposition of early Christian life, as that is indicated in the remains of early Christian art. He could have given another volume on early church life, as that is presented in early patristic literature. In this way he could have given a fuller treatment to most of the topics which are now so briefly noticed in his work. Very often this treatment is so meagre as seriously to impair its value. We must commend the numerous illustrations of this volume, the translations of the inscriptions found in the text and in the plates, and also especially the literature of Christian Archæology. We regret the omission of Dr. Cotes' *Archæology of Baptism*. The author had studied the subject at Rome and Paris; and had given a treatise quite free from a polemic spirit. His work within its range is quite as authoritative as most of those found in Dr. Bennett's list. We cannot believe that it was left out because the writer belonged to the Baptist denomination.

Any work on Christian archæology would be sure to challenge criticism. Dr. Bennett is, however, always learned and always dispassionate. So much must be said in his praise. But we regret to add that he is not impartial; and that this partiality is all the more potent because he seems to be unconscious of its presence. We refer to the frescoes of the catacombs of Rome representing Christian baptism.

There are in the crypt of Lucina two wall paintings of the baptism of Christ. They are very similar and have the same import. They are important because they are the earliest representations of the baptism of our Lord. Dr. Bennett's description is correct, and we reproduce

Digitized by Google

it: A nude male figure is stepping from the water, which reaches a little above the knees. "A man clad in a tunic is standing on the shore and extending his hand in helpfulness towards the one who has received baptism. Above is the dove, bearing in its beak what seems to be an olive branch, symbolizing the Holy Ghost, who attests the act." Now Christ had been baptized and was moving towards the shore. This is the act which demands a natural interpretation. Dr. Bennett gives it in the following words. "There is no suggestion of an immersion, but rather of aspersion by the ministrant who stands on the shore." He goes even further than this, and says of the similar picture: "The scene can only, by an unwarrantable stretch of the imagination be regarded as the last stage of an immersion. The simpler and more obvious act is that of an aspersion, since there is no suggestion whatever that the ministrant has before been standing in the water." But the author's view is not consistent. Our Lord was further from the shore when he was baptized, and John could not have sprinkled him without being in the water himself. Besides, what would the fresco suggest to the early Christians when immersion was everywhere practiced. There was then no dispute as there is to-day about the form of baptism. There was at that early period no need of a fuller suggestion that John had come up out of the water to wait on his Lord. If immersion had not been the mode used, except in cases of necessity, the interpretation might be doubtful, but the author frankly admits that immersion was commonly practiced. He says: "This is indicated not only by the general signification of the words used in describing the rite, but the earliest testimony of the documents which have been preserved, gives preference to this mode." Could we not then reverse the author's statement and safely declare that the scene can only, by an unwarrantable stretch of the imagination, be regarded as the representation or the suggestion of sprinkling? This view of the meaning of this fresco is the more astounding when we consider that all the authorities on the subject are against him. Even De Rossi, with his polemic zeal in favor of pouring or sprinkling does not here agree with him.

This prince of archæologists makes no reference to this painting in support of his notion that immersion and infusion were often united in the early Christian pictorial representations of baptism. He refers to quite a number, but omits any mention of this. Garucci, who has labored nearly as long as De Rossi, insists over and over again in his great work on the *Histology of Christian Art, in the First Eight Centuries*, that when pouring does appear it is merely as the accompanying ceremony of baptism, and that baptism is always by immersion except in cases of necessity. Roller, a learned French scholar who has given us an independent work on the catacombs of Rome, in two folio volumes, is direct and explicit in his testimony. He affirms that: "It was an immersion as complete as could be expressed." Victor Schultze, who also has given us a work in German, on the Roman Catacombs, in which he declares that baptism was conferred by immersion in this fresco, as well as in the two others. Strzygowski in his *Iconography of the Baptism of Christ*, holds to the same opinion.

The views of these chief authorities is supported by other writers. We will mention only three, Abbe Pardiac, in his *History of St. John the Baptist and his Cultus*, thus expresses himself: "The evangelical text

Digitized by Google

expressly informs us that our Lord was baptized by immersion. This was observed in the debut of Christian art." The baptism of our Lord is recognized at every step in the Catacombs. We refer to what De Rossi has discovered in the cemetery of Saint Calixtus. The fact is there reduced to the simplest expression: "A man plunged in the water from which he issues aided by another personage, who extends his hand, and a bird is flying above his head." (p. 244) Dr. Schaff in his *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. says: "The oldest of these pictures represents the baptized as coming up (after immersion) from the river." (p. 37) Dr. Bennett has failed to account for the mental observation of the foremost men in his special study. Certainly there is a stretch of imagination either in their case or in his own.

There are other frescoes in the cemetery of Saint Calixtus of the baptism of our Lord. Dr. Bennett holds that these two are also representations of sprinkling. In both cases the youth stands in the water below the knees. The chief difference between them is that in one case there are numerous sprays or dashing of water about the head and person of the candidate. There is no evidence of the water turned or thrown by the hand or poured from any vessel, so it seems absurd to insist that such pictures denote simply sprinkling. In fact the water about one of them seems to intimate that there has been or is to be an immersion. Shultze holds strongly to the idea that immersion is here taught, as also in the other case. De Rossi holds (owing to the shallowness of the water) that we have a union of partial immersion and pouring or sprinkling. Roller follows De Rossi and also decidedly holds that we have here two immersions. The learned Abbe Martigny in his great French work on Christian Antiquities holds that one of these and that too the one where the water only covers the ankles, represent immersion: "We have an example of simple immersion, much more ancient than anything which we have hitherto considered in the paintings recently discovered in the cemetery of Saint Calixtus and which we have ourselves examined."

Garucci takes the same view as Martigny and is not at all troubled at the weakness of the symbolism. For in an age where there was no baptismal controversy, there was no need of a full presentation of the apostolic rites; nor in fact was this possible. The initiated must decide between pouring and immersion and there were no signs of the first, and there was a clear and unmistakable sign of the second. We may doubt its import; those who baptized always (cases of necessity excepted) by immersion could have no hesitation in interpreting the meaning.

We have one more testimony as to the import of these two frescoes. Palmer, an Oxford scholar, who busied himself in the Catacombs of Rome, seems to have been alive to this fact, and has thus delivered himself: "The baptizer holds his right hand on the head of the catachumen, to plunge him in the water (baptism in those early times being conferred, except in cases of necessity, by immersion), and in his left hand he holds the roll of the Gospel. In the same cemetery we have another baptism, with only this difference, that the person baptized has been plunged at least once, for the green lines near his head are water falling from him. Though these lines show that the person baptized has already been plunged, it by no means follows that he has been

Digitized by Google

plunged for the third and last time. The hand of the baptizer laid upon the head of the baptized (being in place until after the immersions are completed) is no sign of itself of confirmation when the person baptized is still standing in the water." (p. 31)

We remark that the hand of the ministrant resting on the head of the candidate while he stands in the water is regarded by nearly all the leading archæologists as a sign that the immersion is about to be performed.

If, as we have said, the symbolism in these frescoes seems to be weak, yet it was all that was needed for the subapistolic times. Strzygowski strikingly remarks on this very point: "We see how early Christian art adjusted itself in a simple, plain way to the small claims made upon it, since the artist puts only so much into the composition as was essential in order to understand its meaning." (p. 9.)

We have alluded to the polemic spirit of De Rossi on the mode of baptism, and we must make good so grave a charge. In company with other Catholic archæologists, he openly avows his purpose to defend the faith and practice of his church. Thus, in his preface to the first number of the *Bulletin of Christian Archæology*, published in 1863, he says: "It is the organ of a science, whose revival in our age is perhaps a providential antidote to its very many and very great errors, and it is destined, I hope, to secure new victories for the truth and for the faith." This gives the general polemic aim which, both in the *Bulletin* and in his work on the *Catacombs of Rome*, finds more specific expressions in support of the Romish dogmas and practices. It is in place here to refer to only one of them. He thus utilizes his interpretation of two of the frescoes, as supporting the Catholic practice of pouring: "It is a point of great moment in the history of the baptismal rite and in the controversy regarding the right mode with the modern Greeks, who are accustomed to impugn the validity of baptism by pouring and by sprinkling." (Vol. 2, p. 334.) Here the great Italian betrays his leanings. But he even goes so far as to defend the union of immersion and infusion. Garucci repudiates this view altogether. De Rossi claims the authority of Tertullian in support of his view. He relies on the following passage: "Others make the suggestion, forced enough clearly. Now the apostles then served the turn of baptism when in their little ship they were sprinkled and covered with the waves. It is, however, as I think, one thing to be sprinkled or intercepted by the violence of the sea, another thing to be baptized in obedience to the discipline of religion." But here the African father does not refer to any practice of his day, but only to a strange fancy which he repudiates. Besides, the words *fructibus adspersi operti sunt* only describe the progress of the storm, and here it is the drenching which suggests the baptism. Schultze, in a note in his *Archæological Studies*, remarks: "De Rossi is wrong in referring to Tertullian as affirming that the apostles were baptized when they were sprinkled and covered by the waves, for the full context proves just the opposite." (p. 56.) We can only account for such a reference by his desire to make out a case for his opinion. For Tertullian knows of no other baptism than that of immersion, and he presents this mode of initiation into the church in many passages, and implies it in still more.

But another token of this polemic spirit is found in De Rossi's inter-

Digitized by Google

pretation of the symbolic lines which issue from the dove in the mosaic of the Arian baptistry of Rome. He insists these have reference to a literal baptism. That is, that they denote the pouring of water. But the lines spread like a fan, and so cannot well represent water. The older view seems to be the true one—that they denote rays of light. And Corblet makes the fatal objection that on this theory there is no ministrant. Richter has here followed De Rossi, but not without a decided protest from an eminent German professor at Münster. Professor Frantz, in his recent *History of Christian Painting*, thus declares his convictions: "Such a conviction of the evangelical narrative could hardly be found in the entire iconography of the baptism of Christ, and the Holy Spirit has certainly never officiated as dispensing water even in the boldest fancy of the Arians. Even Agnellus would hardly have endured such an unheard-of conception, and one, too, which contradicted the text of the Biblical narrative." (p. 37) Victor Schultze, in his learned treatises on the *Theological Results of the Catacomb Investigation* and the *Christian Period of Art*, both published in Germany, calls special attention to the polemic attitude of De Rossi. We quote briefly from the latter work: "Especially ought we to watch and keep within proper limits the connection between these monuments and the Catholic doctrine and practice which the author is constantly seeking to establish." (1878.) The judicial element is strong in De Rossi except when he feels called upon to be an advocate; then he is ingenious, but not candid. But his pre-eminence as an archæologist and the evident influence of his opinions justify the criticism we have made on his polemic attitude.

Let us now turn to Dr. Bennett. He was troubled with the fact that on the two frescoes noticed above, the water was between the ankles and the knees. We supposed in reading this portion of his work that he would at once recognize immersion in the Mosaic of the Arian baptistry of the Catacombs. In both, Christ is nearly up to his waist in water. We found ourselves mistaken. Singularly enough, he gives the pontian picture to show the persistence of the art representations of the rite of aspersion or pouring. Now the hand of John rests in both cases on the head of Christ. There is no sign of sprinkling whatever, and the water is deep enough for immersion, and yet the Mosaic and the painting represent aspersion. Besides, with exception of Ciampini, whose engraving of the Mosaic is repudiated as untrue to the fact, and Parker, who only expresses his doubt, the archæologists and historians of Christians agree that the hand in both of these representations simply rests on the head of Our Lord. Many of these expressly affirm that immersion is taught and all of them imply as much. To make his case stronger he refers to Strzygowski for a complete representation of these and similar paintings. Now this careful observer is utterly opposed to his view. In opposition to the chief defender of even the union of immersion and infusion he says: "Nevertheless, directly against Graniallo, I have this affirmation to make, that all the examples introduced by him on page 1,832 following, in which Christ is about to be baptized by the pouring of water on his head are either false or in the highest degree improbable." (p. 36.) Here and in this reference, we are sorry to say there is a suppression of the truth. After the author had gone thus far, we are not surprised that he can

Digitized by Google

add: "From the second to the ninth century there is found scarcely one pictorial representation of baptism by immersion." If this were only reversed it would be true. Dr. Bennett remarks in a foot-note that this argument was given to the School of Theology of Boston University in lectures on monumental theology. He notices, too, the bearing of such a view on Christian union. Will the falsification of the facts of history, even unintended, help such a union? There is one point that ought to be insisted on, namely: that while pouring as a mode of completing immersion does appear here and there in early Christian art, yet sprinkling as distinct from pouring does not appear at all. We have not met with any account of a pictorial representation of sprinkling, properly so called, for the fifteen centuries which preceded the Reformation. Christendom is now thus divided: the Greeks and the Baptist communities practice immersion, the Catholics pouring, and the Pedobaptists, sprinkling.

On infant baptism the author declares that the most explicit statement is found in Justin Martyr, who says: "There are among the Christians of this day many of both sexes, sixty and seventy years old, who have been made disciples of Christ from their infancy." The translation is faulty. The one given in the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, and which agrees with more Latin versions is the following: "And many, both men and women, who have been Christ's disciples from childhood, remain pure at the age of sixty or seventy years." The German version, with an introduction by Ziegler, and Roessler in his *Library of the Church*, give the same rendering. This last author expressly denies that there is any reference in the text to infant baptism. He says: "This is not the ordinary way of expressing that idea, and it was not the purpose of the author to express it." Semisch, in his *Monograph on Justin*, thus comments on this passage: "Nothing more is meant by these words, than that many persons of both sexes had already in early years become the disciples of Christ. The language here used does not necessarily include baptism. It merely compels us to think of the Catachumens. And even if it does involve the idea, the reference is by no means to the baptism of infants. The Greek word here used could just as well indicate youths of both sexes, especially when contrasted with sixty or seventy years of age." Otto, who not only edited the works of Justin, but wrote a prize essay on his life and doctrines, remarks: "There is not a syllable on the subject of infant baptism in Justin's writings"

The leading church historians take the same view. Even Weiss, in the great Catholic work on *Christian Antiquities*, edited by Kraus, remarks: "We can furnish no historical proofs from the first apostolic period for the actual practice of infant baptism." Steitz, in the *Protestant Encyclopædia*, gives a like testimony, and so does Hœflung in his *Sacrament of Baptism*.

The author makes the most scanty reference to the baptisteries, in striking contrast with Ruseno on the same subject. But we have no space for any further criticism. We are unable to accept the invitation of the publisher to introduce it into the Seminary at Hamilton, but have responded to their request for a candid notice of the work.

E. DODGE.

Digitized by Google

History of the Christian Church. By PHILIP SCHAFF, Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Vol. VI. *Modern Christianity.* The German Reformation, A. D. 1517–1530. 8vo. pp. 755. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

The publication of this volume of Dr. Schaff's *History* is an event of more than usual interest to all Christian scholars. No work has ever been issued in the English language, covering the whole field of church history, which can be compared with this in fullness of learning, minuteness of research and candor of treatment. These qualities are as conspicuous in the newly-published volume as they were in the first instalment of the *History* that the author published a generation ago. That his life may be spared until he shall be able to complete his task will be the hope of every Christian student.

One general criticism may, perhaps, be made upon the work as a whole, and upon this volume in particular, that, while it displays all the characteristic German thoroughness of scholarship, it is marked in equal measure by the German carelessness about form. It is, indeed, a large accumulation of the materials of history, rather than a history of the Church in the proper sense of that word, that Dr. Schaff offers us. The force of this criticism would be, however, considerably diminished by the consideration that Dr. Schaff writes, not for ordinary readers, but for scholars and students, and that he has been at pains to give us, not an animated, connected and picturesque narrative, but a series of investigations of each period, with biographical studies of the more famous leaders in the history of the Church. The work possesses an encyclopædic character, and, like an encyclopædia, it is valuable for the information that can be extracted from it, even though that information is contained in somewhat disconnected sections.

Portly as this volume is, it covers only the first dozen years of the Reformation movement, and it would therefore be unjust to the author to pass final judgment on his treatment of many topics, on which he will have more to say, no doubt, in the volume to come. One such topic is the discussion of those religious bodies comprehensively known as Anabaptists. Fuller details about them may be expected in Vol. VII., but so far as this volume goes it requires one important qualification of the remark above made about Dr. Schaff's candor. Whether his investigation of the Anabaptists has been less thorough than it is his wont to bestow on the subjects he treats, or whether his prejudices against these parties of the Reformation period were too inveterate to be overcome by any evidence, for some cause he has given not merely an inadequate but a misleading account of them. In the first place, he attempts to connect them through Thomas Münzer with the Peasants' War, the agitation at Mühlhausen and the religious revolution of Münster. Secondly, he ignores entirely the frequent and vehement protests made by Anabaptists of various parties against all seditious and violent movements, by which they sought to disclaim their sympathy with such methods of righting wrongs as that attempted in the Peasants' War, and such means of religious reformation as marked the Münster uprising. And finally, in discussing the question of Protestantism and religious liberty, he ignores as completely the fact that the Anabaptists were the only party of the Reformation period that in the writings of their principal representatives, and in the con-

Digitized by Google

fessions that they put forth, insisted on the principle of equal religious liberty for all, and not merely on the toleration of some.

Dr. Schaff uniformly associates Thomas Münzer with the Anabaptists. For this there is no just ground. Thomas Münzer, it is true, at one period of his life taught anabaptism—that is, that infant baptism is nugatory, and that adult Christians ought to be baptized on profession of faith; but at a later period of his life, and especially during the Münster period, he ceased so to teach and practiced infant baptism, having his own children among others sprinkled. He is, therefore, no Anabaptist, but a Pedobaptist, and should be so classed. The fact is, and it is well known to all students of the Reformation period, that the Lutheran and Catholic leaders employed the term Anabaptist with great looseness to denote almost any body of Christians that could not be classed with one of these parties. Any Protestant who was too radical in his religious views to follow Luther was set down at once as an Anabaptist.

The last and most thorough investigator of the Anabaptists of the Reformation period is Dr. Ludwig Keller, Royal Archivist of the State Archives at Münster. In his *History of the Anabaptists and Their Kingdom at Münster*, he says:

"It is an arduous task to gain a general view of the religious beliefs and ecclesiastical principles which were brought together under the title of Anabaptists. . . . The name Anabaptists, which was bestowed upon them by their opponents because of their baptism of adults, is fundamentally only fitting in so far as it gives a designation which, after the year 1525, is common to all adherents of the sects."

In his *An Apostle of the Anabaptists*, which is a biography of John Denck, he says:

"When formerly the name Anabaptist was mentioned, most persons at once thought of that wild sect which, under the leading of John of Leyden, founded the Münster Kingdom. . . . There were Anabaptists long before the Münster rebellion, and in all the centuries that have followed, in spite of the severest persecutions, there have been parties which, as Baptists or Mennonites, have secured a permanent position in many lands. The extent of the Anabaptist movement, in the first period of its growth, is at present very considerably undervalued in cultivated circles. . . . . It has been most rightfully shown that on the same grounds on which it is attempted to prove Menno's connection with the followers of John of Leyden, it could be proved that Luther and the Romish Church formed in truth only one party, for the latter really have, in many respects, more points of contact than the Mennonites and the Münster rioters. . . . We must distinguish among the so-called Anabaptists three principal parties which came on the stage, one after the other, in three epochs under different men. In the period which lies between the years 1525 and 1530, among the opponents of infant baptism no man possesses a greater and more genteel esteem than John Denck. In the time from 1530 to 1535, the forerunners of John of Leyden (and at last he himself) became masters of the situation; and from thenceforward Menno Simons maintained a controlling influence."

It is significant that the name of John Denck is not once mentioned by Dr. Schaff. He does, however, mention Balthasar Hübmaier, and, on the whole, favorably, though with this significant exception: "He made common cause with the Anabaptists of Zurich and with Thomas

Digitized by Google

Münzer, who came into the neighborhood of Waldshut and kindled the flame of the Peasants' War. He is supposed by some to be the author of the Twelve Articles of the Peasants." The last statement is indeed true, for these Articles are attributed to a considerable number of men, but there is no reasonable ground for supposing that Hübmaier had any part in the making of them. The mention of Hübmaier's name in connection with that of Thomas Münzer can have no object except to insinuate that Hübmaier sympathized with or was responsible for Münzer's excesses. Nothing could be further from the truth than this. Sympathy with any form of civil violence, or the reformation of religion by force, were by no one repudiated with more emphasis and iteration than by Hübmaier. His writings abound with protests against the use of the sword to propagate the religion of Christ.

What Keller says of the character of the Anabaptists and of the way in which heterogeneous sects were classed under that head has received the assent of all writers who have carefully investigated this period. Ypeig and Dermont, in their *History of the Netherland Church*," say:

"Since the enlisting of the rebel Anabaptists happened in this manner, it is sufficient evidence that the great majority cannot be supposed to have been Baptists in heart or belief. They were people of every variety of religious beliefs, and many of them of no religion at all in heart, although they aided the Protestant cause. From the nature of the case the majority of the Romanists knew no difference between the various Protestant parties and sects, and would make no distinction. Hence, the abhorrence deserved only by some of the Anabaptists was bestowed upon all Protestants. . . . The Lutherans also were compelled to undergo the most distressing persecutions on account of the indignation of the Romish government and priesthood at the wicked conduct of the Anabaptists. . . . The Anabaptists seemed to them (Romanists) to be a lawless people consisting partly of Baptists, partly of Zwinglians, partly of Lutherans—men who formerly adhered to the old Catholic faith, but who had now entirely renounced religion."

The simple truth is that the term Anabaptists was a very convenient designation for any sect or leader condemned by whatever church was supported by the civil power. When that church happened to be the Roman, Lutherans, Zwinglians and Baptists were all included under the opprobrious term of Anabaptists. though properly speaking it belonged only to the latter. When the Lutheran Church happened to be in the ascendency they applied the term indiscriminately to all who did not agree with them. The principle was the old one, "Give a dog a bad name and then hang him." But modern church history ought to rise superior to these ancient prejudices and distinguish between things that obviously differ.

The news of the troubles at Münster reached Switzerland very soon, and a letter was addressed to Thomas Münzer by Conrad Grebel, Felix Manz, and others, in which they wrote as follows: "Is it true as we hear that you have preached in favor of an attack on the princes? If you defend war, or anything else not found in the clear word of God, I admonish you by our common salvation to abstain from these things now and hereafter." This letter bears date September 5, 1524. On February 24, 1527, a company of Anabaptists met at the little village of

Digitized by Google

Schleitheim and adopted a confession of faith or statement of their principles, of which the following is the sixth article:

"The sword is an ordinance of God outside of the perfection of Christ, (*i.e.* the church) which punishes and slays the wicked and protects and guards the good. In law the sword is ordained over the wicked for punishment and death, and the civil power is ordained to use it. But in the perfection of Christ excommunication is pronounced, only for warning and for exclusion of him who has sinned, without death of the flesh, only by warning and the command not to sin again. It is asked by many who do not know the law of Christ respecting us, whether a Christian may or should use the sword against the wicked in order to protect and guard the good or for love. The answer is unanimously revealed thus: Christ teaches and commands us that we should learn from him, for he is meek and lowly of heart, and so we will find rest for our souls."

The article goes on to say that while the Christian should render obedience to the civil power, typified by the sword, he should not be a magistrate if elected to that office. For "the rule of the magistrate is according to the flesh, that of the Christian according to the spirit. . . . The weapons of their contest and war are carnal and only against the flesh, but the weapons of the Christian are spiritual against the fortresses of the devil; the worldly are armed with steel and iron, but the Christians are armed with the armor of God, with truth, righteousness, peace, faith, salvation, and with the Word of God."

Menno Simons, in his "Humble and Christian Defense," says:

"We consider the Münsterian doctrine and life in regard to king, sword, rebellion, retaliation, revenge, polygamy and the temporal kingdom of Christ, as a new Judaism and a misleading error, doctrine and abomination which is not at all in keeping with the Spirit, word and example of Christ. . . . Our weapons are not swords and spears, but patience, silence and hope, and the word of God."

In his tract called "Testimony Against John of Leyden," Menno expounds these views at considerable length. Did space permit, the number of these quotations might be indefinitely increased from the writings of Denck, Rothmann, Menno Simons and other leaders among the Anabaptists. It was a small and comparatively unimportant section of the so-called Anabaptist sects that believed in the use of the sword to promote the reformation of religion or even the righting of civil wrongs.

Luther in various passages of his earlier works speaks great and swelling words in favor of religious liberty. Thus in his exposition of the First Epistle of Peter, made in the year 1523, he says.

"If the civil magistrate interferes with spiritual matters of conscience in which God alone must rule, we ought not to obey at all, but rather loose our head. Civil government is confined to external and temporary affairs. . . If an emperor or prince asks me about my faith, I would give answer not because of his command but because of my duty to confess my faith before everybody. But if he should go further and command me to believe this or that, I would say, Dear sir, mind your secular business. You have no right to interfere with God's reign and therefore I shall not obey you at all."

But he did not long continue of this way of thinking. As late as 1528 he did indeed protest against the cruelties with which heretics were treated, especially Anabaptists: "It is not right, and I deeply regret

Digitized by Google

that such wretched people should be so miserably murdered, burned, and cruelly put to death. Every one should be allowed to believe what he pleases. If he believes wrongly, he will have punishment enough in the eternal fire of hell. Why should they be troubled in this life also?" But about the same time he also wrote: "I can in no way admit that false teachers should be put to death; *it is enough that they should be banished.*" So soon as he found himself in power he did wish those who disagreed with him silenced or banished by the government. He was especially intolerant towards the Jews, and wrote several violent treatises against them, in one of which he spoke of them as follows: "A Jewish heart is so stock-stone-iron-devil hard that it can in no way be softened. .. . . In fine, they are young devils condemned to hell." His companion, Melancthon, the mildest of reformers, in a letter to Calvin approved the burning of Servetus: "And I say too that your magistrates did right in that, after solemn trial, they put the blasphemer to death." And later he called the execution of Servetus "a pious and memorable example to all posterity."

How far all this is from the teaching of the Anabaptists might be shown at great length; but a few brief quotations must suffice. The first is from Hübmaier's "Christian Baptism of Believers," and sets forth the true distinction between the magistrate's civil duties and the right then claimed to punish heretics—or in our modern phrase, the distinction between Church and State:

"We confess openly that there should be secular government that should bear the sword. This we are willing and bound to obey in everything that is not against God. And the more Christian this government is the more does it with Solomon implore God for wisdom to govern, that it may neither turn to the right nor the left against God. Therefore should we earnestly and with great zeal pray to God for it, that we may lead a peaceful and quiet life with each other, in all godliness and honesty."

Protesting against the cruel persecutions in which magistrates then engaged, he says:

"Take care, O magistrates, and do not spot your hands and wash them in the blood of the innocent. . . . Remember that you have a Judge over you in heaven, who will measure you with the judgment of Adonihezek. Ye cannot escape the measure of judgment ye have measured to others."

In his tract on "Heretics and Those Who Burn Them," the first work extant that protests against all persecution for religious belief, Hübmaier says:

"Those who are heretics one should overcome with holy knowledge, not angrily but softly. . . . If they will not be taught by strong proofs or evangelical reasons, then let them be mad, that those who are filthy may become more filthy still. . . . This is the will of Christ who said 'Let both grow together until the harvest, lest while ye gather up the tares ye root up also the wheat with them! . . . Hence it follows that the inquisitors are the greatest heretics of all, since they against the doctrine and example of Christ condemn heretics to fire, and before the time of harvest root up the wheat with the tares. . . A Turk or heretic is not convinced by our act, either with the sword or with fire, but only with patience and prayer. . . . And now it is clear to everyone, even the blind, that a law to burn heretics is an invention of the devil. Truth is immortal."

Digitized by Google

Scores of similar testimonies might be cited, with which these pages must not be burdened. Such doctrine is to be found in no other writings of the Reformation period. Yet Dr. Schaff, in his account of the progress of religious liberty, does not so much as mention these devoted pioneers, who sealed their devotion to the truth with their blood. Isolated statements of this principle may be found here and there prior to the Reformation, and partial recognition of it was common from the reformation onward, but the German Anabaptists were the first organized body of Christians to make this a part of their confessions of faith and to advocate it as a fundamental principle of Christian life. To these, our forefathers in the faith, we owe a debt of gratitude and honor for the blessing that we inherit of a free Church in a free State.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

III. SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

Philosophy and Religion. A Series of Addresses, Essays and Sermons Designed to set forth Great Truths in Popular Form. By AUGUSTUS HOPKINS STRONG, D.D. 8vo. pp. 632. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son.

The first thing that will impress any one who turns over the table of contents is the wide range of topics discussed. The author has gone far to justify himself in taking as his motto, had he so chosen, the noble though now somewhat hackneyed line of Terence—

Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto.

How catholic the culture, one says, how generous and multifarious the learning, how versatile the mind that these more than fifty papers exhibit. More still, how sure the taste and how fine the style that many of them reveal. And, most wonderful of all, how untiring the industry that has, in the midst of absorbing official and professional duties, produced a volume of writing so large and of excellence so uniformly high.

The great variety of topics treated in the volume would make it possible to classify it in either of several departments of literature. We have placed it among works on "Systematic Theology," not because it partakes of the nature of a formal treatise, but because it discusses in a popular and literary style most of the important problems that Dr. Strong has treated with a more rigid scientific method in his *Systematic Theology*. It is, if we may so say, a translation of dogmatic theology into popular theology. It is not to be inferred from this that there is any loose thinking or loose writing. Dr. Strong is a firm believer in the capacity of plain people, of fair average intelligence and culture, to comprehend the profoundest truths of theology, if the truths are properly expounded. And he is past master in the art of exposition. For absolute clearness of statement, combined with a grace of style generally looked for only in purely literary essays, we know of nothing superior to these papers. No theological essays that we have ever read, with the one exception of Dr. Shedd's unsurpassable volume, come within gunshot of these. Does this appear to be a risky assertion? Let any reader who so thinks taste for himself, and if he knows a good thing when he sees it he will be forever grateful for the suggestion.

Digitized by Google

It does not necessarily follow that one will approve all of Dr. Strong's teachings in these essays and sermons, many of which cover ground stoutly contested for generations, and doubtless to be contested for generations to come. We may be pardoned, perhaps, for saying that neither the essay on "The Will in Theology," nor "Modified Calvinism," seems to be the final word on the freedom of the will, though both are able and suggestive discussions. The essay on "The Method of Inspiration" does not, to our mind, quite clear up the difference between illumination and inspiration. And, for our part, we should dissent from some of the critical judgments pronounced in the very admirable papers on Dante and Robert Browning. But a book with every part of which every reader should agree—supposing such a book possible—would be a miracle of dullness. It would by no means be true to say of Dr. Strong's book that it starts more questions than it settles, but it is just to say that it is stimulating and suggestive to a remarkable degree. It will add measurably to the very high reputation of its author for accurate scholarship, knowledge of the Scriptures, clear thinking, sound common sense and literary art.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

The Credentials of Science the Warrant of Faith. By JOSIAH PARSONS COOKE, LL.D., Acting Professor of Chemistry and Mineralogy in Harvard University. New York: Robert Carter & Bros.

This volume has in several respects a rare interest: in its title, its author, its history, its dedication, and its relation to no less than six other volumes that have come from the University dedicated two centuries and a half ago to "Christ and the Church," and incapable of proving faithless to its trustful founders. "Science" is but a gradual increasing *aid* to faith supplied by a few investigative minds. "Faith" is the inborn and necessary guide of every human being in all stages of practical life, since the agricultural chemist is no less a subordinate assistant to the myriads of farmers toiling to feed the world than is science in any department but the hand-maid to faith alike in man's secular and religious life. The first and last charm of this volume is its recognition, alike divinely reverent and humanly courtly, of this real mission of science; alike apparent in its first and second oral presentation to select New York and Boston audiences, and now in written form addressing itself to the intelligent and appreciative American people. Its *author* is one who has seldom been drawn, as was Agassiz often, to address audiences distant from his lecture-room; and hence the clustered ripe fruit from Eshcol which bends the pole on which it is borne. Its history shows that Horace's rule of publication has been followed. The germinal thought, as the author states, was presented more than twenty-five years ago on the Graham foundation, in Brooklyn in a course of lectures then published under the title, "Religion and Chemistry, or Proofs of God's plan in the Constitution of the Atmosphere." Yet more, this course of lectures, delivered first before the Union Theological Seminary of New York, in the spring of 1887, was tested before the Lowell Institute of Boston during the winter and spring months of the present year, until now it is given to the public through the honored publishing house of the Carters. Its touching, as well as specially fitting dedication to "Roswell Dwight Hitch-

Digitized by Google

cock," who, just at the close of his eminent service, listened with delight while presiding over the course as first delivered, gives a personal interest to intelligent readers, for, just as hundreds of auditors watch the countenances of leaders on the platform while drinking in a stimulating popular address, so to thousands of readers the thought that Dr. Hitchcock was nearest to the lecturer and specially sympathetic in the first utterance of these lectures will inspire confidence in readers who might not trust themselves as judges.

To those who, either from ancestral or from other kindred sympathy, watch with interest whatever comes from Harvard University in line with the comprehensive truth ever maintained by strict constructionists in adherence to both the letter and spirit of the teachings of Divine Revelation, this volume adds a delight which not all readers can share. The college of the Bible-loving Puritans and of the consecrated Pilgrims, whose first two Presidents shared the convictions of Roger Williams, as did also its two most bountiful early donors—that College has sent forth a succession of voices that claim widespread and thoughtful attention. This volume is the sixth of a succession of courses of lectures given before the Union Theological Seminary on a foundation established by Mr. E. B. Ely, in 1865, and among its specially careful selection appear two men of Cambridge, the third being by Dr. A. P. Peabody, Professor of Divinity in Harvard University. Yet more: The author of this volune is the sixth in a series of Cambridge professors who have effectually met during the last forty years popular forms of religious scepticism that have beguiled many American college professors. First, Greenleaf in Law, whose work on Evidence, lies side by side in American courts with the English Starkie, gave his matured powers in applying the principles of Evidence to the *Harmony of the Four Narratives of Christ's Life and Teachings;* the most valuable work of the kind in the English language. Second, Agassiz's from 1846, till his death, defended the integrity and Divine authority of the Old Testament statement as to creation, silencing the superficial voice of atheistic clamor in opposition to the declaration of Moses and David, of Isaiah and Daniel, of John and Paul. Third, Peabody pointed out the fallacy of agnostic advocates, who, by declaring that man cannot "know" whether there is or is not a Divine Being, make law the sport of fancy, and government the trick of deceivers—Peabody, directing attention to the fact that the term "comprehension" is by special pleaders artfully substituted for "apprehension"; for, who does not "*apprehend*" alike the positive existence of infinite space and of Infinite Mind ruling throughout the universe, though his man intellect cannot *comprehend* the simplest facts in nature? Fourth, Abbot, roused by new assaults on the fourth Gospel—the keystone in the arch around the Divine throne—wore himself out in the defence of its integrity and guarded its ever perfection. Fifth, Bowen in Philosophy, seeing as did the eminent statesmen of the American Revolution, that popular doubt, fostered by superficial students as to the Divine authority of the Bible as a revelation from God, threatened the godless anarchy, which as in Paris has manifested itself in Chicago—Bowen has brought all his power to arrest the undermining flood. And now sixth, comes Dr. Cooke's *Credentials of Science the Warrant of Faith.*

Though no mere outline can do anything like full justice to the

Digitized by Google

close logic everywhere wrought into this comprehensive survey, and though copious disconnected extracts fail to hold its connections, yet the hinging links may be sufficiently scanned to test the value of the chain. The ten lectures are entitled 1st. "The Argument of Natural Theology;" 2d. "Preparing the Way;" 3d. "The Induction of Newton;" 4th. "Deduction;" 5th. "Examples of Scientific Investigation;" 6th. "Laws of Nature;" 7th. "Determinate and Indeterminate Laws;" 8th. "Theories or Systems of Science;" 9th. "Predominant Principles of Scientific Thought;" 10th. "The Systems Compared: Religion and Science."

In his first lecture the author calls attention to the confusion caused by the expression, "Design supposes a designer;" since the *fact* of design must be reached by *induction*, whereas it is by *deduction*, after the scientific establishment of existing design, that the conclusion thus stated is reached. Here law students call to mind that their authorities in moral science and in systematized codes of law take for granted that the "induction" by which statutes have reached their form rests on common conviction, in all ages alike recognized, and hence Wayland and Blackstone, like Paul to the Romans, begin with "deduction." As a master in "material" science, Dr. Cooke proposes, and wisely, to carry the method of "induction" into "spiritual" science. With admirable propriety, therefore, he states: "The conception of God" is "a suggestion of nature confirmed by experience," and, he adds, "Christ said: 'If ye do my will ye shall know of the doctrine;'" the Divine Teacher himself demanding inductive investigation. Dr. Cooke here alludes to the course of lectures given by him in Brooklyn twenty-five years before; and hence, true to the method of natural science yet not undertaking "ontological arguments based on the equally definite facts of consciousness," he proposes to draw his "arguments from the facts of external nature." He makes just allusion to the distinction between knowledge of "the Almighty" and knowledge of "Jehovah," replying without direct allusion, to the flippant perversion of Exod. vii 3, sufficiently explained by collation with Exod. iii: 6, 13, 14, and v: 1, 2; statements incapable of perversion by such a Bible student as Dr. Cooke proves himself everywhere to be. In concluding this lecture it is well stated that every attempt to "set aside the inductive from nature," by "showing how this universe might have issued without an intelligent Creator, from the time of the 'fortuitous concourse of atoms,' of Lucretius, to the 'struggle for life' of Darwin has signally failed."

The merit of the second lecture is that Dr. Cooke, like Agassiz, declares the legitimacy of Aristotle's logical analysis as opposed to Bacon's criticism and counter methods. He cites Aristotle's statement: "Induction makes clear, only it does not prove;" and traces at length his masterly distinction between induction and deduction; in which Aristotle met the speculations of Plato as Dr. Cooke does those of theorizers of the present day; the "syllogism," borrowed by Aristotle from the Sanscrit of Gotama, recognizing the true linking of premises leading to legitimate conclusions. In this Dr. Cooke agreed with Whewell, from whose *History of the Inductive Seiences* he quotes, and he cites with a turn of thought worthy the pulpit, Moses' statement that man was "made in the image of God." The cause of the progress of modern science he thus characterizes: "To explain such a wide-

Digitized by Google

spread intellectual movement we must look to a more potent cause than the influence of any man, however great; and as it seems to me, this great revolution can be directly traced to the influence of Christianity, and to the spirit of humility and self-devotion which its founder sanctified and rendered glorious."

Thus introduced, the history of the special "induction," attesting universal mutual attraction, suggested by Grecian sages dimly, alluded to by Arabian chemists, but elaborated by Copernicus and demonstrated by Newton, is exhaustively considered. The true field of "deduction" in the pure mathematics, and in chemical analysis and synthesis, is then traced, and the causes of "uncertainty, of probable error and of constant error," are traced by a master mind in chemical science. Examples of successful "inductions" down to the discovery of the planet Neptune are detailed, "deductions" from scientific principles fully established being made to take their appropriate place in the chain of successive investigations. Under the "Laws of Nature" statements of Jevons are cited with approval. A "law of nature" is defined to be "a declaration or statement of a certain order, sequence, or relation observed among material phenomena." In this definition every word is weighty, and specially illustrative of, as well as in harmony with, Blackstone's definition given by jurists, "Law is a rule of action prescribed by adequate authority;" for, certain as are the "order, sequence and relation of *material* phenomena," those of *moral* relation are equally distinct in "human consciousness," and their *penalty*, inflicted by adequate authority, has always been as "certain" as is the operation of material law. Under "Determinate and Indeterminate Law" natural science is made instructive in its suggestions to religious teachers, "nature" alone, as the Bible to the Christian preacher, being the final appeal. "Theories of science," hotly opposed, find their counterpart in "dogmas" in theology as distinct from simple Scripture statement, "positivists" and their *a priori* speculative theories being prominent in the lecturer's thought, while the defects of the reasonings of Darwin are manifestly recognized.

On "Theories or Systems of Sciences" Dr. Cooke has suggestive statements, some requiring care in the application. The remark, "Man's discernment and God's inspiration blend together, and no one can distinguish the point where they meet," may be in the view apparently designed like the action of the human and the Divine when the palsied man stretched out his hand; yet in *cause* they were distinct, though in *effect* indissolubly blended. The associated remark as to the "positive philosophy," individual and special, not generally accepted and universal in its deductive data, seems to draw the just line. The application to the undulatory theory of light, to the transmission of heat, to molecular structure and atomic analysis, is profound. As to the three postulates of Darwin, the statement is made: "There is not one of these propositions which has been demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt." The "Predominant Principles of Scientific Thought" are made to consist mainly in the principles of "analogy and continuity," "illegitimate analogies" and "breaks in continuity" being especially discussed; while the consideration of free will and of Divine "fore knowledge," which Dr. Cooke maintains is "actual knowledge," is made to indicate the vital "distinction between the material and the

Digitized by Google

immaterial." It is admitted that "no man as yet has been able to discover traces of the first introduction of a new species," and yet caution is suggested as to the interpretation of Genesis in describing the original creation "by the great I AM."

In the tenth and concluding lecture it is urged that the ruling truth of Christian faith has been the "positive fulfillment in Jesus" of what had been long promised, while the aspirations of Socrates and Plato failed of such fulfillment. It was "experience realized" that gave the "power of the Gospel." The lessons urged on students for the ministry by the eminent man of science include these: that the concrete life, the illustrated doctrine, the spiritual as superior to the material in all the analogies of Christ, the Great Teacher, be the theme of the pulpit.

In parting from this rich contribution to current thought, it is a delight to the Christian student to find "motes in the eye" as rare as oversights in literary finish, exemplified on p. 39 by "four first" for "first four," and on p. 289 by "on to" for "upon." The lecturer, the presiding officer, the general title of the series, the successive themes and the final issues, emphasize with an authority seldom so avowed these *facts* specially needed in our day and land: First, it is the great army of the Christian church, with its appointed ministry, to which men of science look as the hope of all humanity holds dear. Second, true men of science are counselors of indispensable value to Christian preachers and pastors. Third, the scientist is shut up to knowledge in a very narrow range, and can most fully appreciate the rule of "faith" by which he and all men must alike be guided in practical life. Fourth, the scientists as truly as the statesmen of the American republic *feel* their dependence on the "spiritual" host, who are the defense of all they hold dear. *Can such a trust be trifling?*

G. W. SAMSON.

IV.—PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

Report of the Centenary Conference on the Protestant Missions of the World, held in Exeter Hall, London, June 9–19, 1888. Edited by the REV. JAMES JOHNSTON, F.S.S., Secretary of the Conference. In two volumes. London: Nisbet & Co. New York: Fleming H. Revell.

These two large volumes, of nearly twelve hundred closely printed pages, are a sort of encyclopædia of missions, a storehouse of missionary information. It will be remembered that in June last the World's Conference of Protestant Missions assembled in London, that there were nearly sixteen hundred delegates from all over the world and representing all denominations of Protestants. Since quite frequently sessions were held simultaneously, no one delegate could possibly attend every session of this great congress of missions. Often also the papers greatly exceeded the length allowed to them, and the choicest parts were omitted. In the volumes before us only so much of the addresses is cut out as would be but repetitions in different sessions of the same statements. Full and accurate reports of the written addresses and (from stenographic reports of the most skilled set of stenographers London has), also, most careful reports of the remarks of those who spoke extempore are given. The volumes are lacking in one single respect.

Digitized by Google

There are no accounts, statistical or otherwise, of the labors of the societies individually; this is however supplied in *The Missionary Year-Book* (London: The Religious Tract Society, 2s. 6d) which gives historical and statistical information of the missionary societies of Great Britain, Europe, and America. The report is arranged somewhat differently from the actual proceedings of the Conference. First, we have the increase and influence of Islam, Buddhism and other systems of religion, the Roman Catholic missions, the relations of home and foreign missions, commerce and missions, then a contrast of the state of the world a hundred years ago and now as respects foreign missions. In the second part the mission fields are separately surveyed. In the third part special missionary topics are considered, missions to the Jews, medical missions, women's missions to women, the present duty of the Church. At the end of Volume I. is the account of the valedictory meetings, with the addresses on the relations of the Bible and Christian literature to missions, and with those on the opium trade with China, the liquor trade with Africa, and government license of vice in India. The Rev. S. M. Jackson, a Presbyterian minister of New York, contributes to this volume a most excellent little missionary bibliography, giv ng the names, in classified lists, of a large number of the best books on imissionary topics. The Second Volume has to do with the meetings for "members only." The reports of these sessions are not, as one might expect, "edited by suppression" of incautious utterances and the like, but are given, apparently, with verbal exactness. Missionary methods, medical missions, women's work, education and missions, literature and missions, the organization of native churches, and missionary comity are all fully treated. Upon this last topic as far as one's recollection goes, the report is wholly accurate, even to the reproduction of the names of those societies that were referred to as violating the laws of Christian comity. Our own denomination was both attacked and defended. The books are thoroughly indexed.

From the very brief and condensed sketch of the contents of these massive volumes it will be seen that there is hardly a topic of present interest in connection with missions that has not been dwelt upon, and the owner of the work will have at hand a reference book of the greatest value. In order to secure a larger circulation for the volumes a sumof money was given to pay a large part of the cost of their production, so that the New York (and Chicago) publisher is able to sell them at $2 for the two volumes.

FRANK S. DOBBINS.

Leaves from an Egyptian Note-Book. By ISAAC TAYLOR, M.A., Litt.D. Hon. LL.D., Canon of York. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

Canon Taylor has become well known as the leader, not in point of time, but in point of position and force of character, in an attack on Christian missions. He has, in papers before the Church Congress and in the great Reviews, been giving blow after blow to missions. His principal point of attack is the work of the Church Missionary Society. The mission work of the Church of England is carried on by two bodies: one representing the High Church party—the Society of the Propagation of the Gospel and the Universities' Missions; and the other repre-

Digitized by Google

senting the Evangelicals, the non-ritualistic branch—the Church Missionary Society. Canon Taylor's assault is directed wholly against the latter. The Canon followed up his plea, at the Wolverhampton Church Congress, that Mohammedanism is a semi-Christianity, by a charge that the work of the Church Missionary Society is mismanaged and that its missions are a lamentable failure, due to improper methods of work. A year ago Canon Taylor spent a time in Egypt. He had been the recipient of so many kindly written letters from Moslems of note in Egypt, as well as in Turkey and Syria and Persia, that he determined to spend some months among the followers of Islam, in the study of their principles and life. He found his every opinion confirmed and returned to England a more enthusiastic advocate of Islam's claims as a sister faith to Christianity. *Leaves from an Egyptian Note-Book* contains the story of his visit, the record of his impressions, and the new statement of his argument. The Canon attempts to prove, and his argument is very plausible, that a vast change has taken place in recent years in the Moslem world. He shows, that, as far as his observation went (and of course before excepting it fully we shall do well to await confirmations from others and from more extended observations), both the customs and the beliefs of Mohammedans are approximating those of Christians. All of this may be due, as indirect results, to Christian missions; yet this does not occur to Canon Taylor, who rather would believe that it has come about in spite of mission teaching. Canon Taylor shows, rather despairingly, since it saps the strength of his whole argument, that Islam will never accept the doctrine of a crucified Saviour. The book is well written, and the friends of missions will find it a very suggestive little volume.

FRANK S. DOBBINS.

Digitized by Google

THE

BAPTIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XI. APRIL, 1889. NO. 42.

I.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS IN THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

OF THE thirteen Epistles of Paul, the Epistle to the Romans holds, by general consent, the first place. "It is the Epistle of the Epistles as the Gospel of John is the Gospel of the Gospels." Clear and strong in its presentation of divine truth, it has had an important influence in the development of the Christian Church. Within the limits of an essay the evidence on this point, which history has preserved, can be shown only in part; yet this will be sufficient to make it abundantly manifest that, in every age, from the apostolic period to the present time, the Epistle to the Romans has not only profoundly stirred and greatly stimulated the thoughts of men, but it has effected, in a very marked degree, their doctrinal views and teachings; and, further, that, has error prevailed, there has been found in this Epistle an armory of weapons to which those earnestly contending for the faith once delivered to the saints, have not repaired in vain.

At the outset, it is worthy of mention that the genuineness of the Epistle to the Romans has rarely been questioned. Even the destructive criticism of Baur leaves this

Digitized by Google

greatest work of the Apostle Paul unassailed, with the exception of the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters. The genuineness of these chapters, however, in the opinion of scholars like Meyer, De Wette and many others, is sufficiently attested. Indeed, there is hardly any work that has come down to us from ancient times which is so well authenticated.

In reference to the place and time of composition, a brief statement will be sufficient: The Apostle, when he wrote this Epistle—as we learn from one of its chapters (15,25)—was about to make a journey to Jerusalem in order to carry to the Christians there the collections which during the previous year (2. Cor. 9:2) at least, at his suggestion, had been made by the mission churches of Macedonia and Achaia. From 1. Cor. 16: 1–3 and 2. Cor. 9, it is evident that this labor of love, in behalf of the brethren in Judea, was brought to an end at Corinth. According to Acts 20:3 the Apostle remained at that time in Corinth three months, and then made his way to Jerusalem (Acts 24: 17). During this period, therefore, probably near its close, in this wisely-chosen seat of so much apostolic labor, Paul wrote this Epistle to the Romans.

In reference to the time of composition this only need be said, that the Epistle was written probably in the spring of 58 (Tholuck, Lightfoot, Howson, Farrar), though some, (Meyer, Lange, Olshausen) assign it to the following year. Reuss thinks it was written in 60, while Stuart thinks it was written at the close of 57.

Tertius, apparently a Roman Christian, acted as Paul's amanuensis (16:22); and the Epistle was carried to Rome by Phœbe, a deaconess resident at Cenchrea, the eastern port of Corinth. In other ways Phœbe had previously been helpful to the Apostle, so that he could say, "She hath been a succourer of many, and of myself also." In 16:2 it is intimated that she made this journey to Rome in order to transact some private business.

Digitized by Google

The object of the Epistle thus confided to her care was to make known to the Roman Christians the affectionate interest which Paul felt in the welfare of these disciples of a common Master, and at the same time to bring before them the distinctive truths of Christianity which he had received and which he was accustomed to teach and preach as an Apostle of Jesus Christ. For a long time (15:23) it had been his purpose to preach the Gospel in Rome. As the metropolis of the world that great city afforded many advantages for the prosecution of apostolic labor. But as yet he had not been able to carry out his purpose, nor could he expect to be able to do so at present. The offerings of the Gentile and Jewish Christians in Macedonia and Achaia he must first bear to Jerusalem. "When, therefore, I have performed this, and have sealed to them this fruit," he says, "I will come by you into Spain. And I am sure that, when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ." (15: 28,29). Meanwhile this Epistle, in which the Apostle had outlined "a grand scheme of his whole teaching," would be his best representative.

How many Christians there were in Rome at this time we do not know. From the Apostle's words, "Your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world" (1:8), we may infer that the number was by no means small. Many of these Roman Christians were converts from Judaism. Such were Aquila and Priscilla, mentioned in 16:3, who came to Corinth as Jews (Acts 18:2) and became Christians in connection with the labors of Paul in that city, but were now again living in Rome. That the majority of the Roman Christians, however, were of Gentile origin at the time when the Apostle wrote is evident from the Epistle itself in the opinion of scholars like Neander and Meyer. To these Christian converts, therefore, partly of Jewish but largely of Gentile descent, many of whom may have been proselytes to the Jewish faith (Jowett, whom Farrar follows), Paul now

Digitized by Google

made known, by a communication from himself, the Gospel which he preached, and which he believed to be "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." (1:16).

How the Epistle was received by the Roman Christians we may easily imagine in the absence of any historical account. Hitherto these Christians had, for the most part, been taught the truths of Christianity by earlier disciples, or by faithful instructors like Aquila or Priscilla, who having received Christ in the school of Paul at Corinth had returned to Rome as teachers of the Word. Now, however, they were to have the truth as from the lips of the great Apostle himself; and we may well believe that they hailed the arrival of the Epistle with heartfelt joy, and that they listened to its words of apostolic wisdom with the deepest interest. At once they recognized its value, and care was taken that the manuscript should be sacredly preserved.

Copies of the Epistle were doubtless soon made; and we may think of it as the cherished possession of many a Christian Roman household. Its careful study, and the unfolding of its teachings in the assemblies of the Church, determined, in a great measure, the character of Christian thought in Rome; and we have thus an explanation of the fact that in the Roman Church the characteristic features of Paul's teaching originally prevailed.

Traces of the Epistle are found in the earliest Christian writings. Clement of Rome, who died about the year 101, in his Epistle to the Corinthians—the only known copy of which is preserved in the British Museum—not only refers to it, but in his presentation of the great doctrines of the atonement and justification he agrees with Paul, and thus furnishes evidence of the profound influence which the Epistle to the Romans had exerted upon him. Allusions to the Epistle are also found in the writings of Ignatius and Polycarp, affording us a proof of what might be inferred from the character of the Epistle, that it was welcomed by

Digitized by Google

Christians in other places at a very early period in the history of the Church. Justin Martyr, too, makes reference to it; and thus attests his familiarity with it. This also is true of Irenæus, Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria—the three great witnesses of the early Church.

The first commentary on the Epistle to the Romans was prepared by the learned Origin of Alexandria (*d.* 253). In the form in which it was written this work has not been preserved. There is, however, an imperfect translation by Rufinus, who made it the mission of his life to translate the writings of Origin. He died in 410. From Chrysostom, the most eminent of the Greek fathers (*d.* 407) we have a volume of homilies on this Epistle, thirty-two in number, of which there is an English translation in the Oxford library of the Fathers, published in 1841. Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia, in Cilicia, a friend and fellow student of Chrysostom, and one of the profoundest thinkers of his age (*d.* 429), and his pupil Theodoret (*d.* 457), Bishop of Cyros in Syria, a learned writer and a diligent pastor, also wrote commentaries on the Epistle. They were followed in the Greek Church by Severus in the sixth century, Oecumenius in the tenth century, and Theophlact in the eleventh century.

In the Latin Church, in the progress of the centuries following the apostolic period, gradual changes were introduced both in the form of the Church and in its doctrinal teachings. At length, in the writings of Augustine (*d.* 430) many of the thoughts of the Epistle to the Romans reappeared, and again with a mighty grasp laid hold of the minds of men. Indeed, it was a passage from the Epistle to the Romans which was the instrument used by the Spirit of God in Augustine's conversion. He was in great anguish of soul, he tells us, deep darkness having settled down upon him. With sorrowful words he lifted a penitent's prayer heavenward. "So was I speaking," he says, "and weeping

Digitized by Google

in the most bitter contrition of heart, when lo! I heard from a neighboring house a voice, as of boy or girl, I know not, chanting and oft repeating: 'Take up and read! Take up and read!' Instantly my countenance altered. I began to think most intently whether children were wont in any kind of play to sing such words; nor could I remember ever to have heard the like. So checking the torrent of my tears, I arose, interpreting it to be no other than a command from God to open the book and read the first chapter I should find. For I had heard of Antony, that coming in during the reading of the Gospel, he received the admonition, as if what was being read was spoken to him: 'Go sell all that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in Heaven, and come and follow me.' And by such oracle he was forthwith converted unto Thee. Eagerly then I returned to the place where Alypius was sitting; for there had I laid the volume of the Apostle, when I arose thence. I seized, opened, and in silence read that section on which my eyes first fell: 'Not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying; but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh,' (13 : 13, 14). No further would I read, nor needed I; for instantly at the end of this sentence, by a light, as it were, of serenity infused into my heart, all the darkness of doubt vanished away."* Augustine at this time was thirty-two years of age. Thenceforth, to the end of his life, the Epistle to the Romans was his daily companion. Of his thorough familiarity with it, and of its influence upon him, his writings furnish abundant evidence.

From Augustine, therefore, of all the Church Fathers, it would seem, a commentary on this Epistle might have been expected. He left, however, only the exposition of certain select passages under the title, *Expositio Quarundam Propositionum ex Epistola ad Romanos*, and another fragment—

* Confessions of Augustine, Book VIII., 29.

Digitized by Google

the commencement of a work—embracing an exposition of the first seven verses of the Epistle, which he called, *Inchoata Expositio Epistolæ ad Romanos.*

That the views of Augustine powerfully affected the theology of the Church in his own age is a fact no one will question. Equally evident is it that these views have powerfully affected the theology of suceeeding ages. As Neander says of Augustine: "He was one of those great men of world-wide celebrity whose agency is not limited to their own times, but is felt afresh in the lapse of centuries. . . . On the one hand, the development of the Catholic dogma which appears in the writings of the schoolmen proceeded from him, and, on the other hand, a reaction of the pure Christian consciousness against the foreign elements of the Catholic dogma. Those tendencies, within the pale of the Catholic church, from which a new Christian life emanated connect themselves with him. Even the more complete reaction at the Reformation, and the various revivals which the evangelical Church has experienced, may be traceable to the same source."

Pelagius, the well-known opponent of Augustine, wrote a commentary on the Epistle to the Romans which has been preserved in the writings of Jerome. Schaff says of it: "It is brief and superficial, but betrays no mean talent for plain, popular, practical, common-sense exposition of the Scriptures. . . . It is a remarkable fact that Augustine, who of all the Fathers came nearest the Protestant evangelical doctrines of sin and grace as taught by St. Paul, held essentially the Roman Catholic view of justification as being identical with sanctification, while his antagonist, Pelagius, like the Reformers, explained Paul's justification as a forensic act that consists in the remission of sins." The work of Pelagius is said to have undergone some changes in the revision of Cassidorus by reason of the latter's Socinian views.

Digitized by Google

Another commentary of earlier origin to which Augustine twice refers, and known by the title *Ambrosiaster*, because for some time it was ascribed to Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, is generally attributed to Hilary, a Roman deacon of the fourth century.

For a long period after the time of Augustine and Pelagius no new independent commentaries on the books of Scripture were prepared. Theologians were content with compilations from the writings of the Fathers. Gregory (*d.* 604) speaks of the Apostle Paul as pre-eminent in doctrine. For Augustine also he had a great veneration, and the study of his writings exerted an abiding influence upon him, so that through him the views of Augustine were transmitted to succeeding centuries.* It is not difficult, therefore, to find in the doctrinal teachings of Gregory traces of the lingering influence of the Epistle to the Romans.

We now pass to the period of scholasticism, in which Aristotle was extolled as "the precursor of Christ," and his system made the basis of theology. Accordingly, for the most part, the study of the Word of God gave place to the study of philosophy. We meet, however, with a few commentators who in their study of the Scriptures directed their thoughts to the Epistle to the Romans. Among them was Herveus of Bourgdieu, a Benedictine monk, who prepared a commentary about the year 1130. According to Kurtz,† it contained a most accurate and clear exposition of the doctrine of justification by faith. He was followed by Hugo St. Victor (*d.* 1141), Abalard (*d.* 1142), and Thomas Aquinas (*d.* 1274). Of Hugo St. Victor it is sufficient to say that, though he belonged to a distinguished family in Germany, he was regarded by his contemporaries in France as a second Augustine. Abalard not only wrote a commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, but gave special prominence to its teach-

* Neander's *Church History*, vol. III., p. 143.
† *Church History*, vol. I., p. 434.

Digitized by Google

ings in his course of theological instruction. The work of Thomas Aquinas is distinguished chiefly for its theological acumen.

As we approach the Reformation period we observe in many parts of Christendom an increasing interest in the Word of God. Translations of the Scriptures were made into the language of the people, especially by the Waldensians and other advocates of church reform, so that before the time of Luther there were at least fourteen translations into German and six into low Dutch; Wicliffe (*d.* 1384) performed the same service for the people of England, declaring that the Scriptures are the only source and rule of all religious knowledge. The study of God's Word naturally followed, and we soon have the evidence that the Epistle to the Romans had lost none of its power to influence the minds of men.

One of the most prominent reformers before the Reformation was John of Goch (*d.* 1475), "a man of great sensibility, with an intellect equally profound and acute, of glowing piety and a very subtle power of acquisition." The mediæval Church, forgetful of the righteousness that is by faith, had directed the minds of men to the pursuit of righteousness by works. In studying the Word of God Goch discovered the error of such a course, and hastened to set forth what he regarded as the Scriptural view. In so doing he appealed especially to the Epistle to the Romans. "Without neglecting Christ's own sayings in the Gospels," says Ullmann, "and the works of the other Apostles, especially John, the writings of Paul, and, above all, the weighty passages in the Epistles to the Romans and Gallatians, form the mainstay upon which Goch rests his theological disquisitions."* And the result is manifest. Goch adopted reformatory principles, and urged a return to the simplicity and purity of the apostolic period. Indeed, in

* *Reformers before the Reformation*, vol. I., p. 39.

Digitized by Google

his writings the essential doctrines of the later reformers appear.

In John Wessel (*d.* 1489), one of the most accomplished men of his time, and called by his friends "the light of the world," these doctrines are even more clearly discernible. Especially in his statement of the doctrine of justification by faith alone he was in advance of all the other religious teachers of his day. Indeed, Luther said of him on one occasion: "If I had read Wessel before I began, my opponents would have imagined that Luther had derived everything from him, so entirely do we agree in spirit." The explanation is not a difficult one. Wessel was a pupil of the great Apostle. In the Epistle to the Romans he had learned that he who believes he shall be justified by the righteousness which is of the law is ignorant of the way of salvation; and so he preached the righteousness which is of faith in Jesus Christ, so that Melanchthon could say of him: "On most of the main articles of the evangelical creed, Wessel's views had been the same that are taught now, after the purification of the Church."

There is one name in English church history which is deserving of mention at this point—that of John Colet (*d.* 1519), the founder of St. Paul's School, London, and Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral. He was educated at Oxford, and studied on the continent, where he made the acquaintance of Erasmus and other distinguished continental scholars. On his return to England he commenced his career as a lecturer in theology at Oxford. About the year 1497 he delivered a course of lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, which were printed; and it may be added that in recent years they have been reprinted in a translation from the Latin language in which they originally appeared. Colet was suspected of heresy in his treatment of the Epistle, and Latimer said he would have been burned "had not God turned the king's heart." There can be no doubt but

Digitized by Google

that Colet, by these lectures, hastened the Reformation in England.

If the Epistle to the Romans, however, was an important instrument in preparing the way for the Reformation, much more was it an important instrument in securing its triumph. That it opened the mind of Luther to the light of Gospel truth there is abundant evidence. He was at the monastery at Erfurt; yet by no monkish observances, as he tells us, could he obtain the peace he sought in retiring from the world. Then it was that there came to him in his unrest an old Christian brother, his instructor, who, having listened to an account of his struggles, referred him to a passage in a sermon by Bernard, in which that earnest preacher, though in his theology he clung to the Church ideas of the Middle Ages, insists upon faith as the condition of the forgiveness of sins, and quotes that expression of the Apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Romans in which he teaches that a man is justified through grace by faith. This sent Luther to the study of the Scriptures. As he himself tells us, the language of the Apostle in Rom. 1:17, concerning the righteousness of God, was much in his thoughts during his subsequent life at Erfurt. For a long time he could not understand it. He had been taught, in the prevailing theology of the time, that the righteousness of God is an attribute by which God punishes the wicked. But gradually in his study of God's Word he was led to see that "Paul and the Gospel proclaim a righteousness which is imparted by God's grace, so that God forgives the sins of those who believe in his Word, thus making them righteous and bestowing upon them eternal life."* Especially was this true of Luther's study of the Epistle to the Romans. It was eagerly and thoroughly studied, and deeply and permanently its lessons were impressed upon his mind. In after years, when he commenced his labors as a professor

* Köstlin's *Life of Luther.*

Digitized by Google

in the newly established University of Wittenberg, he at once began to give instruction in this important and now familiar Epistle to the Romans, and from it, as is well known, he drew his mightiest weapons during his long and severe conflict with the Papacy. The brilliant but vaccilating Erasmus indeed said: "The abstruseness of the Roman Epistle excels its utility, but Luther called it 'the Lord's lantern illuminating all the chambers of Holy Writ.'" He did not prepare a commentary on the Epistle, but in a lengthy preface to his translation of it he asserted its great value, and urged Christians to make themselves familiar with it. "This Epistle," he said, "is the true masterpiece of the New Testament, and the very purest Gospel, which is well worthy and deserving that a Christian man should not only learn it by heart, word for word, but also that he should daily deal with it as with the daily bread of men's souls. For it can never be too much or too well read or studied, and the more it is handled the more precious it becomes and the better it tastes."

Melanchthon, in his thoughts, gave a like prominence to the teachings of the Epistle to the Romans. He delighted to unfold its truths in his lectures, and twice he copied the entire Epistle in order to impress its contents more distinctly upon his memory. In exegetical studies he recommended that the Epistle to the Romans should be taken up first, and the Gospel of John last, evidently intending to suggest by this order that the doctrine of justification by faith should be both the beginning and the end of biblical interpretation. Two works connect his name with this Epistle; his *Annotationes*, which appeared in 1522, and his *Commentarii*, which appeared ten years later. It should also be said that Melanchthon made the Epistle to the Romans the basis of his *loci communes*.

The doctrinal value of this Epistle in carrying forward the work of the Reformation was also recognized by

Digitized by Google

Calvin. In Strasburg he unfolded its teachings in a series of lectures. Moreover, during his residence in that city he wrote a commentary on the Epistle which is regarded as a model of simple and precise exegesis. Indeed, Calvin's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans is considered the ablest part of his able Commentary on the New Testament, and has been held in high esteem by all succeeding biblical scholars of every school. The influence of the Epistle is also discernible in the doctrinal teachings of the celebrated "Institutes."

Others among the leaders of the Reformation, especially Beza, Zwingle, Bullinger, Bugenhagen and Bucer (whom Calvin called his greatest predecessor), not only made the doctrines of the Epistle to the Romans prominent in their teachings, but prepared commentaries on it embodying the results of earnest and profound study.

Indeed, the doctrinal character of the Lutheran and Reformed churches was determined in a great measure by the doctrinal teachings of this Epistle. This was true also of the Reformed and Independent churches in England and Scotland. John Knox, and many of the Scotch and English Reformers, when in exile, repaired to Geneva and other places on the Continent, devoting themselves to sacred studies. That they were profoundly impressed by the teachings of Calvin is well known, and the influence of these teachings is discoverable in the development of the Presbyterian and Independent churches.

This influence also we discern in the doctrinal views of the Pilgrims and their successors, who crossing the Atlantic, brought to the shores of New England, a steadfastness of faith to which they had attained in the school of the great Apostle.

At the close of the seventeenth century, though the form of sound doctrine remained in the Lutheran Church, there was a general lack of vital piety in its members. Spener

Digitized by Google

and others, who were contemptuously called Pietists, advocated the abandonment of scholastic theology and a return of the Word of God as the true source of saving truths. "We must have," Spener said, "the living faith of Luther as well as his orthodoxy." Accordingly in the revival of practical Christianity of which he was the leader, Spener directed the minds of men to the Epistle to the Romans. "If the Scriptures may be compared to a ring," he said, "the Epistle to the Romans is its precious stone, and the eighth chapter the point of the stone." The pietistic movement effected a much needed reform in the Lutheran Church, and its influence was long felt in many parts of Germany.

In the second half of the eighteenth century Rationalism invaded the pulpits of Germany, and where once the Gospel had been preached, discourses were delivered against lawsuits and superstition, on health, the duties of servants, agriculture, housekeeping, the advantages of early rising, and the necessity of pure air.* "The old liturgies were mutilated or supplanted, and all the superficiality and insipidity of the period were called into requisition to eliminate the old faith out of the Churchly hymn-books, and to smuggle in, in place of the old choice hymns, the weakest hymns of moral reformation."†

In Geneva, the home of John Calvin, rationalism had made a like conquest. Indeed the light of evangelical truth had well nigh gone out, when in 1817, Robert Haldane, a Scotch Baptist, travelling on the continent, came to Geneva. During his stay in the city he made the acquaintance of a theological student, whom to his great surprise he found almost wholly unacquainted with the Scriptures. He had some conversation with him in reference to Bible study, as well as in reference to personal religion. The next morn-

*Hagenbach, *History of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*, vol. 1, p. 312.

†Kurtz, *Church History* vol. 2, p. 280.

Digitized by Google

ing the student called on Mr. Haldane, bringing with him another student. Others followed, and in a few weeks nearly all the students in the theological seminary at Geneva had become students of Mr. Haldane. The text-book was the Epistle to the Romans. Merle D'Aubigne, the well-known author of the *History of the Reformation*, was one of these students, and he has left on record the following account of his conversion at this time through the labors of Mr. Haldane. "I heard of him first," he says, "as an English or Scotch gentleman who spoke much about the Bible, which seemed a very strange thing to me and the other students to whom it was a closed book. I afterwards met Mr. Haldane at a private house, along with some other friends and heard him read from an English Bible a chapter from Romans about the natural corruption of man—a doctrine of which I had never heard before. In fact I was quite astonished to hear of men being corrupt by nature. I remember saying to Mr. Haldane, 'Now I see that doctrine in the Bible.' 'Yes,' he replied, 'but do you see it in your heart?' It was but a simple question, but it came home to my conscience. It was the sword of the Spirit; and from that time I saw that my heart was corrupted, and knew from the Word of God that I could be saved by grace alone." Not a few of these students were thus converted, among them Felix Neff and Adolphe Monod. Cæsar Malan and M. Gaussen, then pastors of churches, were also spiritually quickened and strengthened by their intercourse with Mr. Haldane. Indeed the influence of this awakening was felt not only in Geneva, but in the country around, and even throughout France. Felix Neff carried the glad tidings to the high Alps, while Adolphe Monod at length made his way to Paris, where, with an eloquence almost irresistible, he long proclaimed the Gospel of the grace of God.

In 1817, the same year in which Robert Haldane came to Geneva, Augustus Tholuck entered the University of

Digitized by Google

Berlin. He had come from Breslau, his native city, where he had grown up alienated from the Gospel, and far from any intention of devoting himself to theological studies. Indeed, on leaving the gymnasium at Breslau in an address discussing this question, "What has been the influence of the Arabs on the intellectual development of Europe?" He said: "I placed side by side the three great teachers Moses, Jesus and Mahommed, and to all of them I preferred the Indian Menu, the Persian Zoroaster, and the Chinese Confucius. At that time it was my intention to journey to the Orient in order to prove by means of new discoveries how silly Christianity appears in comparison with the exalted wisdom of the Orient." At Berlin, however, he came under the influence of Neander, and especially of the pious Baron von Kottwitz, an influence which at length resulted in a radical change in his religious opinions.

Such were his great talents and his rapid progress in his studies that, in 1820, when he was twenty-one years of age, he began to lecture in the University of Berlin. In the winter of 1822-23 he delivered lectures on the Epistle to the Romans. In 1824 he published a Commentary on the Epistle which embodied the results of his studies up to that time. It attracted great attention in Germany, and was translated into the English, French and Danish languages. De Wette pronounced it superior to all the works of its class. Baur, in his *Paulus*, speaking of it said, "With Tholuck's Commentary begins a new epoch in the history of the interpretation of this Epistle." The testimony of Dr. Phillip Schaff is of like import; he says "it created quite an epoch in the exegetical literature of Germany, by breaking the way for a return to a reverent treatment of the New Testament as the revealed word of God, and by re-opening the exegetical treasures of the Fathers and Reformers."

When, in 1826, Tholuck was transferred to the University of Halle as the successor of Knapp, he continued his

Digitized by Google

lectures on this Epistle. At that time the dominating influence in the University was rationalism. Out of nine hundred students in the theological department Knapp had found only five who believed in the deity of Christ; and the entire body of the professors, prominent among whom were Niemeyer, Gesenius and Wegscheider, sent to the minister of State for Ecclesiastical Affairs a petition against Tholuck's appointment. But the appointment was confirmed. Tholuck came to Halle, and though he was treated coldly by his associates in the faculty of instruction he soon found his way to the hearts of the students. To many he became a spiritual father, and the teachings they had received were carried by them to all parts of the fatherland. There was a change, too, in the University. Gradually the old rationalism was supplanted, and Halle became the centre of evangelical influences in Germany. New and enlarged editions of Tholuck's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans appeared from time to time, the fifth and last in 1856. In 1825, the year after the publication of the first edition, Tholuck published a paraphrase of the Epistle to which was prefixed Luther's celebrated preface. A second edition appeared in 1831.

Thus, in the most recent period of ecclesiastical history, as well as in former times, the remark of Olshausen is seen to be true that "if the jewel of faith has been discovered under the ruins of the demolished Church we are mainly indebted to the comprehensive, and to every yearning heart, convincing exhibition of truth in Paul's Epistle to the Romans."*

In Germany, since the appearance of Tholuck's Commentary, at least forty commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans have been published; in England and America probably thirty. A full catalogue, however, of the works that, from the time of the Apostle, have been written as aids

*Commentary, vol. 3, p. 461.

Digitized by Google

in the interpretation of the Epistle would present the titles of between three and four thousand volumes. The mere mention of this fact indicates the great influence of the Epistle in the history of the Church.

This grand old Epistle, therefore, which Coleridge once called "the most profound work in existence," which Meyer regarded as "the richest original apostolic charter and model of all true evangelical Protestantism," and which Godet calls "the cathedral of the Christian faith," may well command the earnest, prayerful study of all who love the truth, and desire to prepare themselves to contend for it as good soldiers of Jesus Christ. The best weapons with which to meet the advocates of rationalisn and ritualism are to be found in this Epistle. This is also true in our conflict with Romanism. Meyer, in his preface to the last edition of his commentary on Romans, well says, and with his words I close this paper: "The Epistle to the Romans still stands forth as a never-silent accuser confronting the Roman ecclesiasticism, which has strained to the uttermost spiritual arrogance in the dethroned head, and Loyolist in submissiveness, in the members of its hierarchy (*perinde ac si essent cadavera*); it is still the steadfast divine charter of the Reformation, as formerly our Luther found mainly in it the unyielding fulcrum by the aid of which he upheaved the firmly-knit Roman structure from its old foundations."

HENRY S. BURRAGE.

Portland, Me.

Digitized by Google

II.

A STUDY OF THE AMERICAN NATION.

IT HAS been significantly said that "The nation is a moral personality." The nation is not a mere aggregation of independent individuals. Until recently the tendency of both economic and political thought for a long time had been toward individualism. At last the inevitable reaction has come, and the general mind is now borne strongly toward socialism. Modern socialism, as a recent writer has acutely remarked, is a recoil from the excessive "unsocialism" toward which society had swung since the French Revolution. In part, at least, men had forgotten that man is not only individual, but social as well. There is a true solidarity of the race and of the nation.

The statement that "the nation is a moral personality," is not a mere figure of speech. The nation is a true personality, and as such has duties and responsibilities. Society is organic. Man the unit is incorporate with the life, and endowed with the functions, and put under law to the moral obligations, of the social organism of the town or the city. So, the social unit of the town or city is incorporate with the life of the state, and the state is incorporate with the life of the nation. In the Christian ideal of humanity the nation is incorporate with the life of the race. "God hath made of one, all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth" —not of "one blood," as our common version reads. The unity is not so much of the flesh as of the spirit. The fundamental ground of the unity of the human race is not man's physical origin, nor anything material, but God, the source and sustainer and law and goal of the human spirit. So the

Digitized by Google

unity of a nation is not the product solely of ancestry and language and traditions and dwelling place. There is a "unity of the spirit" in every true nation, without which the population however vast would be but an aggregation instead of an organism.

Socialism, as that term is often interpreted, is a caricature of the true society. It suppresses the individual. But individualism pushed to the extreme, as it has been pushed in some of our theories of economics, and sometimes, even in theology, is a deeper and deadlier denial of spiritual truth than ultra-socialism is.

Man is not fully man when divorced from his fellows. The human body is a suggestive type of human society—many members vitally joined in the unity of a complete organism.

The nation, then, as a moral personality, has powers, duties and a destiny. Men, in the mass, have not yet apprehended, with any fullness and clearness, the real moral significance of the nation or of society. They are on the way toward that great idea. As most men, to adopt Amiel's suggestion, are, as yet, only "candidates for humanity," so, as yet, most communities and nations are only candidates for the true human society. In the book of Revelation is given a type of perfected social being and order—that majestic symbol of completeness, the city that lieth foursquare, of which the length and breadth and height are equal.

In some degree, every nation is a prophecy of the final, perfected human society. This final form of human organization is not the result of any physical evolution, but the culmination of a moral and spiritual process. The continuing impulse is from God. The more fully men enter into the life of the spirit, the more clearly this is perceived; and through this perception, patriotism becomes piety. Political reform follows, not leads, the unfolding of the spirit.

Digitized by Google

The rising moral life of the people draws after it the better, freer and more coherent political organization. The soul of a nation creates and reforms, as well as informs, its body. The nation is never finished in the world any more than the individual is perfected in the world. There is infinite room upward. If the nation were merely a form of political organization and nothing more, it might conceivably be brought to perfection, as an artizan might construct a perfect square or cube. But since it is not a thing but a personality, not an artificial organization but an organism informed with a spirit, its ideal is ever beyond its attainment, and the possibility, nay, the necessity, of continual progress in its moral life carries with it the necessity of continual improvement in order and external form. The expansibility of the individual man inheres also in the collective man.

> "Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp,
> Or what's a heaven for?"

The nation is not an accident or an incident any more than the individual is. The divine education of the human race, which Lessing first clearly pointed out and strongly emphasized, is a divine education of the nation as well as of the individual. Governments are not mere experiments. They are expressions of the moral and intellectual life of the people. It is idle to compare monarchy with democracy. Each expresses a certain stage of moral and intellectual attainment; and neither of these types yet exists in absolute purity. Political order is not clothes made according to a certain fashion. It is the true expression as well as the product of the national personality which it embodies. Political order is not the result even of experience, except as experience is the education and unfolding of the spirit. Therefore is it true that no external conditions or resources of a nation are so significant with reference to the question of a nation's strength and perpetuity, as are the moral ideas and aspira-

Digitized by Google

tions and habits of a nation. An old and sacred song contains these words: "Blessed is the people whose God is the Lord." In these words is a recognition of the truth, the demonstration of which we, in modern times, are reading in the history of the world—the truth that the basis of enduring national life is not material, but moral and spiritual.

Without following any strictly analytical or logical method, it is the purpose of this paper to present some thoughts on the moral life of the nation and the duties and responsibilities which it involves.

There are two propositions which at the outset may be stated without risking contradiction or even debate. They are: I. *The perpetuity of a nation fundamentally depends on its moral health.*

Nothing is more clear in the teaching of history than this. The true spiritual guides of men have perceived this with more or less vividness ever since the days of the Hebrew prophets. The prophets of Israel were the moral and religious censors of the people. They were also the wisest statesmen. They were statesmen mainly by virtue of their penetrating moral insight. Their function concerned the nation as a whole rather than the individuals of the nation, but the burden of their utterance was the denunciation of sin and the inculcation of righteousness. They were, in a sense, teachers of religion—not as the priests were, for they often were arrayed against the priests—for in their minds real religion and righteousness were identical. The prophets expressed the results of that great idea the conception of which distinguishes Israel and immeasurably elevates Israel above every other nation of antiquity—the idea of a moral Deity. "Imagine," says Fairbairn, "the transcendent moment for man, the moment of supremest promise, of grandest hope, when the idea of a moral Deity entered his heart, and passed into his history; when all the energies of religion came to be moral energies for the making of moral

Digitized by Google

men." When that moment was we may not definitely know, but the messages of the prophets are expressions of that idea and of the inferences deducible from it; while the history of Israel abundantly illustrates the influence of acceptance or rejection of that idea on the life and destiny of a people. Christianity is but a great expansion and development of the idea of a moral Deity. The idea of a moral Deity furnished stable ground for the idea of moral law and enduring impulse toward moral conduct and culture. It is trite to say that "righteousness exalteth a nation," but trite only because so inviolably true. The decay of all the great nations that have fallen in the past began within, and the fall of those nations was primarily due not to external but to internal, not to material but to moral, causes.

This principle which history illustrates is as true to-day as ever it was in the past. The development of material civilization is no guarantee of national perpetuity; it may even accelerate national downfall. Purity of life, uprightness of conduct, righteousness of purpose—this makes a people stable. There has been much discussion in recent years on the question as to the dependence of morality on religion. This much may be said without considering the question at length: permanent and adequate morality is inseparable from the idea of a moral Deity. This idea is the essential and indestructible foundation of moral life.

The moral health of a nation insures its vitality, its progress and its continuance. This is the lesson which must be continually taught, and ever more fully incorporated into the social and political life of the people. Neglect of it is like the neglect of gravitation on the brink of a precipice, or the neglect of sanatory and medical precautions in presence of the plague. Because the nation is not a mere aggregation of units, but a coherent body, a moral personality, it is subject to the fullest extent to the operation of moral forces, is under the inviolable obligations of moral law, and

Digitized by Google

realizes true prosperity and peace and the lasting conservation of all its energies only in the continuity of a moral life. The moral life of a people appears in its entire conduct. Immorality in politics is symptomatic. It is not more dangerous than immorality in commerce or in social relations. The fraud and bribery and evasion of law that creep into politics are not more ominous—are even less ominous and deadly—than immorality in the home and the market. A people that is unrighteous in trade will be unrighteous in government. Low domestic morals will make a corrupt senate. The nation is an integer. No single sphere of its activity can be partitioned off and given over to iniquity, any more than pyæmia can be confined to a single member of the body. The generic morality of a nation is the measure of its real health and vigor. The improvement of any impaired function of the nation, so far as the impairment is due to lowered moral life, must be secured by a tonic treatment of the whole organism. Purity and uprightness in the people are the only sure guarantee of functional health in the nation. Where there is not health there is decay, and the beginning of death.

II. The second proposition which will receive unquestioning assent is : *This nation has endured and thrived because of its essential moral health.*

Deep religious conviction and invincible religious faith planted the germ and moulded the young life of the Republic. American history is an illustration of the conservative and progressive force of moral ideas. Great as are the physical advantages of this nation in soil, climate, mineral resources, water-ways and sea-board, large as are the natural elements of prosperity and progress with which it has been endowed by Providence, no mere naturalistic explanation can account for the nation's development to the present time. More potent than anything else in the shaping of its life has been the dominant conception of " a moral

Digitized by Google

Deity" and faith in him. In some true sense the American people has always recognized its dependence on God, and its amenability to his Law. In some true sense the American people have always been at heart serious and moral. Religious faith has inspired the purposes and ruled the conduct and shaped the ideals of the nation. Most strikingly has this been revealed in hours of great national emergency. The deep rooted moral life of the people gave the army of the Union that steadiness and tenacity which increased with every year of the war and assured final victory. The religious spirit of the people manifested itself in the most significant songs that, like flowers in volcanic lands, bloomed brilliantly in the hot air of dreadful conflict. Not an individual woman, but a nation, spoke in Mrs. Howe's impassioned lines:—

> "Mine eyes have seen the glory
> Of the coming of the Lord,
> He is trampling out the vintage
> Where his grapes of wrath are stored,
> He hath loosed the fateful lightning
> Of his terrible, swift sword,
> Our God is marching on!"

But equally in times of peace have great emergencies, social and political, revealed the underlying seriousness and moral soundness of the people. No man can read our history with seeing eyes, and not feel that here are as sacred pages as ever were those that chronicled the story of ancient Israel. "What," asks Archdeacon Farrar, "should be the one and only true ideal of each nation, if it would, indeed, be a wise and understanding people? Let the frivolous sneer and the faithless deride, but there is only one such ideal. It is duty. It is righteousness. It is the law of Sinai. It is the law of Christ. It is purity of life. It is honesty of trade. It is absolute allegiance to truth. It is the inviolable sanctity of the marriage law." "For glory," said Oliver Cromwell to the men of England, "you glory in

Digitized by Google

the ditch which guards your shores: I tell you that your ditch will not save you if you do not reform yourselves." Americans have been regarded, perhaps with some show of reason, as boastful and vain. They may have been so to some extent on the surface. But the nation has never been a frivolous nation. Frivolity is the sickly bloom of immorality. At heart this people has been, not sombre, but serious, with a tenacious regard for the sanctity of law and a persistent conviction that piety and patriotism are indissolubly joined. The people's ideals have been high and holy, and its work has been wrought out with a profound consciousness of the meaning of its sacred, if brief, history.

> "So sacred! is there aught surrounding
> Our lives, like that great Past behind,
> Where Courage, Freedom, Faith abounding,
> One mighty cord of honor twined."

So strong and vital has been the moral spirit of the people that it has endured the strain of colossal immigrations and given tone to the composite life of uncounted heterogeneous multitudes that liberty has invited to these shores. So much for the past. What of the future? It must bring great trials. The problem of national perpetuity is still, and ever must be, before us—solved at each crisis and still to be solved. It is still and must ever be a moral problem. The moral forces which shaped this nation and brought it to its present greatness must still work in the people's heart and mould the people's character. The failure of faith in God, and of the righteous aim which that faith gives, would be the decay of the nation's health and the precursor of its dissolution. God has prescribed the conditions of continuance. They are wrought into the constitution of the world. There is no jugglery by which the consequences of violated moral law can be evaded. Are there signs of decadence in the moral tone of the American people? Is right less sacred and commanding now than in the past? Is truth less sov-

Digitized by Google

ereign? Is the home losing its purity, and social life its tonic righteousness? Is regard for law growing weak? Is commerce parting company with honesty? These are questions which we may well ask. It is easy to prognosticate, and there is a curious fascination in the prognostication of evil. The role of Cassandra has a singular attraction for most writers on the future of American politics. The old wives of whom Whittier speaks in his "Dead Ship of Harpswell" have a numerous kin.

> "Shake, brown old wives, with dreary joy,
> Your grey-head hints of ill;
> And over sickbeds whispering low
> Your prophecies fulfill."

But the disposition to prophesy ill is rooted in unfaith rather than in faith. He who greatly believes in God believes in human nature, and, even in the face of threatening omens, holds fast his happy hope of the triumph of good. The golden age of human government lies not behind but before us. The earth rolls toward the light, and each dawn but heralds a brighter dawn to follow.

Yet it would be not wisdom but the height of folly to cherish a fatuous confidence in coming good, while disregarding the inexorable conditions of human prosperity and peace. Americans would be blind indeed if they did not see that very real dangers threaten them and very searching trials await them as a people. The serious, the devout, the earnest

> "Soul is still oracular—
> Amid the market's din,
> List! the ominous, stern whisper
> From the Delphic cave within:
> They enslave their children's children
> Who make compromise with sin."

Christian's slip in the valley of Humiliation brought the stern conflict with Apolyon in the valley of the Shadow.

Digitized by Google

Our slip from public virtue to-day will bring the inevitable struggle with the powers of darkness to-morrow. Laxity of public morals, too many evidences of which confront us in the social and political and commercial life of the present, is a sowing of dragon's teeth, and the harvest of armed men may have to be reaped with the sword. The very peace and material prosperity of our land invite that carelessness of public duty and that relaxation of private virtue which will breed storms that must sorely buffet the nation. Now, as much as ever, perhaps even more than ever, patriotism must be vertebrate with moral principle and exercised in increasing endeavors to diffuse righteousness and intelligence among the masses of crude people that day by day are seeking incorporation into the body of this nation. The pulpit, and the press, and the school, and the home should be fountains of pure instruction that the liberty and strength of this glorious young Samson may not be lost in the Delilah lap of fast growing luxury and license.

I conclude this study with two remarks:

(1.) Of the nation, as of every individual, a first duty is the duty of self preservation. Upon this nation rests the obligation to live. It has no more right to decline and perish than the individual has a right to commit suicide or waste his powers and life by the pursuit of vice.

The nation as a moral personality has both duty and a destiny. It exists under the solemn obligations of a divinely appointed mission in the world. It is the sacred duty, then, of every citizen to strive for the preservation of the national health. Not as evident, perhaps, this duty is yet as commanding and as holy as the duty of taking arms to protect the nation when its life is threatened by hostile armies. There is no guarantee of public virtue save private righteousness. To be a citizen is to be put under bonds to cultivate righteousness, to practice righteousness, and to propagate righteousness. No man is a true citizen who does

Digitized by Google

not seek to be a good man and to make other men good. Every vice eradicated is a menace to the nation's life removed. Every enterprise which promotes the increase of popular intelligence and the elevation of popular morals is a powerful minister to the health of the State and a pledge of its continuance. All good influences work toward national as well as private ends. A Christian home is a national blessing. A vigorous and intelligently conducted Sunday school contributes directly to national prosperity. Army and Navy, and Treasury and Congress and Judiciary, and convention and caucus and market, are knit in one arterial circulation with the Church and the home circle. There is no public virtue that is not first private virtue, and there is no private virtue but sends its health to the nation's heart.

Individuals and nation are inseparable. If the former become corrupt or incompetent, the latter sinks or crashes to its ruin. Old nations passed away and the people perished. The only seeming exception to this rule is that marvelous people, the Jews, and who is bold enough to hazard the assertion that they will never again become a nation? Americans do not recognize with sufficient clearness that as individual citizens they are responsible for the character and weal of the whole body to which they belong. They ought now, more than ever before, to live in the consciousness of their farthest-reaching ties of influence and obligation. The sense of citizenship sits lightly upon us, but no knightly bond ever rested with such sacredness on the valiant men that sat around Arthur's table as rests the consecration and duty of intelligent patriotism on every American citizen. The life of the nation is in the keeping of each individual who owns the Stars and Stripes as the symbol of his national faith and his national honor.

(2.) But the duty of self-preservation is but the initial letter of national obligation. As man is born into the world

Digitized by Google

not simply to exist, but to achieve; so the nation is not simply to be, but to do. As every man has his calling and mission among his fellow-men; so the nation has its calling and mission among the nations of the earth. As the individual fulfils his mission only in the beneficent service of his kind; so the nation fulfils its mission only in the beneficent service of humanity. As no man innocently lives to himself alone; so no nation lives only for its own ends, its own aggrandizement and glory, without deep and damning guilt. Therefore, upon this nation rests the obligation to serve all other nations, and upon every citizen rests the responsibility for the character and influence of the nation in its relation to the world. I shall seem to some, perhaps, so to have broadened the sphere and multiplied the obligation of citizenship as to make them vague and almost unreal. But those who have sought to penetrate into the deep meaning both of citizenship and of the national vocation will not think so. They will understand that man, the individual, rises to his true dignity and greatness only as he continually sees himself set in manifold and world-wide relations, and daily feels in his heart the pulse-beat of humanity. The essential nature of American, of Christian, citizenship involves the solidarity of the race as its ultimate sphere. The insular man, the selfish man, is never the true type of the citizen. In truth, the individual is the centre of the world. Surely the individual is the centre of the nation. The nation is the man writ large, and upon the man writ large rest the duties, and to him attach the moral and intellectual functions, of the moral individual. We are responsible for what America is to humanity. Through our relations and powers as citizens of the nation we wield the force that shapes the destiny of man.

What, then, is the mission of this nation? There is not space in this paper to do more than to suggest an answer to this momentous question. Surely we read history with

Digitized by Google

blind eyes if we do not see and feel that this nation is providentially called to a mission of peculiar eminence and dignity in the world. Geographical situation, unmeasured material resources, unexampled popular institutions of religion, liberty, industry and education, and root-stock qualifying a composite type of character, rich, versatile, elastic, tenacious, resolute and powerful—all combine to impress upon our minds the thought that this nation is divinely meant to lead the nations of the earth in the march of civilization—to be "the head, and not the tail," and to bear, therefore, the great responsibilities and the solemn obligations of the head.

Whether liberty in the realization of righteous law, whether intelligence enriching all minds and directed to highest ends, whether Christian faith rising to fruition in holy worship and pure customs and stainless honor, shall become the possession of all people and nations in the years of God soon to come will depend, to a great degree, on the clearness with which this nation recognizes its divine calling, and the faithfulness with which it discharges its most sacred obligations. And whether America shall fulfil her manifest destiny or not depends on whether the individual members of this great nation, realizing their responsibilities, with deepening faith in God, and widening knowledge of truth, and increasing devotion to righteousness, shall seek to diffuse, through all the channels of the nation's life, the health of holiness and the vigor of intelligence, and shall create, by the great forces of a spiritual religion, and make universal in the nation, the lofty types of manhood and womanhood which the world has a right to expect.

PHILIP S. MOXOM.

Boston, Mass.

Digitized by Google

III.

AN OUTLINE OF THE HISTORY OF PSALMODY.*

WHILE so much study is expended, and so many books are written, on the history of hymnology, it seems, perhaps not strange, but certainly not right, that so little attention should be devoted to the history of psalmody. Every ground that can be adduced for the study of hymnology would, with equal force, demand the study of psalmody. Are hymns of importance as a part of literature? Hymn tunes hold a rather higher relative place in the world of music; and it is not necessary now-a-days, to say that no human art is unworthy of study. Historically, Luther's "*Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott*," is hardly more important than the melody, born with it and indissolubly linked with it. Are hymns studies as indications of the course of religious thought? Just as surely as religious thought embodies itself in the Church's hymns, so surely does religious feeling express itself in the Church's hymn tunes. And who shall say that, in religion, feeling is of less value than thought? Are hymns loved for their devotional uses? Equally important, though little recognized, is the devotional use of tunes. Only those who have experienced it know how near to God the soul is often brought by a mere tune.

> "God has a few of us here whom he whispers in the ear;
> The rest may reason and welcome, 'tis we musicians know."

Is the object of hymnological study the practical one of enriching the worship of the sanctuary? Every one must

*The word *psalmody* I shall, in this article, consider as bearing the same relation to the existing body of hymn tunes as the word *hymnology* bears to the existing body of hymns.

Digitized by Google

admit that, in practice, the tune is as important as the hymn. Everyone, at least, who has heard a good hymn killed by an inappropriate tune will concede the point. When a committee of our Methodist brethren were selecting the hymns for their official hymnal there was considerable debate on the admission of "I was a wandering sheep." Finally one of the brethren said, "Let's sing it." The tune turned the scale and decided for the admission of the hymn. (Imagine the feelings of the committee when the book emerged from the hands of the "musical editor" with a new tune to the hymn!) Does one study hymns for the mere delight of study, for the pleasure of running down a doubtful authorship, stumbling upon choice bits of poetry, and constructing ingenious historical and critical theories? All this can be done with hymn tunes. Never shall I forget my joy at unearthing some new, old tune by Orlando Gibbons, childlike in sweetness and purity; or perhaps the treasure trove was some out of the way setting by Bach, whose elaborate embroidery only enhances the simple dignity of the general effect. And no "Notes and queries" problem furnishes more ground for speculation than does the origin of the tune, "Sun of my soul."

A complete account of Protestant sacred music would involve a sketch of the music of the Roman Church from its origin (possibly in the Jewish liturgic music) to the time of the Reformation. But as this essay attempts no such complete account it is sufficient, for present purposes, to advert to the fact that, whatever the Roman Church music may originally have been, it was at the time of the Reformation wholly unfit for congregational singing. This was in part due to the general tendency of the Roman Church to relegate the laity to the position of witnesses of certain acts of worship performed for them by a professional class. Music was regarded as an affair of the priests. In harmony with this tendency the music of the Roman Church had been

Digitized by Google

elevated to an extent which rendered a trained choir necessary for the rendition of every part of it. Palestrina reformed it in the direction of simplicity; and Palestrina is as complex as Bach at his most ingenious.

But there was a stronger reason than these. The traditional melodies of the Roman Church were in the keys or "modes" established by Ambrose and improved by Gregory. These modes, when adapted by Ambrose to the purposes of sacred song, were the current musical scales. In them the popular music was pitched. Children grew up in familiarity with them. Men heard them on all hands. Hence Ambrose's flock found it easy and natural to sing Ambrose's chants. But while the music of the church was pursuing a line of development which was to give us what we now know as the Gregorian chant, the music of the people was pursuing an entirely different path.

Casting aside the complicated and artificial Lydian, Phrygian, and the rest, the people and the minstrels had in some way managed to evolve our modern major and minor scales, or rather, retaining these two alone of all the old modes, had evolved a melodic system (and the rudiments of a harmonic system) especially adapted to these scales. The Gregorian chants probably sounded as strange in the ears of one of Luthers contemporaries as they do in ours.

The Reformed Churches, in restoring the primitive order of the Church, naturally revived congregational singing. The two great reformers provided for this want in different ways. The austerely radical Calvin would have in his worship nothing bearing the "mark of the beast." He allowed no words but those drawn from Scripture, and hence confined his congregation to a translation of the psalms. Calvin could not, however, for obvious reasons, takes his music from the Bible, and he would not take it from Rome; hence he had his psalter adapted to various popular melodies, much as our modern choirs set more or less sacred words to the

Digitized by Google

decidedly "less" sacred melodies of "Alice, where art thou?" and "I would that my love." To part company with Rome as widely as possible, Calvin allowed no instrumental accompaniment, and no harmony. This illiberal decision gave the religious music of the French Reformed Churches a set-back from which it has never recovered.

Luther, less severe and reactionary than Calvin, was willing both to retain what was best in the worship of Rome, and to allow the human spirit a certain freedom in the manner of offering its praise to God. His course in regard to the translation and composition of hymns needs no mention here; his action in regard to Church music was in harmony with it. While he could not take his music unchanged from Rome he adapted for the congregation many of the Roman melodies. His desire evidently was to retain to the members of the Reformed Churches, as far as possible, all that had become dearest to them in the worship of the Roman Church. He, too, or his followers with his sanction, adapted suitable popular melodies to his hymns; while the "The Marsellaise of the Reformation" is but one of the tunes by which he aided in laying the foundation of our Protestant psalmody.

Luther's first hymn book—the world's first Protestant hymn book—was issued in 1524, by Luther, and Johannes Walther. It contained eight hymns and five tunes. This ushered in, for Germany, the great, almost the only, period of production of hymn tunes. To the body of tunes produced, adapted and collected in Luther's life time little has been added. Great geniuses have worked on the *chorale*, but even a Bach contented himself with harmonizing the old tunes. To be sure new tunes have occasionally been added to the traditional *repertoire* such as Cruger's *Nun danket alle Gott.* Germany has borrowed with advantage from the French psalters. The reader may recall how Malan's hymn, "*Non ce n'est pas mourir*," which in its orig-

Digitized by Google

inal form nobody knew nor cared for, sprang into new life, under the vivifying touch of a German heart, as "*Nein, nein das ist Kein Sterben*"—one of the classics of Christian song. So these French tunes, their grace and point tempered by German tenderness and strength, have a complete and satisfying charm such as neither land alone could have given them.

The Haydns, too, added something to our Psalmody. Josef certainly wrote a few tunes for the Reformed Church at Lyons; and *Lyons* is to this day one of the best tunes in the hymn books. There are many tunes in various books attributed to Michael Haydn. Tunes by Michael Haydn are open to the same suspicion as are violins by Stradivaries, or pictures by Domenichino. It has been the fashion to father fugitives upon all these. Still as Michael Haydn devoted a long life and no mean talents to the exclusive composition of Church music, it is highly probable that some considerable percentage of the melodies attributed to him did really originate in the brain of that somewhat self-important Salzburger. But in general the fact remains that the Germans have been disinclined to innovations in their congregational music, and that the greater and better part of it is so ancient that its origin can be traced with difficulty, if at all.

Calvin's first book, a Psalter, was issued at Geneva, in 1542, the musical part being under the direction of Guillaume Franc; who owes to this circumstance a widespread reputation as the author of "Old Hundred," a reputation to which he would find it hard to substantiate his claim. This unharmonized psalter was far from giving general satisfaction. Louis Bourgeois attempted to introduce a harmonized setting into one of the Churches at Geneva, where he was precentor; an attempt whose only result was his own resignation. He set the psalter for four voices (with the melody in the tenor according to the custom of the time), for the Lyons Church, in 1561.

Digitized by Google

Probably the finest arrangement of the psalm tunes was that of Claude Goudimel. Goudimel is said to have been an extremely learned and able musician. It must be confessed that the opportunities which an American amateur has for forming an opinion of Goudimel are very limited. Still, inasmuch as all musical historians show a high degree of respect for him we shall be following in the track of orthodoxy in doing the same. Goudimel, then, being a skillful musician, made very scientific settings of the psalms, much in the style of the motets of the Roman Church. This attempt to introduce the refinements of science into the Psalter necessarily failed. His polyphonic music could not be sung, and Claudin Le Jeune, in 1633, issued a simpler version at Leyden. This was an arrangement of the received melodies, less elaborate than that of Goudimel, but simpler, more fitting, and probably more beautiful. At any rate it supplanted all other Psalters, and became the recognized book of the Calvinistic Churches outside of Switzerland, and the foundation of modern French psalmody.

Since the Reformation, the French Church, like the German Church, has produced few original hymn tunes. It has enlarged its *repertoire* by borrowing from German and English sources; but Malan, of Geneva, is about the only well-known composer of whom it can boast.

The English Reformers were influenced chiefly by the Calvinistic Churches of Switzerland and the Netherlands. Hence, we find that the first English hymn books were psalters. First was Daye's Psalter, published in 1563, and notable from the fact that Tallis, the greatest Elizabethan —shall I not say the greatest English composer, contributed to its pages. But by far the most important Psalter was issued in 1621, by Ravenscroft, with the assistance of such men as Morley, Dowland and Tallis. Nothing can excel the simple sweetness and purity of these settings, many of which are, and all of which should be, in use to-day.

Digitized by Google

Playford's psalter, published in 1671, is noteworthy as the first to put the melody in the soprano. Although a far inferior work to that of Ravenscroft it was about as influential, in America even more so, as will be seen when we take up American psalmody.

But the days of Tallis and Gibbons, or even of Purcell, could not last forever. Croft and Boyce wrote some good tunes; but the age of decline was setting in. A florid style of music came into vogue, although it had neither the simplicity necessary to congregational singing nor the dignity becoming the worship of God. The Tausurs, Williamses, and Joneses of this period (although they produced a good tune now and then) need not detain us. The prevailing irreligion and formalism of the close of the eighteenth and the opening of the nineteenth centuries found its fit expression in trivial, tasteless and worldly music.

It is to the Tractarian movement, with its careful and reverent attention to the accessories of divine worship that we owe the present high state of psalmody. This is true, not only for what its adherents have themselves done, but for the emulation they have inspired in others. Certainly it was when the High Church movement was attracting great attention that we find an amount of attention paid to the translation of German hymns which brought into prominence the German hymn tunes or *chorales*. A selection from Miss Winkworth's Lyra Germanica, with German chorales adapted by Bennett and Goldschmidt, appeared in 1863, under the title of *The Chorale Book for England*. This exemplified one of the great tendencies in modern English psalmody—to import freely the German *chorale*. Yet the chorale was never widely adopted as a model by native composers. English psalmody has been more influenced, as we have shown, by the French than by the German music. Even in the late admiration for the German chorale it has been merely an exotic, enriching the stores of Eng-

Digitized by Google

land's psalmody, rather than a fruitful principle vitally affecting its development. The German threads have been embroidered upon the English psalmody, never woven into its warp and woof.

A more real influence has been exerted upon English music by the High-Church movement—setting men to studying, as it did, the best music of the Roman Church. To be sure, its efforts to make England sing the old plain chant may be discounted. Melodies in the old ecclesiastical modes will not get the ear of a modern congregation. But one thing the Tractarian movement has done. It has raised up a school of able and devout musicians devoting no mean talents to the service of God. *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, issued in 1861, is the high-water mark of this school.

If it be asked on what model these men have formed their work, the reply must be, upon the modern English part-song, or glee. This statement involves no dispraise. I have shown how our modern hymn tune was in its origin an adaptation of the prevalent forms of secular song to the needs of divine worship. Long before this, Palestrina, Lassus, Tallis, Gibbons, had written masses and anthems in the same style in which they produced secular madrigals. Any vital sacred music must be a sanctifiaction of the secular style of the time. Of course this does not mean that the music must be secular in sentiment. Though its form may be essentially the same as that of contemporaneous secular part songs, its substance should be entirely different. Therefore, if there is ever to be a fresh growth of hymn tunes in Germany they are more likely to be modelled on *Guten Abend, gute Nacht* than on *Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott.*

The modern psalmodists of England have acted on this principle. Gauntlett to be sure, has tried to revive the old psalter style. He has imitated it very cleverly, but his tunes, while interesting to the musician, fail, like all attempts to resuscitate an out-grown style, to find the heart of the

Digitized by Google

people. If not stillborn, their existence is precarious; and Gauntlett's most successful tunes are those where he is least influenced by Le Jeune. But Dykes, Barnby and Smart, and Monk, who have been eminently successful, write in the style of the part song. Barnby at his best is a Pinsuti turned pious; while Sir Arthur Sullivan—but this is a theme on which I need not expand. One is almost tempted to indulge in a little cheap criticism of these composers with whom every one is familiar—to assign Monk the pre-eminence for sound religious feeling, to say that Dykes is apt to be too ecclesiastical—to express an opinion that Barnby, though a fine harmonist, *occasionally*, in writing a tune, is guilty of the slight oversight of leaving out the *tune*. Such trifles it would be easy to say; but the very ease of saying them throws suspicion on their value.

What the future will be in England I am not rash enough to prophesy. The present psalmodists do not seem to be men of the intense and earnest religious zeal that characterized the early heroes of High-Church music. But in view of the fact that England is the only land in Europe that has preserved any vitality in this branch of art, and in view of the religious character of the English nation, and the progress they are making in musical culture we may not unreasonably expect to find.

"That which they have done but earnest of the things they mean to do."

American psalmody has passed through three distinct periods. The Pilgrims practiced the old Calvinistic music, with no accompaniment and no harmony. This music went through, in America, an analogous course to that which it had run at a slower rate on the continent of Europe. Harmonic arrangements were introduced, which, while generally claiming to be based on Ravenscroft's psalter, really owed much more, authorities assure us, to the inferior work of Playford. For the various movements and controversies

Digitized by Google

of this period, for the strife on the question of "lining out," and for the clerical part of the debates, I can but refer the reader to Professor Ritters "History of Music in America," to which I hereby acknowledge an indebtedness by no means slight. When at last, somewhat before the middle of the eighteenth century, the harmonic arrangements of Playford had become firmly established, the music of Tansur and Williams (already referred to) was introduced.

The history of Church music in America has hitherto been but a pale reflection of that of England. But this state of things was not to continue. America was soon to start out on a track of her own, to pursue a course unlike that of any European country, to chant psalm tunes the like of which had never been heard before, and will not soon be heard again.

The man who inaugurated this new era was William Billings, the first American composer, who lived in the latter part of the eighteenth century.* Billings wrote in a thoroughly vicious style; but he was an undoubted genius; as anyone who has heard his vigorous setting to "The Lord descended from above," can testify. He was deprived, by the circumstances of the case, of any sound musical education, and was cut off from all better models than those furnished by the awkward Playford and the meretricious Tansur. But neither of these had any great influence on him. Possessing hardly enough knowledge respectably to harmonize a hymn tune he must launch forth upon the most intricate contrapuntal style! But the Yankees had been organizing choirs, and the choirs must have a chance to show what they could do. Hence, music of the sort which we should expect from the composer of "The crowning day is coming," if he should try his hand at a hallelujah chorus!

The general style of psalm tune came to consist of a prelude and a short fugue. Many of the writers had genius;

*From 1764 to 1800.

Digitized by Google

but few of them knew counterpoint. Besides which, the utter inappropriateness of fugue tunes to the purposes of public worship need not be pointed out. We are not surprised soon to find a reaction against the Billings school; and another reversion to European models. Boyce, Arne, Handel, Haydn, and Mozart are the sources whence hymn tunes are now derived. The movement thus inaugurated culminated towards the middle of this century, in the school of Lowell Mason† and Thomas Hastings.‡ I shall centre what I have to say about the school around Mason's name, as Hastings is of minor importance, and whatever may be said of Mason is, in a lesser degree, true of Hastings.

This is not the place to narrate Mason's great work in choir training and in the popularization of music. All that demands our attention is his work as a composer. The most obvious thing to say about his tunes is that they show little genius. The same might be said of Watts's hymns. But Mason, like Watts, is thoroughly devout and conscientious, always appropriate, never *outré*. He is extremely practical. Many of the modern English tunes charm us when played on the organ: but give them to a congregation, and they are useless. Not so with Mason's work. It is always adapted to the worship of the great congregation. It sounds better sung than played. It is within the reach of the ordinary voice. It never reminds us of the dance or the opera. Mason made no great claims to originality, and often arranged, with eminent success, themes from the sacred music of the Roman church and of the great German masters. Taking him all in all, the comparison with Watts at once suggests the place which Lowell Mason, on this side of the ocean at least, holds in psalmody. And long may he continue to hold it.

Bradbury is the link between the old church music and

† Born 1792, died 1872.
‡ Born 1787, died 1872.

Digitized by Google

the new Sunday-school music—reëchoing Lowell Mason and foreshadowing W. Howard Doane.

American sacred music has passed through these three stages; what is its present state?

We discern two schools among writers of sacred music in our country. On one side are the organists of our city churches. These men are trained musicians, masters of form and harmony; and they produce musicianly work, after the present English fashion. But they have not the genius which seizes the ear of people. They do not possess a gift for originating melody, (melody *is* indispensable to music—Wagner is a great melodist) and their devotion to the organ has a tendency to make their work instrumental rather than vocal.

Another school is that represented by our singing evangelists. They are generally poorly trained, know but the rudiments of harmony, and often display execrable taste. On the other hand they have some true genius—the best of them have—they can reach the heart of the people, they have the right religious attitude, and, owing to the fact that they are vocalists and choir leaders, their works are always singable.

Each of these schools has produced some work that will live, much that will die. Neither has the future in its grasp. To produce a vital school of American church music these two classes must come together. The best qualities of both must be combined. The scholastic musician must acquire more of a gift at melody and rhythm, while the evangelistic singer must learn to write good, though not necessarily elaborate, harmony, must acquire some of the refined taste of the musician, must, in short, get rid of the idea that God is better pleased with poor than with good music. This would base our American psalmody on that surest possible artistic basis—the marriage of scholastic and popular art.

DAVID CHANDLER GILMORE.

New York.

Digitized by Google

IV.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND; ITS PRESENT CONDITION AND PHASES OF ITS RECENT HISTORY.

THE vast influence of the Church of England and its intimate relation to the social, literary, political and philanthropic movements of the age abundantly justify attention to important phases of its recent history and present condition. The English Church of this century has been marked in education, by the highest culture and special scholarship; in benevolence, by the generous devotion of private wealth to charities, missions and church building; in theology, by important discussions concerning ritual and doctrine; and in legislation, by most equitable changes in relation to Dissenters, Roman Catholics and Jews.

The subject is encumbered with a wealth of material which invites attention. A detailed or even a comprehensive survey is impracticable. A rapid review of some significant features in the organization, polity, thought, worship and practical activity of the English Church, principally during the last sixty years, may be possible. In this review we notice: First—The Organization and increased Practical Efficiency of the Church. Second—Branches or Parties in the Church and their relations to each other, with special reference to questions of Ritual and Doctrine. Third—Privileges and Restrictions of the Church which have led to the agitation of Disestablishment.

Digitized by Google

I. *The Organization and increased Practical Efficiency of the Church.*

The Church of England proper covers the territory of England and Wales and comprises the two provinces of Canterbury and York; the former with twenty-four dioceses, the latter with ten dioceses, including that of Wakefield constituted during the past year. Eleven of these bishoprics, remaining in their ancient seats, ante-date the Norman conquest; four others were transferred to their present seats during the reign of William the Conqueror. Carlisle and Ely were established soon after the conquest. The four Welsh bishoprics are ancient, but were not joined to the province of Canterbury until after the annexation of the principality in 1284. Of the six new bishoprics for which provision was made by Henry VIII., four remain, viz.: Peterborough, Gloucester, Chester and Oxford. The Bishop of Sodor and Man was nominated by a subject, whose ancestors endowed the see, until 1829 when the lordship of the Isle of Man was purchased by the Crown. The bishoprics of Ripon and Manchester date from 1836, and within the last twelve years six new dioceses have been constituted: St. Albans, Truro and Southwell in the southern province; and Liverpool, Newcastle and Wakefield in the northern province.

With the recent rapid increase of population and parishes the extension of the Episcopate was deemed necessary. The reconstruction or division of dioceses was especially urged where the extensive territory or the vast population, in large cities of the old dioceses, rendered thorough Episcopal supervision impracticable. There was, however, a general conviction that more bishops were not needed for political but for religious work. Positive unwillingness to increase the number of bishops who should be entitled to a seat in the upper House of Parliament led to the arrange-

Digitized by Google

ment by which, when the see of Manchester was created, the number of bishops entitled to sit in the House of Lords was restricted to twenty-six.

Of the thirty-four bishops, the occupants of the five sees of Canterbury, York, London, Durham and Winchester are always members of the House of Lords. By an exception, the Bishop of Sodor and Man, in whose diocese there are only forty-two clergymen, never sits in the House of Lords. There remain twenty-one seats which are filled by twenty-one out of the remaining twenty-eight bishops according to their seniority of appointment to the Episcopate. The junior bishop in the House of Lords is Chaplain of the House.

By this adjustment the most serious political objection to the extension of the Episcopate was removed. But there was no provision for the maintenance of new bishops, at all adequate to the dignity and exactions of the office. Many of the active clergy are only moderately paid and there was a natural reluctance to diminish greatly the salaries of the higher officials. Consequently, the recent creation of bishoprics has been conditioned upon the voluntary contribution of nearly the whole endowment necessary for the permanent support of the new bishops. Provision has already been made for the erection of Bristol into a thirty-fifth diocese so soon as the prescribed financial conditions shall be met.

The ready response to the appeal for the voluntary endowment of the bishoprics of Liverpool and Newcastle indicates that when there is a recognized need and an expectation that such a need will be efficiently supplied, the principle of voluntaryism can be effectively and even enthusiastically applied in England as well as in America. The slower endowment of bishoprics in smaller places, like Southwell and Wakefield, shows that when Englishmen pay money out of their private purses they, no less than Americans, expect a *quid pro quo*. In a justifiable sense they prefer to put their money where it will do the most good.

Digitized by Google

The immense revenues of the Church of England cannot be accurately estimated. Their money value varies considerably from year to year. The endowments and tithe rent-charge probably amount to about £5,000,000 per year. It is an interesting fact, not always understood, that in recent years this large sum has been duplicated by voluntary contributions for general Church work and benevolence. These voluntary contributions for the year 1885, which was a year of poor crops and financial stringency, exceeded £5,000,000; and for the twenty-five preceding years the *known* voluntary contributions amounted to more than £81,500,000. Nearly one-half of this amount was devoted to the building and restoration of Church edifices and parsonages, the endowment of benefices and kindred work. The next object which most successfully appeals to voluntary benevolence is the support of elementary education by the Church. Then follow in order Foreign Missions, Home Mission work, charitable work done directly by the Church, and Theological Education. It appears that about £10,000,000, or, in round numbers, about $50,000,000 are annually disbursed by the Church of England.*

The salaries of bishops, though large from an American point of view, constitute but a small part of the sums expended in various departments of Church activity. It must be remembered that the exacting, though unwritten, law of custom makes the necessary expenses and the benevolent contributions of these officials very great. The salaries of the thirty four bishops amount in the aggregate to about £170,000. The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Primate of all England, receives £15,000; the Archbishop of York, the Primate of England, £10,000; the Bishop of London, £10,000; Durham, £7,000; Winchester, £6,500; Ely,

* This may be a high estimate, unless the yearly rental value of parsonages is considered a part of the amount. It is to be remembered that of about £4,000,000 tithe rent-charge, about £1,000,000 are for the benefit of lay mpropriators.

Digitized by Google

£5,500. Five bishops receive £5,000 each, viz.: Bath and Wells, Gloucester and Bristol, Salisbury, Worcester, and Oxford. The salaries of the other bishops vary from £3,000 to £4,500, save that of Sodor and Man, which is only £2,000.

Twenty-eight of the bishoprics have cathedrals, with deans and chapters. The other six seats of bishops are collegiate churches without chapters. Westminster and Windsor are collegiate churches, not seats of bishops, but with deans and chapters. The deans of Westminster and Windsor, therefore, occupy somewhat exceptional positions. The other deans with the chapters have charge of the cathedral buildings and services.

The salaries of the thirty deans range from £700 to £3,000, and average about $7,000. There are 131 residentiary canons with variable salaries; the six at Oxford receive £1,250 each, and several others £1,000. There are about 120 other assistant ministers—minor canons, vicars choral, priest-vicars and chaplains—attached to the cathedrals.

The eighty-five archdeacons relieve the bishops by supervising the business affairs of the various parishes, and by taking the preliminary steps in the examination of candidates for ordination. Archdeacons superintend, in a general way, the temporalities of the Church, and deal with Church wardens in such matters as building and repairing churches and parsonages and improving grounds. Their salaries are small but the positions are held in connection with other preferments.

The aggregate salaries of bishops, capitular clergy and archdeacons, amount to over £350,000, or about $1,750,000.*

* This is less than the annuity paid to the Queen, which is $1,925,000. The yearly cost of the entire Episcopal and the cathedral system, apart from the maintenance of the edifices, is considerably less than the annuities paid for the support of the entire royal family. These annuities amount to $2,715.000.

Digitized by Google

The six hundred rural deans have no fixed powers. They call diocesan meetings for Church work, and are simply helpers to the bishops.

There are about 13,500 beneficed clergymen, and about 23,000 clergymen of all classes. More than 8,000 benefices are impropriated, *i. e.*, they belong to private or lay patrons. The right of presentation to the other benefices belongs to the Crown, to the higher officials of the Church, and to the universities.

The population of England and Wales is about 26,000,000. About one-half of this number, or 13,000,000, may be regarded as the constituency of the Church of England. There are Church sittings for about one-half of this constituency, or for about 6,500,000 persons.

If now we ask what this great Church, with its remarkable history, its complex organization, vast machinery, large revenue, talented officials and influential constituency, is doing, the answer must be, "much every way."

The old-time picture of the provincial cathedral city has not entirely faded away. Some of its outlines might have been traced, by the leisurely observant traveller, a score of years ago, but the colors are fast becoming obscure and already the whole representation must be greatly modified. The sleepy town may be there with its strange appearance of age and its almost unearthly quiet, interrupted only by the hum of bees and the cawing of rooks and jackdaws. The ivy-covered walls and climbing vines, the hospital with its provision for three, seven, twelve, or some other sacred number of old pensioners, whom you are tempted to believe are more like Virgil's shades than living men, the vicar's close, the bishop's palace with the velvet lawn and the fine old trees of the adjoining demesne, the cathedral itself—if it be Salisbury, the most beautiful temple made with hands on earth, and if it be some other, a wealth of architectural beauty, Norman, Early English, Decorated, Perpendicular,

Digitized by Google

or perhaps a combination of all—in a few localities these things remain much as they were a generation past.

But the invisible bishop, overweighted with dignity and luxury, and appointed by favoritism; the dictatorial dean, a man of mediocre talent or a mere *littérateur;* the portly, rubicund canons, whose bibulous habits were the scandal of the reverent and the sport of the profane; these incumbents, who found soft places and lay down to rest with assured and comfortable salaries for the remainder of their natural lives, to the honor of the English Church and the satisfaction of her friends, it may be said have for the most part passed away, and their places are occupied by worthier successors.

The recent revision of the Bible under the auspices of the Convocation of Canterbury, the prolonged labor and high scholarship involved, and the number of prominent Church officials occupied in the work, illustrate the intellectual resources of the Church of England. If there have been times when such a work could not have been creditably done under the leadership of English bishops, such a charge can not be made with men like Lightfoot at Durham, Ellicott at Gloucester, Browne at Winchester, Stubbs at Oxford, and Temple at London. The deans and canons receive generous salaries; but scholars like Church of St. Paul's, Kitchin of Winchester, Plumptre of Bath and Wells, Merivale of Ely, Liddell of Oxford, and Vaughan of Llandaff, are worthy of reward; and something can be said for a system which encourages and sustains men like Canons Liddon, Westcott, Farrar, Tristram, Venables, Bright, and Ince. They represent the high-water mark of English culture and scholarship.

The mental stagnation, not to say stupidity, which was once associated with the rural rectory or vicarage, occupied by younger sons too unpromising for the army or civil service, cannot be justly attributed to the present working clergy in dioceses which have been inspired by the vigorous activity of Samuel Wilberforce, or ennobled by the manly

Digitized by Google

toil of the late Bishop Fraser among the dense thousands of Manchester and Salford.

It is to be hoped that old England has a well-earned freedom from the bumptious pretentiousness, and the fussy, fruitless fretfulness of too many American towns. There ought to be a place of repose and an opportunity for refinement in the English rectory such as is impossible in bustling democratic communities, where innumerable benevolent and malevolent societies and organizations, picnics and fairs, committees and business meetings, charitable and patriotic enterprises, public and personal grievances and scandals, combine with their complex exactions to absorb the time and ruin the scholarship of American clergymen.

The average English rector is not yet the typical Puritan or the modern New England Yankee, but he is neither a sluggard nor a hypocrite; he is not a knave or an idiot. The formation and endowment of new parishes in large towns, the heroic effort to do something in response to the exceeding bitter cry of London's outcast poor (such work, for example, as that of Wm. Walsham How, just made bishop of the new diocese of Wakefield), the phenomenal growth of colonial and foreign missionary work which has advanced almost *ab initio* during the present century, and the recognized necessity felt by her officers, from archbishop to curate, to justify the Church of England before the nation and the world have tripled, and even quadrupled, the voluntary benevolence of the Church, and have created hundreds of helpful charities and agencies for the welfare of Englishmen at home and abroad.*

The past defects of the English Church have been most keenly exposed by those of her own household. But the increase of her vigor and efficiency during recent decades can

* The official year-book of the Church of England, a thick volume of between 600 and 700 pages, furnishes an instructive annual summary of this complex work.

Digitized by Google

not be successfully questioned. It is unknown only to those who are ignorant of the facts.

II. Branches or Parties in the Church.

We now consider some characteristics of the different branches or parties in the Church of England, their relation to each other, and their views of ritual and doctrine.

The different tendencies and types of opinion in the English Church are usually classified as High, Broad, and Low. For want of more accurate terms these are convenient, but they are often misleading.

The Low Churchman may incline to the Calvinism of Whitefield, or he may prefer the Arminianism of Wesley. For a long time High Church ritualism was an enigma to High Church Anglicans; and the Ritualists came to regard Anglican Churchmanship meaningless and narrow apart from ritualistic doctrine. The Broad Church comprehends almost the whole range of independent theological opinion, from a close approach to the views of the Evangelicals to the rationalism of Matthew Arnold.

The terms Low, Broad and High must, therefore, be understood in a very general way, and it must not be forgotten that all these branches represent loyal Churchmen who believe in Episcopacy and in the Anglican Church separated from Rome.

Low Churchmen may be regarded as the natural descendants of those Puritans who did not separate from the Church of England. They accept and rejoice in the name Protestant; oppose the Roman Church everywhere and always, intelligently and unintelligently; and are positive, dogmatic and earnest in the defence of what they regard the fundamental truths of Christianity. In the last century Low Churchmen were greatly influenced by the Methodist movement, and they represented the permanent influence

Digitized by Google

of that movement upon the Church of England. Low Churchmen were most influential at the close of the last and at the beginning of this century, when they came to be known as "Evangelicals," or the Evangelical School. Under the lead of Charles Simeon, at Cambridge, supported by prominent laymen, Low Churchmen purchased the patronage of many benefices in order to present incumbents who held their favorite views. They were zealous philanthropists, and with Wilberforce as a leader, in union with the Friends, they secured the abolition of slavery in the British Dominions. As a rule the contributions of Low Churchmen to special scholarship have not been of the highest order.

High Churchmen differ widely among themselves. With the commencement of the ritualistic revival in 1833, the High Church ritualist was for a long time suspected and scarcely comprehended by many Anglican High Churchmen, who extolled alike Episcopacy, the Prayer Book, the Church, the King and England, and abhorred any innovations in worship, polity, or creed.

The Anglican High Churchman hated Rome quite as cordially as he loved the English Church. The ritualistic High Churchman does not acknowledge papal supremacy but he rejects nothing in doctrine or ritual because it is favored by Rome. He insists that he is an Anglo-Catholic Churchman and not simply a provincial or an insular Anglican Churchman. Ritualists are more than willing to fraternize with the Eastern Church and with the old Catholics, and do not share the Low Churchman's radical dread and dislike of the Roman Catholic Church.

The Anglican High Churchman has suffered some rather rude shocks of late. For him the world has moved fast and changes have dazed him until he hardly knows how to take his bearings. He *was* a typical conservative in both politics and religion, and the two seemed to him to be one

Digitized by Google

and inseparable. He was a firm believer in the English Church, was well satisfied with that Church, and wished to keep it just what and just as it was.

The Ritualist is displeased with the subordination of the Church and its control by the State. He is *not* an Erastian. He desires above all things the disestablishment of the Church without its disendowment; but, if that be impracticable, he is so restive, under restrictive legislation and recent judicial decisions, that unless he can be assured of large liberty he strongly inclines to the independence of the Church from State control even at the risk of partial disendowment. Ritualists regard it a particular hardship that laws affecting religion, like the Act of 1874, for the Regulation of Public Worship, should be made by Parliament and that ultimate authority for the determination of what ritualistic forms are legally permissible and what are prohibited, shall rest with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and not with Church officials. The consistent Ritualist insists that the State does not determine the doctrine of the Church, but he has learned by uncomfortable experience that the State has repeatedly assumed to interpret the standards of the Church and to legislate in divers matters which most radically affect her interests.

The Anglican High Churchman *is* an Erastian, loyal to the Sovereign and to the Church, of which the Sovereign is Head by every kind of right, and especially by the appreciable right of possession and power. On this basis successive generations of English squires have believed in the English Church, with Tudors, Stuarts, and Hanoverians at its head. They have been High Churchmen, but High Anglican Churchmen.

The Ritualistic High Churchman believes in a Church which is greater than any State, King or Parliament, and which might conceivably exist separated from and independent of the State. He is fond of restoring mediæval practices

Digitized by Google

which the rough hand of modern radicalism and the cold type of Hanoverian Protestantism have banished. He has a *penchant* for costly Church ornaments, rich and numerous altar cloths, brasses, crosses, stained glass with memorials of saints; for stately music, imposing processionals and recessionals, elaborate vestments, lighted candles, bowing, genuflections, and even for the use of incense if the chances of the bishop's approval exceed the probability of official admonition. These innovations which the steady-going Anglican Churchman witnessed with amazement and alarm a half century ago, are not with the ritualist a foolish fancy or a transient expression of mere æsthetic preference. They are signs and outward expressions of very well defined doctrinal opinions concerning the peculiar efficacy of the sacraments, especially the Lord's Supper, and of their unique agency as channels of divine grace.

By assent to the articles of the Church of England her clergymen must renounce transubstantiation, but at the settlement of the Church under Elizabeth, the forty-two articles of Edward VI. were reduced to thirty-nine, and the provision against the doctrine of the real presence in the Supper was omitted. The rubrics have often been interpreted as naturally favoring some sort of real presence, at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, somewhat similar to that believed in by Lutherans.

But whatever be the proper interpretation of the Standards of the Church, or the belief of others, Ritualists are not weaklings, as superficial critics have represented them. They base their use of symbolism upon doctrine which they regard as true and important and which, it must be acknowledged, has been held by able churchmen ever since its unqualified advocacy in the fourth century by Ambrose, Hilary, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzen.

The Ritualistic Revival, or the Tractarian movement of

Digitized by Google

1833, marks one of the most interesting epochs in Modern Ecclesiastical History. It was very unlike the Wesleyan movement which began at Oxford a century earlier. The methods and doctrines of the two movements must be contrasted rather than compared. Yet both were protests against stagnation, indifference and willing submission to secular dictation and political expedients. Both were positive assertions of principle and conviction at the cost of personal ease and convenience. Both movements were marked by persistent devotion to a purpose, dogged determination, the use of rare literary and oratorical gifts, and the costly sacrifice of cherished associations and personal friendships. Not a few of those who joined the Oxford movement in their passage to Rome were trained under Low Church influences. Like the earlier Evangelicals, they demanded a more vigorous type of church activity than was encouraged by the conservative type of Anglicanism fifty years ago.

There is a peculiar fascination about the Tractarian movement and the personality of its leaders. John Henry Newman and Pusey were the theologians of the movement; Keble was its poet. Newman was a student of patristics and history; skillful in argument, a subtle thinker and a superlative master of the English language. Pusey was an able philologian and as a polemic, fearless, calm and persistent.

After the issue of many tracts by various authors, who set forth diverse phases of ritualistic thought, the famous Tract No. 90 was published in 1841. In this treatise Newman utterly failed to commend his strained and, as it was termed, "non-natural" interpretation of the Thirty-Nine Articles. After a delay of four years he overcame his objections to the reverence paid to the saints and to Mary, and in 1845 joined the Roman Catholic Church. He was followed by hundreds of able Churchmen, clergy and laity, mostly from the higher classes, including many of the nobility.

Digitized by Google

Pusey remained in the English Church until his death in 1882, and his name was given to the ritualistic movement or party which remained in the Church.

Like the Methodist movement of the preceding century, the Tractarian movement broke in twain. Most of Wesley's followers separated from the Church, but both Wesley and Whitefield wielded a permanent influence over the "Evangelicals" who remained Churchmen.

Newman, Manning, Robert Wilberforce and others like-minded went to Rome; but Sacramentalism developed great strength in the Church of England and soon secured such a position, that though Dr. Pusey was censured by the University of Oxford, in 1843, for his sermon on the Holy Communion, he was able to preach and advocate the same doctrine there, ten years later, not only with impunity but even with approval. In recent years ritualism has been favored by bishops, and has shown unexpected power to attract the common people in cities and large towns. Ritualists have contributed greatly to the increased activity and the aggressive work of the Church during the last forty years.

The Low Church Evangelicals and the High Church Ritualists are radically unlike in doctrine, in their preferences concerning the details of worship, and in their attitude toward the ceremonies and sacerdotalism of the Roman Church. Low Churchmen fear ritualism as a guide-post or highway to Rome. Ritualists dislike and disavow the pronounced Protestantism and the views of the ordinances and of subjective religious experience which are urged by Evangelicals. But while Evangelicals and Ritualists disagree, they are alike in having definite opinions, holding positive dogmas, and fearing above all things extreme latitudinarianism which seems to them certain to issue in infidelity. Both Evangelicals and Ritualists are impatient with doubt, skepticism, or the absence of comprehensive and dogmatic faith.

Digitized by Google

The Broad Churchman's central principle of comprehensiveness, in polity and doctrine, constrains him to treat others with toleration and external fraternity, but he does not share the Ritualist's convictions, and he finds it difficult to maintain even moderate respect for the intellectual attitude of many Low Churchmen. Yet the word Broad is very elastic and is quite as likely to be misunderstood as the word High.

The old parties have been vigorously shaken and somewhat blended of late. The recent rapid growth and manifest comprehensiveness of the Church have necessarily *broadened* the old Anglican if they have not diminished his altitude.

Recent events have taught Low Churchmen that if they are to remain in the Church and not provoke others to schism, there must be room in the Church of England for many who do not hold the type of opinion inculcated by the Venns, the Thorntons, Thomas Scott, John Newton, William Cowper and Charles Simeon. Ryle may be Bishop of Liverpool but he must take counsel with King of Lincoln, and Temple of London. Modern scientific investigation and theological discussion have done much to modify the views of Evangelicals. The sons are less narrow and unintelligent in the support of their views than their fathers were. Three is less illiberal and unwarrantable dogmatism. There are fewer "needless disputations."

It has come to pass that while the Ritualist is a student of patrology and mediæval history, while Low Churchmen are active philanthropists and authors of devotional literature, the high water mark of English culture and scholarship, has found fullest expression in the writings of Broad Churchmen. These writings have ranged from a close approach to the views of Evangelicals to the latitudinarianism of Colenso, with an intermediate class like the works of Whately, Thos. Arnold, Maurice, Robertson, Kingsley, Stanley and Farrar.

Digitized by Google

In his views of Church polity the Broad Churchman inherits the partially, but not perfectly, successful efforts to make the Church so comprehensive that no sharp or offensive theory of *jure divino* Episcopacy or Apostolic succession may exclude Dissenters who are able to accept Episcopacy as a "lawful and the most expedient" form of government for the Church of England.

In the nicer shades of doctrine Broad Churchmen are similarly indefinite. Their doctrinal attitude has been traced to Coleridge, who in early life was a Unitarian, but became an English Churchman. His doctrinal views have been strongly criticised: those of inspiration as erroneous, those of the atonement as indefinite and defective. In his *Aids to Reflection* Coleridge opposed extreme rationalism with characteristic want of system but with great ability. The late Principal Tulloch ascribes to Coleridge "a renovation of current Christian ideas." Tulloch further claims in substance (his exact words are not quoted) that in contrast with the intellectual weakness of prevalent Evangelical literature, Coleridge insisted upon the reality and reasonableness of Christianity as consisting of vital verities; and that he understood man's religious nature so well that Christianity, instead of being a superimposed scheme or device, was to him at once the only explanation of the facts of human existence and the only remedy for human sin.

Arnold, of Rugby, gave tone to the Broad Church tendency and, with Whately, may be said to have made that tendency an intermediate influence, which, by moderation and intellectual ability, long held the balance of power and controlled the Church of England. The breadth of Arnold's views, and his method of transforming the High Church Anglican into a Broad Churchman, are indicated by his claim that every native of England, by virtue of being born an Englishman, ought to consider himself a Christian. This has its parallel in Stanley's favorite designation of Dis-

Digitized by Google

senters as non-conforming members of the Church of England.

But if Coleridge, as a philosopher, and Arnold, as a teacher, gave impetus to the Broad Church tendency, Frederick Denison Maurice is universally recognized as its theological leader. He was the son of a Unitarian minister. He studied at Cambridge, where, on account of his dissent, he could not take a degree. Through the influence of Coleridge's writings Maurice joined the Church of England and took his degree at Oxford. He was Professor of History and Literature at King's College, London, from 1840, and of Divinity from 1846 until removed by the Council in 1853. His theological views gave offense though he believed that they were not opposed to the Standards of the Church of England. He was Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy at Cambridge from 1866, and wrote an extended History of Mental and Metaphysical Philosophy. He died in 1872.

At the height of the Tractarian Controversy, during the year when Tract No. 90 was issued, Maurice published his *Thoughts on Subscription* and *Reasons for not joining a party in the Church.* Through these and other theological discussions he became the nucleus of what was known, though contrary to his protest, as the Broad Church party. He wrote too much, and his writings are of unequal value, but he impressed his views upon a generation of young men who became his enthusiastic pupils and were loyally attached to their master. Among his disciples were some of the finest intellects in England. Robertson, Kingsley and Stanley, as preachers and authors, are too well known to require characterization.

It has been claimed that the extreme wing of the Broad Church has fully justified the apprehensions of Ritualists and Evangelicals. Yet it may fairly be questioned whether Coleridge and Maurice, as the precursors of Broad Church

Digitized by Google

views, were more responsible for skepticism than was the rebound from Low Church repression or from extreme ritualism. The radical opinions of Harriet Martineau and George Eliot can scarcely be attributed to Maurice. The latter was reared among Evangelicals, and the account of her change of opinion does not indicate the agency of the leaders of the Broad Church. The mother of the Newmans was from a Huguenot family and the brothers were trained with Evangelical surroundings; yet Francis W. Newman is one of the most notable examples of those who seem to have drifted far away from early religious influences.

The rebound from ritualism, and the consequent development of religious inquiry, sufficiently account for the atmosphere which favored the famous *Essays and Reviews* of 1860. Those essays, seven in number, were condemned by the Convocation of Canterbury. The authors of two of the more objectionable were charged with heresy, adjudged guilty in the Court of Arches, and suspended for a year with liability for costs. Both these decisions were reversed on appeal to the Judical Committee of the Privy Council. Thus the anomaly was presented of works declared heretical by convocation while their authors could not be condemned as heretics.

The famous Colenso controversy had a similar issue. Colenso's views were condemned by the Convocations of Canterbury and York, by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, by the Synod of the Episcopal Church of Scotland and by all of the provincial Synods of the Colonial Churches. Colenso was first deposed and then excommunicated by Bishop Gray, Metropolitan of Capetown, but the Judical Committee of the Privy Council declared the deposition invalid. Colenso secured his salary from the Colonial Bishopric Fund by a suit in chancery and returned to Natal where he died in 1883.

Digitized by Google

Among those trained in Broad Church views were Stopford Brooke, the biographer of Robertson, whose radical opinions caused his voluntary withdrawal from the Church of England, and Matthew Arnold who believed in the Church of England as "a society for the diffusion of goodness," and remained a member of the Church until his death; but, so far as appears, without definite faith even in the personality of God. Of the authors of *Essays and Reviews:* Frederick Temple was made Bishop of Exeter, and is the present Bishop of London, and Jowett remained undisturbed at Oxford.

By numerous decisions in test cases the Court of last Appeal has repeatedly favored the toleration of all principal branches or parties in the Church, except in the case of certain practices of Ritualists which, by prosecution under the Act of 1874 for the Regulation of Public Worship, have been declared to be illegal. Many Churchmen insist that decisions upon these matters have been erroneous, or if correct that the law is intolerable and should be repealed; while others like Mr. Gladstone have affirmed that it is inexpedient to enforce the law, as interpreted by the courts, against the Ritualists. The present policy of the most influential leaders in the Church is favorable to the expansion and comprehension of the Church, on the basis of the largest possible liberty consistent with efficient unity.*

III. Privileges and Restrictions which have caused the agitation of Disestablishment.

We now notice some of the peculiar privileges and restrictions of the Church of England which have led most

* In this connection peculiar interest attaches to the pending trial of Bishop King, of Lincoln, for ritualistic practices which are alleged to be unlawful. While this article goes to press nothing definite is determined, yet it may be

Digitized by Google

Dissenters and many Churchmen to advocate Disestablishment.

At the beginning of this century the laws discriminated with gross injustice against those who were not members of the Church of England. A certificate of birth was not accepted as legal evidence unless the child had been baptized by a clergyman of the English Church. Dissenting ministers could not legally celebrate marriages. Students could not matriculate at the Universities without subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. A man had no legal right to the privileges of legitimate birth, baptism, marriage or burial; he could not even hold civil offices unless he recognized some relation of submission or obligation to the offices or the officers of the Established Church.

The laws assumed that men ought not to be Dissenters, Roman Catholics, or Jews, and that whoever persisted in holding religious opinions not approved by the State deserved to suffer serious penalities for his perversity. All this has been changed, and for the most part by the cordial co-operation of influential leaders in the Established Church.

The repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts in 1828, the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act of the following year, the Jewish Disablities Removal Act, the System of Civil Registration, the Dissenters' Marriage Bill, and the recent Burial Laws Amendment Acts, together with the establishment of the University of London in 1836, and the opening of Oxford and Cambridge Universities in 1871, without the application of religious tests to candidates for degrees, are instances of the rapid progress of equitable legislation during the last sixty years.

confidently predicted that the accused will not be even severely censured by any strictly *ecclesiastical* court. Should any other court interfere with the forms of worship which the bishop favors, an earnest demand for a change in the methods of judicial proceedure or for a repeal of present laws is much more probable than the positive prohibition of ritualism.

Digitized by Google

There remain few traces of the offensive legal inequalities with which the century began. The Church of England monopolizes certain titles and positions as any Established Church must do. Her highest officials sit in the House of Lords, though an attack upon that prerogative was defeated in the Commons in 1884, by only eleven votes. The bishops have been termed obstructionists and the charge has been made against the entire Upper House, on one occasion with such effect that the Army Purchase Bill became law, without the concurrence of the Lords, by the intervention of the Queen's authority.

It is the privilege of the Archbishop of Canterbury, as the Primate of all England, to crown the sovereign upon accession to the throne but the sovereign, not the primate, is Supreme Head or Governor of the Church of England. Chaplains in the army and navy and the heads of colleges at the old universities must be members of the Established Church. Remunerative places, which are regarded as the great prizes in the Church, and many in the universities are still restricted to churchmen.

But more than any other specific grievance is the fact that the Church is *established by law* and is in a preëminent sense favored by the State. The prestige and social atmosphere of church circles in England make the sacrifice which cultivated dissenters must pay for conscientious adherence to their convictions vastly greater than anything of the kind in America. The age, growth, wealth, culture and power—in a word the very greatness of the Established Church, contrasted with the conditions of his own Church, is a kind of inevitable disadvantage and vexation to a dissenting Englishman, and to Welshmen a large majority of whom do not belong to the Church of England and Wales.

But the peculiar privileges and the exceptional position of the English Church are attended with serious disadvantages.

Digitized by Google

First of all, the Church is not autonomous. The historic rights of the cathedral chapters have lapsed and their only function in the election of bishops is to obey the will of the sovereign. It is possible for an artful politician, as premier to wield decisive influence in the most important appointments of the Church. But more serious than this anomaly is the fact which recent disputed cases, involving the lawfulness of certain rites and doctrinal views, have emphasized, viz: the inability of the Church to rule and protect herself in matters purely ecclesiastical. It is difficult to imagine an ecclesiastical body more helpless in the determination and enforcement of doctrine or forms of worship, or in the modification of creed, ritual, or polity than the Church of England. She is subject to Acts of Parliament, or the will of the sovereign, or both. It is possible for laws, vitally affecting the Church, to be passed which may be obnoxious to the large majority of bishops and of churchmen. Either house of Parliament may refuse to grant legislation most needful for the largest prosperity of the Church.

The reigns of the Georges constitute what has been termed in ecclesiastical history "the dreary Hanoverian period." During nearly all this time, or exactly from 1717 until 1852, the most important functions of convocation were suspended. Elizabeth forbade any legislation in Parliament concerning religion which had not been previously approved by convocation. But under the Georges and until 1852, legislation concerning the Church was conducted independently of the deliberations or the advice of convocation. It is an incongruous state of things (illustrated in the case of Colenso, referred to above) when convocation can condemn a book as containing heretical statements, while at the same time, neither convocation nor any other ecclesiastical body can authoritatively condemn the author of the heretical book as a heretic. The latter prerogative is reserved, in the last issue, for the final Court

Digitized by Google

of Appeal in ecclesiastical cases and may be referred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. High churchmen strenuously object to this arrangement. They protest that such a tribunal ought not to declare what statements of doctrine or forms of ritual are legally permitted or prohibited in the Church.

The patronage and control of the Church by the State have developed certain other evils against which the opponents of Erastianism justly inveigh. Among these evils are the sale of livings, the want of provision for the speedy punishment and removal of "criminous clerks," or for the removal of incumbents who are inefficient on account of age or prolonged disability, and an alleged autocracy of the clergy which makes it possible for individuals among them to disregard the welfare of the laity and the best interest of the Church. The recent years which have been marked by liberal treatment of Dissenters have been among the most prosperous years in the history of the Established Church. Justice rendered to those outside her communion has given self-respect to the Church and has commanded an usual regard and admiration from others.

The greatest dangers and bitterest contentions have existed within the Church. The sorest disappointments have arisen from the control of the State and of civil courts over ecclesiastical matters. These facts have led no small number of Churchmen to look with favor upon the disestablishment of the Church. A large majority of Dissenters—almost all with the exception of some Wesleyans—naturally desire such an issue; but the details of practicable disestablishment have never been satisfactorily stated.

Three classes of persons favor some possible form of disestablishment. There are Churchmen who desire to see the Church free from State control. Again: there are Dissenters who sympathize with these Churchmen and hold that the primary functions of the Church are spiritual, and that no

Digitized by Google

Church can afford to sacrifice her spiritual independence for any kind or amount of worldly privileges. These two classes of persons are not unmindful of the temporal interest of the Church in her immense endowments. They recognize the difficulty which must attend an equitable disposition of the present revenues of the Church in case of disestablishment, but they hold, in general, that the matter of endowments is altogether subordinate to the freedom of the Church from State patronage and control. These persons are not satisfied with the assertion that the sovereign never assumes to perform purely spiritual acts, such as the administration of the ordinances or the consecration of bishops. The burden of complaint is that the sovereign selects the bishops who are to be consecrated, and the State determines the interpretation which must be given to the sacraments by final appeal to the courts. The State is the source of authority in legislation and the real ruler of the Church, though only churchmen are selected and empowered in certain matters, to administer the will of the State.*

A third class demands the disestablishment and in large part the disendowment of the Church as a matter of equity to nearly one half of the English people who are not in the

*Advocates of the autonomy of the Church hold that the relation of the Church to the State, which has existed since the separation under Henry and the settlement under Elizabeth, infringes upon the proper independence of the Church in the following respects, as summarized by Dibdin, the editor of the late J. S. Brewers' work, *The Endowments and Establishment of the Church of England*, pp. 291-296.

1. Convocations of the Clergy cannot meet without royal writ; and *canons* cannot be enacted without the royal permission and confirmation. 2. The archbishops and bishops are appointed by the will of the monarch. 3. The crown is the visitor of the Church of England; just what this visitorial power implies is not certain. It has not been tested or illustrated since the abolition of the Court of High Commission. 4. An appeal lies from the ecclesiastical to the civil courts or to the crown. 5. No change can be made in the doctrine, ritual, or the substance of the Church without the action of Parliament. 6. Legislation directly pertaining to the Church, *e.g.*, the administration of its discipline and the maintenance of its doctrine and ritual, depends upon the State.

Digitized by Google

communion of the established Church. The plans and motives of these people are very diverse. A few are merely destructive and would gladly check the influence of all religious organizations and secularize ecclesiastical property. The majority argue that the claim of the Church to at least that large portion of its revenue known as the tithe rent-charge, which in 1836 took the place of the old tithing system, rests on an assumption which, though legalized by usage, in its origin and development has not been equitable and ought not to be perpetuated.

It is said that all the people of England have directly or indirectly borne the burden, and that all ought to share freely in the wealth and privileges of the Church of Engand. This claim is met by the assertion that none are kept from the privileges of the established Church except by their own choice, that a large portion of the Church endowments originated in private bequests of churchmen to the Church for distinctly religious purposes, and that the confiscation of this property or its diversion from the channels appointed by the donors would be gross injustice.

It is further claimed that the endowments of the Church of England are its heritage from the past, and that it is too late to open the question of how the Church was thus favored, but if that subject were discussed it would be found that the possessions of the Church are so sacred that any radical interference with them, even though authorized by legislation, would be a matter of might, not right—outrageous robbery, a moral wrong, and subversive in principle of all rights of property.

Lord Selborne, in his *Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment*, insists that the present Church in its essentials is not a creation of the State, but is the same Church as the pre-reformation English Church, and is entitled to hold perpetually all the property of the old Church.

Others assert that at the reformation the relation of the

Digitized by Google

Church to the State was lawfully determined by the State, and that the power, then and since assumed, to dispose of the property of the old Church for the benefit of the people of England has not lapsed, but still belongs to the State. If what was originally a *voluntary* gift of tithes by the people to the Church, was converted by kings into a *compulsory* bestowment of such tithes, those kings unjustly encumbered the land and assumed to give to the Church what was not theirs to bestow. Further; if the State has confiscated property, given by its rightful owners to monasteries, and if ultimate power over property, for the good of subjects and the realm, must rest with the State, it follows that while recent private bequests of individuals may properly remain the property of the Church, the burden of compulsory tithes or tithe rent-charge, which rulers had no right to impose upon land, in justice to the English people, should be removed.

It is said, in reply, that while the Church would be crippled by such a process, only a few land owners, who bought and have ever held their lands subject to the encumbrance of tithes (or tithe-rent charge), would be benefited. The English people would suffer by the impoverishment of the Church and her inability to relieve the poor and to maintain her generous charities; and practically, capitalists would be enriched at the expense of the majority of the people.

The State might, however, take the revenue from this tithe rent-charge away from the Church, or the money might be distributed *per capita* among different religious bodies. The latter course would be of doubtful advantage and would destroy the incentive to full voluntary support which many advocates of disestablishment regard as most wholesome. It follows that if disestablishment ever occurs it will probably be attended with the partial confiscation of the present endowments of the Church.

Enough has been indicated to show that the question of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of

Digitized by Google

England is a much more serious and complicated matter than appears at first thought. Protestants of the sixteenth century were divided among themselves into bitterly hostile factions over the question "what shall be done with the property of the old Church?" The disestablishment of the Church of England would inevitably renew those perplexities.

Disestablishment is not likely to take place without some supervision or use of the vast revenues of the Church by the State. Whether these revenues, as Lord Selborne claims, belong to the Church or, as others hold, the larger portion is the property of the nation, it is not at all probable that the State will hand over to a self-controlling body the vast revenues which have been so long subject to State control.

In this matter, as in others, the state is undoubtedly supreme; and it must not be forgotten that the state has already authorized important modifications in the disposition of ecclesiastical property. In 1868, after thirty years of agitation, compulsory Church rates were abolished by Act of Parliament.

It does not clearly appear that the inherent right of one half of the English people to tax land for the maintenance of clergy whom the other half of the people do not employ, can be equitably established or defended. If appeal be made to custom, "whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary," it may be replied that by the same custom, until 1868, dissenting land-owners were compelled to pay for the erection and repair of parish churches which they did not use, but by Act of Parliament that custom was abolished. Until it can be shown that the tithe rent-charge is something more than a *legal* right of the Church of England it appears that Parliament has both the power and the moral right to give equitable relief to those who may demand or deserve it.

Digitized by Google

The exercise of the power of the State over ecclesiastical property has been repeatedly illustrated, notably in the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland, in 1871, and in the disposition of her revenues. Many of the recommendations of the Ecclesiastical Commission, which have been confirmed by Parliamentary legislation, furnish significant illustrations of the discretionary power of the State in the use of Church property. The State has exercised the right to divert funds which could not be wisely used in specified local channels, to the support of needful work in other localities.

On account of the abundant precedents for the control of the property of the Church by the State, and in view of other considerations which have been named, it may be safely assumed that the severance of the Church from the State will not take place without the partial disendowment of the Church. The settlement of practicable and satisfactory details for such a change will be a most difficult and delicate work; yet there cannot be disestablishment without such an adjustment.

The established Church of Scotland may be soon disestablished. A large majority of the Welsh people undoubtedly desire the disestablishment of the Church of England in Wales. But just as certainly the English people do not seem to be prepared for the immediate disestablishment of the Church of England. Disestablishment of the Church in England may come. Some crisis or unforeseen development may precipitate that result. But for various reasons the prospect of the *speedy* disestablishment of the Church of England seems less favorable than it appeared twenty years ago.

The argument of the inefficiency of the Church and the waste of its resources is less forcible than formerly. The Church will be slow to part with the benefit of its endowments. The State will not readily yield its supervision of the revenues of the Church. Not least important is the

Digitized by Google

conservative conviction (not merely a sentimental feeling) that the divine right of kings and the present political system receive some slight support from an established Church, which support would be removed by the separation of Church and State.

BENJAMIN O. TRUE.

Rochester Theological Seminary.

Digitized by Google

V.

THEOLOGY AND SCIENCE.

THE mutual relation of theology and science has been a fruitful theme of discussion. In such discussion, however, attention is more commonly limited to their results, or matured teachings. Less considered, although of perhaps equal interest and importance, are the two questions as to their mutual relation in respect, *first*, to subject matter, and, *second*, to method. This article will treat briefly of the first of these questions, while the second will be reserved for a subsequent article.

The phrase "theology and science" must not be understood to imply that theology is not a science as truly as is astronomy or geology. We rather make the opposite assumption, and leave its vindication to appear incidentally as we proceed. We are to compare the science of theology with the other sciences, or with science in general, as to subject matter. For the sake of definiteness, by theology will be meant the system of Christian doctrine as to God and his relation to mankind. As expressed in life, it is Christianity. As expressed authoritatively for life in word, it is revelation, or the Bible. As formulated in symbols for convenience, it is Christian creeds.

In making our comparison, let us first notice in what way the different sciences are differentiated. Science in general comprehends many particular sciences. These are distinct, having each its own limits by which it is bounded off from all the others; its own distinguishing characteristic, which constitutes it that particular science which it is. Some of the sciences are indeed more intimately related to

Digitized by Google

each other and more closely connected together than others. These, by virtue of this affinity, unite together in groups, or larger wholes. Nevertheless, each member of a group is as truly distinct from every other member as it is from the member of any other group, even the most distant. It is a distinct science, and not the phase or part of another science. Thus the sciences of anthropology, psychology, logic, æsthetics, government and history belong together by virtue of the bond of personal human life that unites them. Each, however, preserves its individuality, and the lines of division are distinct and definite. The attempt to merge all together and treat them as one would be a confusion.

Here, however, it is important to observe that this division of the sciences and their separation one from another does not imply a separation of their subject matter, as though there were partition walls dividing into separate apartments the sum total of being and phenomena. Sciences sharply distinguished and widely separated from each other may, and often do, concern themselves with phenomena and substances entirely identical. As respects subject matter, they occupy the same sphere, are joint-owners of one and the same farm, which they work together. This holds of the sciences named above, and just as obviously of the natural and physical sciences. We thus reach the negative result that sciences are not exclusively, or even primarily, differentiated by differences of subject matter.

We must therefore discover in something else the principal ground of distinction. It will always be found that where different sciences make use of the same material, as is so often the case, each has its own distinct end with reference to which this material is used, and of which the investigation takes ultimate account. This end is the organizing centre. All the facts have respect to it, are seen and interpreted from it and for it. The same fact has many relations. The same group of facts looks to different points of the compass.

Digitized by Google

They are completely understood only when account is taken of all their bearings. Hence precisely the same matter will be investigated now with this and now with that ultimate and determining reference. That which in one science is principal may in another become subordinate, or may indeed be principal in that also; but wherever it appears, and whatever in any given case its relative importance, its significance is its reference to a specific end. These ends, as centres of organization, are not the arbitrary determinations of the human mind, centres simply for thought; they are found in the world's structure, in things, and are known because found. The kingdoms *of* nature are kingdoms *for* nature. We cannot say how many sciences there shall be, but learn what and how many there are.

Thus there is not a single phenomenon which botany owns by an exclusive right, and may therefore keep wholly to itself, saying to geology, geography, or paleontology, or even to ethics or religion, "Hands off!" Yet the use which botany makes of the common phenomenon is exclusively its own. While it cannot say of the thing or the fact, "This is mine, not thine," it not only can but must say this of that use, or ultimate reference of the thing or fact. Thus it is that each science has ownership in the whole universe and in the Author of the universe, while in turn it belongs to every other science.

All this may seem to be so obvious as not to need statement. It has, however, been apparently forgotten at times, and most when it should be best remembered; that is, when the question has been on the rights and relations of theology. This forgetfulness may be due to the fact already noticed, that the subject matter which is most prominent in one science may be the least prominent, if not wholly wanting, in another. Thus psychology takes first account of the soul as a self-conscious agent, whose phenomena are revealed to itself in its self-consciousness; but it has come more and

Digitized by Google

more to take account also of the body and its observed phenomena. On the other hand, physiology makes the body and its phenomena its first and chief object of inquiry, but cannot become even approximately complete until it also knows the soul. We have thus to recognize the fact that while any two sciences must be primarily distinguished by their respective ends, they may also be, in some degree, distinguished by subject matter. And so in our present discussion we have to take account at once of the distinctive aim and of the principal subject matter of theology as related to the other sciences.

The three great ideas which man possesses—which, indeed, possess man—are the soul, the world, and God; finite mind, matter, and the infinite mind. These ideas doubtless exist in all men, yet with very different degrees of clearness and development. With the ideas in their spontaneous and original form there ever exists an assurance of the existence of their respective objects. The idea and assurance together constitute in each case knowledge, primary and fundamental. Thus no one has a bare idea of himself as a self, prior to and without a knowledge of himself as existing. Idea and assurance are the two sides of an indivisible experience which as one whole is knowledge. Upon this immediate and original knowledge there may be exercised our reflective and analytical power, so that we distinguish its two elements and assert the *logical* priority of the idea. There may even ensue a speculative skepticism as to that of which we have original knowledge. All this holds also of our knowledge of the external world. Is there any significant reason to doubt that it also holds of our knowledge of God? The idea of him is as near, as intimate, as spontaneous and necessary as the idea of self. Does it arise in the mind solely as an idea for which an object must afterward be found? Must one take the idea simply as evidence of the existence of the object, and thus, by argument, find first its

Digitized by Google

object? Let him believe this who can. There will be many who will rather hold that God is known immediately, as are self and the world. These three forms of original knowledge constitute the immovable foundation on which are to be reared all the superstructures of knowledge, together constituting one superstructure on the one triple foundation.

True religion takes its rise from a knowledge of God and of his relations. This knowledge, both immediate and mediate, both spontaneous and reflective, is such as to awaken a certain kind and class of sensibilities, and to issue in a certain line of conduct. When sensibilities and conduct conform to knowledge the total product is true religion. As Christian truth is the object of this knowledge, the answering love and the completed life are Christian, and the true religion is Christianity. The point of ultimate and determining reference in theology, in the doctrine which underlies and determines the Christian life, must be the personal union of God and man. In Christianity the centre is Christ, for in his person the ideal union has been realized not only for himself, but, in a true sense, for all others. In him are we reconciled unto God and made partakers of the divine nature. Theology is the doctrine of Christ, of the kingdom of God as revealed and realized in and through Christ. At the centre is so-called "dogmatics," while about this cluster and in this unite, all the other divisions or branches of theological science.

If the question of distinctive aim has been rightly considered, it will be easy to recognize at once the more general and the more special subject matter of theology. As the union with God which constitutes the religious life is personal, it must be mutual, not solely from the one or from the other side. It also involves rational agency on the part of both God and man. God's doing is plainly the prior of man's, as his being is the prior of man's. His agency re-

Digitized by Google

specting and within us awakens our rational and hence free activity toward him. In the subject matter of theology, therefore, God must be the prior. He—his nature, his attributes, his personal dealings with mankind and with men—must be the object of first and chief study, and the knowledge thus gained will condition what can be known and must be taught as to man's relation to God, as to the religious life. If we cannot know him as a being, cannot know what he is or where he is, or whether he is, what he does, or whether he does or can do anything, then there can be no theology and no religion, and these two words should be banished from human speech.

Plainly this is not to say that he must be completely known. We know nothing, not even self, completely. Science does not wait for complete knowledge before coming to birth and even to maturity. Still less is it to say that he must be known as "the Infinite," "the Absolute," "the Unconditioned," "the Unrelated and Unrelatable," or "the All." What magic in these words, presenting to view "continents of mud"! By their manipulation a false metaphysic has often bewildered the false metaphysician and his disciples. Such a God as these terms have been made to designate cannot indeed be known, for no such God exists. What it concerns us to know is the God who holds relations to us and the relations which he holds. Union is relationship, is religion, is life, and theology is the system of doctrine which underlies this rational life of reciprocal agency. There is no call for a knowledge of empty abstractions, of infinity, absoluteness and unconditionateness. If these must be substituted for the living God, theology vanishes and atheism appears.

Theology, however, does not concern itself with relationship in general, with "the Relative" or "Relativity." What were this but to bring in another empty abstraction in place of those just driven out? Were we compelled to

Digitized by Google

choose between this new comer and the banished names we might prefer the others, for they have a certain unique dignity of dim suggestiveness. Theology asks for that particular relation that is realized in that personal union of God and the soul which constitutes Christian life. It has to do with his will and him as willing. It knows the will and Willer when it knows the contents of the will, as will of regard, purpose, command, execution; when it knows the thing willed, the principles expressed, the conduct required. And we get at this will as at everything else, through its manifestation. Whatever expresses it reveals God, and so is the proper subject matter of theology. By the rational handling of that experience, whatever it be—word, work, life, anything—comes primarily the science.

We have already said that the crowning manifestation of God and of his personal relation to mankind is given in Jesus Christ. "In him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." The four gospel records present him in the totality, the integrality, of his person, work and life. Intimately and inseparably connected with these is the whole of sacred history from Adam to the close of the apostolic period, along with the inspired exposition of the meaning of the history. With this must also be taken all Christian history to the present day. It were equally a fault to make the Christian consciousness and life the sole source, the primary source, or no source of Christian doctrine. It certainly cannot be the sole or primary source, for the life, and hence the consciousness, of a man becomes Christian by rational conformity to truth antecedently known. It must be one of the sources, for the Christian life embodies, and so reveals at once to consciousness and observation, its underlying principles. The life is a significant and impressive embodiment, and hence revelation of Christian doctrine. But humanity is one, and the religious phenomena of the whole human race bring their contributions to the true doc-

Digitized by Google

trine of God and his relation to man. Indeed, the whole universe witnesses not less truly to the nature of its Author than to its own nature and relations. To the theologian, therefore, is given as subject matter whatever is given either to or by all the other sciences. He must have the eye to see and the power to interpret the phenomena. But here not less than elsewhere seeing is not imagining, nor is interpreting speculating. If science, theological or other, is to be catholic in spirit and to tend toward completeness in realization, there must be in every inquirer and teacher the eye to see and the mind to appreciate, not that alone which is special to his own chosen science, but that also which is special to each of the others. To this common understanding and this comity of mutual recognition and co-operation should all come, even those who are as far apart as the theologian and the physicist. Anything else is short-sightedness, visual obliquity, or downright blindness.

G. D. B. PEPPER.

Colby University, Waterville, Me.

Digitized by Google

VI.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

A NEW ARTICLE OF FAITH.

Baptists are called upon to add a new article to their confession of faith. They have always professed hearty belief in the inspiration and infallible authority of the Scriptures as a rule of faith and practice; to this they are exhorted to add a profession of faith in the inspiration and infallibility of the Puritans in all matters pertaining to the public worship of God. The Puritans worshipped in houses severely plain; they sang only the Psalms of David, eschewing all "carnal" musical instruments; they rigidly excluded from public worship the use of the Lord's prayer, whether by minister or by congregation, the chanting of psalms and the antiphonal reading of the same, as mere papistry, savoring of the abominations of the scarlet woman rather than of the kingdom of God. If any Baptists like this sort of thing, it is of course the sort of thing they like, and there is no disputing about tastes. But some are not content with liking it and practicing it themselves; they must compel others to practice it too, even if the others do not like it. One has no quarrel with the man who regards corned beef and cabbage as the greatest delicacy of the table, preferring it to *paté de foie gras* or a *ragout au truffes*, so long as he is content to enjoy it by himself; but when he insists on cramming it down one's throat one rebels.

The humor of the thing is that those who insist on making their likes and dislikes the measure of others' liberty, accuse those who desire to give something of variety and warmth and color to public worship, of being "innovators," "ritualists," "apists," and the like. In this they make the not uncommon mistake of confounding vigor of invective with force of logic; but in addition they impute to others the precise fault of which they are themselves guilty. What innovation among Baptists can be so great as that now proposed: making the standard of fitness

Digitized by Google

for public worship the precedents of Puritan example, instead of the teaching of the New Testament? What is less genuinely Baptist practice than placing tradition before Scripture in a matter of this kind? What matters it that the Puritans did this or forbade that? The real question is, What do the Scriptures enjoin, forbid, or permit as to public worship? To ask any other question, to attempt to decide the question on any other basis, is unworthy of a Baptist. But the moment this question is asked these self-constituted censors of their brethren are condemned, for the New Testament is nearly silent on the question, and permits the largest liberty to the people of God. In the little that it does say it is at variance with the censors. Our Lord himself says, "After this manner, therefore, pray ye," but the censors say, "After this manner, therefore, pray ye *not*." "And when they had sung a hymn (*i. e.*, chanted a psalm) they went out;" but the censors say that chanting a psalm, or even reading it antiphonally, is "ritualism" of a most objectionable type. We may celebrate the birth of Washington, but not the birth of our Lord; we may observe the anniversary of our country's independence, but not the anniversary of our Lord's resurrection; we may decorate with flowers the graves of the nation's dead, but not the house of God; we may fill our houses with rugs from Daghestan, and pottery from Japan, and works of art and *bric-a-brac* from the four quarters of heaven, until they are ablaze with color and beauty, but we must worship God in barn-like structures, devoid of beauty, and in a service as funereal and austere as we can make it. Does anybody believe that we please God better by making his house and his worship repulsive than by making both cheerful and attractive?

Our censors answer this question themselves by showing in numerous details that they have not the courage of their prejudices. The "kist o' whistles," against which some of the Presbyterians still vehemently protest as an invention of the devil, has its place in their church edifices, and an organist is not infrequently tolerated who follows up the sermon with an adaptation of an operatic air or the latest popular melody. The severely orthodox Baptists at one time eschewed singing of any kind in the worship of God, and at the very most would admit no uninspired songs, but confined themselves closely to so-called metrical versions of the Psalms of David. Therefore, those who now pro-

Digitized by Google

test so strongly against innovation are themselves guilty of innovating. Moreover, in the Sunday-schools attached to the churches of these brethren, the Lord's prayer is recited with unblushing ritualism, and juvenile "apists" engage in the antiphonal reading of the Scriptures, and have even been known to sing the Gloria Patri. Now, if these things are done in the green tree, what must we expect from the dry? If our brethren suffer the young thus to be educated in the soul-perilling innovations of "ritualists" and "apists," will these young folk not certainly crave something of this kind in the church services when they grow up? And will not the craving ultimately lead to innovation after innovation, until the bald and bare service of the Puritans is transformed into something totally unrecognizable?

But the real humor of the situation lies in the fact that those who are so forward to condemn their brethren as ritualists, are themselves ritualists of the deepest dye. Ritualism is defined in all the dictionaries as the observance of prescribed forms in religion. The essence of ritualism is in the prescription, not in the nature of the forms; and a certain form of worship may be as truly prescribed by a custom having all the force of law as by a written law. There was no less rigidity of form in the worship established by the Puritans than in that of the Prayer-book that they so heartily hated. They merely substituted one set of forms for another; they adopted a different kind of ritual; but when they believed they had freed themselves from the bondage of ritualism they deluded themselves. To change masters is not to escape from slavery; to alter rules is not to throw off the restraints of law; and the bond of custom is often stronger than that of the statute-book. The man who protests against alteration of the ritual established by the Puritans and handed down by custom is himself under the bondage of formalism in worship no less than the extremest "ritualist" so-called. The spirit of the two is one; they merely differ about details. An unwritten ritual has no more power over an enlightened Baptist conscience than a written ritual. Such a conscience declines to be bound by traditions handed down from fathers who were as godly as any the world ever saw—and as fallible. It acknowledges obligation to the Scriptures alone, and where the Scriptures allow liberty it will not be bound by the customs of man. If there is any body of Christians that has the completest freedom in arranging the details of public wor-

Digitized by Google

ship, it is a Baptist church. The great hymns and confessions and songs of Christendom are not owned by any sect. We repudiate the notion that the Lord's Prayer, the Apostle's Creed, the Gloria Patri, the Gloria in Excelsis, and other forms through which devout emotion has found expression for ages, are the exclusive property of the Protestant Episcopal Church. As Baptists, we have a share in the heritage of the Christian centuries—a right that we recognize when we incorporate into our hymn-books for public worship the best hymns and tunes of all lands and all churches. Let us have the courage to take our own wherever we find it.

THE LAW OF MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

Several years ago one of the most brilliant writers among our American divines contributed an article to one of our periodicals on "Polygamy in New England," defining polygamy as the marrying of one wife during the lifetime of another. He said that the crime was a common one in all the New England States, even among members of Christian churches and people of high repute in the communities where they lived. He admitted that simultaneous polygamy, as it exists among the Mormons and Mohammedans, is not practiced in any nominally Christian community; but he did maintain that what he called "consecutive polygamy" was a very frequent offense. The difference between a Mormon elder and a New England deacon was simply one of chronology. The Mormon elder, if he chose, espoused all his wives at once, while the New England deacon espoused his one at a time. Or, as some facetious person put it, "the Mormon drives a team and the deacon drives tandem." In the forum of Christian morals, however, it is evident that the distinction between the two offenders is so slight as not to be worth mentioning. Both equally violate the Christian law of marriage.

The prevalence in so many States of our Union of very imperfect (and, in their practical working, demoralizing) laws concerning the all-important questions of marriage and divorce has caused much adverse comment and led to many demands for their reform. In not a few States marriage may be contracted without any formalities, either religious or civil. It is treated by the law like any other contract, as simply

Digitized by Google

made as an agreement to buy and sell a pound of sugar or a pair of shoes, requiring nothing more than the promise of two qualified persons to take each other as husband and wife. By depriving in this way the ceremony of marriage of all formality and solemnity, it is degraded in the eyes of the people to the level of an ordinary civil contract, and thus the notion is directly encouraged that, like other civil contracts, it may be dissolved at the pleasure of the contracting parties. If marriage were merely a civil contract, this conclusion would, of course, logically follow. That it is a civil contract and that the method of making it may properly be regulated by law all will admit; but Christians, at least, believe that it is something more: that it is an ordinance of God, and that he has prescribed its laws, which civil law indeed may reaffirm, but which civil law cannot repeal or modify. The civil contract theory of marriage has borne its legitimate fruit in the enactment, in many States, of laws permitting the annulment of the contract for various causes; many of them constituting, it must be confessed, serious grievances, but some of them trivial in their nature. It is, of course, a great hardship for a man or woman to be united for life to a confirmed drunkard, or one who treats his family cruelly or neglects properly to support them. The admission of this fact of hardship, however, does not constitute a valid reason for making such conduct a cause for dissolution of the marriage bond. In Christian marriage a man and woman contract in the presence of God and men to take each other for better or for worse until death do them part. If it turns out that one has taken the other very much for the worse, the misfortune is great—but misfortunes must be borne. The fact that such cases occur, and that frequently, is an argument not for a lower view of marriage and greater freedom of divorce, but for a higher view of marriage and for greater circumspection in assuming the responsibilities and risks of the married state. But this is not at the present time the popular view. The drift of opinion is that it ought to be made as easy as possible to form the marriage contract and likewise to dissolve it; and in many States the laws are so liberal in this respect that almost any who wish can be set free from their legal obligation. After prescribing such causes as desertion, cruelty, and incompatibility of temper, the statutes of certain States add words in substance like these: "or any other cause that in the opinion of the court may defeat the object of the mar-

Digitized by Google

riage relation." It would be more honest if the statute had been formed on the plan of the old rhyme, which gives reasons for drinking:

> "If on my theme I rightly think,
> There are five reasons why men drink:
> Good wine, a friend, because I'm dry,
> Or lest I should be by and by,
> Or any other reason why."

Before seeking for a remedy for the evils that are admitted to have grown out of these laws in many localities, it was fitting first of all that an accurate knowledge of the facts should be had. This is now for the first time made possible. Congress, in July, 1887, directed the Hon. Carroll D. Wright, then Commissioner of Labor, to make a thorough investigation into the questions of marriage and divorce in the United States. His report has been presented to Congress and will soon be printed in full, and in the meantime its main results have been made available to the public in a series of tables.

Mr. Wright's investigation has been industrious and reasonably complete—how complete may be judged from his statement that he has succeded in obtaining and tabulating returns from 96 per cent. of the counties in the United States. The records of each county court have been searched by deputies, and every case of divorce recorded appears in these tabulated results. So far as records of marriages exist, they also have been tabulated; but such records are by no means systematically kept, and the number of marriages has therefore been estimated with such help as the decennial reports give. Mr. Wright confesses, however, that his study of the subject is necessarily incomplete in one most important particular. What may be called the sociological data regarding divorce are, in the majority of cases, absolutely unobtainable. By that we mean such facts as the age and occupation of divorced people, their race, nationality and religion, whether the marriage was the first contracted by either party, and whether either party subsequently married again. The court records contain only partial information about matters of this kind, and, of course, it would be impracticable to follow up the cases in independent supplementary investigations. The Commissioner therefore found himself compelled to confine his researches to comparatively narrow limits, but within those limits his accuracy leaves nothing to be desired. According to his tables, the total number of divorces during the last twenty years, from

Digitized by Google

1867 to 1886, inclusive, was 328,716. The number in 1867 was 9,937, and in 1886 it had increased to 25,535. The largest aggregate in any State was in Illinois, 36,072; and next comes Ohio with 26,367; closely followed by Indiana with 25,193. The others above 10,000 are: Michigan, 18,433; Iowa, 16,564; Pennsylvania, 16,020; New York, 15,355; Missouri, 15,278; California, 12,118; Texas, 11,472; and Kentucky, 10,248. The totals are nothing less than frightful when one considers that in the entire German Empire, for example, only about 6,000 divorces were issued for all causes in 1886, and little more than 100,000 during the past twenty years, less than one-third of the number granted in this country. According to the best estimates that can be made, there is now one divorce for every 479 marriages in the United States.

In order to estimate the significance of the totals correctly, the percentages must be studied also. Here there are a succession of surprises. The States that have a bad name for the ease with which divorces may be procured have a relatively good record. Thus, in Connecticut there has been a decrease of divorces in proportion to population of 16 per cent. during the twenty years. Maine and Vermont among the New England States, and Delaware among the Middle States, show likewise a decreased proportion of divorce to population. Illinois, which has a very bad name and a large total of divorces, shows a proportionate increase of only 143 per cent., and Indiana shows only 51 per cent., which are very moderate figures as compared with other States. New York has a fair record, having an increase of but 30 per cent. The most rapid proportionate increase of divorces has been in the Territories, but this is largely to be explained on the ground that twenty years ago there were few courts in the Territories, and therefore few divorces. It is rather startling to read that in Dakota, for example, the increase has been 17,800 per cent., but the surprise is lessened when we turn to another table and find that the total number in 1867 was one, and in 1886 was but 179. This is evidently a case in which percentages are deceiving, and the same holds true of all the recently settled parts of the Union.

The test of percentages is more to be depended upon in the case of those States that have been longer settled, and whose population is both more stable and more homogeneous. The comparison of these

Digitized by Google

States discloses facts that will probably surprise many people. Common report has led the public to form the opinion that certain New England States, as Connecticut and New Hampshire, and some of the Western States, as Illinois, have had the largest number of divorces, but this is not true. The old newspaper joke that conductors on the railroads are accustomed to call, just before stopping at Chicago, "Twenty minutes for divorces!" has caused no little misapprehension as to the facts. It is not in the West, but in the South, that the percentage of divorces to population is greatest, and where the increase of percentage is most rapid. As we have already seen, some of the New England States show an actual decrease in the percentage of divorces during the last twenty years. And while in Michigan the increase has been 198 per cent., in North Carolina it has been 676 per cent. And while Minnesota is credited with 628 per cent. increase, Mississippi confesses to 928. The States showing an increase of 200 per cent. and over, excluding Territories, in addition to those already mentioned, are: Kanas, 975; Alabama, 748; Florida, 625; Louisiana, 496; Arkansas, 433; California, 405; New Jersey, 376; Missouri, 236; Oregon, 207; West Virginia, 201.

Of the total number of divorces granted, according to Mr. Wright's tables, 261,080 were granted for causes not recognized as valid by any Christian moralist. At least 20,000 of this number were granted for so-called "minor causes"—that is to say, on utterly frivolous grounds, like incompatibility of temper, amounting, in fact, to nothing but this: that the parties were tired of each other and desired to be separated.

Now that we know the facts, in something like their true proportions, the question of remedy demands consideration. There is no cure for a moral disease but a moral cure; and the first and main reliance must be on the enlightenment and education of conscience through the Christian pulpit and the Christian press. We have been too squeamish about speaking bold and plain words of rebuke of these breaches of the Seventh Commandment. A different policy must prevail, and we must not hesitate to declare and enforce the Christian law of marriage, and to treat its violation as a fitting cause of discipline in our churches. We have to day in the Baptist ministry men living in relations that our Lord himself has stigmatized as adulterous; and how

Digitized by Google

can such men proclaim the whole counsel of God in this matter? We must be more honest and more consistent if our testimony is to have weight in the world, when it is borne in favor of righteousness and purity.

Something can be done by law also. Inasmuch as it is the fitting province of civil law to regulate the civil side of marriage and divorce, we can certainly strive to have the civil law correspond with the divine law. In many States the correspondence is close; in some States there is no correspondence whatever, but violent conflict. Here is a sphere in which Christian citizens can use their influence to good advantage. How much may be hoped for from the agitation in favor of a uniform law of marriage and divorce for the whole country is much less certain. An amendment to the Federal Constitution would be necessary as a first step, and such an amendment it would be very difficult to secure. Only the pressure of a great public necessity is likely, in the future, to overcome the immense force of political inertia that opposes its passive resistance to every proposition to amend the organic law. Many amendments have duly passed both houses of Congress, as provided in such cases, and have never been seriously considered by the government of a single State. They are not defeated—they are simply ignored. However desirable a general law may be conceded to be, the prospect of obtaining one cannot be regarded at present as flattering. It is well to agitate the question, but without cherishing any false hopes of what is likely to come of the effort. For the stopping of this great evil, as for the staying of the twin evil of intemperance, reliance must be placed in the future as in the past, on the united efforts of good men to foster a purer morality through the preaching of the Gospel, and such helpful legislation as public sentiment will enact and support in the several States.

A CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM.

The precept, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," might suggest to some man of tender conscience the idea that of the money which he had accumulated, say one hundred dollars, he should give half to an acquaintance who was destitute. Having done this he might find another needy person and divide with him the remaining portion, and

Digitized by Google

after a few more such divisions he would have nothing. Meanwhile the recipients of his bounty having come by their money so easily would spend it with like ease, and in a little time all would be truly on an equality—the equality of destitution. If however, rejoicing in the possession of his own hundred dollars, and grieving that all are not as well off, he takes up the case of his destitute neighbors by instructing them in the virtues of industry and foresight, and by teaching them the methods of thrift, he may so incite and guide them that they also shall gain each a hundred dollars, and thus all will be brought to a better equality—the equality of a general competence.

Be it observed, again, that equality of possessions does not secure equality of well-being. If all the private libraries in the community were divided up so that each man were as well off as his neighbor in the possession of metaphysical treatises and editions of the Greek poets, there would be great numbers of our fellow citizens who would find scant pleasure in their dividends. And if all the money were equally divided, the man who knew not what to do with a hundred dollars except to go on a most riotous debauch would still be worse off than his more sensible neighbor. All families are not equally happy which have equal bank accounts. Well being is a matter not merely of external possessions, but still more of personal characteristics. In order that all men may be equally happy, they must be equal in wisdom and other personal qualities.

If a wealthy father wishes his son to be as well off as himself it is not necessary that he leave the boy a fortune; indeed, the possession of an equal amount of property might not make the son as well situated as this father. It will be sufficient and indeed better if he train the boy so that the latter can make a fortune for himself and be independent of a patrimony. Instead of dividing your fish with an unlucky companion, it is better to show him how to cast his line so that he himself shall make a catch equal to the largest. The man who loves his neighbor as himself does not necessarily make that neighbor a gift of property—he simply determines to secure for that one an equal equipment with himself, an equally open way to prosperity, an equal opportunity to accummulate wealth and find happiness.

One man may be better off than another because he was born healthier. Here is a baby which springing from a virtuous, vigorous

Digitized by Google

stock, takes its sustenance heartily, and sleeps soundly, and is the very picture of solid comfort. Here is another little creature which comes of a vicious pedigree. The sour grapes eaten by many generations are rasping its toothless gums, while in its little brain is throbbing the next morning headache of a thousand ancestral debauches. Its tender joints are racked with the tortures of the excesses of long lines of dissipated progenitors, and through its veins is coursing the poison of the licentiousness of a succession of ungodly forefathers. Now what equality can there be when two persons start in life thus diversely conditioned? When one boy is trained in a home of virtue, schooled to industry and all other good traits while another is reared in a haunt of vice, or by unwise parents is allowed to mature in uncurbed wilfulness, how can it be expected that they will succeed equally well in life's struggles? When one man is healthy while another has inherited disease, when one is industrious while another is indolent, one temperate while another is a drunkard, one energetic and sagacious, while another is inert and dull-witted, is it strange that one outstrips the other in life's race?

The prevailing socialism is materialistic, it fails to take sufficient account of moral forces. It aims solely at equality of outward possessions, failing to see that well-being is for the greater part a matter of inward character. It attributes the evils of society to wrong external circumstances while Christianity attributes them to wrong internal states. For the beggar at the temple gate the socialist would have prescribed better clothes and better food, but the apostle prescribed better ankles. Socialism declares that men's surroundings must be changed, but Christianity declares that they themselves must be changed, born again, reconstructed from the foundation. When the time shall come that each man's personal characteristics are as good as those of the strongest, there will result a uniformity of condition and that on the highest plane. The prevailing socialism seeks equality by leveling down; a true Christian socialism will aim at equality by leveling up.

Christianity teaches the solemn duty of care for the bodily health, and if all persons observed its precepts regarding temperance, purity and the like, all posterity would inherit sound bodies, and one child would be born equal to another. Christianity teaches the proper training of children, and when parents are unable to give proper culture to their little ones, it would supply the lack by schools and other institutions

Digitized by Google

so that one child shall be trained as well as another. Christianity teaches that each grown person shall be as industrious and prudent and thoughtful as the best. When each man is made in personal characteristics the full equal of any and all, there will be the most desirable equality in all that constitutes true wealth, *i. e.*, weal or well-being. If some one suggests that it must be a long work to raise up the multitudes of the ignorant and the weak to be equal to "the fittest," we answer that evils which have existed for thousands of years may be expected to require generations for their remedy. But in the direction indicated lies the only way of the rectification of conditions, and if we cannot in our day do the whole work, we may contribute something towards the establishment of that glorious kingdom of Christ.

TWO GREAT TEACHERS.

In the year 1853 there came to Rochester two men, neither of them yet forty, Dr. Anderson to be the head of the college, and Dr. Robinson to take the prominent chair of instruction in the theological school. Though differing widely in their characters and methods, they had many traits in common. Both were tall men, physically as well as intellectually. "There were giants in those days." Thirty-six years have passed, and almost together the two have resigned the high offices which they have been holding. These coincidences of dates enable us to speak of them in the same article.

Dr. Anderson's term of service as college President was of unusual length, and in it he exerted unusual power. But the great teacher, like the great orator, cannot be described. The flash of the eye, the tremor of the voice, the impressiveness of the gesture, it is impossible to picture in words. The force exerted is personal, and those who have not seen the great leader in person cannot be made to understand it. Only those who sat in Dr. Anderson's lecture-room know what his power was, and from their minds the recollection of his manner never can pass away.

His teaching was an active force. Many a professor is like a book on the library shelf—filled with learning, but inert and useless, save to the somewhat exceptional student who knows how to go to work and quarry out some of that great deposit of information. But Dr. Ander-

Digitized by Google

son was a living man. He met the pupil more than half way; he aroused the intellect of the most sluggish, and put life into the dullest brain. He could change his presentation of truth to meet the case of each inquirer, and it was practically impossible for a young man to come into his classes and not receive an intellectual impulse.

His instructions were practical in their nature. There is too much truth in the old picture of the absent-minded college professor who, shut up in his books, is living in an entirely different world from that of ordinary men. Such a one is but poorly fitted to advise and direct a young man as to the course he shall select for his active practical career. But Dr. Anderson, with his many-sidedness, in his wide sympathy with all walks and pursuits, could look at the future from all points, could understand the demands of each profession and business, and, like a father of wide information and experience, could give the weightiest suggestions as to the course to be taken. As an illustration of this many-sidedness of his character, we might repeat the story told of him, that once when he had been riding all dayon the stage-box with the driver, and had been discussing with this experienced functionary pretty much every topic that could furnish matter for conversation, the latter at last turned and said: "Well, now, will you tell me what business you follow? I can always tell a lawyer, or a preacher, or a storekeeper, or a schoolmaster, but what are you?" It was because his passenger was not shut up to any one range of thought that the shrewd countryman, who had especial opportunities to study men of all professions, was completely baffled when he tried to locate this man's particular "shop." It has been said that he speaks the best English who does not betray what part of the country he comes from. It might also be said that the finest specimen of manhood is the one whose mind is limited to no single range of human sympathy and interest.

While the subject matter of the greater part of Dr. Anderson's teaching was secular, his instructions were pervaded by the religious spirit. He pointed out in material nature the presence of the creative intellect, and in his study of the human mind he set forth the workings of the spiritual nature. Many a young man obtained his impulse towards a religious life from some utterance of Dr. Anderson on a matter of purely secular science. His teaching was of a kind to make young men conscientious in doing their work in the world. No student who

Digitized by Google

was present will forget the talk he gave one day after a great disaster on the ocean, in which the loss of life had been greater because of the inability of the captain to control his men. The point of the talk was the solemn duty of every man to fit himself thoroughly for the position to which he aspires. It was such counsels as these which gave impressive seriousness to his every-day instruction.

He has published next to nothing, and his name will not be presented to the next generation by the backs of volumes on the shelf. But his influence, though unperceived, will still remain, as the flowers of the Spring of the present year are beautiful from the power of the sunlight in centuries long gone. He will still live in the lives of his students.

Dr. Robinson also has been a college President for sixteen years, and though the position he has held has brought him into direct comparison with some of the ablest men in American college history, his administration has been so greatly successful as to evoke the highest laudations of the friends of Rhode Island's famous university. But by many of us he is more especially remembered as a theological professor, and it is as such that we shall speak of him here.

His power to stimulate the intellects of students was unequalled. The principal work in his lecture-room was not to force young men to accept certain ideas, but to arouse them to have ideas of their own. Often when he came into his room it was with the plainest signs of fatigue from travel or protracted labor. After the brief prayer in a faint voice came the usual inquiry whether there was any question on the preceding lecture. Some student would ask for further light, perhaps hinting somewhat sharp dissent from the view presented, and instantly the tall form was erect as at the sound of a bugle challenging to battle, the signs of fatigue were gone, and there commenced a keen discussion, whose intense and exciting interest might last through the whole hour. Sometimes two or three days would pass without any advance to new topics, the time being wholly given to discussion on a contested point, and when the students retired from the lecture-room it was with minds thoroughly wearied but wonderfully strengthened by the contests of that intellectual arena. In his power to call out the best efforts of students, Dr. Robinson has probably never been equalled.

It was not his particular opinion on this or that doctrine, but his

Digitized by Google

method of forming opinions, which impressed itself on the minds of young men. Many of his former pupils are now themselves professors of theology or eminent pastors; they are now perhaps older in years than he was when they were in his classes, and they will of course hold some opinions independent of the views of their former instructor. But it would be safe to say that there is not one of them who, in his methods of investigation, in the spirit in which he takes up a topic, is not still swayed by the method of inquiry which he saw continually before him in that lecture-room. The particular teaching which they heard they may not have retained, but the mental stimulus they received, the intellectual shove to which they were subjected, they will feel for life.

Two things were very marked in Dr. Robinson's instructions. First, his reverence for truth. How often in that low-voiced, almost mumbled, prayer which preceded the lecture came the solemn petition: "Make us to love truth; to love it better than creed, better than life." And a second thing came to the student's mind; namely, that Dr. Robinson believed that Christianity was the truth. There never was any suppression of inquiry. He seemed to believe that Christianity would stand investigation, that it did not ask that anything should be covered up. Again and again was the following scene enacted: A student had studied out something which seemed to him entirely to overthrow some ancient doctrine; the next day in class he proceeds to state his point; as he does it rather bunglingly, the doctor interrupts him with, "You mean so and so," and the student assents, his confidence being at the outset well shattered at finding that not only has this wonderful idea of his occurred to others before him, but that the doctor can state it much more strongly than he can himself. If in the discussion which ensues the student's difficulty is not entirely cleared away, the doctor finally says: "Well, think it over. You will come out all right." In other words, the student sees that his instructor believes that honest investigation will never undermine Christianity. How often has a troubled young man been met by a "Hush-sh-sh! You must not ask such questions," and he has been prompted to infer that there is something to be covered up, and has surmised, probably correctly, that his teacher was adhering to Christianity, not from intelligent conviction, but only from traditional influences. But Dr. Robinson's willingness that each one should make the most thorough search

Digitized by Google

for himself, and his evident confidence that the inquirer would come out a more thorough believer than ever, made the student feel that the old views must be correct. Dr. Robinson had that grandest orthodoxy, the persuasion that Christianity can stand examination; and this confidence, and his welcome to honest investigation, strengthened a student's belief as no mere *ipse dixit* could have done. No man has exerted the power on the American Baptist ministry that Dr. Robinson did during his score of years' service as a theological instructor. He was an inspiring force on every one of the many students who passed under his teachings, and his power has been felt far and wide.

And many a student found, sometimes merely by accident, that he was a man of tenderness of heart. That brusque manner was only a thin shell which a light tap would break, and one who penetrated that exterior will never forget the kindly glance of the eye, the warm grasp of the hand, the sympathizing word, which sprang from the noble tenderness of the soul within.

The student who passed under the instructions of Dr. Anderson and Dr. Robinson had educational advantages such as the world rarely offers. They were two mighty men, and their services will not often be paralleled.

Digitized by Google

VII.

HOMILETIC DEPARTMENT.

CHRIST CRUCIFIED.

"*I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and Him Crucified.*" I Cor. II: 2.

It is a thoughtful and suggestive saying of the distinguished Pascal, whose *Thoughts on Religion* has invested his name with immortal glory, that there are three different orbits in which great men move and shine, the orbit of heroism, of intellectuality, and of personal moral worth. It is in this last orbit—to use the figure of our Christian philosopher—that the author of our text, the Apostle Paul, seems to move and shine in conspicuous splendor. Though a magnificent hero, whom the world strove in vain to bend or conquer, revealing elements of will and courage, such as have been exhibited by few whose deeds of daring are told in classic story or on the more sober pages of prosaic history; though a superb intellectual potentate, whose thoughts and words, from the day of his speech on Mars' hill, even to the present hour, have stirred mankind as the teachings of Greek or Roman philosophers have had no power to do; neither heroism, in the popular acceptation of that word, nor mere intellectuality is the distinguishing mark of Paul's character and life, after the one has become renewed and the other remodelled by the Holy Spirit. His is a loftier differentiating characteristic. Self-renunciation, self-sacrifice, self-immolation even —and this illustrated, not as in Marcus Curtius at the Roman Forum, nor in Arnold Winkelried in the presence of a serried line of antagonistic spearmen, but as in the self-denying Lord of Glory—self-renunciation and self-immolation for God's highest glory and man's highest good. It is this man, who, surpassing Wilberforce or Howard in the depth and extent and beneficence of his philanthropy, could look out upon his nation and exclaim, "I could wish myself accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh," and then look up to heaven and with ecstasy declare, "I count all things loss for the excellency of the knowledge of God which is in Christ Jesus my Lord." It is this man, who, addressing the Corinthian Church clamoring for an exhibition, on his part, of worldly wisdom, cries out with force and fearlessness, "I determined to know nothing among you, save Jesus

Digitized by Google

Christ and him crucified." Difficult indeed would it be to find a more beautiful, a more attractive illustration of pure, absolute self-forgetfulness and moral worth, linked with a consuming devotion to Jesus and His redemptive cross, than is furnished in this weighty expression of deep conviction and intense religious fervor.

Analyzing this text as expressive of Paul's great purpose and motive-power in life, we are deeply impressed with certain marked features. Let us look at three of them:

I. In the first place, it is a single purpose, an all-absorbing determination which here thrills and moves our devoted Apostle. "Not to know anything *save* Jesus Christ and him crucified." It is said of Wordsworth that, when engaged in writing his *Excursion*, "one thing covered the whole range of his thought." More may be said of Paul: one thing covered the whole range of his being—thoughts, words, acts. The great ennobling truth of the Cross filled his very consciousness, stirred the depths of his inmost soul, constrained him, drove him to the proclamation ever of that grandest and most marvellous fact in all divine and human history: God in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself. And how? Not through a strange, mysterious incarnation, though Christ was "God manifest in the flesh;" nor through the illumination of matchless doctrine, though of Christ it was said, "Never man spake like this man;" nor through the glory of spotless character, though Christ "knew no sin, neither was guilt found in his mouth," nor even through the majesty of miraculous deeds, though Christ cured the sick and raised the dead; but, God in Christ effecting this reconciliation through the blood of a transcendent, an all-sufficient, an unrepeatable atonement for human redemption—the atonement wrought by Christ crucified. This was Paul's constant theme, his mighty inspiration. The Apostle John is full of love, the Apostle James, of good works, the Apostle Peter, of faith, the Apostle Paul of Him for whom should be all human faith and hope and love and energy. "Two things", once exclaimed Goethe, "awaken within me sublimity: the starry heavens and man's moral nature." "Two things," Paul might have declared, "awaken within me enthusiasm: the cross of Christ and man's moral nature redeemed and elevated by its divine influence and power."

II. In the second place, it is a bold, heroic purpose which the text expresses. Sometimes, when in search of examples of heroism, we bring before our minds such scenes as those presented by Chrysostom before Eudoxia or Athanasius before Constantine in the streets of Constantinople, or Ambrose before Theodosius in the porch of Milan, or Luther at Worms, or Kossuth in the presence of the Sultan; but to my mind, human annals reveal to us few grander pictures of boldness of of purpose, stability of character, moral heroism than the one in the

Digitized by Google

text: such a man as Paul at such a time as this, uttering such words as these—a man, almost friendless and alone; behind him Athens and its scepticism, and Philippi and its prison and scourgings; before him martyrdom for the sake of truth; about him a city where human wisdom is exalted, the cross despised and its victim hated; and yet, bold as a lion, his face turns still towards Calvary and his voice lifts up the cry, "I am determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." Grandly does he actualize, in his superb attitude, the poet's fine conception:

> As some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
> Swells from the vale and midway leaves the storm,
> Though round its head the rolling clouds are spread,
> Eternal sunshine settles on its head.

III. In the third place, not only is the purpose declared in the text single, all absorbing and heroic; it is also rational, well grounded and divinely-inspired. Our apostle was always intelligent in his utterances. His emotions never ran away with his judgment; his knowledge and zeal kept equal pace. His naturally fine powers were quickened by grace in all their parts. His intellect was too vast to be cramped in any narrow view of truth, any restricted range of sentiment, any circumscribed conception of Christianity. And when, in the text, he speaks as he does, he uses no language of fanaticism or ignorance, but speaks the words of soberness and truth, of intelligence and wisdom. The crucified Christ is the central, fundamental, energizing truth of the Christian system; not Christ the perfect man or the elevating teacher, or the immaculate example, or the devoted philanthropist, but Christ "mighty to save" through the unlimited power of His redeeming blood. Christianity's centre is the cross. From this scene of shame and glory, anguish and victory, all the radii of the gospel go out in lines of living light. Redemption is the grand principle into which all our religion—doctrinal, experimental and practical—may be generalized. As Spurgeon forcefully puts it: the heart of the Gospel is redemption and the essence of redemption is the substitutionary sacrifice of Jesus Christ. In the cross men may behold the concentration of eternal thought, the focus of infinite purpose, the centre of divine and illimitable wisdom.

Three facts will make clear the intelligence of Paul's position in the text:

(1). Jesus Christ and Him crucified is pre-eminently and gloriously a Bible theme. Note, I do not say, a New Testament, but Bible theme. The whole Word of God finds its central doctrine and reaches its most glorious culmination in the person and work of an atoning Saviour. It is a noted saying of the great French preacher, Masillon, that all the

Digitized by Google

lines of past human history converge in Jesus, and all the lines of history to come diverge from him. With equal truth may we say, that all the revelation of God gathers in and radiates from the Crucified One. All the older revelation points to him; all the new revelation proceeds from him. The lines of God's eternal truth cross and recross in him. Here emphatically

> The Old Testament is the New Testament concealed,
> The New Testament is the Old Testament revealed.

(2). Jesus Christ and him crucified presents the most authoritative and most consoling revelation of God—the only perfect mirror of the moral and affectionate nature of the Eternal Father. Men in going out after images or revelation of God have been disappointed in every direction, except in Jesus, the Son; disappointed as they sought him in nature—this great, gorgeous material universe of sun and star and planet; disappointed in providence, the daily movements of individual and national history, with its strange mixture of joy and sorrow, prosperity and adversity; disappointed even in Old Testament teaching—that earlier revelation of God through patriarch, psalmist and prophet, with their yearning soul, their anticipatory song and their future hope. No one of these media presents God in that fulness and glory of his moral attributes which invite the tired human heart to lean on him as a Father. In each of these God is Jehovah, far-off, inaccessible, awful. Christ is God's answer to humanity's universal longing, and Christ on the cross the fullest revelation of the boundless love and sympathy of the divine heart.

(3). Jesus Christ and him crucified is the only propitiation for human sin and the divinely-wrought magnet to draw human hearts to God. From the earliest day of man's existence on earth, the supreme question of his immortal being has been the vexed problem that puzzled even the "perfect and upright" patriarch of Uz: "How shall man be just with God?" And it is not within the province of science or philosophy or ethics to answer this question. None of these can bind together the sinless and the sinful, the infinite and the finite, the Creator and the creature. Nor can natural religion, Buddhism, Brahminism, Confucianism—the cry of each of these systems is but the echo of Lady Macbeth's exclamation of anguish:

> "Will all great Neptune's ocean wash the blood
> Clean from my hand?"

Now, before the bowed head and bleeding heart of impatient humanity, steps forth Christianity with its crucified Christ, and declares, as it points to the world's Redeemer, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law." "He tasted death for every man." "He is the pro-

Digitized by Google

pitiation for the sin of the whole world." "His own self bore our sin in his body on the tree." In Christ and him alone finds man a personal revelation and a satisfactory demonstration of an atoning sacrifice for sin. To use Krummacher's beautiful figure, the cross is the condition which carries off the destroying flash from our race by Christ attracting it to himself.

TWO PRACTICAL LESSONS.

1. Jesus Christ and him crucified should be the central theme of the Christian ministry. Not ethics, nor moral philosophy, not geology, nor history, nor political economy, but Christ on Calvary's summit, the centre of humanity's brightest hopes, noblest aspirations, divinest life.

2. Jesus Christ and him crucified should be the grandest inspiration in all church and missionary enterprise. "Wherever," writes the gifted author of "Christianity's Challenge," "wherever Christ crucified has been expunged from the creed and the life of a church, there has been no aggressive force, no regenerative influence, no transforming power." Eradicate the cross, and faith fails, hope dies, love grows cold and the Christian profession becomes as a clanging cymbal: emphasize the cross and all Christian graces develop in beauty and strength, and all Christian labor, at home and abroad, becomes gladly and successfully dedicated to him who is both Sovereign and Saviour.

Grand Rapids, Mich. KERR B. TUPPER.

THE CHURCH THE COMPLEMENT OF CHRIST.

Ephesians 1:23.

The church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all.

The Church is an unique institution. The State has its political parties; society has its clubs and clans; philosophy has its sects and schools: but it is only beneath the ægis of the cross that the church is found. It is built *on* Christ, *by* Christ and *for* Christ. In the text it is presented as the complement of Christ, or as that through which he is made complete, or full. By this is not meant that it is the complement of his person or of his character, but of his official work and purpose as the world's Redeemer. And by church is not meant any particular denomination of Christians, but all of every name and of no name, who constitute the visible body of our invisible Lord.

I. And first, let us search the proofs of this statement.

1. Take the text as a starting point. The language is figurative. The symbol is that of an organism, of which Christ is the head and his people are the body. But the body is as essential as the head to the completeness of the organism. So a Christ without a church would be as anomalous as a head without its body.

Digitized by Google

2. This same truth is embodied in the figure of the vine and its branches, which is used by our Lord to symbolize the relationship that exists between him and those who abide in him. The branches are a part of the vine. Entirely remove them and the wholeness of the vine is destroyed. And then, it is through the branches that the vine attains its end—fruit bearing. Similiarly the church is the complement of Christ and through it the fruits of his redeeming work are realized.

3. This truth is also expressed through the marriage relation. Scripturally regarded, marriage is not the lordship of man, nor the subjection of woman, but the union of two persons into one life through the mystic, mighty power of love. "The twain shall become one flesh." Each is designed to be the complement of the other. Thus is it with Christ and his people. He is the bridegroom and the church is his bride.

4. This same truth is expressed through an architectural symbol. The church is compared to a building, of which Christ is the foundation. The superstructure is the completion of the foundation.

5. If additional illustration and proof of this thought is demanded, then look at the nature and scope of that union which exists between Christ and his people, as it is revealed by our Lord in his last discourse recorded in the last chapters of the Gospel according to John. Let us now advance a step and inquire.

II. In what particulars the church is the complement of Christ?

1. It is the complement of his incarnation. The entrance of the Son of God into our nature, our condition and experience, was vastly more than a historic fact. It had other ends than to make his atoning work possible. It was a revelation to men of the godhead, bodily. The world needed such a revelation in flesh and blood. The world needs it to-day. They need to see the moral beauty of the divine character and to feel the beneficence of divine love and power in human form. That want is supplied through the church in whom Christ dwells and through whom he works and reveals his saving strength. This is the first fundamental duty of Christians, to bring God to men that they may bring men to God; and in doing this, they are completing the great fact of Christ's incarnation.

2. The church completes the sufferings of Christ. Not his sufferings for sin, "For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified," but the suffering requisite for the salvation of the world. On the cross he enthroned the law of vicarious sacrifice. In obedience to that law his people are to fulfill the great commission. That which they endure for his sake is represented as his sufferings. He forewarned his ambitious disciples, that they should indeed drink of *his* cup, and be baptized with his baptism. Paul declared that the sufferings of Christ abounded in him and his fellow apostles; he sought to

Digitized by Google

fill up the lacking measure of the sufferings of Christ and to know the fellowship of his sufferings. Peter exhorted the persecuted saints to whom he wrote, to rejoice inasmuch as they were made partakers—*sharers*—of Christ's sufferings. His people are so vitally linked with him, that their sufferings for his sake are part and parcel of that great total of sacrifice through which he is to subject all things to himself.

In like manner, if the limits of this discourse permitted, it could be shown that the church complements the intercessions of Christ, by standing as the priests of the world while he is the high priest of his people—of the work of Christ by carrying out into final completion the work which he began, and of the glory of Christ, which shone forth in his incarnation and which will attain to its zenith only when the top-most stone shall be brought forth with shoutings, "Grace, grace unto it."

If such is the relation of the church to Christ let us be cautious how we treat that church. If she is our Lord's bride we cannot ill-treat with impunity. The day is coming when she shall be arrayed in her bridal garments and thrice blessed will those be who shall hear the words, "Come and see the Lamb's wife."

AN EXEGESIS OF THE JOHNS. 3: 5, 5.

"*Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.*"—John, 3: 3, 5.

There are two parts of this statement of our Lord upon which religious thought has been divided: The water, and the kingdom. Without meddling with the opinions of others we shall attempt to show what seems to be the comparative significance of Scripture teaching upon these two terms. And it seems necessary first to understand what is meant by the phrase: kingdom of God, or kingdom of heaven. That it is not a visible organic body, either political or ecclesiastical, is clearly seen from the following expressions found elsewhere in the Scriptures: "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." "The kingdom of heaven is within you." "The kingdom of heaven cometh not with observation." "Go thou and preach the kingdom of God." "The kingdom of God is not in eating and drinking; but righteousness and peace, joy in the holy Spirit." From these statements, as well as the many comparisons our Saviour made of the kingdom of heaven in his parabolical discourses, it is evident that the phrase "kingdom of God" means nothing more than the spiritual working of the principles and privileges of the gospel dispensation, in distinction from the former dispensation of the law. The one was a ministration of death, and the other a ministration of life. It is, therefore, the dispensation, or kingdom of grace; the long-promised reign of heaven upon earth, which

Digitized by Google

was to bring men into relation with the unseen, intangible realm of the Spirit; in which Christ reigns supreme in all things pertaining to salvation. Not that the kingdom of heaven was to have its throne and court here upon the earth, for those are fixed forever in heaven. But it is the working of the Spirit's administration of life, love and joy. Thus it is a kingdom of heavenly nature, laws, and privileges, that men can neither see nor enter into without a change of heart—a new nature —a birth from above. And being in the kingdom has the same meaning as being in Christ. Believers are said to be in Christ, and Christ is said to be in them. So they are in the kingdom, and the kingdom is in them. And to be in the kingdom here, is to be an heir of the kingdom, or Father-home above, to which Christ has promised to take his people. There is a difference between the kingdom and the church. They are not one and the same as many suppose. For as we have seen, the kingdom signifies God's gracious administration of Gospel blessings, and as such it is set up in men's hearts without observation, and rules in their wills and dispositions to obey Christ as their Saviour and Sovereign. But the church is Christ's body, of which he is the head, and in which, by his Spirit, he is incarnated and lives on the earth: and it is composed of all who are in the kingdom. But its outward visible organization is made up of those who profess his name and have been baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; and are thus united together to maintain the worship doctrines and ordinances of the Gospel. Therefore the Church is the executive body of Christ divinely constituted to advance the interests of his kingdom in the world. But Christ is head and king in the Church, and kingdom; so that the Church has no legislative rights, but are the Lord's administrators to confer Gospel blessings on their fellow race. Therefore they are to go out and preach the kingdom of God. But they cannot preach the Church; for the Church is not authoritative, but subjective, and in many respects different from the kingdom, although much of what belongs to the one, enters into the other and gives it life and character. This kingdom of gracious rule was foreseen by kings and prophets and righteous men under many aspects in olden times, and was symbolized to Nebuchadnezzar in his dream of the great image and the little stone, cut out of the mountain, without hands, which filled the whole land: a kingdom which the God of Heaven was to set up, that never was to be destroyed, nor left to another people, but was to stand forever; and it was also seen by Daniel in his vision of the four beasts and the ancient of days—a kingdom that the saints of the most high were to possess, and was to have dominion and rule in all the earth under the whole heaven; and all peoples were to serve and obey their king. Observe, this kingdom was to be set up in the day of these kings; that is, it was in part to be contemporaneous with their

Digitized by Google

reign, and by its righteous principles overthrow their cruel policy. But there is no intimation that it was in any wise to be a supplanter, or a successor of any of their dynasties. This is the kingdom of heaven that both John the Baptist and Jesus preached as then at hand, for men to enter into and become the subjects of, by repentance and faith—the development of regeneration. And I believe this is the only kingdom of heaven that can ever be known upon earth; for his kingdom is not of this world, because it is of heaven. And in his parables our Lord likened it in its operations in the human soul and in society to almost everything except a kingdom. He used the phrase kingdom of God because it was the one the Jews used to express their idea of the Messiah's temporal reign upon the earth; and to teach them that it was not to be an earthly temporal kingdom he came to establish, but a heavenly and spiritual one in its nature, working and results.

Now let us see what the term water in the text means, in the sense in which our Lord uses it—this momentous declaration. Having seen that kingdom of God is purely a spiritual power operating within and among men in this world, it is therefore obvious that nothing effecting the body, such as literal water, can have anything to do with renewing the soul. And the only factors the Scriptures mention in producing this wonderful change are the Word and Spirit of God. And as Jesus had been preaching repentance as a requisite to entering the kingdom then at hand, it is evident that moral development and spiritual death must be removed by spiritual purification and quickening. And this can only be accomplished by a belief in the Word of God and the operations of his holy Spirit. For the Apostle Paul tells us that God purifies men's hearts by faith in his Word, and he also tells us that faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God; and that that Word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thine heart—that is the word of faith which we preach. God's words are his thoughts, expressed in time that we may get them into our hearts and purify our souls. And when the efficacy of the Word is described as cleansing or purifying the soul, or quenching its thirst, it is frequently expressed by the term water, both in the Old Testament and the New. And it is supposable that Nicodemus, a master in Israel, knew something of the figurative use of that term; for he must have been acquainted with Old Testament figures of speech.

He had doubtless read such prophetic statements as these: "Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing; for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert; and the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of *water*." "When the poor and needy seek water and there be none, and their tongue faileth for thirst, I, the God of Israel, will not forsake them; I will open rivers in high places, and fountains

Digitized by Google

in the midst of the valleys; I will make the wilderness a pool of *water*, and the dry land springs of *water*." "He that hath mercy on them will lead them; even by the springs of *water* shall he guide them." "Ho! every one that thirsteth, come ye to the *waters*." "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and uncleanness." All of which set forth in poetic figures the words of Gospel grace and their saving efficacy. And the New Testament contains many expressions where the Word of God is figuratively represented by the term water, and its uses in cleansing the soul and quenching its thirst. Our Lord said to Peter: "If I wash thee not thou hast no part with me," and "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit." And he gives us the idea when he says: "Now are ye clean through the *Word* that I have spoken unto you." Paul says, "That according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the 'Holy Spirit.'" And again he says, "That Christ loved the Church and gave himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water in the *Word*." And there are other texts where the Word and Spirit are compared to water. Jesus says: "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink," and "He that drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst, but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up unto everlasting life." And he also says that his words are Spirit and life. Therefore his words are living and cleansing *water*, being coupled with the Spirit. But the word or letter alone killeth, and is represented as an instrument of death or of separation. It is called a sword, a pruning knife, a hammer, a fire, all of which needs a gentle hand to control them and make them useful; and this is the prerogative of the Holy Spirit. He makes use of the divine Word in bringing man to a knowledge of himself and of his Maker. It is the Word being mixed with faith in them who hear it that purifies their souls, and the Spirit gives them life, which is the same as being born again. And there is another figure used in Scripture which shows that the Word with the Spirit are the only factors in the work of regeneration. The Word is represented as the seed of truth. Our Lord, in his parable of the sower, says that the seed is the word of the kingdom. And the Apostle Peter says: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed but of incorruptible, by the *Word* of God which liveth and abideth forever." And James says: "Of his own will begat he us with the Word of truth." From all these statements of Scripture, showing that it is by his Word and Spirit God renews the human soul, we therefore conclude that the term water in the text is expressive of the Word, and that water and Word, as instruments in the work of regeneration, are interchangeable and synonymous. The Word of itself does not renew the soul any

Digitized by Google

more than dead or stagnant water produces life without the light and heat of the sun. It requires the Word and Spirit of God to new-create the moral agent who is dead in trespasses and sins, in order to his entering into the kingdom of God. Analogous to this view we are informed that man was first created or formed by the Word of God, but not until the Creator breathed into him the breath of life did he become a living soul. And Ezekiel first prophesied to the dry bones, and said: "O ye dry bones, hear ye the Word of the Lord!" and that caused a shaking and brought a large number of them together, and many bodies formed; but he had also to prophesy to the winds or breath, and say: "Come, O four winds, and breathe upon these slain," before they had life and power to stand up—an exceeding great army. Paul says that "We are created in Christ Jesus unto good works," which is only another way of saying that we are born again. And John says that those who believe in Jesus are born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of man, but of God. So we see that the Word of God creates and his Spirit gives life, and that nothing physical nor material, such as literal water or ceremonial appliances, can have any effect in producing the new birth, but the Word and spirit of God only. Therefore the term water in the text must have a figurative meaning, and as the Holy Spirit uses no other instrument in this renewing work but the divine Word, it is therefore self-evident that being born of water and of the Spirit means nothing more nor less than being renewed by the Word and Spirit of God. It may be asked: Why did not our Saviour use the the term word instead of the term water? We answer: Because he knew that Nicodemus had every chance to know the figurative use of that term in the Scriptures, and would thereby more readily conceive the necessity of divine cleansing, as well as the need of divine quickening, and also see how dependent he was upon God for this needed change in his own soul, so as to see the kingdom of God and enter into its privileges.

The word see in the third verse also requires a passing notice. It may have the same meaning there as it does in other parts of the Scripture—that of enjoyment; but it is true here in another sense also, and must be so understood to get its meaning; it is that of perception. The apostle says that the natural man receives, not the things of the spirit, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.

Therefore, the natural man cannot see—that is, he cannot discern the kingdom of God until the eyes of his understanding are enlightened by the Word and Spirit of God, for he is blinded with sin by the god of this world. "The entrance of thy Word giveth light," says the psalmist. The kingdom of God being purely spiritual and heavenly in its nature, principles and privileges, requires a spiritual sight to see it,

Digitized by Google

as well as a spiritual nature to enter into it. Therefore Nicodemus, although a good member of the Jewish church, which did not require a change of heart to belong to it, could neither see nor enter into the kingdom of God until he was born anew, or from above; and what was true in his case is still true in the case of every one who is not made a new creature in Christ Jesus. It is the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus that sets us free from the law of sin and death, and brings us into relations with the Father in heaven, and introduces us into the kingdom of grace, of light, life, love and peace, which are among the soul-enjoyed privileges of being born again. If any should ask: Has not the term water in the text any reference to baptism? We answer: So far as the symbolism of baptism goes, it is a representation of the new birth in two aspects of Scripture statement. For natural birth is a coming forth into this life in a state of sin and death; and being born again is coming forth from the former state of sin and condemnation into a state of grace, of pardon, peace and righteousness, and as such we are the subjects of the kingdom of God. And this change of character and standing before God is likened also to a resurrection; and as baptism is the burial and raising of a body from a watery grave, there is a semblance of coming forth into a new life. But the term born of water, as we have seen, can have no reference to the necessity of baptism in order to entering into the kingdom of God, but to the necessity of divine renewal by the Word and Spirit of God.

J. H. HUGHES.

Arcadia, Yarmonth, N. S.

THE NATURAL HISTORY OF SIN.

"*But each man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own lust and enticed. Then the lust, when it hath conceived, beareth sin: and the sin, when it is fullgrown, bringeth forth death.*"—James 1: 14, 15. (R. V).

The degeneracy of human nature is reflected in the degenerate meaning of many words, of which the word tempt, is an example. Primarily this word means to try or test. In this sense God tempted Abraham, and tempts everyone; and the genuinely good are the better for it. But through the failure of human nature generally to stand the test, and the consequent breaking down under it, the word comes to have a second and evil meaning, in the sense of seduce or allure to evil. In this sense God tempts no man; but everyone who is thus tempted, is tempted by and from within himself. As men are often disposed to make God responsible for their sin, the text gives the natural history of

Digitized by Google

sin, that the blame may be wholly put where it wholly belongs, upon men themselves.

1. *Sin has a vagrant mother, the evil desire of the heart.* Lust, or evil desire, in the sense of inordinate thirst for pleasure, honor, power, or gain; or in the sense of a tendency toward error, envy, malice, impurity or any other evil, is the origin and fountain of sin. From within, out of the heart, proceed primarily all manner of evil things. All alluring to evil comes from the vagrant, lawless, uncontrolled desires of the heart.

2. *Sin has a corrupt father, the evil consent of the will.* There is generally a gradual progress, descent, toward full and final consent to evil, on the part of the will. The will first endures evil thoughts, feelings and fancies, in a largely passive way; then it takes a more familiar and sympathetic interest in them, like some rash, curious, self-deceived, self-confident spectator at a theatre, drinking saloon, gambling hell, or any other scene of temptation and sin; and finally it becomes entangled, prostrated and enslaved. An insidious descent to a corrupt conclusion.

3. *Sin has an evil birth, the commission of actual transgression.* The union of the evil desire of the heart with the evil consent of the will issues, as opportunity offers, in overt acts of evil. Evil wish and evil will, result in evil deed; and what is once done can never be undone. Pardoning and renewing grace may indeed encompass the person, but omnipotence itself cannot annihilate the fact of the sin.

4. *Sin has a pernicious growth in the development of evil habit and character.* It is antecedently far more probable that anyone who has entered upon a sinful way will continue in it, than that he will forsake it. Those deluded persons who trifle with temptation and dally with sin on the pretext that in thus "seeing life" they will thus learn the evil of evil things and shun them, might as well visit districts infected with small-pox, yellow fever, and cholera, in order to avoid these plagues.

The cumulative power of evil physical habits are strikingly exhibited in the bodily use of tobacco, alcohol and opium; but evil habits of heart and will, have an inconceivably greater cumulative power and tyranny than physical habits distinctively considered. With repetition, sin becomes ingrained into the character, constitutes the transgressor an incarnation of sin, and grows up in him interminably.

5. *Sin has a frightful progeny, death in all the dread and varied meaning of the term.* Sin "brought death into the world and all our woe." Every sin develops within itself the germs of death, physical and spiritual, temporal and eternal. Sin shatters the body. Sin induces insensibility, paralysis, incapacity and corruption in the soul.

Digitized by Google

Sin separates the soul from God, who is its life. Sin consigns body and soul to the second death, unending misery in another world.

All this makes plainly apparent the guilt and misery of sin, the imperative need of Christ's atoning and interceding work, the Spirit's regenerating and sanctifying grace, communion with God and the hiding of his word in the heart, and earnest, constant watchfulness and prayer.

New York. MALCOLM MACGREGOR.

Digitized by Google

VIII.

REVIEW OF CURRENT LITERATURE.

A. THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

1. EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

HEBREW GRAMMARS.

1. **A Grammar of the Hebrew Language.** By WILLIAM HENRY GREEN, Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. New Edition. Carefully revised throughout and the Syntax greatly enlarged. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1889. Pp. viii+418, 8vo.

2. **Introduction to Biblical Hebrew presenting Graduated instruction in the Language of the Old Testament.** By JAMES KENNEDY, B.D., Acting Librarian in the New College, etc., etc. Williams & Norgate, London, 1889. Pp. ix+234+xxx+58.

3. **Elements of Hebrew Syntax by an Inductive Method.** By WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER, Professor of Semitic Languages, Yale University. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1888. Pp. 177.

The Grammar of Dr. Green has been known and prized by American Hebraists for more than a quarter of a century. When published in 1861 it sealed as true the forecast of Addison Alexander that its author would stand at the head of American Hebraists. It is the work of a hand that collected the facts with untiring zeal, and thumbed all preceding grammars, but, mastered by none, grouped the facts and stated the conclusions of a thinker, reverent towards all others yet independent and self-reliant. And so it comes that after twenty-seven years of constant use and criticism there is still call for this grammar. The well-worn book is repaired, not destroyed, is revised, not discarded. Like Kautzsch's revision of Gesenius's grammar, the sound framework and divisions are maintained, and to them are added the best results of Hebrew philology since 1861. This is not a grammar for beginners. It is a guide, philosopher and friend for the student who has got beyond the arid plain and tiresome foot hills of early Hebrew study, and on the high mountain land needs some brain that is steady to give him sagacious counsel and some hand that is firm to point him to the numerous evidences of the right path.

In this day, when there is so much of the cheap scholarship whose stock in trade is to follow the Germans, and, without an attempt at independent work, to assume that the dogmatic assertions of German professors is the end of all intelligent controversy, it is refreshing and inspiring to meet with a sturdy thinker who is intimately acquainted with

Digitized by Google

and grateful for all that the Germans have said and done in Hebrew philology, but who keeps on his own way and reaches his own conclusions.

With a writer of this calibre one may disagree and retain his own self-respect and the respect of the author—for the most truly learned are always the most willing to hear what may be said against their positions and are far from rolling infallibility under their tongues. Whatever abatement must be made from some of the positions taken by Dr. Green in this revision, we believe that no young American Hebraist can neglect this grammar without peril to his critical accuracy, and that no one will carefully study it without an advantage to be obtained nowhere else.

The *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew* by Mr. Kennedy, is as its title implies, a grammar for beginners, bearing a family likeness to the well known grammar of Prof. A. B. Davidson, of Edinburgh, but far better than that grammar in statement and arrangement, with its clearly defined rules and wealth of exercises to accustom the student by gradual steps to walk intelligently and firmly in the maze of Hebrew forms. There is no treatise of Syntax as a separate part of the work, but the rules of Syntax needful for a beginner are noted in the progress of the exercises. Of all the Introductory Hebrew Grammars produced in England this seems by far the best. If in a new edition the author will add to his instruction on the vowels and the whole Masoretic system, illustrated exercises as full and well chosen as those which follow, he will supply what seems to be a lack in his excellent work. The first step in sound instruction is the correct reading of the text, and owing to omissions here there seems to be few who ever gain sufficient knowledge to open the Hebrew Bible anywhere and read a page without halting and stumbling—not to speak of reading the Hebrew with appreciation of its meaning and corresponding expression.

The Elements of Hebrew Syntax by an Inductive Method is an addition by the indefatigable Professor of Yale University, to his *Elements of Hebrew* and *Introductory Hebrew Method and Manual*, which have done so much in his hands to revise the study of Hebrew in America. Professor Harper believes in laying certain examples before the student and then stating the laws which govern them and all similar cases, just as Mr. Kennedy believes in first stating the general law and following it by numerous examples. To those accustomed to Professor Harper's method of teaching, this new work will be specially grateful. It is marked with all the excellencies which have made his teaching so acceptable and successful.

To those who would like to compare the deductive and inductive methods of teaching, no better examples for comparison will be found than Mr. Kennedy's and Professor Harper's works. Whether one gives first a few examples chosen to fit the laws which are about to be stated, or whether he first states the law and then illustrates it with examples, would seem to be almost a matter of indifference in the hands of equally capable teachers. Neither system of teaching either ancient or modern languages is new. Hebrew grammars on both systems have been known for centuries, from Reuchlin's onward. The teaching depends upon the teacher more than upon the system, a poor teacher failing to impart sound knowledge even with the best system. But if we question the experience of the greatest number of good teachers of Hebrew, as

Digitized by Google

well as of other languages, through the centuries, it will be found that they have settled upon the deductive system as the one which, all things considered, best meets the needs of the student. The Germans and the French and the English certainly have written their best books and done their best work on that system, and still continue to do it. In our country, at present, there seems to be a strong tendency towards the inductive system of teaching languages, but unless some new discovery of science shall guide it, it is most likely to meet the fate of its predecessors.

HOWARD OSGOOD.

Babylonisch Assyrische Geschichte. Von C. P. Tiele. 1 Theil: Von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Tode Sargons II. 2 Theil: Von der Throubesteigung Sinacheribs bis zur Eroberung Babels durch Cyrus. Gotha, 1886, 1888. Pp. XIII., 647.

This is one of the hand-books of ancient history now issuing from the press of the well-known firm of Perthes, in Gotha. Fifty years ago such a work as this would have been entirely impossible. But to-day a book of this kind is a fact only because of the literature unearthed and deciphered within two generations. Inferences deduced from these decipherments are merely transitory or conditional. The facts alone remain. Works on ancient history are works of a day; they must be revised and rewritten every few years. New decipherments and discoveries antiquate and render obsolete many of the inferences and conclusions of the previous decade.

This work is by the Professor of Comparative Religion in the University of Leiden, Holland. His special work has necessitated on his part an intimate acquaintance with cuneiform literature, so in many ways he was prepared for his task. His work displays an independent judgment on questions of a critical or philological nature. In fact, he is a specialist, putting into popular form the results of the best work in the field of Assyriology.

His information is not, as a large amount of the historical literature produced to-day, in any sense *second-hand*. He deals with the most difficult of questions with the ease and familiarity of a master.

The general disposition of his material is good.

The introduction covers ninety-nine pages, and discusses the sources of information, the land and people with which this history is connected, and the various periods into which it is divided. The introduction goes into some points which would not interest the general reader (*e. g.*, pp. 66-69), but rather disturb him.

The old Babylonian period is the first to claim attention. An attempt is made to construct at least a skeleton out of the early disjointed records that remain to us. But at present the attempt is almost vain, and numerous inferences and conjectures unprofitable and uncertain (*e. g.*, pp. 102-112).

The history of Assyria is divided into two periods. First extends from earliest times to close of the reign of Asurnirar II. (754-746). This period, though not giving us a continuous succession of kings or history, has given us considerable literature. The second period begins with the reign of Tiglathpileser II., 745 B. C., and extends to the downfall of the Assyrian kingdom, the fall of Nineveh in 606 B. C. The

Digitized by Google

literature on this period is abundant; the data are sufficient to form a connected and reliable thread of history. Professor Tiele has done the work in a very creditable manner. The second Babylonian period begins with the reign of Nebukadnezzar II., and closes with the fall of Babylon under Cyrus.

Professor Tiele is most at home probably in the last chapter of his work, where he takes up the Babylonian-Assyrian culture. He discusses the State, its laws and morals; religion, mythology, beliefs, and the Pantheon; literature, science, art, industries and commerce. These topics receive very careful attention, and are probably the most valuable part of the work.

The book from beginning to end shows that the author is striving, though sometimes in vain, to speak to a popular audience. Many things in the body of the work should be in the foot-notes, and in some places the body enlarged upon. No man in our day ought to think of putting out a historical work without an accompanying map. But this work contains none.

The book is the best of its kind, and is an authority on this subject. It is deserving of the careful study of every one especially interested in ancient history, literature, art and archæology.

IRA M. PRICE.

II. SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

Inspiration and the Bible. An Inquiry. By ROBERT F. HORTON, M.A., late fellow of New College, Oxford, London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1888.

This is a very readable and interesting book, and an important one. The author is an English Congregationalist, and his book is written in defense of inspiration from a modern and progressive point of view. Two facts impress the reader: first, that the writer believes most earnestly and enthusiastically in the inspiration of the Scriptures, and second, that he has no fear of investigation, lest some discovery should destroy the grounds of his confidence. Canon Liddon, in a recent sermon, stakes the whole inspiration of the Bible on the date of the Book of Daniel, and is not far from risking the trustworthiness of our Lord upon the same. Mr. Horton holds to inspiration, on grounds that would not be affected by any decision as to the date of Daniel, or the authorship of the Pentateuch, or the genuineness of Second Peter, or any similar matter. If such confidence as this can be rightly held, all thoughtful students of the Bible ought to know it.

Mr. Horton's method is to reject all *a priori* theories of inspiration, all prejudgments as to what inspiration is, or must be, or ought to be, and to define it inductively. The fact that the Bible is an inspired book is taken as the starting-point; but what its inspiration consists in is yet to be ascertained. Having an inspired book in our hands, Mr. Horton would have us examine it most thoroughly, and learn from the book itself in what sense it is inspired. This is our sole source of knowledge, for we possess no class or group of inspired books, including the Bible and more besides, from which to frame a general definition. The Bible is inspired as it is inspired, and we must search the book itself for our definition. Free, fearless, candid study of the Bible must teach us how

Digitized by Google

it is inspired. The writer says—and the position is hard to controvert --that "every fact which the most fearless criticism, historical, scientific or literary, is able to establish concerning our Old Testament"—and equally concerning the New—"is to be humbly accepted, and our idea of inspiration is to be shaped, or re-shaped, in order to include it" (p. 130). His limits do not allow him to go through the whole work of examination that is just suggested, but in outline he covers the ground. Between his opening discussion of the Meaning of Inspiration and his Summary and Conclusion, he has chapters on the Epistle in the Inspired Book, the Biographies, and the New Testament in general: on the Prophet, and the History in the Inspired Book, the Law, and the Poetry and the Miscellaneous Writings. Thus he touches the main points, and in all these regions he searches for facts which must be regarded in defining that inspiration which he recognizes as the ruling quality of the Bible.

Starting thus, he is not afraid of any fact that he may meet; for all the facts are essential to his conclusion, and he is prepared to look with welcoming eye upon anything that proves true. As to his conclusions, on the negative side we find the following: that our belief in inspiration does not depend upon authorship—it cannot; for in very many cases authorship is either uncertain or wholly unknown: that inspiration does not give present binding authority to all inspired writings; for the superseded Mosaic law is written in the inspired book, as well as the Gospel that superseded it: that inspiration does not guarantee that there shall be no errors in historical writings, but allows men to write after the manner of their times, and with such limited knowledge of past events as they may possess. Inspiration is quite consistent with the using of documents already in existence, and does not ensure literary perfection in weaving different records together into a continuous whole. Inspiration, in fact, is not inconsistent with anything that the Bible actually contains: and the Bible does contain, he thinks, writings inferior to its own highest, writings that now have only historical and illustrative interest and are not binding upon the Christian conscience, and such errors of detail as the literary standards and methods of that age would naturally bring to pass.

What then is inspiration? Coming to the positive side, the author cannot define it as precisely as could some whose *a priori* method he rejects. A definition inductively drawn from a mass of facts is liable to be less exact than an *a priori* judgment. As to the meaning of inspiration, a reader cannot help wishing for a more compact and manageable statement than the book anywhere contains. Yet the thought is not altogether elusive. Mr. Horton locates inspiration in the spiritual character, quality and use of the Bible. The canon brought together and included "books of a certain stamp," and rejected such as did not possess the peculiar quality, indefinable indeed, and "recognized by an intuition rather than by a judgment," that makes the Bible what it is. It is in the purposed relations of these writings to God and the approach of men to him that their inspiration is found. "We call our Bible inspired, because by reading and studying it we can find our way to God, and can find what is his will for us and how we are to carry out his will" (p. 268). God is in the history, the laws, the spiritual forces of the book. God is in the divine, and God is in the preservation of the

Digitized by Google

abundant and various human, of the Bible. Above all, God is in Christ. The inspiration of the Bible is not a mode of writing, but a quality in the substance. It is not the seal of a document, but the wings of the truth. It is not an outward formality, but an inward divinity. It is not God's penmanship, but God's life. Whatever the facts may prove to be upon any disputed point within the book, this divine quality remains, and will remain.

The book has made a stir among the English Nonconformists. It seems somewhat revolutionary as one reads, and some of its pages would surprise those who have not met the questions that are involved. Yet the spirit is everywhere profoundly reverent, and it is vain to deny that the exhibition of facts is forcible, and the reasoning strong. Probably the book fairly represents the practical view of inspiration upon which many thoughtful men of this age have been working. It certainly is worthy of general attention. Here we have, at any rate, a view of the Bible upon which the popular infidelity of the day could be far more successfully met than upon such views as are represented by the position of Canon Liddon.

W. N. CLARKE.

The Bible Doctrine of Inspiration, Explained and Vindicated. By BASIL MANLY, D.D., LL.D., Professor in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. 12mo. pp. 266. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son $1.25.

The title of this volume is significant, and well describes the purpose of the author and the chief characteristic of his work. It is the Bible doctrine of inspiration, not merely a theological or philosophical treatise on the subject, that he sets out to expound and discuss. This is as it should be. For while there are various reasons afforded by natural religion for expecting a revelation from God; and while there is an antecedent probability that if God gave the world a revelation, it would be in writing, and that he would take care that his will should be correctly made known to man; the chief reason for believing the Scriptures to be inspired is, that they testify of themselves, not that they contain, but that they are, the Word of God.

In Part First Dr. Manly discusses the general doctrine of inspiration in relation to a theological system. His work here is to define, to distinguish, to clear away misapprehension, and in general to prepare the way for an inductive study of the Scripture testimonies regarding inspiration. This part of the work is well done, so far as the text is concerned. Some sketch of the history of the doctrine of inspiration, and much fuller references to the literature and the subject, would have been highly desirable and extremely useful. Dr. Manly defines inspiration as "that divine influence that secures accurate transferrence of truth into human language by a speaker or writer so as to be communicated to other men." This is a sufficiently accurate definition of religious inspiration in general, but it seems to us to be much less satisfactory as a definition of the inspiration of the Scriptures than that quoted by Dr. Manly from Dr. A. H. Strong's *Systematic Theology*: "That special divine influence upon the minds of the Scripture writers in virtue of which their productions, apart from errors of transcription and when rightly interpreted, together constitute an infallible and sufficient

Digitized by Google

rule of faith and practice." All the qualifying phrases of the definition are necessary. The doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures does not imply that the inspired writings contain no errors, because many errors are known to have been introduced by careless transcription. Nor does it imply that any single writing, taken by itself and without being supplemented or interpreted by other writings, is an example of "accurate transferrence of truth into human language by a speaker or writer." For this accurate transferrence of truth we must have recourse to the whole Scriptures; that is to say, they "*together* constitute an infallible and sufficient rule of faith and practice."

Part Second, called "Proofs of Inspiration," is largely given to an examination of the Scriptures themselves, and a co-ordinating of their teachings with regard to their own origin. The examination of the Scriptures is exhaustive and thorough. No difficulty is shirked. The fact of inspiration is proved (1) by the general manner of quoting Scripture in Scripture; (2) by passages which affirm or imply the inspiration of the Scriptures as a whole; (3) by declarations affirming the inspiration of particular persons or passages; (4) by promises of inspiration to the sacred writers; (5) by assertions of inspiration by the sacred writers; (6) by passages in which the union of human and divine authorship is expressly recognized. The proofs are well marshalled, strongly presented, and candidly treated.

Part Three is devoted to the answer of objections. One chapter considers objections drawn from certain Scripture passages where it has been supposed that inspiration was disclaimed. Dr. Manly feels bound to maintain that these disclaimers have been misunderstood, but those who differ from him on this point will not feel these disclaimers to be any difficulty. For, if it be granted that Paul expressly says that certain passages in his epistles are not inspired, but are written on his own individual responsibility, and express merely his personal opinion, that very disclaimer emphasizes the fact that all the rest of the writing was considered, both by the apostle and by those to whom the letter was addressed, to have been composed under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit. Another chapter is devoted to objections growing out of general difficulties and obscurities in the teaching of the Bible, and a third to objections based upon alleged discrepancies or mistakes. These two chapters are perhaps the least satisfactory part of the book. It was perhaps impossible in the limits of this volume to discuss the questions adequately, but the author might have given more extended and critical references to other volumes in which the questions are satisfactorily answered. The two chapters given to objections on critical grounds and on scientific grounds are to some extent open to the same criticism.

The objection is frequently made to Dr. Manly's book, and to others of the same kind, that they are, as somebody said of commentaries, very good until you come to a hard place. The charge is made that they skip the difficulties and ignore the really serious objections to the orthodox view of inspiration. One writer in this REVIEW has stated his idea of the Scriptural doctrine of inspiration in this wise: "The apostles' writings were inspired just so far as their acts and oral utterances were inspired; no less, no more." This is, if we consider the words, merely a truism that no one dreams of disputing. Strictly speaking, when we talk of the inspiration of the Scriptures we fail to

Digitized by Google

express our real thought. What we mean is the inspiration of the sacred writers. The inspiration, in other words, is not in the writing, but in the writer. As a result of the writer's inspiration, the writings are an infallible and sufficient rule of faith and practice. The texts of Scripture quoted in proof of inspiration do not distinguish between inspiration for oral discourse and inspiration for written discourse. Such passages as "Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," while they apparently refer to oral discourses, are shown plainly by their context to cover also written discourse. No one will dispute that Paul, in his sermon on Mars' Hill, was as truly inspired as when writing the Epistle to the Romans; or that Peter, in that sermon on the day of Pentecost which resulted in the conversion of three thousand souls, was speaking under the inspiration of God as really as when he wrote the epistles that bear his name.

It is the application sometimes made of this statement of inspiration which is open to objection. First, there is drawn from it a corollary, that as the apostles were not always inspired when they spoke, they were not always inspired when they wrote. This is also an entirely unobjectionable and obviously true statement. Peter certainly was not inspired when he denied his Lord, unless inspired of the devil; and Paul need not be supposed to have been under the inspiration of God when his anger flamed out against the high priest who had commanded him to be smitten contrary to the law, nor when he quarreled with Barnabas. Likewise, we may suppose that Paul and the other apostles wrote personal letters that were in nowise inspired of God. It cannot be possible that we have in the New Testament canon all the writings of all the apostles. Many things that they committed to paper must naturally have been trivial and without special Divine guidance, and these writings have perished.

This corollary is applied to the Scriptures in this way: As the apostles sometimes spoke without inspiration, there may be, and probably are, passages in the New Testament that were not inspired, and it is for us to use our judgment to separate the inspired from the uninspired, just as we separate the inspired oral discourses from the uninspired. A great deal of stress has been laid upon this argument, and the world has been challenged to refute it. It really needs no refutation, for the moment it is examined it proves to be a fallacious application of a principle acknowledged on all hands to be correct. When we distinguish between oral discourses of the apostles, we distinguish between integral discourses. We say: This speech was uninspired, That speech was inspired, but we do not distinguish between parts of the same speech. We do not, for instance, take Peter's Pentecostal sermon and say that parts of it were spoken by inspiration of God, but that his quotations from the Old Testament display a wrong exegesis, and were, therefore, uninspired. We do not take Paul's sermon on Mars' Hill and say that it was all inspired except the statement that God hath made of one blood all nations of men. We cannot thus distinguish between several parts of one speech. It would be absurd to suppose that at one instant an apostle could be speaking under the inspiration of God, and therefore infallible, while in another instant that he would be speaking on his own authority solely, and so make mistakes. The speech, as a whole, is either inspired or uninspired, and is so judged. Now, apply

Digitized by Google

the same rule to a writing. We must take it as a whole, and so determine its value as an integral composition. Either the writer was under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, or he was not. If he was, the writing, as a whole, is inspired. If he was not, the writing, as a whole, is uninspired. The question, therefore, as regards the New Testament documents, is simply this: Have these writings been properly admitted to the New Testament canon, or should they be eliminated from it as not satisfactorily proved to be given by inspiration of God? The distinction, as regards the apostles' written discourses, between the inspired and the uninspired parts, relates not to sections of the same document, but to integral documents. It is the belief of Christian theologians, and has been from very early times, that the uninspired writings of the apostles quietly perished, and that only the inspired survive. There is no warrant in Scripture for the belief that parts of the Bible are inspired and that parts are uninspired. Not a text can be quoted that even seems to support a theory so intrinsically absurd as that God would give us a revelation of his will in writings in which truth and error were inextricably blended.

We commend Dr. Manly's book as the best monograph on inspiration that has been produced by an American scholar. In many respects, indeed, it is the best monograph in the English language.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

Biblical Eschatology. By ALVAH HOVEY, D.D., LL.D. 12mo. pp. 192. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society.

Dr. Hovey is just completing his fourth decade as a theological instructor, so that his views are the outcome of mature deliberation. But not the youngest of Newton's *alumni* will give a more hospitable consideration to a new suggestion than he. While he is pre-eminently a "safe" theologian, his writings display a liberality of view which commend his conclusions to the most progressive thinkers.

The present volume is a good representative of his methods of presenting doctrine. While thorough in its scholarship it is devoid of obscuring technicalities, or rather because of a thorough study of its topic, the treatise is so simple and plain as to be read with interest by the layman as well as by the professional investigator. It presents in impressive array the biblical reasons for the doctrines prevailing in evangelical circles.

Of course some readers will wish that this or the other point had been dwelt upon at greater length. Take for instance that tenet which lies at the bottom of all eschatology, the doctrine of a future life. Butler's reasoning in the *Analogy* would prove the pre-existence of the soul as well as its future existence. A past existence and a future existence, stand closely related in natural theology. If the soul had a beginning it is possible at least that it will have an end. We believe that a man will exist after he has put off his garments, for we know that he existed before he put them on, and if we knew that the soul existed before the body we should expect it to exist after the body. But if the soul did not begin to exist till the body began to exist, the presumption is that the soul will cease to exist when the body ceases to exist. It is consequently not without reason that some theologians have declared that it is only

Digitized by Google

through Christ that immortality is brought to light, that we have no proof nor even presumption of a future state except as it is found in the sacred Scriptures. One might desire, therefore, a special presentation of the "Biblical" evidences of immortality as distinct from the suggestions of natural theology.

And what is the meaning of the term "Biblical" as applied to an eschatology? Strictly speaking, it would imply that the doctrine was derived from the Scriptures alone. Regarding the "Evidence of the Resurrection," Dr. Hovey remarks: "This evidence is wholly Biblical." And surely if the body is to rise from the grave that fact could not be guessed out by human reason, it could be known only by direct revelation from God. But the passages in the Bible from which the doctrine was derived, Dr. Hovey fails to cite. He quotes, indeed, certain texts from the New Testament, but it was not from these that it came for the belief existed in its entirety before a line of the New Testament was written. Martha's "I know that he shall arise again," and Paul's appeal to the party feelings of the Pharisees, show that the doctrine of the resurrection was fully held before Jesus began to teach. If, therefore, it is "Biblical," it must have been drawn entirely from the Old Testament. In what passages then, of the ancient Scriptures, is it set forth? It is sometimes said to be hinted at by the patriarch's "In my flesh shall I see God," but this is too much like the finding of the doctrine of the Trinity in the plural form of Elohim or in the "Let *us* make man." And at any rate vague hints are not sufficient. It cannot be said that the Pharisees drew the doctrine from the Old Testament unless it can be shown to be set forth there not in vague hints and remote suggestions, but in clear and explicit terms. Now the Sadducees denied utterly that the doctrine was taught by the Mosaic writings, while Warburton and other Christian scholars have endorsed their view, declaring that the Old Testament is entirely silent as to a future life. But unless the doctrine of the resurrection of the body can be fully proved from the Old Testament alone, the evidence for it is not "wholly Biblical," but is drawn from human speculation. The same may be said of the doctrine of Gehenna which the scribes held in its completeness before Jesus began to teach. Are there Old Testament texts from which these doctrines may have been drawn in their fullness? If not, whence did they originate?

Current discussions give an especial interest to the section headed "Human souls are not on probation in the middle state." What then is meant by the declaration that "they do not, according to the teaching of Holy Scripture, have the offer of pardon through Christ in that state?" Are we to understand that, in the future life, even if a man *should* truly repent, the Lord would not pardon him; that the "Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out," is limited to a specific time; that, after a given day, though one came to the Saviour in the sincerest contrition he would be rejected the same as if he persevered in rebellion? In what text of Scripture is this taught? Would it be an error to say that in the future life as in the present, the only reason for a man's ruin is found in the "Ye *will* not come unto me that ye might have life?" If it be true, as is often asserted by evangelical teachers, that God cannot make a holy being wretched, it follows that if a man turned from sin even in the future state he would attain eternal life.

Digitized by Google

Now, if it can be said that in case men *did* turn to Christ in the future life they would be saved, why are they not "on probation," there as truly as they ever were here? If, on the other hand, all that can be said is that they *will* not turn to Christ, this is a thing which was true of them when still in this life, and why may it not be declared that they were "not on probation" even here? Will some one tell us the meaning of this non-Biblical term "probation."

The question may arise whether the texts cited by Dr. Hovey in support of his thesis declare anything more than that the persistently rebellious will persistently suffer; that there is "a great gulf fixed" between guilt and sweet peace, such that even the deepest pity of the pure hearted cannot mitigate the wretchedness of the obstinately sinful. Do those passages, then, teach that one who died in sin would not be pardoned on true repentance, or even that such a one will never repent?

And some may question whether the silence of the Scriptures can be pleaded in this connection. When a man is sentenced to prison for life, it is not added that possibly he will repent and become a better man and be pardoned and set free, but such is the fact nevertheless.

Does a condemnation to "everlasting punishment" make it any more certain that the man would not be pardoned on true repentance or that he will never repent? The Scriptures are silent regarding the salvation of those who die in infancy, but Dr. Hovey declares his belief in this all the same. The Scriptures are not a "whole body of divinity," discussing every possible case; they are written merely for practical guidance. It is sufficient for us to know that if we will to-day repent we shall be saved. What God will do with those who die in infancy or in heathenism, what he would do with one who should repent after death, and whether any who die in sin will ever repent, it is not necessary for us to know, and therefore the Scriptures cannot be expected to tell us. But if regarding that half of the race who die in infancy, God may have plans of salvation which he has not revealed, the question arises whether regarding some in the other half, he may not have gracious purposes of which he has not thought it necessary to inform us.

There are other inquiries which arise in the mind of the reader of Dr. Hovey's interesting volume. Happy are the young men who sit on the benches at Newton and can ask him questions with which we outsiders would have no right to trouble so busy a man as he.

NORMAN FOX.

B. GENERAL LITERATURE.

Omitted Chapters of History, disclosed in the Life and Papers of Edmund Randolph. By MONCURE DANIEL CONWAY. 8 vo. pp. 401. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

The career of Edmund Jennings Randolph (he dropped the middle name), seems to emphasize the proverb that republics are ungrateful. He was too young to be distinguished among the colonial statesmen, but he bore himself honorably during the revolutionary struggle and took a prominent part in making the feeble colonies a strong nation. He was a member of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, and, as Governor of Virginia, used his great influence in the State to secure

Digitized by Google

the ratification of the Constitution. Patrick Henry led the opposition, and no one was more influential in the State than he. Nothing but the potent name of Washington, and the active exertions of Randolph, prevented Henry's triumph—which the latter came to see would have been a disaster to his country. Randolph urged that when the Constitution had been adopted, it would be possible for Virginia within the Union to procure amendments covering the objections of Henry and his party. As we all know, this was done, the first ten amendments being passed almost immediately. For this one thing, if he had never done more, Randolph deserves the affectionate remembrance of his countrymen.

As a matter of fact he did much more. He filled the office of attorney-general with credit, being the first man to occupy that responsible post; and afterwards was an able and efficient Secretary of State, after the retirement of Jefferson. It was while holding this office that he met with his first serious reverse. In the course of delicate negotiations with England on the one hand and France on the other, Randolph managed Fauchet (the French minister) with great adroitness. Fauchet was vain, and Randolph's flattering attentions turned his head. He hinted in dispatches to his government of important secret communications made to him by Randolph, which he afterwards confessed in other dispatches to have been worthless or misleading. He also told his government he had received a hint from Randolph that a present of a few thousand dollars would have a marked effect on diplomacy. This dispatch was, unfortunately for Randolph, intercepted by a British ship, forwarded to the English minister, and by him laid before Washington. The conduct of Washington indicated, as Mr. Conway thinks, that he did not believe a word of the charge. Indeed, considering the personal proofs he had of Randolph's disinterestedness, it is hard to see how he could have believed it. But, as Mr. Conway also says, it is hard to see how he could have saved the Secretary even if ready to share his fate. It was a political necessity to accept Randolph's resignation, and he retired from public life under a cloud, notwithstanding the fact that the leading men of his own State showed their confidence in him by public and private demonstrations of respect. He procured from Fauchet a complete retraction of the charges, and published a "Vindication," which, however convincing it may have been to the judicious and thoughtful, did not fully remove from his name the stain of the false accusation. The reputation of a public man, it was held, like the chastity of Cæsar's wife, must be above suspicion. But there is no reason why the present generation should fail to do Randolph the justice that his own day refused him. Mr. Conway has brought together a mass of testimony that proves clearly enough the honorable character and career of the man. He was unfortunate, but not guilty; he was a scapegoat of the political situation, not a traitor to his country.

Another misfortune has pursued Randolph beyond the grave. An account was made up against him by the Treasury of $49,000, placed in his hands to defray the expenses of foreign intercourse. There was evidence enough that the money had been properly used, though necesarily disbursed secretly, as intended; however, when, after a time, he left the matter to arbitration and the case was decided against him, he did not murmur, but nearly ruined himself, by sacrifice of his

Digitized by Google

property, to pay the State what he probably never owed. Mr. Conway shows that the United States received from him $7,000 more than the amount claimed, yet by some careless book-keeping it is still made to appear on the Treasury books that Randolph is a defaulter, or, at least, a delinquent debtor. The injustice is admitted by Treasury officials familiar with the facts, but nothing is done by way of remedy. There should seem to be sufficient cause here for Congressional action, in order that the name of a patriotic and honorable man may no longer be clouded by an admittedly false official accusation.

Mr. Conway has drawn his materials from a great variety of sources. Many of them have hitherto existed in manuscript only, and are now for the first time used to clear up interesting chapters in the early history of our country. We cannot have too many books of this kind, in which original research, sturdy patriotism and good literary taste combine to make the narrative delightful and full of pleasing surprises.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

The Diary and Letters of Gouverneur Morris. Edited by ANNE CARY MORRIS. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 604, 630. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

These two stout volumes are enough at first sight to daunt even an enthusiastic reader, but no one who gives them a fair trial will pronounce them too long. There is no specially enjoyable flavor in the style. Literary merit of any kind is not conspicuous, by either presence or absence. It is not the form but the substance of the work that constitutes its charm; but that the charm is verv real and very great, that it continues to hold the reader to the last, is beyond question.

A large part of this charm lies in the fact that Gouverneur Morris was a very high type, in his private journals at least, of the well-bred gossip. He delights in recording minute and characteristic particulars about a multitude of persons, which is one of the great attractions in such books as Boswell's *Life of Johnson* or in Pepys's *Diary*. Morris was a cultivated and urbane man, who lived many years in the society of distinguished, educated, and able persons. He knew the people best worth knowing wherever he went, and his pen was busy with those whom he knew. And it was not an ill-natured pen. If he now and then records foibles and tells disillusioning tales of famous men, it is merely because he sees clearly and records accurately, not because he goes out of his way to find things of the kind to record. If some things that he tells us are scandalous, it is because he is a truthful historian, and not that he has a passion for scandal. On the whole, one must have considerable respect for a man who could see so much of the world's hollowness and insincerity, not to say wickedness, and yet write of it with so much *bonhommie* and freedom from cynicism.

It is not every day that one lights on a book, the reading of which is plentiful in innocent enjoyment. But these volumes have a double claim on our regard, in that they are as instructive as they are entertaining. Practically the whole of the first volume, and a part of the second, is given to Morris's career as American Minister to France during the Revolution. He reached that country just before the meeting of the States-General, and remained during the Reign of Terror, until

Digitized by Google

after the fall of Danton. His pictures of French society, and sketches of the leading men and women of the time, most of whom he personally knew and many of whom he knew intimately, are very valuable. Lafayette is made to appear a pitiful, almost a despicable character, by this shrewd observer of men and things, contemporary testimony thus confirming the view now taken by the best historical critics. These diaries of Morris would not enable one, without other aid, to understand this period of French history; but to one who already has the outline of the period sketched, the particulars he supplies are an invaluable aid for filling in the details of the picture.

There is some matter of importance in Morris's account of contemporary British statesmen, and various secrets of our early diplomacy he has recorded. Some of these things will no doubt be turned to good account by future historians. But Americans will be still more interested in the chapters covering the later years of his career, when, after his return to his own country, Morris sat in the United States Senate. What he has to say of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, and other distinguished men of his time seems almost uniformly just and discriminating. One would like a little more enthusiasm sometimes, and less calm, cold criticism; but Morris was not a man of warm temperament, and it is something to find a critic of his contemporaries who tries to be scrupulously just.

It will be gathered from what we have said that this is not a biography in the ordinary sense of the term, nor yet autobiography. The book is, indeed, rounded out with a preliminary sketch of Morris's earlier years, and honorable part as a member of the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention, as well as by a concluding account of his declining years. This gives it completeness and makes it serve, in some sort, as a biography. The title, however, accurately describes the work and indicates its special value. These contemporary records from day to day by such a man, all his life in the thick of affairs, cognizant of State secrets, on good terms with men of widely differing opinions, have a value that never attaches to "recollections" or autobiographies written years after the events, when, perhaps, memory has begun to fail.

We cannot undertake to specify the good things in this selection from Morris's papers, for if we should once begin where could we end? Nearly every page contains something good and quotable. As to the form of the book, one knows not whether to admire more the good taste and discretion of the editor, or the skill and enterprise of the publishers. The two have united to produce a work as beautiful in appearance and tasteful in literary form as it is delightful in substance. The frank expression of opinion that made Morris at times a terror to his friends as well as to his enemies becomes, after this lapse of time, wholly engaging; and the sarcasm that made contemporaries writhe only makes us smile. An open and sincere character shines through these journals, and no one will lay the volumes down without a conviction that Gouverneur Morris was one of the good and useful men of his time, though perhaps not a man of the first rank.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

Digitized by Google

The Nun of Kenmare, An Autobiography. 12mo. pp. 558. Boston: Ticknor & Co.

We are much deceived if this book does not make a great sensation, though there is nothing "sensational" about it. It would be hard to conceive of a more straightforward, matter-of-fact narrative than it contains—a narrative fortified at every important point by documents that amply attest its accuracy. It is the most serious attack on the Roman Catholic Church in our generation, and the more effective because it is not intended to be an attack. The author, Sister M. Frances Clare Cusack, late Mother-General of the Sisters of Peace, is a devout Catholic, and is still in full communion with her church. She has, moreover, the favor of the Pope and of the Propaganda—the Sacred College having carefully examined into the charges circulated by her enemies and exonerated her.

The Nun of Kenmare gained her distinctive appellation in connection with the famine of 1879. She was originally of a Protestant family, but was admitted to the Roman Catholic communion in 1858, and soon after became a sister of the order of Poor Clares. When the famine began she was an inmate of a convent of Kenmare, and had already gained a considerable reputation as a writer of devotional and historical works for Catholic readers. Moved by the sufferings of the Irish peasantry, she issued an appeal for aid, which was circulated literally around the globe, and large sums of money came to her in consequence, which she expended with great industry and judgment. But this activity roused against her the enmity of the Catholic landowners, and of some influential ecclesiastics. That enmity has continued since, with gathering force, until her health has been undermined, and her work so hindered that she has finally withdrawn from the Generalship of the order she founded.

It is worth noting that the Nun of Kenmare is still loyal to the Catholic Church, so far as acceptance of the Pope's authority is concerned, and full belief of its doctrines. She has been pretty well freed from her first illusions as to the superior holiness of its ecclesiastics, having found them to be very much like other men, only worse. She does not make charges against them of impurity or immorality, though certain hints lead one to infer that she could easily do so if she chose, and, what is more, could prove them; but she does charge them with quickness to take offense, readiness to resent injuries, unwillingness to forget or forgive, ambition, a domineering spirit towards inferiors, and insubordination to those above them—in short, pretty much all of the official vices of which an ecclesiastic could be guilty. Protestants, accustomed to regard the Catholic hierarchy as a well-organized scheme, in which from the Pope to the humblest priest there is implicit obedience to superior authority, will be amazed to learn that even the Pope's orders are not respected unless they have the endorsement of the bishop of the diocese, and that this endorsement is often refused with scant courtesy. Doubtless a bishop who went too far in his disobedience would meet with punishment for his contumacy, but within certian well-understood limits he is supreme in his diocese, and may bid defiance to the Pope himself. Moreover, in case of conflict, he has every chance in his favor in an appeal to higher authorities. Witness the prompt support given to Archbishop Corrigan in the McGlynn case,

Digitized by Google

wherein right was by no means indisputably on his side. The Pope's blessing and autograph approval, the commendation of the Propaganda, and the canon law, have all proved less than the authority of Archbishop Corrigan and other ecclesiastics. A religious "boycott" has been pronounced against Sister Clare, and she has yielded to it, so far as to abandon her work. But her spirit is unsubdued, and in this book she makes her bold protest against the iniquity practised against her. How outspoken she is at times a few extracts will show:

In many cases Roman Catholic priests and superiors put obedience to themselves in place of obedience to God, and, though they do not and dare not teach a theory of personal infallibility, they act as if it were an article of faith, and make it a sin if obedience is not rendered to commands which are often wrong, because they are contrary to the true spirit of Christian charity. We have lately had an instance of this in the case of a Roman Catholic priest who, without any pretence to a fair trial, was driven out of his home with but a few hours notice, under circumstances of heartlessness and injustice which startled every thinking man. We know of a great many cases in which sisters have been treated with equal injustice and without assigned cause. Such proceedings dare not be attempted by secular courts, and why should ecclesiatics be supported in practising what seculars dare not attempt?

And then follow the deepest evils of all. If any priest or laymen venture to express an opinion he is at once denounced as disloyal to his church, as if the action of a bishop or a priest should be protected from criticism more than the action of a layman. The outcome of this is too often not merely a miserable demand for silence on the part of those who look on these evils with a sorrow which they dare not express, but often an expression of approbation of what they condemn is required. An expression of confidence in the conduct of the ecclesiastical judge must be got at any cost. And the priest knows what he must suffer if he dares to refuse his signature to a declaration which he abhors, and the consequences of refusal are such that few men dare to risk it.

It does not require any special knowledge or ingenuity to apply these remarks to a well-known case of discipline in this city. Speaking of one who appealed to to the Pope, and the result, she says:

I know, however, he went to Rome, like myself, only to find, as usual, that the Pope's writ does not run unless the bishop concerned is willing that it should.

This story will illustrate several things, among them the character of a certain powerful ecclesiastic:

A certain priest in the New York diocese was made a monseigneur by the Holy Father, and rejoiced thereat greatly, as this admits of dressing very much like a bishop, which, so far as I can understand, is about all the advantage gained thereby; but according to ecclesiastical etiquette it was necessary for this compliment to pass through the hands of the bishop of the diocese, and the bishop of the diocese, not admiring the independent ways of the priest in question, refused to give it.

What is likely to be the result of such a policy Sister Clare does not hesitate to say:

I firmly believe that there will be a reaction against the Roman church in America, unless there is a reform in that church which its past history does not lead us to hope for. A church which claims infallibility in all its doings as well as for all its doctrines, will neither listen to a cry for needed reforms nor avert

Digitized by Google

calamity. And it will not even learn from history. Already there are signs of the beginning of the end, if only those who could avert evil by reading them aright would read them.

What will be the consequences to the Nun of Kenmare of publishing this outspoken book we cannot say, but that it will greatly damage the Roman Catholic Church seems not to admit of doubt.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

Penological and Preventive Principles, with Special Reference to Europe and America. By WILLIAM TALLACK, Secretary of the Howard Association, London. London: Wertheimer, Lea and Co., 1889. Price, 8s.

AN excellent review of the wide field of crime and the treatment that criminals should receive from society. The author writes from long experience in dealing with these questions, and wide acquaintance with the leading penologists of the world. His views are largely those of the best authorities generally, but in some matters he stands in a minority, and works out his problems from his own experience and principles. The interest of the book to the readers of this Review lies in the fact that he writes from the position of a decided and out-spoken Christian. Most expressly and emphatically does he recognize the spirit of Christ in the Gospel as at once the guiding example and the most effective agency in dealing rightly with criminals. Throughout his work he is constantly recurring to the application of Christian principles, and judging in the light of the gospel. It will be interesting to see a few of his main conclusions.

The object sought in dealing with criminals is not retribution, the infliction of suffering proportioned to the offence, but the diminution of crime. In this object, reformation of the individual offender is of course one element, but deterrence from criminal action in the community is another, and a greater. Prevention, repression and reformation must be sought together. Prison discipline should therefore be decidedly and unmistakably deterrent: if it is not made thoroughly disagreeable, it fails: and yet the element of hope should always be in it, and kindness should never be absent. Life in the famous Reformatory Prison at Elmira, N.Y., the author regards as too comfortable for the attainment of its object. Yet certainty of punishment is far more important than severity. Crime must infallibly land the person who commits it where he does not like to be. Capital punishment fails of the requisite certainty, and thus fails of its object: but it may be far more merciful than lifelong imprisonment, which is intensely cruel, when it is not reduced to comparative insignificance by laxity. The author would have sentences short, but cumulative, growing heavier with each return of the offender to prison. He does not believe in the associate, or congregate method, by which prisoners are allowed to be much together, but in the "separate" system, of cellular confinement. He would provide such hand-labor as could be done in the cells, and would exclude steam-power and the accompanying machinery. He would allow a carefully-guarded contract system, in disposing of the products of prison-labor, but would not expect a rightly-conducted prison to be self-supporting. For the prisoners personally, he would encourage systematic and organized Christian visitation, not by ministers alone, but by judicious private

Digitized by Google

Christians, with a view to personal reformation. Far greater care should be taken than is exercised at present with regard to the character of the officers of prisons: and in the prevention of crime, the helpful function of the police force has not yet been adequately recognized. Very important is the subject of aid to the prisoners when discharged. For the providing of such aid society is responsible, and it should be given with certainty, wisdom, patience and truthfulness. The author believes in the lighter forms of corporal punishment for certain purposes, in fines, sometimes to be paid by instalments, as substitutes for imprisonment in some cases, and in sentences condemning to a liability to be imprisoned for a certain period, which may not be enforced unless found necessary. He is certain that life in prison does not contain the conditions best suited to reformation, and would have the time that men spend there used for the purpose of rendering prisons superfluous, so far as possible. He is most earnest in urging temperance as the condition, and godliness in Christ as the means of all virtuous living.

These conclusions, and others worthy to be mentioned with them, are illustrated and enforced by reference to experience in all the chief nations of the civilized world. The author gives also—what perhaps society needs quite as much—an exhibition of the unsatisfactoriness and deplorable failure of existing prison-systems generally. The brief exhibition of the state of American jails is terrible and mortifying. The book is a storehouse of information, and affords the Christian student an encouraging view of the entrance of the Lord's own law to a difficult but most important field.

W. N. CLARKE.

Digitized by Google

THE
BAPTIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XI. JULY, 1889. NO. 43.

I.

THE ANABAPTISTS IN SWITZERLAND.

THE history of the Anabaptists of the Reformation period has yet to be written from an impartial, unsectarian standpoint. The polemical attitude of the Reformers against them has warped the judgment of historians. They were cruelly treated in their lifetime by Romanists and Protestants, and misrepresented after their death as a set of heretical and revolutionary fanatics who could not be tolerated in a Christian State. The excesses of a misguided faction have been charged upon the whole body. They were made responsible for the Peasants' War and the Münster tragedy, although the great majority of them were quiet, orderly and peaceful citizens and would rather suffer persecution than do an act of violence. The Mennonites and the regular Baptists of England and America are the true successors of the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, and help us to understand and appreciate the latter.

The official reports on the proceedings against the Anabaptists are from their enemies and more or less colored. The works of Anabaptists are few and scarce. It would be a great service if the books and tracts of Dr. Hübmaier and other leaders were critically edited. This would be a

Digitized by Google

worthy task for some Baptist historical or publication society. I understand that there is a tolerably complete collection of them in the Theological Seminary at Rochester. In the *Staatsarchiv* of Zurich there are preserved about 250 documents under the title *Wiedertäuferacten*. Egli, in his *Actensammlung zur Geschichte der Zürcher Reformation* (Zurich 1879), and in his *Die Zürcher Wiedertäufer* (1878), has used them. Very important are also the Moravian, Austrian and other Anabaptist chronicles, which have been published in part by Beck, in his *Geschichtsbücher der Wiedertäufer in Oestreich-Ungarn* (Wien 1883). Professor Cornelius, of Münich, a liberal Roman Catholic, has done great service to the cause of historic truth by his works on the Anabaptists (*Geschichte des Münsterschen Aufruhrs*, Leipzig 1866–'60, 2 vols., and *Die Nederländischen Wiedertäufer*, 1869) which are based upon a careful investigation of the sources, and written in a fair spirit of justice. He puts to shame many Protestant historians. The Anabaptist hymnology has also received attention by Lilienkron (*Zur Liederdichtung der Wiedertäufer*, Munich, 1877), Wackernagel (in the third and fifth volumes of his monumental work *Das Deutsche Kirchenlied*), and Dr. Burrage (*Baptist Hymn Writers*, Portland, 1888, p. 1–25). Dr. Ludwig Keller, a learned layman of Münster, belonging to the German Reformed Church, has devoted much time and zeal to the rescue of the memory of the Anabaptists and connects them with the Waldensian Brethren and other mediæval sects by striking, but arbitrary, combinations and conjectures. His chief works in this line are his *Geschichte der Wiedertäufer und ihres Reiches zu Münster* (1880), and *Die Reformation und die älteren Reformparteien* (Leipzig 1885).

I have made use of these and other works in preparing a historical sketch of the Swiss Anabaptists in the Reformation period. The biographers of Zwingli and the historians of the Swiss Reformation mostly side with the Reformers

Digitized by Google

against the Anabaptists, although some condemn the harsh measures against them. A recent Roman Catholic writer, Richard Nitsch, in his *Geschichte der Wiedertäufer in der Schweiz zur Reformationszeit* (Einsiedeln, 1885) tries to do them justice, although the principles of his Church condemn both parties. Dr. Henry S. Burrage has presented the subject from a Baptist standpoint in a valuable monograph on *The Anabaptists of Switzerland* (Philadelphia, 1882). On the other hand, the most recent writer on the subject, Dr. A. Baur, in his *Zwingli's Theologie*, 1888, Vol. II. pp. 1–267, elaborately discusses the controversy with the radicals in Zurich in full sympathy with the Reformer and the civil magistrate. I shall treat the subject, as far as I am able, from a purely historical point of view.

The controversy between the Reformers and the Anabaptists referred only to the *subjects* of baptism, that is, to the question whether *infants* are proper subjects of baptism or not. The former affirmed, the latter denied this. The ground of opposition was the same as that taken by modern Baptists, namely, that baptism presupposes repentance and faith, of which infants are incapable. Behind this was another and deeper question concerning the nature of a true church and the voluntary principle of religion. The *mode* of baptism was no topic of controversy, because immersion was still extensively in use, and decidedly preferred by Luther and other Reformers, as the most expressive and primitive (though not as the *only*) mode.

The Swiss Reformation, like the German, was disturbed at an early stage by the Anabaptist movement, but allowed it more freedom of development. Zwingli, in Zurich, was placed between the two fires of Romanism and Ultraprotestantism. He was attacked in the front and rear; by the Romanists on the ground of tradition, by the radicals on the ground of the Bible. In some respects the danger from the latter was greater. Liberty has more to fear from

Digitized by Google

the excesses of its friends than from the opposition of its foes. It is very questionable whether the Reformation would have succeeded without conservative self-restraint.

The Reformers aimed to reform the old church by the Bible; the Anabaptists attempted to build a new church from the Bible. The former maintained the historic continuity; the latter went directly to the apostolic age and ignored the intervening centuries as an apostasy. The Reformers founded a popular state-church including all citizens with their families; the Anabaptists organized, on the voluntary principle, select congregations of baptized believers, separated from the world and from the State.

The radicals made use of the right of protest against the Reformation, which the Reformers so effectually exercised against Popery. They charged them with inconsistency and semi-Popery, yea, the worst kind of Popery. They denounced the state-church as worldly and corrupt and its ministers as mercenaries. They were charged in turn with Pharisaical pride, with revolutionary and socialistic tendencies. They were cruelly persecuted by imprisonment, exile, torture, fire and sword, and almost totally suppressed in Protestant as well as Roman Catholic countries. The age was not ripe for unlimited religious liberty and congregational self-government. The Anabaptists perished bravely as martyrs of conscience. Luther called them martyrs of the devil; but Leonhard Käser, to whom he wrote a letter of comfort and whom he held up as a model martyr to the heretical martyrs (see *Briefe*, ed. De Wette III. 179), was not a Lutheran, as he thought, but the pastor of an Anabaptist congregation, at Scherding. He was burnt August 18, 1527, by order of the bishop of Passau. (See Cornelius II., p. 56).

Zwingli took essentially the same conservative and reactionary position towards the Anabaptists as Luther in his controversy with Carlstadt and Hübmaier. He defended

Digitized by Google

the state-church or the people's church against a small fraction of sectaries and separatists who threatened its dissolution. But his position was more difficult, because he was much less influenced by tradition and more radical towards the Roman church. He himself, like the Baptists, aimed from the start at a practical purification of church life, and doubted for a while the expediency of infant baptism, deeming it better to put off baptism to years of discretion. But he saw the impossibility of realizing an ideal church of believers and stopped with what was attainable. As to infant baptism he changed his view and defended it with the analogy of circumcision in the Old Testament, and the comprehensiveness of the New Testament covenant which embraces whole families and nations. He also appealed to Christ's treatment of children, to 1 Cor. 7: 14, and to the cases of household baptisms in Acts 16: 25, 33 and 1 Cor. 1: 16.

The Anabaptist movement began in Zurich, in 1523, and lasted till 1532. The leaders were Conrad Grebel from one of the first families of Zurich, a layman educated in the universities of Vienna and Paris, whom Zwingli calls the corypheus of the Anabaptists; Felix Manz, the illegitimate son of a canon of the Great Minister, a good Hebrew scholar; Georg Blaurock, a monk, of Coire, called on account of his eloquence, "the mighty Jörg," or "the second Paul;" and Ludwig Hätzer, of Thurgau, chaplain at Wadenschwyl, who with Hans Denck prepared the first Protestant translation of the Hebrew Prophets,* acted as secretary of the second Zurich disputation, and edited its proceedings. With them were associated a number of ex-priests and ex-monks, as Wilhelm Reubli, minister at Wyticon, Johann Brödli (Paniculus) at Zollicon, and Simon Stumpf, at Höng. They took an active part in the early stages of the Refor-

*Their translation of the Prophets appeared at Worms in 1527 (and often); that of Zurich in 1529; and that of Luther was not completed till 1532.

Digitized by Google

mation and stood in the front rank of the image-stormers. They also opposed the fasts, the tithe, usury, military service and the oath. They denied the right of the civil magistrate to interfere in matters of religion. They met for prayers and Scripture reading in the house of "Mother Manz," and in the neighborhood of Zurich, especially at Zollicon.

The German radicals, Carlstadt and Münzer, were also for a short time in Switzerland and on the Rhine, but did not rebaptize and had no influence upon the Swiss radicals who resisted violence. Carlstadt gradually sobered down; Münzer stirred up the Peasants' War, took the sword and perished by the sword. Dr. Hübmaier, of Bavaria, the most learned among the Anabaptists, and their chief advocate, took part in the October disputation at Zurich in 1523, but afterwards wrote books against Zwingli (on the baptism of believers, 1525, and a dialogue with Zwingli, 1526), was expelled from Switzerland, and organized flourishing congregations in Moravia.

The radical movement spread with great rapidity, or rose simultaneously, in Berne, Basle, St. Gall, Appenzell, all along the Upper Rhine, in South Germany, and Austria. The Anabaptists were driven from place to place and traveled as fugitive evangelists. They preached repentance and faith, baptized converts, organized congregations and exercised rigid discipline. They called themselves simply "brethren" or "Christians." They were earnest and zealous, self-denying and heroic, but restless and impatient. They accepted the New Testament as their only rule of faith and practice, and so far agreed with the Reformers, but utterly broke with the Catholic tradition, and rejected Luther's theory of justification by faith only, and the real presence in the Eucharist. They emphasized the necessity of good works, and deemed it possible to keep the law and to reach perfection. They were generally orthodox, ex-

Digitized by Google

cept Hätzer and Denck, who doubted the doctrine of the Trinity and the divinity of Christ.

The first and chief aim of the Anabaptists was not (as is usually stated) the opposition to infant baptism, still less to sprinkling or pouring, but the establishment of a pure church of converts in opposition to the mixed church of the world. The rejection of infant baptism followed as a necessary consequence. They were not satisfied with separation from Popery; they wanted a separation from all the ungodly. They appealed to the example of the disciples in Jerusalem, who left the synagogue and the world, gathered in an upper room, sold their goods and held all things in common. They hoped at first to carry Zwingli with them, but in vain, and then they charged him with treason to the truth and hated him worse than the Pope.

Zwingli, like Luther, could not find the material for a pure, self-supporting and self-governing church, separate and distinct from the world. He could not follow the Anabaptists without bringing the Reformation into discredit with the lovers of order, and rousing the opposition of the government and the great mass of the people. He opposed them, as Augustin opposed the schismatical Donatists. He urged moderation and patience. The Apostles, he said, separated only from the open enemies of the gospel, and from the works of darkness, but bore with the weak brethren. Separation would not cure the evils of the church. There are many honest people, who though weak and sick, belong to the sheepfold of Christ, and would be offended at a separation. He appealed to the word of Christ, "He that is not against me, is for me," and to the parable of the tares and the wheat. If all the tares were to be rooted up now, there would be nothing left for the angels to do on the day of final separation. The opposition to the mixed state-church or popular church which embraced all the baptized, legitimately led to the rejection of infant baptism.

Digitized by Google

This became now the burning question. The radicals could find no trace of infant baptism in the Bible and denounced it as an invention of the Pope and the devil. Baptism, they reasoned, presupposes instruction, faith and conversion, which are impossible in the case of infants.* "Voluntary baptism of adult and responsible converts is therefore the only valid baptism." They denied that baptism is necessary for salvation, and maintained that infants are saved without baptism by the blood of Christ. But baptism is necessary for church-membership as a sign and seal of conversion.

From this conception of baptism followed, as a further consequence, the rebaptism of those converts who wished to unite with the new church.† Hence the name *Anabaptists* (*Wiedertäufer*) which originated with the Pedobaptists, but which they themselves rejected, because they knew no other kind of baptism except that of converts.

The demand of rebaptism virtually unbaptized and unchurched the entire Christian world, and completed the rupture with the historic church. It cut the last cord of union of the present with the past.

The first case was the rebaptism of Blaurock by Grebel, in February, 1525, soon after the disputation with Zwingli. At a private religious meeting Blaurock asked Grebel to give him the true Christian baptism on confession of his faith, fell on his knees and was baptized; then he baptized all others who were present, and partook with them of the Lord's Supper, or as they called it, the breaking of bread.‡

* Hübmaier, when in Waldshut, substituted first a simple benediction of children, in place of baptism, but baptized when the parents wished it. See Gieseler's Church History, III. A. p. 210.

† The Augsburg Confession, (Art. IX.) condemns the Anabaptists for teaching "*pueros sine baptismo salvos fieri.*" There are few Lutherans who would subscribe this condemnation now.

‡ Füsslin II., 338. The report of a Moravian Baptist chronicle quoted by Cornelius (II. 26 sq.), is as follows: "*Und es hat sich begeben, dasz sie bei einander gewesen sind, bis die Angst auf sie kam und sie in ihren Herzen gedrungen*

Digitized by Google

Reubli introduced rebaptism in Waldshut in Lent, 1525, and convinced Hübmaier of its necessity, so that Hübmaier at Easter was rebaptized and baptized about three hundred persons.

Baptism was not bound to any particular form or time or place or person. Any one could administer the ordinance upon penitent believers who desired it. It was first done mostly in houses, by sprinkling or pouring, occasionally by partial or total immersion in rivers.*

The *mode* of baptism as already remarked, was no point of dispute between Anabaptists and Pedobaptists in the sixteenth century either on the Continent or in England. Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth were baptized by immersion, and the Anglican Liturgy prescribed this as the normal

wurden; da haben sie angefangen ihre Kniee zu beugen vor dem höchsten Gott im Himmel, und ihn angerufen, dass er ihnen geben wolle, seinen göttlichen Willen zu vollbringen. Darauf hat Jürg [Blaurock] sich erhoben und um Gottes willen gebeten, dass Conrad [Grebel] ihn taufe mit der rechten wahren christlichen Taufe auf seinen Glauben und seine Erkenntniss; ist wieder auf die Kniee gefallen und von Conrad getauft worden; und allen übrigen Anwesenden haben sich dann von Jürg taufen lassen. Hiernächst hat derselbe, seinem eigenen Bericht zufolge, damit die Brüder des Todes Christi allweg eingedenk wären und sein vergossen Blut nicht vergässen, ihnen den Brauch Christi angezeigt, den er in seinen Nachtmal gehalten hat, und zugleich mit ihnen das Brot gebrochen und den Trunk getrunken, damit sie sich erinnerten, dass sie alle durch den einigen Leib Christi erlöst und durch sein einiges Blut abgewaschen seien, auf dass sie alle eins und je einer des anderen Bruder and Schwester in Christo ihrem Herrn wären." Cornelius adds to this report: "*Diese Dinge haben sich wenige Tage nach der Disputation des 18. Januar zugetragen, und rasch, noch ehe die Verbannten ihren Abschied genommen hatten, ist, zum Theil mit ihrer Hülfe, der Gebrauch der Taufe und des Herrn Brodes nach Zollikon und über die ganze Genossenschaft verbreitet worden.*"

* "Nitsche says, p. 30: "*Wenn über jemand 'der Geist Gottes kam,' beklagte und beweinte er seine Sünden und bat den ersten besten, ihn zu taufen; dieser bespritzte oder überschüttete ihn unter Nennung der drei göttlichen Personen mit Wasser. Einem förmlichen Untertauchen, wie es später wohl vorkommt, begegnen wir zunächst nicht. . . . Meistens wurde die Taufe in irgend einem Hause vollzogen; aber auch im Freien wurde getauft: so Rudolph Breitinger bei Gelegenheit eines Spazierganges am Neppelbach, ein anderer beim Brunnen zu Hirslanden.*" Egli, p. 23 sq.: "*Wie es scheint, war Blaurock der eigentlich populäre Täufer und wandte den Gebrauch allgemeiner an auf den ersten Besten, der weinend zu ihm kam.*"

Digitized by Google

mode.* On the other hand the early Anabaptists baptized by sprinkling and pouring as well. We learn this from the reports in the suits against them at Zurich. Blaurock baptized by sprinkling,† Manz by pouring.‡ The first clear case of immersion among the Swiss Anabaptists is that of Wolfgang Uliman, an ex-monk of Coire, and for a while assistant of Kessler in St. Gall. He was converted by Grebel on a journey to Schaffhausen and, not satisfied with being "sprinkled merely out of a dish," was "drawn under and covered over in the Rhine."§

The Lord's Supper was administered by the Baptists in the simplest manner after a plain supper (in imitation of the original institution and the Agape) by the recital of the words of institution and the distribution of bread and wine. They held the Zwinglian view.

These two ideas of a pure church of believers and of baptism of believers only, were the fundamental articles of the Anabaptist creed. On other points there was a great variety and confusion of opinions. Some believed in the sleep of the soul between death and resurrection, a millennial reign of Christ, and final restoration; some entertained communistic and socialistic opinions which led to the catastrophe

* Erasmus says, "With us" (on the Continent) "infants have the water poured on them, in England they are dipped."

† In the trial of fourteen Anabaptists, February 7, 1525, Marx Bosshard testified that Hans Bruggbach of Zumicon, after the reading of a portion of the New Testament in a meeting, confessed and deplored his sins and requested as a sign of his conversion to be sprinkled in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; whereupon Blaurock sprinkled him. "*Darauf habe ihn Blaurock bespritzt.*" Egli, *Actensammlung*, p. 282.

‡In the same suit Jörg Schad said, "*er habe sich lassen begüssen mit Wasser, und syg* [*sei*] *Felix Manz toifer gesin* [*Täufer gewesen.*"] Ibid. p. 283.

§Kessler, *Sabbata* I. 266, "*in dem Rhin von dem Grebel under getruckt und bedeckt*") Comp. Burrage, 104, 117, 204. Burrage claims also the river baptisms in St. Gall as cases of immersion. The river Sitter which flows from the Säntis into the Thur is deep enough for immersion, and in that river modern Baptists perform the ceremony by immersion. So I am informed by an intelligent Swiss of that region.

Digitized by Google

of Münster (1534). Wild excesses of immorality occurred here and there.* But it is unjust to charge the extravagant dreams and practices of individuals upon the whole body. The Swiss Anabaptists had no connection with the Peasants' War, which barely touched the borders of Switzerland, and were, upon the whole, like the Moravian Anabaptists, distinguished for simple piety and strict morality. Bullinger, who was opposed to them, gives the Zurich radicals the credit that they denounced luxury, intemperance in eating and drinking and all vices, and led a serious, spiritual life. Kessler of St. Gall reports their cheerful martyrdom and exclaims: "Alas, what shall I say of the people! They move my sincere pity, for many of them are zealous for God but without knowledge." And Salat, a Roman Catholic contemporary, writes, that "with cheerful, smiling faces they desired and asked death and went into it with singing German psalms and other prayers."

The Anabaptists produced some of the earliest Protestant hymns in the German language, which deserve the attention of historians. Some of them have passed into orthodox collections in ignorance of the real authors. Blaurock, Manz, Hübmaier, Hetzer, Kock, Wagner, Langmantel, Sattler, Schiemer, Glait, Steinmetz, Büchel, and many others contributed to the great body of Christian song. The Anabaptist psalms and hymns resemble those of Schwenkfeld and his followers. They dwell on the inner life of the Christian, the mysteries of regeneration, sanctification, and personal union with Christ. They breathe throughout, a spirit of piety, devotion, cheerful resignation under suffering and readiness for martyrdom. They are hymns of the cross, to comfort and encourage the scattered sheep of Christ ready for the slaughter in imitation of their Divine Shepherd.

We pass now to the measures taken against the separatists. At first Zwingli tried to persuade them in private con-

*As in St. Gall and Appenzell; see Cornelius, II. 64 sq.

Digitized by Google

ferences, but in vain. Then followed a public disputation, which took place by order of the magistrate, in the Council hall, January 17, 1525. Grebel was opposed to it, but appeared, together with Manz, and Reubli. They urged the usual arguments against infant baptism, that infants cannot understand the gospel, cannot repent and exercise faith. Zwingli answered them, and appealed chiefly to circumcision and I. Cor. 7: 14 where Paul speaks of the children of Christian parents as "holy." He afterwards published his views in a book, "On Baptism, Rebaptism and Infant Baptism." (May 27, 1525). Bullinger who was present, reports that the Anabaptists were unable to refute Zwingli's arguments and to maintain their ground. Another disputation was held in March, and a third in November, but with no better result.

The magistrate decided against them and issued an order that infants should be baptized as heretofore, and that parents who refuse to have their children baptized should leave the city and canton with their families and goods.

The Anabaptists refused to obey, and ventured on bold demonstrations. They arranged processions and passed as preachers of repentance, in sackcloth and girdled, through the streets of Zurich, singing, praying, exhorting, abusing the old dragon (Zwingli) and his horns, and exclaiming: "Woe, woe unto Zurich!"*

The leaders were arrested and shut up in a room in the Augustinian convent. A commission of ministers and magistrates were sent to them to convert them. Twenty-four professed conversion and were set free. Fourteen men and seven women were retained and shut up in the Witch Tower, but they made their escape April 5.

Grebel, Manz and Blaurock were rearrested, and charged with communistic and revolutionary teaching. After some other excesses, the magistrate proceeded to threaten those

*Zwingli, *Opera* III. 364.

Digitized by Google

who stubbornly persisted in their error, with death by drowning—a cruel irony.

It is not known whether Zwingli really consented to the death-sentence, but he certainly did not openly oppose it.*

Six executions in all took place in Zurich between 1527 and 1532. Manz was the first victim: he was bound, carried to a boat, and thrown into the river Limmat near the lake, Jan. 5, 1527. Grebel had escaped the same fate by previous death in 1526. The last executions took place March 23, 1532, when Heinrich Karpfis and Hans Herzog were drowned. The foreigners were punished by exile and met death in Roman Catholic countries. Blaurock was scourged, expelled, and burnt 1529, at Clausen, in the Tyrol. Hätzer who fell into carnal sins, was beheaded for adultery and bigamy at Constance, Feb. 24, 1529.†

Other cantons took the same measures against the Anabaptists. In Zug, Lorenz Fürst was drowned, Aug. 17, 1529. In Appenzell, Uliman and some others were beheaded, and some women drowned. A Council of Basle, Nov. 13, 1530, banished the Anabaptists with the threat that they should be drowned if they returned. A Council of Berne took the same measure.

In Germany and in Austria the Anabaptists fared still worse. The Diet of Speier, in April, 1529, decreed that "every Anabaptist and rebaptized person of either sex be put to death by sword, or fire, or otherwise." The decree was severely carried out with the exception of Strassburg and the domain of Philip of Hesse. Hübmaier was burnt at the stake. The most blood was shed in Roman Catholic countries. Hübmaier was burnt at the stake in Vienna, March 10, 1528, and his wife drowned in the Danube three days

*Egli, p. 93, thinks that if he consented, he did it with reluctant heart, not like Calvin in the case of Servetus, with a strong sense of duty.

†Burrage defends Hätzer against these charges, p. 200 sqq., but Keim and Cornelius (II. 59) sustain the charge.

Digitized by Google

afterwards. "In Tyrol and Görz," says Cornelius,* "the number of executions in the year 1531 reached already one thousand, in Ensisheim, six hundred. At Linz seventy-three were killed in six weeks. Duke William of Bavaria, surpassing all others, issued the fearful decree, to behead those who recanted, to burn those who refused to recant. Throughout the greater part of Upper Germany the persecution raged like a wild chase. The blood of these poor people flowed like water that they cried to the Lord for help. But hundreds of them of all ages and both sexes suffered the pangs of torture without a murmur, despised to buy their lives by recantation and went to the place of execution joyful and singing Psalms."

The blood of martyrs is never shed in vain. The Anabaptist movement was defeated, by fire and sword, but not destroyed; it revived among the Mennonites, the Baptists in England and America, and more recently in isolated congregations on the Continent. The question of the subjects and the mode of baptism still divides the Baptist from the Pedobaptist churches; but the principle of religious liberty and separation of Church and State, for which the Swiss and German Anabaptists suffered and died, has left its imprint upon the course of history, has triumphed in America, and is making steady progress in Europe.

PHILIP SCHAFF.

Union Theological Seminary, New York.

*L. C. II. 57 sq.

Digitized by Google

II.

PAST ATTEMPTS AT CHURCH UNION, ESPECIALLY ON THE CONTINENT.

THE question of the day among Protestants is Church Union. The reunion of the old and new school Presbyterians suggests the union of Presbyterians north and south. The Pan Presbyterian alliance has resulted in the organization of all Reformed and Presbyterian mission churches in Japan into one synod. The various Methodist bodies in Canada now affiliate, and the Free Will Baptists are considering overtures of union from Regular Baptists on the one hand and from Congregationalists on the other. The Episcopalian Bishops in the United States have entered into formal correspondence with different denominations with a view to church union. This is an era of good feeling. The steam car and steam ship and telegraph have facilitated intercourse and spread enlightenment to such an extent that misunderstandings, one of the chief sources of controversy, have been substantially removed. No sentiment is so sure to be applauded as one advocating unity and brotherhood. When we observe what joy the "variations of Protestantism" give to the enemy, who of us "are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph?" Who can read the Saviour's prayer "That they may be one even as we are one" without adding an amen.

It has been well said that no subject is known until its history is known. What light is thrown upon the present agitation of church union from previous efforts to gain the same end?

When the Reformation was established on the Continent

Digitized by Google

of Europe, the views of Calvin prevailed in France, Switzerland, Holland and Hungary, and those of Luther in Scandinavia, while in the German States both reformers had their adherents. Germany therefore was to be the field of theological strife or concord. The first effort to unite the divided ranks against the Papists and Charles V. was due to Philip of Hesse. The Swiss were eager for reconciliation but the Saxons attended the conference only at Philip's urgent entreaty. "I know well that I will not yield to them at all, I cannot either, because I am so confident in my opinion that they err and, more than that, are uncertain in their own minds," said Luther. The Swiss doctors taught that the Lord's supper is a mere memorial, but Luther insisted upon the real presence of the Saviour in the elements. After receiving the guests at Marburg and treating them like princes, Philip arranged for private interviews between the contending theologians before the public session. Luther was closeted three hours with Oecolampadius, and Melanchthon six with Zwingli. Saturday, October 2nd, 1529, at six o'clock in the morning, in the presence of sixty scholars and diplomats, these four men, seated around one table, began the debate on the real presence of Jesus in the bread and wine of the eucharist. "I know of no other way but for them to honor God's word and to believe with us," cried Luther, after long and useless debate. "At least treat each other as brothers," said the despairing Philip. To this Zwingli replied; "There are no persons on earth with whom we would rather agree than with the Wittenbergers." But Luther withheld his hand, remarking "You have a different spirit from us, still I am willing to give you the love every Christian owes his enemies." In Zurich it was reported that Luther had been impudent. In Wittenberg the story was that Zwingli had shown much arrogance. Melanchthon said he preferred death to contamination by fellowship with the Swiss. However, before the disputants parted, Philip

Digitized by Google

induced Luther to draw up articles upon which both sides agreed and then to state the points still pending. Such a document was drawn up, closing in chilling terms, as follows: Each side should manifest toward the other Christian love as far as conscience allows, and both sides should diligently entreat the Almighty to confirm us by his spirit in the right understanding.

The Marburg interview accomplished so little that next year when the Augsburg Confession was prepared, phrases were inserted that excluded the Reformed and compelled them to hand to the Diet a creed of their own. However, politics brought about what debate had failed to accomplish, not merely a truce but an act of concord. Luther at first would have nothing more to do with the Reformed, who said one thing to him and then printed the opposite in Switzerland. "Rather leave things as they are than patch up a fictitious union." But when Charles V. renewed his threats of war upon the Protestants, Luther changed his mind, as appears in a letter to Bucer of Strasburg, who had urged him to be reconciled with his Swiss brethren. "I wish that the schism might be healed, if it cost three times my life, for I see how necessary your fellowship is to us and how much trouble this disunion has caused the gospel, so that I am convinced that if we had remained one, all the gates of hell, the whole Papacy, the Turk, the whole world, the flesh and all evil besides could not have caused the gospel so much injury."

Bucer did not regard the sacraments as fundamental, and accepted nominally all Luther taught concerning consubstantiation, so at last there was signed at Wittenberg, in 1536, an act of concord. The Swiss had prayed: "May the God of peace, for the right establishment of the gospel, restore unity among us." To this Luther replied: "Let the turbid water settle. Let all bad feeling be put away, that there may be room for the Holy Spirit." Bugenhagen closed the conference with the sentiment: "Not that we

Digitized by Google

may approach you, or you us, but that both of us may approach the truth." As D'Aubigné says: "It was Luther's left hand that repulsed Zwingli at Marburg, but it was his right that signed the Wittenberg Act of Concord." Soon, in less than ten years, the old spirit ruled Luther again and he attacked the Swiss position in his rudest fashion.

Instead of carrying out his threats toward the Protestant Princes, the Emperor sought their help, pressed as he was by France on the west and by the Turks on the east of his dominions. In April 1541, he summoned a colloquy at Speier, to "so arrange matters that the tedious divisions of religion might be united in Christian concord." The clerical and secular delegates assembled finally in Worms, toward the last of November. The month of December was spent in arranging preliminaries with the cunning Papal nuncio. Three days in January were given to the discussion of the doctrine of original sin, by such giants as Melanchthon, Calvin and Eck. Thereupon, the next day, with nothing accomplished, the colloquy was closed, on account of the impending Diet at Ratisbon. Thus was put to shame the hope of many "expectant" Catholics, who, with Wicel, demanded that the Pope and Luther should yield to "the judgment of the Fathers who ruled the Church a thousand years ago."

One more official effort was made to unite Protestants and Catholics, this likewise at Worms, but in 1557 by King Ferdinand, who did not wish to see his kingdom divided by warring creeds. The Catholic disputants shrewdly exposed the divisions in the ranks of the Protestants, who, thereupon, threatened to expel each other from the conference; Brenz became so angry he could not speak, and "there never was before such horrible strife and confusion." The conference broke up with no good results, but with anger and resentment rankling in the breasts of many, and the gulf between the Lutheran parties wider than ever. This

Digitized by Google

growing bitterness inside the Protestant ranks discredited evangelical theologians and theology; the people were in doubt what to believe, while talented young men were repelled from the ministry by the angry war of words, and Hyperius expressed his apprehension that the churches would soon be without pastors unless the strife ceased. Calvin wrote, in 1556, of his ardent desire that there might be a Protestant congress to forward Church union. In 1564 the Elector of the Palatinate and the Duke of Wurtemberg tried to accomplish it within their borders. They "would have nothing to do with the troublesome heads of the theologians," and thought they had a union arranged "because no theologian was there."

In the same year the Roman Catholic Cassander wrote the Emperor Maximilian II. a plan of religious peace upon the basis of the Apostles' Creed and the Church Fathers before Gregory the Great. The Sacrament might be dispensed in two kinds (bread and wine), and priests might be allowed to marry. Even such concessions condemned his writings to the Index of Prohibited Books.

The basis of Church union in Melanchthon's mind was "the legitimate use of the Sacraments and a consensus in the incorruptible doctrine of the Gospel." He knew of no union of faith without the acceptance of the same theological formulæ. Melanchthon was moderate, benevolent—hating sophistry as he loved the truth; but his reason for wanting to die, found on the last scrap he left on his desk, was "to be liberated from the rabies of theologians."

The next efforts at Church union proceeded from Du Plessis Mornay, the Huguenot statesman, and Pareus, likewise of the Reformed faith. Both, in the year 1614, recommended a general synod, or ecumenical council of all Protestants to formulate a new creed, avoiding articles that would lead to strife. James I., of England, replied to the suggestion, but in 1618 the Thirty Years' War broke out

Digitized by Google

and interfered with all such proposals. The Lutheran Sigwart designated Pareus' irenic, in favor of mutual toleration, as "an invention of hell."

Soon after, in 1627, the oft-quoted phrase "in necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, in utrisque caritas" was first published by its author, Rupert Meldenius, who attributed theological rancor to pride, envy or the love of money. Luther's noble wine had indeed turned, as Pufendorf said, into sour vinegar.

During the "religious war" two colloquies were held. The one at Leipsig, in 1631, was to be secret. Common fear kept both sides together in politics, but danger led neither side to change an iota in its confession of faith. The other was held in 1645, at Thorn, in Poland, and included Romanists. The Reformed and Moravian brethren had harmonized their differences in Poland as early as 1555, and into this alliance the Lutherans were compelled to enter in 1570 from fear of the Jesuits. The three parties thus united secured at Warsaw in 1573 an article in the constitution requiring an oath from the new King, granting peace and equal rights to all the churches. In 1575 the King said: "I am king of men, not of consciences, and dare not rule the conscience which belongs to God alone." Wadislaus IV. loved peace, and thought it feasible, by a quiet, mutual talk and understanding about points in dispute, to bring the parties together. The Lutherans thought a union that would please God was impossible without an agreement in doctrine, which did not exist. Calixtus, of Hanover, who devoted "all his life to the suppression—or at least to the diminution—of the rents in the church," was one of the delegates. After separate worship, the Romanists, Reformed, and the Lutherans solemnly enter St. John's at Thorn. In the King's opening speech it was required that first of all a liquidation should take place, each party presenting its own views clearly, to avoid subsequent misunderstandings. The

Digitized by Google

further recommendations of the King were not reached before the long convention was broken up. There were debates as to rank between Lutherans and Reformed, which were settled by giving the chief seats in the synagogue to each party alternately. Then the Lutherans would not join in the opening prayer with the others. Strict rules were laid down as to the names each party should go by, and a bishop objected to the title, when a Lutheran referred to the Reformed as "venerable brethren." All were tired before the three months were over, and the discussion came to an end without reaching a conclusion. Calixtus said it was not "a charitable colloquy. It was irritable and no colloquy at all."

Though the University of Giessen designated Calvinism "a horrible infidelity, an abominable idolatry and a spiritual fornication," and the professors at Wittenberg called Calixtus and his friends "putrid members of the church body," because they sought union with the Calvinists, the effort was not abandoned. Calixtus clung to the saying of Jerome: "Christ is not so poor as to have a church in Sardinia alone. All Christendom belongs to him." He wished to see the internal civil wars of the Church of Christ extinguished and the contending warriors united, that "turning about, and going out, the wretched heathen might be converted to Christ by a united Christendom." This one of the earliest appeals in modern times in behalf of foreign missions, sprang from the heart of one whose whole life was an advocacy of church union.

Calixtus' hope of union revived when a man of kindred spirit, John Dury, the Scotchman, obtained the consent of Landgrave William VI., of Hesse, to call another colloquy at Cassel. The time, 1661, was favorable. The long war had kept the contending sects in one camp for thirty years, and produced better feeling than had been known for a century. The Landgrave hoped that a convention to compare views

Digitized by Google

might lead, if not to agreement, yet at least to a better understanding and to mutual tolerance. The conference was friendly and might have led to a general congress, but the death of the Landgrave disappointed that expectation.

A contemporary of Calixtus, Amyraut, the leader of the French Protestants, expressed the opinion that "if the Reformed and Lutherans only met to confer they would find the differences between them were not vital. If they met, not for strife, out of which one side would come forth victor and the other vanquished, but for the truth's sake, they could agree. But men prefer victory to truth. A majority of votes in synods will accomplish as little as a mixing of conflicting opinions in equivocal formulæ, the interpretation of which will lead to fresh complications. Rather take out the questions in controversy, strip from them all derivative issues, and when you come to the root you will find both sides agree. Written opinions will help those who really seek for an understanding. Going to church together, communing together and the exchange of pulpits will add to the good feeling. If the clergy would treat each other in a more friendly manner, the people would soon be reconciled." But such views were so far in advance of the age that Amyraut was denounced as a heretic by his co-religionists in Holland.

Molanus of Hanover, a disciple of Calixtus, with the motto "Blessed are the peacemakers," was the next agitator of church union. The question was forced to the front toward the close of the 17th century by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, which filled Germany with refugees. The presence of these Frenchmen of the Reformed faith brought the question of church fellowship home to the Lutherans. Molanus interested Leibnitz, the philosopher, in the movement, and they were supported by no less a personage than the first king of Prussia, William I. who looked upon theological differences as "a sour sauce stirred up by the ministers." Turretin, at the royal suggestion, entered

Digitized by Google

into correspondence with Leibnitz on a project of union. The Genevan affirmed that the points in debate "do not concern salvation nor prevent essential unity. Controversy will not bring us together. Strife only embitters. Let our intercourse be loving, for with open arms we welcome Lutherans to our communion table in Geneva." King William I. now that Saxony had become Roman Catholic, determined that Prussia should rally around her all the Protestant states. He was not content with the old solution of the difficulties by toleration, but he wished to go a step further and establish union. "As the differences are not fundamental, let them be set aside. Let the old names, Lutheran and Reformed, be merged in the new title, Evangelical. Let all unite in worship and eucharist." Molanus dreamed of "one and the same, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Evangelical, and Reformed church." With the help of Leibnitz, he prepared a "via ad pacem," and the philosopher added his "tentamen irenicum," in which he explains the cause of the dispute as to predestination and the supper. After several interviews and much correspondence between Berlin and Hanover, secret preliminaries were perfected for a public "collegium caritativum," or charitable convention, to meet in Berlin in 1703 to do something about union. The conservative Spener, who thought the time was not ripe and the age too bitter for such an attempt, was not invited, but the zealous Winkler was there, who by his effort to cut the gordian knot at once, and publishing his "royal arcanum," put an end to the proceedings. Winkler's programme, which aroused such a storm of opposition was indeed disavowed by the convention, but it was too late, the mine was sprung. Winkler urged the King to unite the churches by a royal fiat, to reduce the differing rites to uniformity, and to issue a creed with a minimum of doctrine and a maximum of ethics. Leibnitz was recalled by his Prince, and the cause to which he had devoted twenty years of his life, proved a failure.

Digitized by Google

The philosopher thought Church Union out, as a theory, with perfect clearness, but he made no allowance for the strong hold old doctrines and customs have on society. And Molanus learned that it was one thing to grieve over rents in Christendom and to recognize the duty of closing them, and quite another thing to effect union at a certain time. But neither philosopher nor theologian ever abandoned the hope that "sometime, of necessity, for the welfare of Protestantism, the thing will adjust itself."

Meanwhile, Molanus had conferred with De Spinola, the confessor of the German Empress, and Leibnitz with Archbishop Bossuet, as to union between the Holy See and Wittenberg. Spinola promised concessions as to the Eucharist, the marriage of priests, and another Ecumenical Council, but the propositions were rejected with indignation by the German people.

The correspondence between Leibnitz and Bossuet lasted from 1691 to 1602, but as they could not agree upon the decrees of the Council of Trent as a standard of appeal, the learned debate was necessarily fruitless. It is no wonder that the archbishop rejected the philosopher's plan of settling the questions in dispute by ignoring them.

The second centennial celebration of the Reformation, occurring in 1717, revived interest in the subject, which had thus far defied the powers of Church and State. Pfaff found in 1720 an echo to his peace sentiments in Holland and England, but next year came from Hamburg as a rebuff: "The present union movement with the so-called Reformed is opposed to all the ten commandments, to all the articles of the Apostles' Creed, and to all the petitions of the Lord's prayer."

In 1724 Von Loen published his "Evangelical Temple of Peace, after the model of the Primitive Church, in which Christians of all nations and confessions may unite their praises, hymns and prayers, in holy devotion and charity." This was followed in 1750 by "The only true religion, gen-

Digitized by Google

eral in its principles, confounded by the disputes of the scribes, split into all kinds of sects, united in Christ." The Holy Scriptures, he said, are the only perfectly valid sources of the Christian religion. All creeds and symbols are valid only as far as they use the expressions of Scripture and agree with the mind of the gospel. Christianity has been deformed by pride, useless doctrinal disputes, excessive ceremonies, and blind religious zeal. As the chief cause of dispute has been the Lord's Supper, let it be dispensed with for the present. Let the royal authority expedite Church Union without consulting theological faculties. It cannot be expected that ministers will favor union. If there can be no agreement in doctrine, let there be union in faith and love. With Von Loen agreed Werenfels who found all the trouble in the heart. It is human weakness to differ. Let there be inter-communion even if there can be no consensus of creed statement.

Von Loen's attack upon theology, upon the old orthodoxy that had reigned during the preceding century, is an expression of the pietist movement, which transferred the emphasis from the head to the heart, from doctrine to life. The blow administrated to rigid dogmatism by pietism in the opening of the 18th century was followed at its close by another from rationalism. Rationalism transferred the emphasis from revelation to reason, from the Bible to nature and philosophy. The intellectual and religious confusion produced by rationalism was followed by political disintegration through the wars of Napoleon. The German victory at Waterloo in 1815 awakened profound gratitude to the God of battles, and the approaching third centennial of the Reformation in 1817 revived memories of Luther and of the truth he proclaimed. At length chastened by the French oppression, and weary of the negations of rationalism, the hour had arrived when German Protestants were willing to so far sink their differences as to unite in their church life.

Digitized by Google

In that year Frederick William III. celebrated the festival of the Reformation by forming in Potsdam, the city of royal residence, a Union church, and he appealed to all Germany to follow his example. "You are one in fundamentals. It is only externals that divide. Union will please God. Let not Lutherans become Reformed, nor Reformed, Lutherans, but let both together form a new Evangelical Christian Church in the spirit of its Founder." Beginning with Nassau, one state after another tried the royal experiment. The sentiment was not unanimously in its favor.

Tittmann wrote adversely in 1818, and in 1822 Steudel objected to "the diplomatic arts and confusion of conscience inseparable from a union by royal decree." Yet that was precisely the plan that had been suggested by Planck and Schleiermacher as early as 1803. Planck thought the Union might be accomplished without the knowledge of the people, or "the masses" as he styled them. Schleiermacher made no account of "the uneducated classes" in the plan he proposed to the King. "A Church Union must be established without touching the creed, the liturgy or religious convictions. It is useless, yes, almost ridiculous to discuss doctrinal differences. Church Union can be easily restored by the practice of intercommunion." So little account was taken of doctrine in this movement, that Sack suggested, in 1812, the Apostles' creed as a sufficient doctrinal basis. But the King and his theologians counted without their host. The form of worship appointed was too antiquated for the Lutherans and too novel for the Reformed, and though the days of bitter theological rancor had passed, still the differences of view would assert themselves, and in 1834 the old creeds were again restored. The decree refusing to recognize any but Union churches was rescinded soon after, and, in 1852, votes in the Union synods were allowed to be taken by the two confessions separately. Thus more and more the bond of union proved to be a factor of dissolution. Fault was

Digitized by Google

found with Schleiermacher for his indifference to doctrine in his plan of Church Union. In 1830 D. Schulz and Von Kölln wrote: "The Augsburg confession is no longer adapted to represent the unity and fellowship of the faith and doctrine of the Evangelical church. In a better future when there is greater agreement and a general spread of right views, it will be possible and advisable to put forth a new and more valid creed." In the same tone Julius Müller wrote: "The Protestant church will destroy itself if it tries to restore the standing of the symbols in their strictly literal sense. It can as little bind itself by the Holy Scriptures alone, as such a bond would have no definite meaning and contents. The better plan would be to reaffirm the fundamental articles of the Augsburg confession."

Schleiermacher replied: "New creeds are never a good thing for the Church, but always a matter of necessity. Even a rationalist can accept and use orthodox doctrines and formulæ and liturgies (of course in his own sense and understanding) without being chargeable, in every case, with lack of fidelity and faith, or with mental reservation."

There were not lacking those that favored the Union. Ebrard expressed his delight with it in 1849: "We have true union because we live with the Lutherans in brotherly harmony, and in harmony because each creed is master in its own house, and is not disturbed in its dear doctrines and usages."

Twesten pointed to the precedent of Church Union in the days of the apostles, when differences of opinion were overlooked in love. "The end of union efforts should be to unite all believers, living at the same time in the same place in mutual edification. For edification, I say, leaving controversy to the schools. It is not to be taken for granted, as the formulæ of concord do, that of two opposing opinions only one can be scriptural and true."

Of course the strict Lutheran Guericke opposed the union

Digitized by Google

as "a purely royal work." Nitzsch and Dorner saw no hope for permanent union except upon a doctrinal basis.

Rothe was deeply interested in the concord of Christians, but not at all in the union of churches, unless it leads to Christian concord instead of preventing it. "It would have been better if church union had never been thought of. The schism between Luther and Zwingli is a sin against the principles of the Reformation, but it cannot be covered up by the amalgamation of the two churches into one."

Zeschwitz could not conceive of "a union in the government of the church without a union in the creed of the church. Any other is a false, external *unionism*. Intercommunion is to be deprecated not because it pollutes the altar, but because it confuses the conscience and disturbs the boundary of the creed."

It is interesting to hear the views of the statesman Stahl in this conflict of opinion.

He reckons among fundamental delusions the idea that the church and the congregation are identical, and that the general priesthood of believers should be taken not only as the foundation but also as the formulative principle of the constitution of the church. The school of Schleiermacher has abandoned the thought of the possibility of an absolutely pure doctrine, finding, as they do, opposing doctrinal tropes in the Holy Scriptures themselves, and leaving church dogmas in a perpetual flux. The true value of union is in the worth put upon fellowship, in the respect shown for the peculiarities of the other man, in the thought of the invisible church as against rationalism, pantheism and materialism. True Catholicism does not begin in union, but finds its impediment there. The Evangelical Alliance can do as little as the Jesuits toward interconfessional peace. The king should not alienate faithful hearts by unionizing, for this union is not an ideal one resting on doctrine, but is merely a convenient ecclesiastical arrangement."

Digitized by Google

A review of the past attempts at church union is not without its lessons for the present and the future. The sixteenth century attempted to unite Christendom on the basis of a long creed and failed, as did the seventeenth on the basis of a shorter one. Then the last century sought a practical basis for union, no longer in creeds but in intercommunion. That also failing, the present century has offered, but in vain, a new, modernized creed in place of the old symbols. If therefore, human creeds, long, short, old and new, and communion, however open and free, will not unite Christendom, what is the solvent that will crystallize the mass of Christians into order and beauty.

All the centuries teach us that neither the beauty of art, nor the learning of philosophers, nor the fear and favor of kings can serve as a girdle for the bride of Christ. There is a girdle, a double girdle, heaven designed and God-made, which will bind the Church together again as it did in the first century. But baptism and the supper cannot be used as the ordinances of Christian and church union, until men subtract what they have added to the liturgy, government, doctrine and discipline of the Church of Christ and the Apostles.

W. W. EVERTS, JR.

Haverhill, Mass.

Digitized by Google

III.

OUR ETHICAL THEORIES.—WHAT ARE THEY?

MACAULAY'S well known thesis, that Theology is an unprogressive science, seems in the main to be sound and defensible. The substantive facts and doctrines of revealed religion are contained in certain authoritative documents to which nothing can lawfully be added, and from which nothing can lawfully be taken away. In point of fact human investigation and discovery have not increased by so much as a single article the germ of our sacred credenda, nor have they diminished that germ. The apostles of the New Theology, inheritors though they are of ages of ever advancing learning and criticisms are certainly no wiser and safer religious guides than the Apostles John and Paul. The claims of a progressive theology find their only consistent basis in Cardinal Newman's un-Protestant principle, that revealed truth forms a simple *depositum* of faith intended to grow and expand by a process of development into what ultimately become real additions to the creed of Christendom. One would think that the doctrines already acquired by this process, such as the Immaculate Conception, and Papal Infallability, are sufficient to condemn the principle by a palpable *reductio ad absurdum.*

There is no doubt a qualified and important sense in which the science of theology may justly be styled progressive, and one which Macaulay would readily have accepted. Interpretations of Scripture may change and improve, and thus supply occasion and warrant for the revision and restatement of Christian doctrines. Its inexhaustible fullness may reveal to the patient student deeper meanings, and

Digitized by Google

these may suggest easy methods of reconciling its teachings with the sober conclusions of the most advanced scientific knowledge. The Bible being what it is, at once fixed and elastic, immutable in its letter but flexible and adaptive in its spirit, the theology drawn from it may well have variable as well as constant elements. It is to be observed, however, as a curious characteristic of progress in theology, that it is backwards as well as forwards, always seeking a truer conformity to the oracles in which the divine will is stereotyped.

What is true of the unprogressive nature of theology is not very much less true of ethics. The elementary principles and rules of morality are substantially the same to-day that they were 4000 years ago. The Decalogue remains the fundamental and inimitable code of universal morals. It is true that in the progress of the race new applications of ethical principles have been discovered and ethical standards have become higher and higher. Moral elements have been traced in relations where once they were not apparent. The moral conceptions and sentiments have been enlarged and refined so that their scope has been widened and their sensitiveness quickened. Here too, as well as in theology, and yet more certainly, variable elements must be recognized which provide for a truly progressive morality, so it is that some things, such as slavery, polygamy and cruelty to enemies, counted right in one age or country, are subsequently and elsewhere recognized as wrong.

But on the whole the reproach of being a fixed and stationary science, if reproach it be, fairly attaches to ethics. It must be confessed that Abraham and Joseph, Cyrus and Confucius, Pythagoras and Herodatus, recognized the authority of essentially the same moral principles that govern our 19th century. Especially is it noteworthy that the teachings of Jesus Christ, now nearly 2000 years old, supply a perfect revision of practical morality that presents the last additions and improvements of which it seems

Digitized by Google

susceptible. The easy preëminence of Jesus in the department of ethical instruction is admitted by all classes of thinkers. Of the pagan Socrates too must it be owned, that in essentials his moral lessons are identical with those delivered from the Ethical Chairs of modern Universities. While charges amounting to absolute revolution and reconstruction have characterized the history of most branches of human knowledge, especially the physical sciences, Theology, Ethics and even Psychology, remain much what they were thousands of years ago.

But while admitting that ethics, especially as a practical system, is very little distinguished by change and progress, it by no means follows that it has on that account lost anything of importance or interest. Age can never stale its freshness, and charms of novelty could hardly make it more attractive. New problems of duty are constantly arising to test the vitality and adequacy of its old principles. Matthew Arnold's averment as just as it is quaint, that "Conduct is three-fourths of life," carries in it an explanation of the unfailing interest excited by ethical studies. No argument is needed to show that what constitutes so large a part of our human experience should be the supreme subject of human consideration. The various definitions of ethics such as "The Science of Duty," "The Doctrine of Human Character," "The Science of Life and Character," all justify, in their slightly different phraseology, the unabated and absorbing attention given to this subject.

There are, indeed, those who hold that theories and opinions concerning conduct are of small consequence. Leslie Stephen in a review article, entitled, "Belief and Conduct," scouts the notion that "Morality is dependent upon Speculative Opinions," "The facts of consciousness," he adds, "remain and it is upon them, and not upon theories about them that morality really depends." It may readily be admitted that so long as questions of theory are

Digitized by Google

not stirred, practical morality may be trusted to hold its ground and assert its control by virtue of the native impulses of the human constitution. Men, happily, will continue to regard truth as obligatory and falsehood a reproach, without any abstract theory touching the question. *Why* ought I to tell the truth? But whenever this question distinctly emerges and becomes the subject of earnest discussion, it is inevitable that conduct share in the agitation and respond to its result. Actions cannot fail to be modified by accepted theories, since it is of the nature of these theories to breed convictions which finally become "facts of consciousness." So long as problems of fate and free will are but abstractions whose discussion amuses the leisure of philosophers, the stream of life flows on undisturbed by the debate. But once let the mass, or a considerable part, of any society really accept the doctrine that fate is the law of human action and that men are not properly responsible for their deeds, then flagrant demoralization will surely ensue. Where such theories are prevalent murder will find a better plea than "Emotional insanity," and anarchy a more effective justification than the oppression of Capital.

Herbert Spencer would not seem to share Mr. Stephens comfortable indifference to "speculative opinion" as related to morality. In the the preface to his *Data of Ethics* he expresses concern at the assumed breaking down of the old ethical systems, and recognizing himself as chief of the destroyers, he feels summoned to hasten to the rescue of society by supplying a new and better system. He says, "the establishment of rules of right conduct on a scientific basis is a pressing need. Few things can happen more disastrous than the decay and death of a regulative system no longer fit, before another and fitter regulative system has grown up to replace it. Those who believe that the vacuum thus created can be filled, and that it must be filled, are called

Digitized by Google

on to do something in pursuance of their belief." It is proverbially much easier to destroy than to build. Whether Mr. Spencer has succeeded in either of these great enterprises is a very open question; but meantime it is apparent that he recognizes, whether consistently or not, the importance of having a true theory of morals if we would insure right conduct.

The natural and intimate relation between Ethics and Psychology has been recognized by all writers on these subjects. Indeed, so close is this relation that one's Ethical system may almost infallibly be inferred from his Psychological. If a sensationalist in Philosophy, he will be a Utilitarian in morals; if a Realist or Idealist in the former, he will be an Intuitionalist in the latter. Comte's violent depreciation of Metaphysics was absurd. After pronouncing Psychology impossible, on the ground that introspection is impossible, he at once proceeded to construct a Psychology of his own; a very thin and meager one it is true, as might have been anticipated. Quite as matter of course nearly all the great intellectual philosophers have dealt also with Ethical problems; and nearly all Ethical investigations have grounded their systems, with more or less elaborateness of treatment, in some philosophy of mind. In fact Ethics, strictly and properly, is but a branch or sub-division of the wider science, that deals with the spiritual constitution of man.

While only one class of Ethical teachers start with the postulate that man by nature is a moral person, all classes agree that as now known, at least in a civilized state, he is in fact such a person. All agree that he discerns in actions a peculiar quality which is called moral, that he has a perception and feeling of right and wrong, good and evil, and a sense of obligation that some things ought to be done, and some things ought not to be done. To this extent a nearly absolute con nsus of opinion may be assumed. It is only

Digitized by Google

when, going beyond these simple postulates, we seek the origin and genesis of moral ideas, and the grounds of obligation underlying them, that serious conflict occurs. When, in other words, we ask, *how* do I get my sense of right and wrong, and *why* are some things counted right and others wrong? divergence and discord immediately ensue. Here is the parting of the ways for Ethical teachers and schools.

It is to be observed at this point that questions relating to the sources of moral conceptions, and to the grounds of moral obligation, are not one and the same, and therefore should not be confounded. They are, however, so closely related, and they so easily run into one another, that it is not always easy, and frequently not very important, to maintain between them a clear line of separation.

In treating of Ethical theories a considerable variety of classifications has quite naturally been suggested. The most noteworthy are, the *Utilitarian* and the *Intuitional;* the *Intuitional* and the *Derivative;* the *Objective* and the *Subjective; Intuitionism, Egoistic Hedonism,* and *Universalistic Hedonism;* the last named being that proposed by Professor Sidgwick. Dr. James Martineau's division into Psychological and Unpsychological is broad and natural, and possesses certain obvious merits. It will adequately serve the purpose of this paper, which seeks simply to give to the average reader a brief, comprehensive, and comprehensible statement of the progress and present condition of Ethical opinion, to keep to the familiar classification of theories into Intuitional and Utilitarian, with a glance at the new system which calls itself the Scientific or Historical.

A preliminary sketch of Ethical speculation among the ancients, although pertinent and desirable in a thorough treatment of the subject, is of necessity, ruled out here by limitations of space. It is important, however, to observe that *the method* of inquiry among ancient philosophers was essentially Unpsychological. They began their researches

Digitized by Google

outside the human soul, indulging in Metaphysical and Ontological speculations whose results were imposed upon the mind as at once its necessary laws and furniture. Theirs was in the main, "the high priori road," which scorned patient induction. Instead of resorting to introspection and analysis, and thus finding what are the real contents of the soul, they gave themselves to inquiries respecting "the good," "the beautiful," and "the true." They made eager outward quest for the *summum bonum*, and in their pursuit of abstractions missed the simple facts of consciousness out of which alone a genuine theory could be constructed.

With Descartes, the recognized father of modern philosophy, Ethical theories began to take definite form. Their elements, scattered through the speculations of the great masters of ancient thought, were now collected and built into orderly and coherent systems. Descartes' great aim was to find a ground of certitude for human knowledge, and this he believed himself to have reached in the veracity of consciousness. This discovery was effective in introducing the new and true Psychological method of moral investigation. Consciousness, it was soon understood, is just as valid in Ethical studies as in those relating to pure intellect, and thus from his day these studies took a new departure and with far better results. Questions concerning the source and standard of moral distinctions became henceforth of supreme consequence and were treated in a manner comparatively scientific. In Descartes' doctrine of innate ideas, subsequently modified into necessary truths, fundamental laws of belief, or innate faculties, the real basis of modern Ethical thinking was laid. Strangely enough Descartes was false, so far as Ethics was concerned, to his own method, as was his wayward, brilliant, subtle disciple, Spinoza. The former fell into the snare of Determinism, and the latter spun a fatalistic theory, in which good and evil were but the terms for phenomena that are the result of a resistless order

Digitized by Google

of development. With Spinoza, morality became a word emptied of all real import. Descartes prepared the way, but it was reserved for that clear, courageous, hard-headed English thinker, Thomas Hobbes, fairly to introduce the process of sorting and arranging Ethical materials in accordance with a distinctly reasonable plan and purpose. The result was the separation of moral philosophers into two clearly defined parties, styled Intuitionalists and Utilitarians. These parties have kept the field ever since, and with no very unequal numbers and abilities, have maintained an unremitting controversy over Ethical problems.

I. The Intuitional school holds, in a general way that the soul itself is the native seat and spring of moral ideas and that distinctions between right and wrong, immediately apprehended under certain conditions, are accompanied with a feeling of obligation, and followed, in the case of voluntary actions, with a sense of approval or condemnation. Man is a moral person endowed with a moral faculty, as truly as he is an intelligent person endowed with a reasoning faculty, and this moral faculty intuitively recognizes the existence and authority of moral law. It pronounces upon good and evil, right and wrong, independent of experience, and irrespective of any observed tendency to produce consequences of happiness or misery. By not a few this function of Ethical discrimination and judgment has been assigned to a distinct compartment or separate organ of the soul, usually styled conscience. The disposition among Intuitionalist philosophers now is, to drop this separate endowment view as awkward and embarrassing, and to lodge moral functions in the mind acting as a whole. It is enough to say that just as we are made capable of Intellection, or Reasoning on the truth and falsity of propositions, and just as we have Taste which detects and appreciates the quality of Beauty in objects, so are we possessed of the power of discriminating a quality in actions termed moral and pro-

Digitized by Google

nouncing upon conduct as right or wrong whether in ourselves or others. Consciousness in its broad sense becomes Moral Consciousness when dealing with a particular class of subjects, and is intensified into conscience as it deals with our personal conduct and character. This moral consciousness, as just intimated, gives us the revelation of moral law, and the conception of oughtness or obligation. Moral conceptions are native and original with the mind, spontaneously emerging under suitable circumstances. An act of conscience, that is of the mind dealing with the individual's conduct, contains a *perception*, a *judgment*, and a *sentiment* —a perception of right and wrong, a judgment of oughtness, and a sentiment of self-approval and satisfaction, or of condemnation and pain. The broad contention of all Intuitionalists is, that the mind applying itself to a certain class of subjects does something essentially different from what it does in a merely rational exercise of its powers, and finds a distinct element which simple intelligence could never give.

While Intuitionalists agree in the general principles thus stated, they differ among themselves in various particulars, especially in relation to the precise genesis of moral ideas and the final ground of their authority. On this last named point, differences are especially vital and influential.

The opinion that things are right or wrong simply by *God's appointment*, has been held by many eminent thinkers, among them Descartes, who went to the extreme of maintaining that it is quite conceivable that God by an act of his will might have made 3 plus 2 equal 6, or the three angles of a triangle less than two right angles. This extravagance involves the fatal concession that morality is wholly arbitrary and relative, liable to change in different periods and different worlds. The true position is, not that a thing is right because God decrees it, but that he decrees it because it is right. It is unthinkable that he could ordain truthfulness a vice and perfidy a virtue. Moral distinctions are to

Digitized by Google

be regarded as lying in the very being and nature of God, rather than in any positive exercise of his will. According to this view conscience is a direct witness to the existence of God and is invested with a supreme authority as reflecting his infinite perfection.

In determining the ground of obligation, Intuitionalists have often been betrayed into one-sided and exaggerated views. The celebrated Samuel Clarke found this basis in what he styled "the eternal fitness" of things and made virtue consist in harmony with this fitness. But such a definition by necessarily raising questions as to what is "fitness," and when a thing is "fit," reduces virtue to a matter of estimate and adjustment, and thus approaches the Utilitarian standard. Besides, it involves an inversion of the true order of thought, according to which virtue is what it is, not on account of any quality of fitness, but rather has everlasting fitness because it is virtue. And yet further, it is evident that simple fitness is in itself a relation without any moral element. A burglar's implements may be as admirably adapted to house-breaking as are a carpenter's tools to house-building.

While Cudworth maintained, with vast erudition and ability, that the soul has *a priori* categories of thought and intuitive notions of right and wrong, he at the same time unduly exalted the functions of reason in ethical processes, making in fact right and wrong but a species of the true and false. Resolving the moral sentiments into modes of intellectual apprehension he introduced into his lofty speculations a dangerous strain of Utilitarianism.

Shaftesbury emphasized the moral faculty as an organ of taste, which takes cognizance of the true, the beautiful, and the good, and blends these into the conception of the right. He is the author of the phrase "the moral sense," in some respects a most happy and useful phrase, and one that still holds its ground in ordinary speech, though justly liable to

Digitized by Google

suspicion on account of the danger lurking in the word "sense." By a surprising inconsistency Shaftesbury lapsed into a qualified Utilitarianism after having announced and defended the principles of Intuitional morals.

To the same class of æsthetic moralists belonged Hutcheson, who has been styled the virtual founder of the Scottish school. He adopted and enlarged the term "sense," introduced by Shaftesbury, speaking of it as the "internal sense" in correspondence with, and contradistinction to, the external or physical senses. His speculations led him to insist on the doctrine of human disinterestedness, and to regard "all virtue as benevolence." Before Hutcheson's day our own great metaphysician, Jonathan Edwards, had fallen into a kindred error in making virtue consist in "the pure love of being."

A notice of the singular theory of the moral sentiments originated by Adam Smith, an admirer of Hutcheson, may perhaps be introduced as appropriately here as anywhere else. According to this theory, long regarded as a mere curiosity of speculation, but of late seriously taken up and adopted by scientific moralists, these sentiments are derivative and secondary, rising out of the more primary endowment of sympathy. Men in society, it is claimed, are affected by the praise or censure which prevails there, and finally adopt the tone of those around them until a consensus is reached which becomes a kind of "abstract man within the breast," and whose judgments and feelings are called moral. Right is that conduct which one assumes would be approved by his fellow creatures, and wrong that which they would condemn. This theory is demonstrably an inverted cone with a top quite too heavy for its base, and so doomed to fall. It contains in its conclusions moral elements which have neither been developed nor accounted for in the psychological processes described.

Richard Price who supported very ably the claims of intuitive morals weakened his advocacy by imitating Clarke and

Digitized by Google

Cudworth, and exaggerated the service of reason in the shaping of ethical ideas. In his apprehension of danger from the favor shown to the suspicious term "sense," he went to the extreme of seeking a *rational* ground for these ideas, and in this way, impaired the direct and authoritative averments of conscience.

The greatest expositor, almost the discoverer, of the true theory of ethics, was Bishop Butler. Subsequent writers on the Intuitional side have done little more than work on the lines which he distinctly projected, correcting some of his mistakes, and supplying deficiencies almost inevitable in an attempt to present a moral system by the fragmentary method of sermons. The facts and laws of the moral faculty, or conscience, were set forth by him with masterly precision and force, and in accordance with true psychological principles. A volume of moral truth is packed in that fine sentence; "Had it (conscience) strength as it has right, had it power as it has manifest authority, it would absolutely rule the world."

The illustrious Kant has influenced modern Ethical opinion even more, probably, than he has Metaphysical. Whatever Intuitionalists may think of his speculations in the latter department of knowledge, they gratefully welcome his conclusions touching the Practical Reason, or Conscience, with its Categorical Imperative or binding Moral law. They accept his dictum, "Act from a maxim at all times fit for law universal." In a degenerate age he made a brave and successful stand for those primal and immutable principles of conduct on which the welfare of human society depends. "Two things," he said in words of true sublimity, "there are which, the oftener and more steadfastly we consider, fill the mind with an ever new, an ever rising admiration and reverence: the *Starry heaven above*, the *Moral Law within.*"

Passing Reid and Stewart, who followed consistently and

Digitized by Google

ably on Intuitional lines, and coming down to our own times, the names of Wayland, Alexander, McCosh, and Calderwood are familiar as conspicuous advocates of the same doctrines. The now very venerable James Martineau has served the Intuitional cause with an ability, learning, dialectical skill, and exquisite charm of expression, which constitute him its first living champion.

Dr. Porter, Ex-President of Yale College, has presented in his "Elements of Moral Science" a system which may be regarded as an attempt to mediate between the two great Ethical Schools and effect a compromise of their rival claims. An Intuitionalist in his Psychology, he still favors a derivative theory in morals. He holds that Ethical judgments are not the result of a direct mental exercise, but are reached through a series of rational processes conducted under the control of a law which obliges us to find and accept "the norm and standard of duty in the natural capacity of man." With him "the best end possible" and "the best natural good" would seem after all but another expression for the greatest happiness.

A valuable text-book entitled "Principles of Morality," has recently appeared from the pen of Dr. E. G. Robinson, President of Brown University. It upholds the Intuitional theory, and has a particularly strong and lucid chapter affirming the nature of God as the Ultimate Ground of Obligation.

While Intuitional Morality stands or falls with Intuitional Psychology, it finds powerful confirmation of its claims in its natural and observed effects in forming noble character and elevating the ethical tone of communities and nations. By accentuating the idea of *duty* it supplies a steady incitement to virtuous conduct, such as the calculations of expediency can never furnish. The co-ordinate dignity and authority which it gives to the conception of right and the impulses of love, constitute it the prolific germ of

Digitized by Google

heroic deeds. The spirit of the Intuitional Morality is generous, brave, unselfish, and is the natural inspiration of martyrs, patriots, missionaries, and all who freely sacrifice the world and life for the promotion of high ends.

II. The *Utilitarian Scheme* of morals, which has long rivalled the Intuitional, was perhaps never more confidently held and more ably defended than it is to-day. Broadly speaking, this system maintains that morality is a calculation rather than an Intuition, a thing of observation and experience rather than of immediate insight and spontaneous judgment. It reaches moral ideas by a process of derivation or development, instead of accepting them as an original contribution of man's nature. Utility, or observed adaptedness to promote certain ends, such as truth, order, happiness, life, constitutes an action moral. Virtue is thus a *means* to something ulterior, and is inferior in value to that in which it terminates. The end almost universally agreed upon as the proper test of virtue is pleasure or happiness or, more generally still, agreeableness. As with Intuitionalists, so with Utilitarians there are differences of view, giving rise to various sub-schools or classes. Some regard *individual* pleasure or happiness as the supreme end, and these have been styled Egoistic Hedonists or Egoistic Endæmonists. Others find that end in "the public good," making "the greatest happiness of the greatest number" the primary expression of their creed. These have been called "Universalistic Hedonists."

Undoubtedly the drift of ancient ethical speculation set strongly toward Utilitarianism. Epicurus and his disciples promulgated it in its baldest form. The father of this system in modern times, however, was Thomas Hobbes. "Whatsoever," he explicitly says, "is the object of man's appetite or desire, that it is which he, for his part, calls the good." Hobbes held that nothing is simply and absolutely good or evil, but only such relatively to the individual man,

Digitized by Google

or higher yet to the commonwealth. By a quite natural course of reasoning he made the authority of the State the rule of good and evil, and sought to justify despotism in Civil Government.

In 1747, Hartley announced a doctrine which has played a great part in the speculations of our later Utilitarians. This doctrine, known as Association, or the Association of Ideas, is thus lucidly stated by Paley: "Having experienced in some instances a particular conduct to be beneficial to ourselves, or observed that it would be so, a sentiment of approbation rises up in our minds, which sentiment afterwards accompanies the idea or mention of the same conduct, although the private advantage which first existed no longer exists." The highest and purest virtue is here traced to a sordid origin, and the process is hinted by which it loses in the end the baseness of its parentage.

John Locke, deriving the idea of moral good from sensation, says, "things are good or evil only in reference to pleasure or pain; that we call good which is apt to cause or increase pleasure."

David Hume, while referring the explanation of moral distinctions to "the original fabric and formation of the human mind," still held that "the internal sense or feeling" which finally determines moral conclusions, determines them according to qualities of agreeableness or disagreeableness.

Paley, following in the same path, gave by his character as a recognized religious teacher dignity and vogue to the Utilitarian system. His famous definition of virtue served in no small degree to degrade the moral thinking and tone of several generations. "Virtue is the doing good to mankind, in obedience to the will of God, and for the sake of everlasting happiness." We have here a three-fold falsehood, misrepresenting at once the essence, the ground, and the motive of true virtue.

Helvetius in France, adopting Locke's sensational phil-

Digitized by Google

osophy carried the hedonistic and selfish conception of virtue to its last extreme. He declared of man that "being by nature sensible of no other pleasures than those of the senses, these pleasures are consequently the only objects of his desires and passions." To him Jeremy Bentham, the chief prophet and apostle of English Utilitarianism, was largely indebted. Bentham averred that "nature has placed mankind under two sovereign motives, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what he ought to do." He summarized the Utilitarian creed in the brief symbol, "The greatest happiness of the greatest number," and from this text preached with insolent dogmatism. He denounced the terms "ought" and "duty" as pestilent intruders into human speech, though, as noticeable in the sentence just quoted, he used them himself.

The fame of James Mill, a resolute and thorough-going defender of Utilitarianism, has been overshadowed by that of his illustrious son, John Stuart, by far the ablest champion of this system. The latter, taking up and expanding some of the views of Auguste Comte, gave a modified form to the Utilitarian theories, softening their grosser features and introducing certain principles which lend to them a character of elevation and refinement. By insisting upon a graduated scale of pleasures, as higher and lower, intellectual and social as well as physical, he sought to free the older Utilitarianism from the opprobrium of coarse selfishness under which it had labored. He strove to replace individual enjoyment by regard for humanity, and to make his system inculcate an altruism which should be superior even to the disinterested benevolence of the Intuitional school. It is certainly a very curious transformation which Utilitarianism exhibits under the magic of Mill's touch. From "Each for himself," with which it began its history, it now displays on its banner the motto, "Each for all." How it claims to have effected this strange transformation or transition would

Digitized by Google

require an amount of explanation which cannot here be undertaken. One can hardly help feeling that the process, whatever it is, can be little better than a trick of psychological jugglery.

Professor Bain has succeeded in our day to the honors of championship in the Utilitarian camp.

An adequate criticism of the Ethical Theory whose origin and progress have thus been briefly reviewed would require a very large space. It must suffice here barely to indicate the objections which must ever discredit its claims as being a satisfactory account of morality.

1. Utilitarianism, as has already been implied, rests upon a false Psychology, and falls to the ground with the Sensational Philosophy on which it is built. It arbitrarily rules out of the catalogue of original, primary faculties certain endowments which have just as clear and valid a title to recognition as intellect, sensibility, and will. In its attempt to simplify the innate contents of the human soul it excludes some of our most valuable possessions, and sets us up for spiritual house-keeping with a pauper outfit and equipment of furniture. The attempt to justify this exclusion by appealing to the lack of moral perceptions in children and savages, and to the variety and contradiction characteristic of moral judgments in different times and places, falls far short of proof. Such appeals simply show, in the cases cited, that the moral faculties are in the same defective and undeveloped condition with reason and taste. The diversities and anomalies of ethical judgment, of which Utilitarians make so much, may fairly be explained by the operation of causes which leave the assumption of innate moral faculties untouched. The germs of conscience are in human nature and, however overlaid and perverted, they only require appropriate conditions to mature them into a sovereign power of moral authority and guidance. That ideas of utility and virtue are perfectly distinct is attested by the feelings and

Digitized by Google

language of mankind. All the literatures of the world in their use of such contrasted terms as justice and prudence, rectitude and cunning, bear the same witness.

It is to be observed further that the system which denies to us innate moral faculties and makes useful consequences the sole criterion of virtue, involves conclusions which outrage the universal sentiment of mankind. On this theory numerous detestable dispositions and acts, such as the greed of the miser and the bloody ambition of the conqueror, must still be pronounced noble if they chance to eventuate in the promotion of human welfare. Even the infamous maxim, "let us do evil that good may come" receives a genuine consecration. The motive, usually esteemed the prime element in virtue, is to be taken no account of, and truth may be sacrificed without hesitation or scruple when the sacrifice seems to insure more pleasure than pain. Surely results like these fatally discredit the Psychology and fundamental assumptions of the Utilitarian system.

2. But this system, besides building upon an unsound Psychology, starts with the false postulate that pleasure or happiness is the supreme end of human existence. The perfection of man, attainable only through obedience to the dictates and laws of duty, is more properly affirmed to constitute that end. While happiness, no doubt, is in general the result of the normal action of the human powers, it is not true that interest and virtue are always coincident. It is not true that rigid adherence to the right is sure, so far as this world is concerned, to pay in the profit of immediate or even remote pleasure. And what happiness does accompany or result from virtuous conduct, is only obtainable on the condition that it is not pursued as an aim, but is allowed to come as the necessary and unconscious result of well-being and well-doing. To seek happiness as a distinct end is to engage in a fraudulent and futile enterprise. The moral system of the New Testament, by the prominence which it

Digitized by Google

gives to rewards and penalties, may seem to make interest the main reason for virtuous conduct. But this confessed prominence, is by no means exclusive of, or inconsistent with, the deeper truth that conformity to the archetypal excellence of the divine nature is man's supreme business in this world. "Be ye therefore perfect as your Father which is in heaven is perfect," may be cited as one of the many Scriptural affirmations which point to a basis of moral obligation far profounder, and a moral aim far more exalted, than any provided in the scheme of Utilitarianism.

3. In dealing with the false postulate just considered, the experiential moralists introduce the unfounded assumption that a man *ought* to study and choose his own pleasure or happiness. Unfounded, I say, for how does one come by this sense of *oughtness* if he has no moral faculty to suggest it? *Why* should he make this, rather than something else, his dominating aim? In answering these questions it is not at all to the purpose to say, that because of his native impulses he is sure to choose in this way. It is not the fact, but the alleged reason of the fact, that demands explanation. And then the further inquiry rises, *why* ought a man to substitute another's happiness, as an object of regard, for his own? What claim upon him has even "the greatest happiness of the greatest number," when it asks that he shall make sacrifice of his own happiness? Denying the intuitive and peremptory functions of conscience, the Utilitarian can give no satisfactory answer to these questions.

4. In all its forms the Utilitarian system is an essentially derivative and development system, obtaining moral ideas through a round-about process from unmoral data and sources, a process of which no satisfactory account can be given. Hartley's principle of Association, Adam Smith's ingenious theory of Sympathy, and Bain's recognition of Conscience as an effect of civil society, all fail to supply the unique moral element which is the object of their common

Digitized by Google

quest. They all involve a violation of the universally accepted doctrine of causation, according to which nothing can be in the effect which was not already potentially in the cause. The generation of moral ideas out of unmoral is but a process of psychological alchemy, or an example of the transmutation of species in the realm of spirit such as has no analogue in the realm of matter.

5. The practical difficulty of determining when an action will certainly produce happiness, either personal or general, must forever discredit Utilitarianism as a true working theory for human life. There is no calculus so fine and far-reaching that it can solve this complex problem. The moral faculty can in general be safely trusted to give a prompt decision upon the right or wrong of conduct; but to estimate its consequences, near and remote, baffles the forecast of the profoundest sagacity.

6. Utilitarianism is a scheme of selfishness dishonoring to the generous instincts of human nature, debasing in its effects on individual character, and sure to work demoralization in the societies in which it prevails. It is true that its more recent advocates, repudiating the coarseness of Hobbes and Mandeville, have striven to escape these reproaches, and have even claimed for it a lofty character of disinterestedness, but the effort is clearly illegitimate and futile. The transition from pure selfishness to exalted altruism, is a logical impossibility. "The sty of Epicurus," "the pig philosophy," "the hog-wash" of Carlyle, are confessedly not very polite and conciliatory phrases, but they are scarcely too strong for denoting the natural tendencies of the old Epicurean philosophy under any of the disguised forms it may assume. The greatest and most sacred words in human speech are "right," "duty," "conscience," "obligation" and "responsibility." Utilitarianism empties these of their real significance, and substitutes for them such sordid terms as "pleasure," "prudence" and "expedi-

Digitized by Google

ency"—terms that can never supply inspiration for lofty ideals and noble deeds. It is not, of course, intended to deny that the holders of this moral creed have often been admirable examples of public and private virtue; but they have owed this to other causes than their ethical beliefs. The fact that utilitarianism, as an accepted theory, entered human society at so late a stage of its progress, and has always been confronted by better systems, sufficiently explains its comparatively small effects in the way of individual and general demoralization.

III. A third Ethical theory remains for brief notice, styled by its friends the *Historical* or *Scientific*, but more correctly characterized as the mechanical—the theory of the Evolution Philosophy. So far as it is historical, whatever may be its scientific claims, it is conjectural history of what is unknown and must forever be unknowable. Its subject matter is missing links and imaginary changes through countless ages that have left no chronicles. It must be confessed that, as an account of morals, it is new, and marks movement, if not progress. Though distinctly Utilitarian in its principles, it is still so differentiated from other systems grouped under that general division, that it stands by itself and demands a separate treatment. Originally propounded by Mr. Darwin, its great expositor and advocate is Herbert Spencer; the latter, however, as becomes such an intellectual potentate, presents the Darwinian theory with his own additions and modifications. "The intuitions," he tells us, "of a moral faculty, are the slowly-organized results of experience received by the race;" and again, "I believe that the experiences of utility organized and consolidated through all past generations of the human race have been producing corresponding nervous modifications, which, by continued transmission and accumulation, have become in us certain faculties of intuition." According to this confession of faith, what is called morality is simply the

Digitized by Google

mechanical result of a process material in its origin, Utilitarian in its blind aims, necessary in its unfolding stages, and involuntary in the sentiments and judgments which it finally reaches. I repeat that this is certainly new, and if as true as it is new, an ethical revolution is at hand.

Not all who profess and call themselves Evolutionists go the length of Mr. Spencer's doctrine. Many, like Professor Schurman, of Cornell University, whose recent volume entitled "The Ethical Import of Darwinism," displays ability of a very high order, part company with their evolution friends when it comes to generating man's spiritual faculties by purely mechanical processes. They distinctly recognize the principle that the cause must always be adequate to the alleged effect, and that mere material combinations can never account for reason and conscience.

What Martineau calls "hitches" in the "Evolutionary Deductions" are numerous, and harder to deal with than Gordian knots. The emergence of the animate from the inanimate, of the sentient and conscious from the insentient and unconscious, of the mental, with its high qualities, from nerve-force and nervous "shocks," and finally of the moral from "initial adjustments having intrinsically no moral character"—at each of these points there is a "hitch" too serious for evolutionary manipulation, a chasm that mocks the skill of evolutionary bridge-building. Especially in the assumed upward path of progress from the lower animals to man, is the *imperative* element in conscience, its peculiar sense of *oughtness*, a stumbling-block which shatters the claim of Mechanical Ethics. Indeed, it is the pervading fallacy of this system to derive moral ideas from conditions which pre-suppose them. Its conclusions contain elements denied to the premises from which they are deduced. James Martineau strikingly says: "Inherited accumulation of experiences may account for an ever-quicker, and finer and larger sense of expediency, but for nothing else; as an in-

Digitized by Google

finitude of sand-grains may make a shore, and an infinitude of drops a sea, but neither effect can take the place of the other. Add as long as you will, if the items of the sum are all prudence, the total will not come out as duty."

One of the most curious feats of evolutionary Hedonism as of the older Utilitarianism, is its pretended passage from Egoism to Altruism, and its final issue in absolutely disinterested benevolence. Mr. Spencer declares that "the sense of duty or moral obligation is transitory, and will diminish as fast as moralization increases." It is true, no doubt, that the highest state of virtue is marked by spontaneousness and absence of all struggle in doing what is right. But it does not follow that the sense of duty ever is, or ever should be, lost to the mind. Here again Mr. Martineau's words may be quoted: "A right act does not cease to be my duty because I do it willingly; my conscience does not perish the moment I am in harmony with it."

The Evolution Ethics, by its super-fine and etherial quality, is well calculated to excite our suspicion. Its outcome is not at all in keeping with its beginnings and intermediate manifestations. Its parts lack not only coherence but resemblance. It is to be observed, too, that its final stage of disinterested virtue is not merely the result of a fatalistic process of development conducted under the constraint of environment, but itself excludes deliberation and choice. The ideal excellence which it accomplishes proves after all to be lacking in the most primary and essential quality of virtue—free volition. Man reaches perfection through a real *felo de se*, or, more exactly perhaps, through a necessary process by which he becomes other and more than man. One may be pardoned for long hesitation in accepting this as the final philosophy.

J. R. KENDRICK.

Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Digitized by Google

IV.

THE LORD'S PRAYER.

THAT the Lord's Prayer is the perfection of simplicity in thought and language is shown in the fact that it defies merely ingenious and speculative interpretation. Men may indulge in flights of fancy, or twist the Scripture into harmony with their preconceptions when treating of other portions of Holy Writ, but here they must be sober, reverent, and candid. A parable may be made to illustrate many things that were not in the mind of the Teacher, as a magician's hat supplies many things which were not seen to be first placed there; and a miracle, wonderful as illustrating what divine power can do with the laws of nature, may become ten-fold more wonderful in its interpretation as illustrating what may be done with the laws of language. But the Lord's Prayer is neither. And the interpreter who comes into its presence feels that here, at least, he is upon holy ground, and the critic is lost in the reverential worshiper.

The prayer arouses the whole man. It inspires the soul by asserting the Fatherhood of God, and the sonship of the believer. It stirs the conscience by a confession of sin. It destroys pride by an humble appeal for daily bread, and for the help through which alone man can be kept from sin. It quickens expectation and faith by its entreaty for the coming of the kingdom of God. Never was so much in substance and variety compressed into so few words. Tallyrand's maxim, that "words are made to conceal thought," is proved to be false in this case, for here the

Digitized by Google

thought shines transparently through the words with the clearness of revelation.

Grouping with this prayer certain other words of the Lord upon this subject, we get a doctrine of prayer complete and final. Let us see what the Lord's teaching is.

FORMS AND FORMALISM.

John had taught his disciples a form of prayer. This appears in the request, "Lord, teach us to pray as John also taught his disciples." It was also remarked upon by the Pharisees, "Why do the disciples of John fast often and make prayers?" What the form was that John used, we have no means of knowing. We know that forms of prayer were very common amongst the Jews. They were accustomed to have prayers at meals, at feasts, in the family, in the synagogue, and in the street. Like the Muslim of later time, they were willing to lay themselves open to the charge of being ostentatious in prayer rather than to that of neglect. And the frequency of prayer as a religious exercise required of every Jew, made necessary the prayer of the street as well as the secret prayer of the heart. According to Edersheim, prayer "mingled with every relationship, and literally pervaded the every-day life of Israel." "In every domestic occurrence, in danger or deliverance, nay, almost for every act and event of life, there were prescribed formulas which the devout Jew had to repeat."

This fact of the very common use of prayer among the Jews has led some among the critics to charge the Lord with plagiarism in appropriating as his own, forms and phrases that were in common use. But it has been shown by those who have examined the Talmud for this purpose, that there is no exact parallel to this prayer to be found in that huge compilation. Besides, the rabbinical prayers there quoted are of a later date, at least in their written form. Of the phrases used in the Lord's Prayer two or

Digitized by Google

at the most three are found in that repository of Jewish tradition. These are: "Our Father who art in heaven;" "Hallowed be thy name;" "Bring us not into temptation." Broadus, with supreme common sense, asks: "Would the Great Teacher have given a prayer for the common people made up of expressions which nobody ever heard of before?" And he quotes Grotius as saying: "Our Lord was far removed from all affectation of unnecessary novelty." So that while there is no certainty that the Lord quoted at all from any source, we need not feel disturbed in mind if we should be forced to conclude that he did incorporate in his prayer some of the current phrases of his day. In any case, the original thinker is like the inventor who uses common material and well known mechanical devices to produce an entirely new result. The Lord's Prayer is new to the world, and separate from all that has gone before in its simplicity and adaptation to every man's use. Pope's "The Universal Prayer" is not so universal as the Lord's Prayer upon which it is based.

Forms of prayer are as natural as any other of the conventional usages among men. It cannot be otherwise and it is well that it cannot be. There is merit in repetition and advantage in familiar usage. That parishioner who said that he had attended the ministrations of his pastor now for many years and had never heard him offer the same prayer twice, did not so much commend the prayerful spirit of his pastor as his intellectual diligence. Vain repetitions are worse than useless, but repetitions that are the utmost expression of one pressing need are the truest prayer that the soul can utter.

On the other hand the use of forms of prayer may come to be thought a thing meritorious in itself. That is formalism. That is substituting the fossil for the living thing. In the time of Christ the Jew was mainly a formalist in prayer. At an earlier day this danger had been foreseen and guarded

Digitized by Google

against. Edersheim quotes Rabbi Eliezer as being, "in the habit of every day saying some one new prayer for fear of falling into formalism, while other rabbis either added a new eulogy or some verses of Scripture to the ordinary prescribed prayers." The purpose of prayer seems to have been well understood by them, but in time puerile and barren discussions begun about the matter of prayer that sapped its very life and made spontaneous prayer an impossibility, and that brought upon the people all the evils of a dead formalism.

But our Lord does not teach a dead formalism, a slavish adherence to one form. While he gives a form it does not seem to have been again used by himself or his disciples. At least no mention is made of such use in the New Testament. If we hold that the form given in Matthew is but his report of the same incident given in Luke, as the weight of critical authority seems to incline, then we have but the one mention of this prayer. The prayers of the Lord and of his disciples, as found in the New Testament, are in no sense a copy of this prayer. Their prayers are in each case suggested by circumstances. Evidently while this form is given as an example of what a prayer should be neither the Lord nor his hearers understood it to be a copy to be slavishly followed. This is brought out in the phrase with which it is introduced. "After this manner" pray ye and not after the manner of the heathen who use vain repetitions and think they shall be heard for their much speaking. All such perfunctory and superstitious and public praying is in vain. When these two tendencies toward formal and public prayer go unchecked and unrebuked, prayer degenerates into a mere matter of attitude, recitation and publicity, without feeling and without understanding. The Lord certainly did not intend to encourage that which leads by so short and sure a road to spiritual death, and we may dismiss without further remark the idea that because the Lord gave his dis-

Digitized by Google

ciples a form of prayer, therefore he meant that prayer should be a matter of form.

What, then, are we to conclude? Simply this: that forms are inevitable and may be oftentimes the only natural prayer. The spirit of importunity must cry out in repetitions. Earnest prayer is importunate and unceasing. When the widow urges her case before the unjust judge, a parable which the Lord uses to illustrate this matter, I take it that she harps only on one string; that she urges but one plea. Variation from the original theme was hardly possible. The form may be made useful and natural when the spirit behind it breathes into it the breath of life. But when the spirit is absent the prayer is dead, and becomes an offense in the ear of God.

TIMES OF PRAYER.

Another interesting question is that of the times or frequency of prayer. Jesus does not here commit himself on that point. He leaves it with the disciples with the single word "when." He inveighs against the frequency which is one of vain repetitions, but not against frequent prayer. In the parables to be found in Luke ix., given to illustrate prayer, the idea of frequency is prominent. Such expressions as these occur: "Ask in prayer." "What things soever ye desire when ye pray." "Whatsoever ye shall ask when ye pray." "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name." But as we are always in a condition of want, prayer must always be in order. At no time are we above want, and at no time are we above asking. The frequency of prayer is determined by a law as constant as that which makes the earth look longingly toward the sun. If we should pray as often as we ought, not much time would intervene between prayers, even though an observer might not be able to discern that we were praying. The conclusive word of the Lord is, "Men ought always to pray and not to faint." And

Digitized by Google

his own practice emphasizes his teaching. So far as the customs of the Jews were concerned, it may be added that the rabbis fixed three times a day as seasons for private prayer. They had many curious traditions and theories of the relation of prayer to the daily sacrifice that had to do with these arrangements, and that served as the foundations of these rules for times of prayer.

THE POWER OF PRAYER.

That the power of prayer in bringing things to pass should be questioned is not so strange, but that any believer in the Lord Jesus should question it is certainly surprising. The Lord's Prayer is a series of petitions asking for Divine intervention in personal and human affairs. Its every word is based upon the idea of the power of God being held in readiness to serve the holy and righteous desires of man. To make prayer to be nothing more than the effervescence of the human soul, a sort of instinctive mental exercise that may serve as a vent for religious feeling, as bodily exercise serves as the vent of animal spirits, is to fly in the face of all the utterances of the Lord upon this subject of prayer. In speaking of the unclean spirit that held the boy in a grip that the apostles were not able to loosen, Jesus said: "This kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting." He encourages us to believe that we shall have things when and because we ask for them. He tells the disciples explicitly: "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven." And it is further declared that the failure to receive what was asked in certain cases was due to the fact that they "asked amiss." That prayer is a power, or a means, of invoking the divine aid, is a doctrine that has been passing through the crucible of scientific examination in recent years, with the result of leaving the Christian disciple more firmly than before anchored in the faith that

Digitized by Google

these words of the Lord concerning the answer to prayer are simply and clearly true.

OPEN AND SECRET PRAYER.

Another departure from the customs of the day is to be found in the teaching of the Lord upon secret and open prayer. Something has already been said upon this in the paragraph on Forms of Prayer. It may be added that the rabbis taught, as quoted by Edersheim from the Talmud, that "He who does not pray in the synagogue deserves the name of impious." Great stress was placed upon the value of prayer offered in the sight of men. The synagogues had been established after the Babylonian captivity for two purposes: "That in every place Moses should be read; and to have some central spot where prayer was wont to be made." Of course, the temple remained, after its restoration, as the one central place of Jewish worship, and the service of the temple included prayer as an essential part in every case. And these prayers were not alone the duty of the priests, but of the people as well. For when Zacharias was offering incense "the whole multitude of the people were praying." And this constant, open and public prayer was taken as a sign of righteousness, and brought on that ostentatious attitudinizing in the temple and synagogue and on the street corners that the Lord so unsparingly reproved.

Praying to be seen of men being encouraged, all sorts of hair-splitting discussions followed as to the relative merit of this or that way of doing it. The Talmud makes a distinction between bending the knees, and bowing the head, and falling prostrate on the ground, "the latter being reserved only for those in closest fellowship with God." May not this throw some light on the Saviour's prayer in the garden, where he "fell on his face, praying"? Not that he cared for the attitude, but that the teaching which he had heard unconsciously affected his action at the time. Besides

Digitized by Google

this, the rabbis discussed much the degree to which one should bow his head, the elevation of the voice, the accuracy of the pronunciation, the posture to be assumed when at work—as in the case of a workman on the walls, or carrying a burden, who might not safely assume the most meritorious attitude. All these foolish and mischievous refinements and rules were swept away at once by the Lord's teaching about secret prayer. Attitude is nothing, form is nothing, publicity is nothing. What the Lord notes is the words of the mouth and the meditation of the heart. The Father sees in secret; with men we have nothing to do in prayer. Piety is judged of, not by sanctimoniousness of manner, but by strength of faith and virtue shown under pressure. That cashier who maintained the habit of secret prayer by using any interval of leisure that came to him at his desk in writing to his Lord, enjoyed and profited by his praying in secret as much as if he had been absolutely hidden from the eyes of men in a cenobite's cell.

THE SEPARATE PETITIONS.

Taking the prayer as found in Luke, let us give attention to its several sentences.

Our Father which art in heaven. The idea of Fatherhood is one not unknown to the world outside of the circle of revealed light. But the fatherhood of God, as a relation, arising out of the adoption of the soul through Christ, is not presented anywhere but in the New Testament. The conception in the Old Testament was far more general and broad. There God is a dimly conceived father of nations and more clearly as the father of Israel. Father and Son are used several times of Jehovah and Israel, though I find Godet saying, "The pious Israelite felt himself the servant of Jehovah, not his child." But there can be no dispute that the Fatherhood of the New Testament and of the Lord's Prayer is a much more distinct vision of the fatherly affections

Digitized by Google

of God than the world had ever seen before. Christ teaches us to call God our Father. Never before had the sense of divine sonship been so distinct and real; never before had the human heart been made to feel the power of this relation. All men must pray. And all men may use this phrase, "Our Father." But many must understand it in a limited sense. Their appeal is to the Father who did create, and after whom all the families in heaven and earth are named; to him who is the Father of Lights and the Author of all Being. But he who is taught of Christ can add to that all that his adoption in Christ suggests. He prays to the Father who makes us to be partakers of his divine nature, that we may be filled with all his fullness; the Father who loves his child and has redeemed him and brought him to a new and more perfect knowledge of his kinship. This is revealed to the believer alone and is for him. Happy the man who can call God Father as the child of his love and care.

Hallowed be thy name. Beecher says that a man can get some idea of his religious condition by noting what emotions are stirred in him by the mere name of God. The man who reveres the name will not be likely to scorn the person; while the man who consents to blaspheme that name in his speech will not hesitate to scoff at God himself. Yielding to the habit of irreverent or profane speech, or becoming hardened to the hearing of it from others must necessarily deaden one's reverence for him whose name is thus continually and lightly used. The sentiment of the Jews that the name of God was unspeakable, which led them to read and speak Adonai for Jahveh was right even if the course pursued in altering the sacred name was unwise. The Bible attaches supreme importance to keeping the name of God holy. It sees the need of maintaining the highest place in human reverence for the name itself. "Let them praise thy great and terrible name; for it is holy." "Holy and reverend

Digitized by Google

is his name." This want of reverence may also exist where there is no profanity. Dr. Arnold, in one of his letters, speaks of a certain life of Christ, said to be written in a purely historical tone, as painful to a Christian reader, because in such a case neutrality is almost hostility. Reverence and so-called impartiality could not go together. For the impartiality required is that a man shall speak neither as a Christian nor yet as not a Christian. And in a note on Goethe he adds, "To give entirely without reverence a representation of God is in itself blasphemous." With that opinion I must agree. And this clause in the Lord's prayer seems to me one of the most important in it as a means of maintaining in our souls that reverence for God without which we can have no proper love for him nor regard for his will.

Thy kingdom come. Not the Jewish Messianic kingdom but the Christian Messianic kingdom;—the kingdom of righteousness and grace, in which shall be seen the sway of peace and good will. It is the kingdom introduced by the angels with the chorus, " on earth peace, good will to men," for which we pray.

Thy will be done as in heaven so on earth. This passage is not found in Luke. Godet thinks it must be a part of the prayer, and adds that no reason is known for omitting it from so many MMS. The assertion that God's will is done in heaven is a higher thing than to say that it is done in the heavens. Glorious as are the heavens, brilliant with the shining of numberless stars or with the light of the sun, to control it is, after all, only to control so much matter. But heaven is the world of personal intelligences and wills. And to be ruler here is greatest of all. Moreover God's rule amongst these intelligences is a rule recognized and honored as the rightful and supreme authority, and so there is not only no rebellion but there is joy in obedience. The rule is not forced upon the inhabitants of heaven, it is gladly owned

Digitized by Google

and accepted by them. So it will be here when God's will is done upon earth, as it is in heaven. Then his will, as Abbott says, "will be done in us and respecting us." Then the refrain on every lip and in every heart, will be the words of the Psalmist, "I delight to do thy will, O my God."

Give us this day our daily bread. Instead of "this day" Luke uses "day by day." Matthew makes the sense of dependence a little closer by asking for only "this day." Yet the distinction is too fine to attach much importance to it. A good deal of study has been put upon the word for "daily." It occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, and its etymology is doubtful. The only other meaning that has been largely advocated is "needful" or "convenient." Accepting the petition as it runs it is an appeal for the food we need as we need it. The prayer has passed from things spiritual to things bodily; from the things of the glory and kingdom of God to the common wants alike of the highest and the humblest life. The physical man has needs that may be brought before the King of kings. If we expand the thought to its limits it becomes an asking even as God's bounty is full and our possessions are nothing. We ask for fruitful seasons, a fertile soil, a refreshing rain and a quickening sunshine. We ask that we may labor in hope and reap in joy; that we may have the shelter and protection which shall encompass us in safety, and that as we eat our bread we may thank the bountiful Giver from whom cometh every good and perfect gift.

And forgive us our sins; for we ourselves also forgive every one that is indebted to us. Matthew puts the word "debt" into both clauses. Broadus notes that the Aramaic word is "debt." Forgiveness is a new grace not found in Greek or Roman literature. The author of Ecce Homo says of it, "a new virtue has been introduced into human life." To forgive a debt is to release the debtor from all obliga-

Digitized by Google

tion. We have no right to ask for the mercy we are not willing to grant. Abbot says: "How shall I feel toward another? is to be answered by, How do I wish Christ to feel toward me?" The fullness of the forgiveness that we hope to enjoy must be the measure of our forgiveness of others. To forgive, but not to forget, is a false pretense. It cancels the debt, but holds the debtor. It writes across the face of the account the one word, "Scoundrel," and so leaves the debtor in worse case than before. Where forgiveness exists there is the restoration of friendly relations and genuine esteem. In view of the difficulty of bringing human nature to this point, even when aided by divine grace, we may rightly conclude that "straight is the gate, and narrow is the way that leads unto life, and few there be that find it." And so the prayer passes back again from the bodily to the spiritual, and this momentary descent into the world of matter where we ask for bread is followed by a swift return to the things of greatest moment, the condition of the heart, and our hope of peace with God.

And bring us not into temptation. Matthew adds, "but deliver us from evil." Godet calls attention to this word "deliver," as being a military term denoting "rescue," thus implying that we are already in the hands of the evil, and so are lost if God does not by superior force take us out of its grasp. There are forms of temptation that are not evil, as witness James, who tells the saints to count it all joy when they fall into divers temptations. But the temptation of the prayer, which we may pray not to be brought into, is indicated by the clause added in Matthew, to be a temptation devised by the spirit of evil to lead the soul astray.

With this petition the prayer ends. In some MSS., is given the doxology found in Matthew, with which we have become so familiar. Lange traces the use of it to I. Chron., 29: 11. Broadus says that it is wanting in many of the best MSS., that the testimony of the Latin and Greek

Digitized by Google

Fathers is adverse to it, and that it was not introduced into the book of common prayer until the time of Charles II. Yet it forms a fitting close to the prayer, and is not out of harmony with it. Edersheim says: "In the temple it was customary to respond, not by an amen, but with this: 'Blessed be the name of the glory of his kingdom for ever and ever.'"

Some devout minds have found a difficulty in what seems an omission here of what our Lord placed a good deal of stress on at other times, that all asking in prayer should be in his name; and further, that there is, in this prayer, no mention of the fact that we are made sons of God through Christ's work. Various things may be said in answer to these doubts that certainly must have the effect of relieving the matter of any great difficulty to any candid mind, though it is not pretended that we know exactly the reason that was in Christ's mind for omitting any mention of these two things.

It is easy to so expand the words of some of these petitions that they must be made to include just these things that seem to be omitted, or to construe the very fact of our having the right to use this prayer as one that rests upon our previous recognition of the cross of Christ. It may be said that this was before the crucifixion, and that it would not have been possible to introduce at this time any mention of that event that would have been plain to the disciples. But it seems to me that there is a value in the omission of any words of this kind, in that such omission seems to emphasize the phrase, "After this manner," and keeps us from giving to the Lord's Prayer too large a place in our private and public devotions, and so helps to save us from the fault of formalism.

C. W. CURRIER.

Winfield, Kansas.

Digitized by Google

V.

THE MAN OF SIN.

EACH of the three great eras of New Testament revelation has contributed its prophetic and predictive elements to the body of Christian doctrine; each has transmitted to the Church an *apocalypse*—a symbolic vision of the career and destiny of the Kingdom of God. From the first era, that of the personal teaching of Jesus, we have the discourse recorded in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew. From the third era, that which closes the Apostolic century, we have received the apocalyptic visions seen by John the Apostle in the isle of Patmos. Between the two falls the Pauline apocalypse, of which, however, only fragments remain, chiefly contained in a few paragraphs of the epistles to the Thessalonians, the two earliest writings of the apostle now extant. A unique interest attaches to that passage in the second epistle in which, using the language of symbol and vision, he predicts the advent and the destruction of the Man of Sin.

There are few thoughtful readers of Scripture whose attention has not been arrested by the striking picture there drawn. The writer's principal theme has been the Day, the Advent, the Coming of the Lord. The apostle and the teacher has become the prophet and the seer. The Spirit has declared to him, as afterwards to John in Patmos, "things which must shortly come to pass." He too has stood on some mount of apocalyptic vision, and can say

> "Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord."

For the hope and comfort of the Thessalonian Church he has imparted to them certain definite instructions concern-

Digitized by Google

ing this future event. Then, in order to check the haste and impatient restlessness produced in part by these disclosures, he again lifts the veil of the future, and suddenly throws upon the screen a human figure, dark, gigantic, portentous. Not that of "The Last Man," as seen in the imagination of a modern poet against the horizon of the world's sunset:

> "I saw the last of human mould
> That shall creation's death behold
> As Adam saw its prime."

It is the figure of the Man of Sin, to speak more accurately the Man of Lawlessness, the great antagonist of Christ and precursor of the second advent, whose destruction is to be one of the distinguishing events of the final consummation.

The passage reads as follows; I have departed from the Revised as well as from the Authorized version, hoping to convey to the English reader the sense of the original with more force and precision. The text followed is that of Westcott and Hort, except in the matter of punctuation.

"But we beseech you, brethren, as regards the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto him, that ye be not quickly unsettled in mind, nor yet be troubled, either by spirit, or by word or by epistle purporting to come from us, to the effect that the day of the Lord is now present. Let no man beguile you in any wise; for it is not to be, except the apostasy shall have first come, and the Man of Lawlessness shall have been revealed, the Son of Destruction, the Opposer, the Exalter of himself against every one that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he hath taken his seat in the Temple of God, declaring that he himself is God. Do ye not remember that while I was yet with you I told you these things? And now ye know that which restraineth, in order that he may be revealed in his own season. For the mystery of lawlessness is already working; only there is one who restraineth now, until he be out of the way. And then shall be revealed the Lawless One, whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the breath of his mouth, and bring to nought by the manifestation of his coming; even he whose coming is according to the working of Satan, with all power and signs and wonders of falsehood, and with all

Digitized by Google

deceit of unrighteousness for them that are perishing; because they receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God sendeth them a working of error, that they should believe the falsehood; that they all might be judged who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.

I invite the readers of the REVIEW to a fresh study of this passage, not in all its details (these I have discussed in a forthcoming volume of the New Testament Commentary now editing by Dr. Hovey) but with reference to the general outlines of the description and the identification of its chief figure. Nor is it as a curiosity of exegesis, a riddle of "mystical lore" that it deserves attention. It was written not to conceal, but to disclose truth; it threw light then upon the future, it is still "a lamp shining in a dark place," aiding to elucidate other passages of New Testament prophecy, and strikingly suggestive of certain great moral principles never more in need of emphasis than in our own time. It is much to be regretted that so instructive and generally valuable a work as Farrar's Life and Work of St. Paul should on this topic merely throw dust into the air, and obscure rather than explain. Farrar regards it as reasonably certain that the "restraining" power—"that which restraineth," and "one who restraineth"—is the Roman Empire and the Roman Emperor, that beyond this all is uncertain conjecture, and the passage as a whole is to be treated as an insoluble enigma. If he had not already encumbered himself with the theory of Reuss and Renan that the anti-Christ of the apocalypse was the Emperor Nero, the enigma would have been less formidable. The fact is there has been considerable exaggeration as to "the air of mystery and secrecy" enwrapping the theme treated of by Paul, as if he were apprehensive of special danger in committing to writing what he had to say to the Thessalonians.

The following pages advance no new theory. They subject to clearer definition a theory already well known to

Digitized by Google

Biblical scholars, and point out historical correlations that seem sufficient of themselves to establish its correctness, detaching it at the same time from errors of interpretation that form no essential part of the theory itself. It is substantially the view of Whitby, set forth in his *Paraphrase and Commentary upon all the Epistles of the New Testament*, London, 1700. Bishop Lightfoot, among those now living, has assented to it. I may be allowed to add that during the past seven or eight years each step of further inquiry into the history of the New Testament period and the inner life of the apostolic Church has brought to my own mind a fresh vindication of its truth. In a word, the Man of Lawlessness described by Paul was *the corrupt and impious Judaism of the apostolic age.* And here a distinction is important. It was not the Jews as a nation, nor merely the Jewish hierarchy; it was not the Pharisees as such, though no one class or organization was more actively representative of the principle of evil which the apostle depicts; it was not any one among the false prophets and messiahs who were from time to time making their appearance in that age; it was rather the evil principle embodied in the then existing anti-Christian Judaism—the Judaism that had already deliberately rejected the Christ, and was now coming more and more defiantly to cast off all law, human and divine, filling to the full its cup of iniquity. It is not our concern at this point to decipher the characters of the prediction that still belong to the future, but to discern the antagonist whose mysterious agency was already operative, whose moral form was soon to be revealed, and whom the Lord at his coming was to destroy.

Before setting out to verify this identification from known facts and from other Scripture, let us take into account several

Digitized by Google

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS.

1. New Testament prophecy is organically one. The groundwork of all apostolic prediction concerning the last things is to be found in our Lord's teaching and especially in his longer discourse recorded in Matthew. On the other hand, New Testament prophecy is rooted in the soil of the Old, and in its apocalyptic portions shows the influence of Daniel, the last of the four greater prophets. It would seem that no other book of the Old Testament was more extensively studied during the New Testament age than Daniel, and not by the Jews only, but in the early Church. Both directly and through the Revelation of John it made a powerful impression upon primitive Christian thought and experience. Its influence upon Jewish thought for centuries before the destruction of Jerusalem is well known. The Books of Ezekiel and Daniel became the productive impulse to a considerable body of writings which may almost be said to form the characteristic literary feature of the period—a more or less distinct species of predictive compositions to which the name "apocalyptic" has since Lücke been quite generally given. They had for their leading theme the future conflicts, triumphs and glories of the Messianic kingdom.

2. The Pauline apocalypse communicates special revelations made to the writer himself. In the fourth chapter of the first Epistle he claims to speak "by the word of the Lord," and so it is, doubtless, in the present passage. It presupposes the eschatological disclosures made by Christ to his disciples, and its tone and imagery are those of a vision of Daniel. Hence, in seeking the key to Paul, we turn back to these earlier sources. But it must not be too hastily assumed that Paul is speaking of the same persons or events as Daniel. In Daniel the great enemy of the faith, he who "shall exalt himself and magnify himself

Digitized by Google

above every God," is the Syrian king, Antiochus Epiphanes; it is he who is seen in vision as the typical earthly adversary of God's chosen people. His invasion of Judea, and his desperate attempt to extirpate its religion, marked the last great crisis in Jewish history previous to Christ. His seizure of the Holy City, his cruel persecutions, his desecration of the temple by erecting in the holy place an altar to the Olympian Zeus and sacrificing thereon an offering of swine —these things made a deep impression upon the mind of the whole Jewish people. Thenceforward the brilliant but detested Syrian king became to them, according to the prophetic word of Daniel, a type of the anti-Messiah, the anti-Christ, an impersonation of heathen antagonism to the God of Israel. In the first Book of Maccabees (2 : 48) he is called "the sinner" (ὁ ἁμαρτωλός), as if by pre-eminence. Now, the parallelism between the eleventh chapter of Daniel and the prediction of the apostle Paul in the present passage is only of the most general kind. The latter is not interpreting a former prophecy, but communicating a new revelation. He also is depicting a typical adversary of the kingdom of God, but it is another and a wholly different one.

3. It is not to be forgotten that the apostle imparts no full instruction on the topic in hand. The passage is only a supplement to the section in the first Epistle concerning the advent (I. Thess. 4 : 13—5 : 11). It seeks to correct an erroneous impression with reference to what he had taught upon that subject. In neither passage is full and systematic instruction given on the great theme; only sufficient to meet inquiries and difficulties of the moment, together with allusions to previous instruction given orally. Thus there are but few facts and data from which the interpreter may reconstruct the entire delineation as the apostle had previously given it to his converts. The case is similar regarding the anti-Christ mentioned in the Epistle of John. The

Digitized by Google

writer refers to more detailed oral teaching which his readers would recall. It may be noted in this connection that Paul never uses the term "anti-Christ," nor do his Epistles elsewhere allude to "the Man of Sin."

4. I take for granted in the present discussion that Paul's doctrine of the Parousia is the same as that of the Gospels. He predicted, as did Christ, a second advent. His prediction is still to be fulfilled; *the* second advent has not yet taken place. But who will deny that in some germinal, typical signification there was *a* fulfillment when the wrath of God came down upon the Sanctuary, the Holy City, and the Jewish nation? The destruction of Jerusalem was the predicted coming of the Son of Man in the *primary* sense of New Testament prophecy. Alford, Eadie and others deny that Paul uses the term Parousia with this implication; but this is to remove from apostolic prophecy almost its entire historical groundwork. It is evident that there are two points of view from which the prediction concerning the Man of Sin are to be considered —that of the primary, and that of the final fulfillment. Assuming that *a* Parousia did take place in the apostolic age, our first and obvious inquiry is: Did a revelation of the Man of Sin take place as a prelude to that? This inquiry is likely to be far more instructive than any speculations concerning either the *time*, or the *form* of the ultimate fulfillment still future. It is not the function of the interpreter to translate prophecy into terms of future fact, but to discern its lessons and elicit its principles as they come to view under "the divine and steady light of history."

5. Another question may properly be considered at this point: Is the (described or predicted) Man of Sin *a person?* The affirmative is frequently assumed, almost as a matter of course. Thus Lünemann, that it denotes "not a collective idea, but an individual person." Lillie, more cautiously: "According to the most obvious and natural, though not

Digitized by Google

the necessary import of the language, some one man, the personal anti-Christ, the recipient of all Satan's energy, in whom Satan should, so to speak, become incarnate, and thus bring to a decision the long-standing feud between himself and the woman's seed." Now the *representation*, it is true, is of a man, but this by no means limits the reference to a single person. Nothing is more characteristic of the prophetic style than pictorial or personifying terms. "In all figurative passages," says Bishop Lightfoot, "it is arbitrary to assume that a person is denoted where we find a personification." It is notably the usage of the Old Testament prophets to personify collective or generic conceptions, and it is often difficult to distinguish a personification from a person. "The Son of Man," until our Lord adopted it, was not the name of a particular person; the "Servant of Jehovah" stood primarily for the true spiritual Israel; "Zion" also was used in the same sense. It will account for Paul's use of the term "Man" (ὁ ἄνθρωπος it is to be noted, not ὁ ἀνήρ) if he is depicting a human polity or institution, or a generic principle of human action, or any organized agency belonging to the sphere of earthly and human history. The malignant figure that looms up to his view, though satanic in selfishness, energy and deceit, is nevertheless an earthly adversary, and belongs to the human sphere—no foe from the unseen world, no principality or power of darkness.

If Paul's "Lawless One" be restricted to a single individual, it becomes equally necessary so to restrict the "false prophet" described by John in the sixteenth, nineteenth and twentieth chapters of Revelation—an interpretation beset with difficulties. On the other hand, it is the distinguishing mark of the prophetic mind to perceive principles, to apprehend them as the tangible realities of existence. They front him as it were living beings in flesh and blood. His friends or his foes are the moral forces in history that hasten or retard

Digitized by Google

the coming of the Kingdom of God. Paul, even in his ordinary teaching, pictures and almost personifies Law, Flesh, and Sin; it was still more to be expected, in a passage so strikingly apocalyptic in style, that he should thus personify the deadliest enemy of the Church, that propaganda of falsehood and hate, the degenerate Judaism of the apostolic age.

MAIN FEATURES OF THE DESCRIPTION.

Let us now scrutinize the leading features of the figure he delineates, and afterwards inquire where its counterpart is to be found. What are the prominent traits of "this terrible image which Christ's apostle, standing in the bright Pentecostal morn of Christianity, already saw casting a baleful shadow across the heavens, and lifting looks of proud defiance even in the temple of God?"

1. *Lawlessness.* Its distinguishing feature is *Anomia*, iniquity or lawlessness. He is the "Man of Lawlessness," the "Lawless One"; his working is "a mystery of lawlessness." This triple repetition lends significance and emphasis to the name of the Pauline anti-Christ. It designates the most obvious aspect of his sin. The term is not a weak negation, marking lapse from law, mere moral defect; it is rather resistance, deliberate disobedience and transgression. The seat of the antagonism is the will; this incarnate iniquity is self-will raised to its highest power.

2. *Opposition to Christ and his Kingdom.* This is the notable mark. He is the Opposer. He represents the chief human force arrayed against Christ. His sin is not merely ungovernable defiance of moral law, bursting through all restraints, but is a definite antagonism to Christ and his redemptive work.

3. *Self-Deification.* "Who exalteth himself against all that is called God, or that is worshiped;" he even declares himself to be God (verse four). All sin tends to this. Selfishness is the folly that says in its heart, no God! But

Digitized by Google

the sin here charged reaches the very height of impiety—a deliberate and avowed assumption of the prerogatives of God. It implies a claim to obedience and worship. Coupled with this is the fact that he hath taken possession of God's temple, enthroning himself, so to speak, in the very presence chamber of God.

4. *Mystery.* Its arrogant and ungovernable impiety was cloaked in mystery. Its deeds were known to the apostle and his readers, its agencies in active operation, yet to a certain extent concealed within a veil of secrecy. We must note, however, that "mystery" in the New Testament denotes not only that which is hidden, unknowable by human reason alone, but that which it belongs peculiarly to the Christian revelation to disclose. If we are to take the term here in its specific New Testament sense, it points to a mode and degree of iniquity inexplicable except through divine revelation, and which only the fuller unfoldings of the plan of grace will explain to the understanding of man.

5. *Lying pretensions and false miracles.* It "works with signs and lying wonders, and with all deceit of unrighteousness." It is Satanic in pretension, in power, and in deceit. It is a "working of error" causing those who are perishing to "believe a lie." These are appropriate traits in one who arrogates to himself religious pre-eminence, and enthrones himself in the place of God. They are traits that properly belong to the *religious* sphere, and mark a person or a power not merely opposing Christ, but claiming to supersede him, demanding exclusive allegiance and arrogating to itself the whole domain of faith.

6. *To be revealed before the Parousia.* What the apostle predicts, is not the coming of the Man of Sin, but his *revelation.* That which had been hidden from mankind—somewhat pertaining to his agency, personality, covert and deceptive operations—shall be in due time disclosed. No definite statement is made either as to the manner or as to

Digitized by Google

the content of this "revelation," only that it and the apostasy are the two notable precursors of the Parousia.

7. *The revelation delayed by a Restrainer.* There is *one who restrains*—there is *that which restrains* the full manifestation of this Incarnate Iniquity "until he, the Restrainer, be taken out of the way," or, as it might better be rendered, "until he be out of its way." When once that restraining force shall be "out of its way," shall cease to be exerted in its restraint, then the revelation shall take place. This restraining force, it is now generally admitted, was the Roman Imperial government.

8. *Doomed to destruction at the Parousia.* The destruction is not described literally, but in the familiar language of apocalyptic symbolism: "Whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the breath of his mouth, and bring to nought by the manifestation of his coming."

THE DESCRIPTION VERIFIED.

Let us now verify the description, taking the above points in order. Does the anti-Christian Judaism of the apostolic age furnish the counterpart of the figure described? In proof of the affirmative we find.

1. *Lawlessness* was its leading trait. It was distinguished by an ungovernable defiance of law both divine and human. Our Saviour's own indictment of the Jewish leaders declared: "Within ye are full of hypocrisy and *iniquity*" (ἀνομία, *lawlessness*). A signal illustration and proof of the lawless spirit that had taken possession of them is to be found in the trial of Christ, a procedure grossly illegal in form, as it was iniquitous in purpose. Edersheim and others have shown how it outraged every principle of Jewish law. Paul also arraigns his countrymen for such flagrant transgression of their own law as to occasion blasphemy among the Gentiles (Romans, 2: 23, 24). Of the inner history of Judaism at this period preceding the destruction of Jerusa-

Digitized by Google

lem, we know but little; the New Testament and Josephus form the principal extant sources. Josephus declaims repeatedly against "the lawless violence" of the insurgents who seized Jerusalem. Their leaders claimed authority paramount to the proper rulers (Jewish War, II. 20, 3); they took it upon themselves to appoint the high priest; they were driven headlong by "a desperate frenzy." In one of his addresses to the people within the walls, Josephus thus inveighs against the leaders: "Secret sins you have not disdained—thefts and treacheries and adulteries—while in rapine and murders you vie with each other, and cut out for yourselves new and strange paths of malignity;" "You make an exhibition of your iniquity as if it were a virtue (V. 9. 4). "No other city ever endured similar calamities, and no generation ever existed more prolific in crime" (V. 10. 5).

How thoroughly the lawless spirit characterized the civil life of the Jews at this period may be inferred from the great number of banditti that overran the country. The brigand chief Eleazar had ravaged Judea for twenty years before he was captured and crucified by the Procurator Felix. Other robbers without number were crucified by him about the same time. "Scarcely had the country been cleared of these," says Josephus, when there sprang up in Jerusalem another description of robbers, called Sicarii, 'assassins' (II. 13.3), besides many impostors and deceivers," whom he afterwards describes. He calls the nation *a diseased frame*, one member after another becoming inflamed, till anarchy pervaded the entire body politic. True, all this is the language of a partisan, not of a dispassionate historian; still, all that he says on this score is more than confirmed by other glimpses of Jewish impiety, recklessness and fury—notably during the revolts which terminated in the defeat of Bar-Cochba by Hadrian. If ever in human history sin took incarnate form, as *lawlessness*, it was

Digitized by Google

in the dominant faction of Judaism during the century that followed the crucifixion of Christ.

2. *Opposition to Christ and his Kingdom* was at that time pre-eminently characteristic of Judaism. No recital of facts could testify to this so impressively as Paul's fierce outburst of indignation against his persecuting countrymen in the first epistle: "who both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drove out us, and please not God and are contrary to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they may be saved, to fill up their sins alway: but the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost." The Jews were everywhere the jealous, malignant and energetic enemies of the Gospel. At Antioch, Thessalonica, Corinth, and in every principal city, they kindled opposition and persecution. In one of the latest of his epistles Paul writes: "Beware of the dogs, beware of the evil workers, beware of the concision" (Philippians 3:2). At first it was not the empire, nor Paganism that made deliberate, organized opposition to Christianity. As Pilate would have released the Saviour but for the Jewish hierarchy, so the imperial authorities regarded the church with indifference and contempt, except when its industrious Jewish enemies succeeded in exciting their suspicion or their fear. Ewald rightly attributes the relative exemption from persecution which it enjoyed for many years to the Roman government; speaking of the period from A. D. 44 to 60, he says: "We do not possess much detailed information with regard to the condition of Christianity in the land of its birth during the next ten or fifteen years, which is to some extent a good sign, inasmuch as we can infer therefrom that the new outbreak of the severest persecutions was at least kept down to a considerable extent, thanks to the Roman government" (History of Israel, Vol. vii, p. 275). During our Lord's ministry it was the Jews who were primarily "his adversaries" (Luke 13: 17); it was the same during the ministry of the apostles.

Digitized by Google

3. *Self-deification*: "So that he sitteth in the temple of God, *setting himself forth as God.*" The tendency to emperor-worship throughout this period has led many to identify the Man of Sin with some one of the Roman emperors. Caligula had arrogantly demanded divine honors, and in the year 37 had even commanded his statue to be set up as an object of worship in the temple, an act that sent a shock of horror throughout the whole Jewish world. Yet, horrified as the Jews had been by this act of heathen wickedness, it did not equal the impious self-assertion that developed itself among their own rulers the religious leaders of the chosen people—an impiety of deeper guilt because involving intelligent and deliberate resistance to divine revelation. Whether Paul had in mind any single act of profane self-exaltation committed by the Jewish hierarchy, cannot certainly be said, but his words put in a nutshell the spirit and tendency of their system.

"It is more punishable," says the Mishna, "to act against the words of the scribes than against those of Scripture." Our Lord charged them with laying aside the commandment of God, and substituting their own in its place. Compare also their profane legend of the dispute that once took place between God himself and the heavenly academy, and which was decided by an appeal to a certain rabbi (Edersheim, Life of Jesus, II., 409). Similar in spirit were the pretensions to divinity of various false prophets from the time of Simon Magus on to that of Bar-Cochba. Throughout this last period we remark among priests, Rabbins, and false prophets how truly the prevailing tendencies of Judaism were culminating in a self-idolatrous atheism.

Furthermore, of Judaism alone could it then be said that *it had its seat in the Temple of God.* The Temple at Jerusalem was the throne from which Judaism ruled the religious world. The mere fact that they were in possession of it gave to the Jewish hierarchy vast power over the imaginations and con-

Digitized by Google

sciences of men. Its antiquity, its splendor and wealth, and its unique religious history, had attracted universal attention, until "a general awe of the religion of this people was making itself more and more profoundly felt at that time throughout the Roman empire." Offerings and sacrifices were brought to it from all parts of the world by Pagan Kings and other Gentile worshipers. It was in the Temple that the Jewish leaders had plotted the death of Christ, and there he had pronounced his woe upon them. And Josephus says of the insurgents during the siege of the city: "It [the Temple] was their asylum, and the seat of their tyranny."

4. Again, Judaism may well be termed a *mystery* of the New Testament period. As the person and work of Christ constitute pre-eminently the mystery of Godliness, so the figure of anti-Christ is the mystery of iniquity. One mystery is the counterpart of the other. This feature is strikingly suggestive of anti-Christian Judaism, in whatever sense we apply the word mystery. It was the secret mechanism of the Jewish Hagiocracy that made its hostility the more terrible. With dagger or bribe or plot it could strike down an enemy in the remotest recesses of the empire. Its emissaries shaped the whisper of the throne; its agents were active on sea and land. The cause of the persecution of the Christians under Nero is still unknown—and particularly how the suspicion of the burning of the city, with which they were charged, fell on them. But history is probably not at fault in tracing it to the deadly jealousy of the Jews in Rome. "The Jews were by far the deadliest enemies of the Christians; and two persons of Jewish proclivities were at this time in close proximity to the person of the Emperor. One was the pantomimist Aliturus, the other was Poppæa, the harlot Empress" (Farrar, Early Days of Christianity, p. 36); compare also Ewald, who speaks of "the dazzling splendor and the mysterious terrors that surrounded the Hagiocracy."

Digitized by Google

But it was also a *mystery* in the profounder New Testament sense. The secrecy with which Judaism wrought its deadly work was less a "mystery" than the unfathomable depth of its sin and guilt. The moral character of Pharisaism, and of the generation that perished in the overthrow of Jerusalem, is an inexplicable problem except in the light of the Cross of Christ. There was a moral doom that came upon the soul of the nation long before the city fell. It is this profoundest problem in ethical history with which Paul deals in the ninth, tenth and eleventh chapters of Romans—these "unsearchable judgments," and these "ways past tracing out." "God gave them a spirit of stupor, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear, *unto this very day.*" (Romans 11 : 8).

5. The next mark, *lying pretentions and false miracles*, notably applied to Judaism, and it is that on which the apostle lays full emphasis; "whose coming is according to the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceit of unrighteousness." Religious imposture was the mark and curse of the age, and the masters of the art were Jews. Simon Magus, the sorcerer who professed Christianity during Philip's ministry in Samaria, and Simon of Gitta, who is mentioned in Justin Martyr, are conspicuous examples. The latter declared himself to be God, taking to himself, according to Jerome, such titles as "Son of God," "the Paraclete," "the Almighty." He is known in Church history as "the great Heresiarch, the open enemy of the apostles, inspired it would seem by the spirit of evil, to countermine the works of the Saviour, and to found a school of error in opposition to the Church of God." There is no need to identify him personally with Paul's Man of Sin, as was done by Hammond. He, and other influential impostors, and false prophets, were symptoms of the "diseased frame" of which Josephus speaks. These fanatics were the outbreaking manifestations of the deeply-seated principle of

Digitized by Google

corruption—a malignant spirit of political and religious anarchy that remains without a parallel in history. They belonged for the most part to that extreme faction of Judaism that kindled the fires of persecution, whose hands were reeking with Christian blood, and, in all ways, proved the foe of the early Church. It was foretold by our Lord that such men would appear before the destruction of Jerusalem. "And many false prophets shall arise, and shall lead many astray;" "For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders, so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect;" (Matthew 24: 11,24). Did Josephus know when he wrote his history, that he was writing an illustrative commentary upon these words? "But besides these (*Sicarii*) there rose up another herd of villains, with purer hands indeed, but with views more impious, who not less than these assassins disturbed the happiness of the city. For these impostors and deceivers, under the garb of inspiration aiming at innovation and change, persuaded the multitude to forego their reason, and led them into the desert, assuring them that God would there give them tokens of freedom." (Jewish War II. 13.4), He tells also of an Egyptian false prophet, artful and arrogant, who gathered followers to the number of thirty thousand, but was intercepted on his march to Jerusalem by the procurator Felix. In the aftermath of the harvest of destruction brought on by the Jewish revolt, the celebrated and powerful Bar-Cochba, "Son of the Star," was another false Messiah. He was said to breathe fire from his mouth, and to be invested with miraculous power. He wrought with such "deceit of unrighteousness" as to gain the adherence of Rabbi Akiba, the most learned and revered of the Rabbins. His cruel persecution of Palestinian Christians, it is well remarked by Farrar, "first thoroughly opened the eyes of the Pagan world to the difference between Jews and Christians." What is said by the historian concerning this period applies equally to the earlier period

Digitized by Google

before the destruction of the city: "The empire swarmed with Jewish wonder-workers, mathematicians, astrologers, or whatever other name or office they assumed or received from their trembling hearers," (Milman, *History of the Jews*, II. 459).

6–7. The historical verification of the sixth and seventh points above may be summed up in the answer to one question: How was the restraining power, the imperial government—or the Restrainer, the Emperor, *taken out of the way*? Whitby holds that the apostle refers to the power of the Emperor *Claudius;* that he had so signally favored the Jews and placed them under obligation by his edicts, that they could not for shame think of revolting from his government. But this is extremely improbable. The difficulty of reaching a satisfactory answer to the question is no doubt chiefly due to our slight knowledge of Jewish history in its relations to the Empire during this period. The expression is a general one, the being taken out of the way is probably no more than the opposite of being "in the way," or being obstructive. Now we know that in the year 66 the Jewish leaders were greatly elated by their victories over the Romans, and a new era of freedom had apparently begun.* For more than six months the imperial troops were withdrawn from Jerusalem. By this withdrawal and the temporary successes in other parts of Syria, Jewish fanaticism, as if in an instant, took fire, and the history of the following years may well be called a *revelation* of its *iniquity*. The revealing took place as soon as the coercive control of Rome was withdrawn. Although it was, on the part of many noble spirits, a patriotic struggle for freedom, the revolt was nevertheless an infuriate conflict of desperate fanatics—men, to use Paul's language, who pleased not God, and were contrary to all men. Its real character reappeared in the revolt of Bar-Cochba, the final sequel of the struggle for Jewish independence.

*See Ewald, vii. pp. 494-515.

Digitized by Google

8. The Man of Sin was *doomed to destruction when the Lord should come.* The two events, the Parousia and the destruction of Jerusalem, are so closely connected in our Lord's last prophetic discourse that they belong together in every adequate conception of New Testament prophecy. All subsequent history has seen in the overthrow of the Jewish polity the signal vengeance of an offended God. Alford interposes as "a fatal objection," that "it is impossible to conceive of the destruction of Jerusalem as in any sense corresponding to the Parousia in St. Paul's sense of the term." But surely St. Paul's sense of Parousia can only be defined by the sense attached to it in our Lord's discourse. Understanding it thus we see how he could well say of the Judaistic adversaries, "the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost;" the cloud of vengeance was even then ready to burst upon their heads. It may be objected that Judaism was *not* destroyed by this Parousia of Christ; that the Jewish race still continues intact, and that Jewish antagonism to Christianity has not ceased. To this objection it is sufficient to reply that a complete and final fulfilment of the prediction is not to be sought in the events of that age. *The* Parousia is still future, and the great destruction of the anti-Christ is yet to come. It remains true, however, that the polity of Judaism was then brought to an end, and it ceased to be one of the world powers; as a religious propaganda, and an aggressive enemy of the Church, its power was annihilated. The prevailing objection—to many a decisive one—to this interpretation is that it is *praeterist;* that the Man of Sin on this view has already been revealed and destroyed, and the whole prediction is thus taken out of relation to the still future Advent of Christ. It has been often pointed out that one fulfilment does not preclude a future and profounder fulfilment; on the question in hand, however, the interpreter must allow the passage to speak for itself. In addition, therefore, to the above elements of the prediction (which

Digitized by Google

we have verified one by one), it is vital to the true conception of the passage to bear in mind its

ALLUSIONS TO CONTEMPORANEOUS FACTS.

The language throughout implies a personality or agency contemporaneous with the writer. Paul is evidently in the first instance, speaking of a Man of Sin of his own time.

It would seem as if the apostle's language could hardly be mistaken on this point. See verse seven: "For the mystery of lawlessness is already working;" it is common to detach this statement from its context, and to resolve it into a generality; *e. g.* for lawlessness is already mysteriously at work. Alford rightly places emphasis on *μυστήριον* (in his notes) but says (Proleg. p. 69) "It, the *ἀνομία*, in the hearts and lives . . . of men, is and ever has been working in hidden places." Lünemann also gives as the meaning: "Wickedness in so far as it is still a mystery;" "Paul thinks on the detached traces of wickedness . . . which only at a later period will concentrate themselves and reach their climax in anti-Christ." Riggenbach: "He sees before him the scattered shapeless mass of ungodliness which is first to gain form and personality in anti-Christ," p. 129. Ellicott: "All that mass of uncombined, and so to say unorganized *ἀνομία* which . . . will find its complete development and organization in the person and power of anti-Christ." Zöckler (1887) seems to agree with Riggenbach.

I cannot accept any of these interpretations; *μυστήριον* (standing as it does at the head of the sentence, and detached from its following defining genitive) can only refer to the hitherto active but unrevealed agency of which the writer has been speaking. It is a definite form of evil, of lawless power,—defined by the words of the preceding sentence, and corresponding to the implied object of *κατέχον* ——— thus cannot refer to mere lawlessness in general. While it

Digitized by Google

would be too much to say that τὸ μυστήριον is *identical* with the Man of Lawlessness, it is, nevertheless, a term descriptive of the same specific agency.

In verses 9–12 also the language is that of a writer whose thought is chiefly upon existing facts. The use of the present (ἐστὶν ἡ παρουσία) after the futures ἀνελεῖ and καταργήσει, and the present πέμπει in verse eleven, can hardly be accounted for on any other supposition. It is possible to throw all these predicates into the future, but only by a forced interpretation of the sequence of the Greek tenses. In verse eleven πέμπει obviously means *is sending*, the ordinary progressive force of the present indicative.

To the same effect is verse six. We need not insist (against Alford) that νῦν is temporal ("and at *the present time* you are aware what it is that restraineth"); the sentence, irrespective of this adverb, evidently refers to an existing force or agency that is being restrained by another agency ——both agencies already known to the writer and his readers; if there could be any doubt on this point, the ἄρτι in verse seven would be decisive.

Verse four, being simply an attributive adjunct, gives no distinct note of time, whether present or future. The clause ὥστε αὐτὸν. . . . καθίσαι may be rendered either "so that *he takes his seat*," or "so that *he hath taken his seat* in the temple of God." The latter is in my judgment preferable.

The prediction, so far as concerns the Man of Sin, predicts a future fact,—whether near or distant is not said. But what is that future fact? Not the *coming*, the advent, of the Man of Sin; not the coming of a time when his dire agency should be known and felt; but his *revelation*,—his manifestation in the sight of the world—and his *destruction*. In all the rest of the prophetic delineation there is not a single trait, no color of allusion even, that would carry the mind forward to the distant future.

Digitized by Google

NERO NOT THE MAN OF SIN.

The foregoing review of the description makes it evident that we cannot find its counterpart in the Emperor Nero. The Fathers, Chrysostom and others (see Döllinger, First Age of the Church) early began to apply part of the description to that Emperor; in him "the mystery of lawlessness" was already working; referring this phrase, however, not directly to the real and final anti-Christ of the prediction. Döllinger has strongly advocated the reference to Nero. "It is a new Antiochus, a heathen monarch, that St. Paul refers to." "All that is essential in his description is fulfilled in Nero and the events connected with him." But Döllinger has not sharply distinguished between what is descriptive, and what is purely predictive in Paul's language. As we have seen above, we must seek for facts and personal agencies contemporaneous with the apostle, and known to him. He had explained them to the Thessalonians, and they had understood him. But what could Paul, writing in the year 53, have known of the Nero whose character was not unmasked to the world till several years later? The question is not, Did Paul predict the anti-Christian career of Nero? but, Was Nero already known to him and his readers? And how could it be said of Nero, at that time, that he had taken his seat in the temple of God? Lünemann, too, is doubtless right in his remark that "it is entirely erroneous to seek the anti-Christ who belongs to the purely *religious* sphere, in the *political*—among the number of the Roman emperors." (p. 177). Nero was indeed a moral monster, and his crimes vividly impressed the imagination of his contemporaries, as of all the following ages. Farrar says: "Nero was destined to enter into far deadlier and closer relations with the nascent Faith, and to fill so vast a space in the horrified imaginations of the early Christians, as to become, by his cruelties, his blasphemies,

Digitized by Google

his enormous crimes, the nearest approach which the world has yet seen to the 'Man of Sin.' He was the ideal of depravity and wickedness, standing over against the ideal of all that is sinless and divine. Against the Christ was now to be ranged the anti-Christ—the man-god of Pagan adulation, in whom was manifested the consummmated outcome of heathen crime and heathen power." But it is an error to look anywhere on Pagan soil for the fullest development of the principle of sin. The greater the light, the deeper the moral darkness of those who refuse the light. It was the Pharisees, the religious leaders of the people, whom Jesus warned against the danger of committing an eternal sin by blaspheming the Holy Spirit. The guilt of the crucifixion rested upon the Jews rather than upon the Gentiles.

I may add finally, as strongly confirmative of the interpretation set forth in the foregoing pages, that *it falls in with the general scope of Messianic prophecy.* As the true spiritual Israel became a type of Christ, so a false and carnal Israel might well be made, before the close of the old dispensation, the type of anti-Christ. Israel was the Son; "Out of Egypt have I called my Son," said the Lord to Hosea, in words of redeeming love. So, also, "Servant of Jehovah," by the same divine condescension, became an official name of the nation. Delitzsch says: "The conception of the Servant of Jehovah is, as it were, a pyramid, of which the base is the people of Israel as a whole, the central part Israel, according to the spirit, and the summit, the Mediator of salvation who arises out of Israel." (See Briggs, Messianic Prophecy, p. 347). But there were prophetic types of anti-Christ, as well as of Christ. (See Fairbairn, *Typology* I., 180). These were not exclusively Gentile, as the Antiochus Epiphanes described in Daniel. "Hagar was the type of a carnal church, that should be in bondage to the elements of the world, and of a spirit at enmity with God, as Sarah was of a spiritual Church, that

Digitized by Google

should possess the freedom and enjoy the privileges of God's true children." God's most terrible threats were issued against his own people, should they break their covenant and revolt against him; read the twenty-eighth chapter of Deuteronomy. They did rebel, and incurred the threatened penalties to the letter, notably in the last days under the Old Covenant. Never did sin take form in so determined and self-conscious opposition to God and his Church; it was where the Law had entered in that the trespass abounded; the profoundest moral corruption had been developed in the historic sphere of revelation. Christ's parables addressed to the Jewish leaders contained warnings significant of this fact. Concerning the man from whom the evil spirit had departed and afterwards returned, he said: "Then goeth he and taketh with himself seven other evil spirits more evil than himself, and they enter in and dwell there, and the last state of that man becometh worse than the first. Even so shall it be also with this evil generation." And at the close of the parable concerning the Wicked Husbandmen he summed up all the terrible threats of earlier prophecy: "Therefore say I unto you, the Kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof, and whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder." If then the true Israel, as the "Son" and the "Servant," constituted a type of the Christ, where, in Biblical history, is there to be found a more distinct and conspicuous type of anti-Christ than that false Israel which slew the prophets, crucified the Lord, and became the fiercest persecutor of his Church?

OTHER INTERPRETATIONS.

It would be an endless task to present a history of the various interpretations of this passage, first, those current in the early Church, and then those that have found advocacy

Digitized by Google

in modern times, especially since the Reformation. The views of different interpreters cannot be properly set forth without some explanation of the dogmatic or critical presuppositions by which their interpretations are modified or determined. The historical or critical position of a given writer will sometimes suggest at once the reason and the explanation of his theory. It can easily be understood, for instance, how Luther should hold the Man of Sin to represent the Papacy, or how a modern critic like Kern, who supposes the epistle to have been written after Paul's death, should find here nothing more than a description of Nero. A few of the opinions of recent commentators may be mentioned. For a fuller historical sketch the reader is referred to Alford's Greek Testament, in the Prolegomena to this epistle.

Riggenbach, in Lange's Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical Commentary, continues the exposition begun by Auberlen, and adopts substantially his views. He identifies the Man of Sin with "the Godless, self-deifying ruler of worldly empire"; in other words, some imperial autocrat, arrogant and atheistic, who is yet to appear. The Restraining Power is the existing moral and legal order in human society.

Weiss (Biblical Theology of the New Testament) holds "the Apostasy" to be the final rejection of the Gospel by the Jews, the final display of their hostility to God and his law. The Man of Sin is the pseudo-Messiah who issues forth from and heads this apostasy. Weiss, however, considers these earlier predictions of the apostle to be inconsistent with those in the ninth, tenth and eleventh chapters of Romans.

Lünemann (author of the exposition of First and Second Thessalonians in Meyer's Commentary), thinks that the apostle had adopted erroneous Jewish ideas concerning the coming of a personal anti-Christ, but that he sets forth im-

Digitized by Google

portant truths concerning the culmination of ungodliness which shall precede the final coming of the Lord.

Alford scarcely attempts to elucidate Paul's conception, as it was, and as his readers understood it, but inquires what the future reality is which it represents to us. He regards the Man of Sin as "the final and central embodiment of that lawlessness, that resistance to God and to God's law, which has been, for these many centuries, fermenting under the crust of human society, and of which we have already witnessed so many partial and tentative eruptions. Whether he is to be expected personally, as one individual embodiment of evil, we would not dogmatically pronounce; still, we would not forget that both ancient interpretation and the world's history point this way."

Dr. Warfield in an instructive series of papers in the *Expositor*, 1886, entitled The Prophecies of St. Paul, argues that the apostasy "is obviously the great apostasy of the Jews;" that the Man of Sin is "the line of [Roman] emperors, considered as the embodiment of persecuting power;" and that the restraining power is probably the Jewish state.

Dr. Dods (in Popular Commentary on the New Testament, edited by Dr. Schaff) says: "It seems idle to speculate in what precise form the Man of Sin will appear. It is possible that as in Paul's day the Jews were the most bitter antagonists of the Gospel, so it is reserved for them to exhibit wickedness and opposition to the truth in the most aggravated form possible to man."

More confidently, Godet:* "Whence is such a being most likely to come? Evidently from the midst of the same people among whom the Messiah himself appeared. It therefore seems to me probable that the false Messiah will be an outcome of degenerate Judaism, and that the Jewish nation putting itself at the head of the great falling away or apostasy of Christian humanity, toward the close of

* The Expositor, Feb., 1885.

Digitized by Google

its existence, will then give birth to its false Messiah, the very ideal of man's natural heart, which has rejected the true Christ. With a daring impiety, such as can only belong to him who has turned his back on a holy destination, a Jew wonderfully gifted, will by raising the standard of atheistic pantheism, proclaim himself the Incarnation of the Absolute, and draw after him the great mass of mankind by promising a golden age."

Lillie, in his Lectures on Thessalonians understands the prediction to point to some one man "the recipient of all Satan's energy, in whom Satan so to speak, should become incarnate, and thus bring to a decision the long standing feud between himself and the woman's seed." He is incorrect in stating that expositions such as Whitby's *restrict* the prophetical character of the description to persons and principles and events that preceded the destruction of Jerusalem.

By far the most popular theory in Protestant Christendom is that which identifies the Man of Sin with the Roman Papacy. With the English reformers it was almost an article of faith; the translators of King James's version take it for granted, as will be seen from their dedication, that the Pope was the existing representative of the Pauline anti-Christ. Among the more recent advocates of this view are Birks, Fairbairn, Elliott, and Mr. Henry Grattan Guinness. One indication of its popularity is the extensive circulation obtained by Mr. Guinness's book, *Romanism and the Reformation*. Bishop Wordsworth vigorously advocates the same view; see his *Greek Testament;* also a small pamphlet *Is the Papacy predicted by St. Paul*," London 1880. In the latter he says: "Although I firmly believe this Prophecy to have long since *begun* to be fulfilled and to be now in *course of fulfillment*, in the Roman Papacy, I do *not* suppose that it has been *exhausted* by the Papacy, as it now is. If I might venture to express an opinion as to the future, which I do

Digitized by Google

with all reverence, I am inclined to believe that the Roman Papacy will develop itself into something worse. The impulse and encouragement which, by its monstrous dogmas, usurpations, and superstitions (revolting to the intellect of Europe), it has given, and is giving, to *Infidelity*, leads to the expectation that it will probably give rise to the appearance of some personal Enemy of God, who will exhibit in all their terrible fulness the features portrayed by St. Paul; and who will be destroyed by the second coming of Christ."

Now, while it is true that the history of the Papacy reveals an astonishing likeness in some points to the figure delineated, this view must nevertheless be rejected. The Papacy could not have been primarily and chiefly in the mind of the apostle, if we admit that the restraining power of which he speaks denotes the Roman Imperial Government. The "Protestant" interpretation so called has been dispassionately criticised by Pelt (Ad. Thessalon. pp. 197-204) Riggenbach (in Lang's Comm.) and Eadie (Comm. on Thess., 1887).

PRESENT BEARINGS OF THE SUBJECT.

To the modern Church what is the teaching of this portion of Scripture? Is it but a piece of history, and is the predictive element simply zero? I do not so read Biblical prophecy. Our Lord's word applies in this case also: "I have told you *before* it is come to pass." But that it is the function of the interpreter of prophecy to construct history in advance, is by no means to be admitted. In spite of the weight of authority for the contrary view, in opposition even to Bengel—*clarum et venerabile nomen*—we must hold that interpretation transcends its proper function when it presumes to outline the actualities of the future, fixing dates and predicting local or individual circumstances of history. Neither prophet nor apostle was enabled even by inspiration to do it; Paul himself but imperfectly apprehended "what or what manner of time the spirit which was in him did sig-

Digitized by Google

nify." It is only in the light of subsequent events that we can understand, as he could not, the relation between the dissolution of the Jewish polity, which ended one age, and that final "end of the age" to which all prophecy points.

It is, however, the interpreter's task to educe the lessons of prophecy, and if not to fashion its terms into facts of the future, at least to translate them into the terms and the thought of his own time. It is not difficult to discern truths applicable to our day in the passage before us. Clouded as it is in a chaos of interpretations, there spring clearly into view important spiritual principles. A brief mention of several of these principles, without unfolding or illustrating any one of them at length, will bring the present discussion to a close.

Lawlessness is one of the distinguishing features of sin. There is no ethical truth which this prophetic description teaches with more emphasis, none which is more thoroughly inwrought into the whole Pauline doctrine of sin. In delineating the typical hero of evil the distinguishing title with which he brands him is *Lawless.* He will fix our attention chiefly upon this trait. The anti-Christ defies and hates law. We must not pause to analyze this fact, but plainly his antagonism to law is not because law expresses cosmic order, but because it manifests God; it is from above, its "seat is the bosom of God." Note also the language of John in his first epistle; he identifies the two, the terms are practically commensurate: "Sin is lawlessness." In another form and for a different purpose Paul emphasizes the same truth when he declares that "apart from the law sin is dead," and the coming in of the law was "in order that the trespass might abound." The law was not the source of sin, but, according to the constitution of the moral universe, it is and remains an essential condition of the vitality, growth, and power of sin.

The practical admonition, however, is this: Let us learn to discern lawlessness as evil, and wholly evil. Let it be

Digitized by Google

stigmatized as inseparable from sin—a detestable and damning factor. Is not the trend of ethical teaching at present somewhat away from this line? Not to speak of theological tendencies, is it sufficiently emphasized among us that magistracies and the civil law are ordained of God? Impatience of authority and law in the family, as well as in social and civil polity, is a fact often remarked upon. Are foreign observers altogether wrong when they criticise such an impatience as one characteristic of American life? There are reformers who are willing, in order to carry their object, to relegate law, "the sovereign State's collected will," to a place far lower than that which it occupied in the Christian system, who, in fact, hold no law in high regard except as it promotes their project. It was but a few years ago that Wendell Phillips, before one of the most intelligent audiences that could be gathered on the continent, declared his approval of the Russian nihilist program, and, if I am not misinformed, his utterance was received with considerable applause. College life is not free from the same spirit; those who have been students know well how frequently it is maintained even by Christian young men that they are not bound by college law, and that it is no crime to lie to the faculty. Washington and Lincoln are types of a nobler ideal. One of Lincoln's earliest printed speeches furnishes the key to the moral grandeur of his character; a single paragraph may well be quoted here:

"Here then is one point at which danger may be expected. The question occurs, How shall we fortify against it? The answer is simple. Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well-wisher to his posterity, swear, by the blood of the Revolution, never to violate in the least particular the laws of the country, and never to tolerate their violation by others. . . . . Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap. Let it be taught in schools, in seminaries and in colleges. Let it be written in primers, spelling-books, and in almanacs. Let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts

Digitized by Google

of justice. And, in short, let it become the *political religion* of the nation."

Sin is infinitely selfish. That selfishness is the real and positive principle of sin has often been shown; nowhere more convincingly than in the strong scriptural and philosophical argument of Julius Müller. But the particular truth taught us here is that selfishness is a principle which develops with accelerated energy, and, if unchecked by divine power, stops at no point short of self-deification. It is an appetite not sated, but growing by what it feeds on. Human sin, at the remotest stage of its development presented to our view in Scripture, is selfishness in its highest potency. Its hero "exalteth himself and declares himself to be God." This is egoism at its climax of folly and guilt. The Man of Sin is egoism carrying to an extreme, if not to a logical conclusion, the theory that every person is an end in himself, and affirming with Schiller's Wallenstein:

> "In the right
> Is every individual character
> That acts in strict consistence with itself;
> Self-contradiction is the only wrong."

In Pagan story Achilles is the hero that fires the unregenerate imagination; in modern history, Frederick, marching out of Berlin bent on "glory." The poetry of Tennyson has exalted love and duty; it is one of the distinguishing merits of George Eliot's fiction that it endeavors to make egoism odious. But what poet or novelist can vie with Paul in delineating the evil and the selfishness of the human soul. From the beginning to the end of the epistles his pen is used by the Spirit to "convince of sin." The Man of Lawlessness has dethroned Duty and has quenched Love in his own arrogant and malignant soul. The apostle does not use the word selfish or selfishness (it is not found, I believe, in either version of our Bible, certainly not in the New Testament), but

Digitized by Google

here he portrays the monster himself. The Man of Sin is the incarnation of selfishness.

"Exalteth himself:" compare with this the "emptied himself" with which the same apostolic pen, in the second chapter of Philippians, describes the act of Christ—that unique and ideal act of love which issued in a world's redemption. The two terms mark the opposite poles in the universe of moral thought. The self-renunciation of Christ, the self-exaltation of the anti-Christ—Incarnate Love and Incarnate Selfishness—let these stand imaged to the believer's thought in perpetual and admonitory contrast.

Sin will not die out; only by an act of supernatural power will its dominion be brought to an end. We are told by Professor John Fiske, in the eloquent pages of his book, The Destiny of Man, how vice is becoming slowly eliminated from the race under the influence of natural selection, and the brutal passions of men becoming replaced by tender and unselfish feelings. "And thus at length" he says "we see what human progress means. It means throwing off the brute inheritance—gradually throwing it off through ages of struggle that are, by and by, to make struggle needless. Man is slowly passing from a primitive social state in which he was little better than a brute, toward an ultimate social state in which his character shall have become so transformed that nothing of the brute can be detected in it. The ape and the tiger in human nature will become extinct." Now Paul's interpretation of history, take his writings through, is distinctly the reverse of this, and equally distinct is his teaching in the passage before us. As he glances down the future it is with the eye of hope. He beholds progress, the triumph of righteousness. But it is not because sin will have spent its strength, or have come to an end in the natural order of things, or will have finally developed into forms of good. One of the plainest lessons deducible from this chapter of prophecy is surely that of the innate vitality

Digitized by Google

of sin—its increasing momentum and energy in the soul as time goes on. Sin is a growth, a progress from bad to worse; it can be arrested only by a counter force external to its own sphere. "But evil men and impostors shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived."

We may not shut our eyes to the fact that the chief ills of life are not wholly remediable in the existing moral order of the world—so long, that is, as the apostle John's word remains true, "the world lieth in the Evil One." No progress of truth, no industrial reform, no scheme of national co-operation, no social or moral development of humanity will eradicate selfishness, lawlessness, falsehood, and satanic energy—the factors embodied in the Man of Sin. Until the great Day, the Church is to have its anti-Christ, and thus to be under probation, a state implying as Butler has taught us, trial, difficulties and danger, and having for its end moral discipline. As Bryant has apostrophized freedom, so it may be said to the Church

> "Thou must watch and combat
> Till the day of the new earth and heaven."

Yet the prophetic word of the apostle is one of assurance, not of foreboding or despair. The Man of Sin, in whatever form, or under whatever name he shall finally appear, shall be revealed only to be destroyed. He is to perish at the advent of the King, slain by the breath of his mouth, and brought to nought by the manifestation of his coming.

WM. ARNOLD STEVENS.

Rochester, N. Y.

Digitized by Google

VI.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

GROWTH IN THE MINISTRY.

No man has a right to be a drone, or even a dwarf, in his profession. No man should submit to be borne along on the current of professional life and opinion. If the current flows in the wrong direction, he ought to stem it; if it flows in the right direction, he ought to swell it. No man has a right to tax the patience, excite the pity, or merit the contempt of his professional brethren. It is not enough that a man should not lie down in helpless, hopeless supineness on his profession. He should lift it on his manly shoulders; he should feel his indebtedness to it so much that he would make its indebtedness to him unspeakably great. Think how much Blackstone, Kent, Story, Marshall and Webster did for the profession of Law; think of what scores of physicians in our own day are doing for the profession of Medicine, and what a chosen few are doing for the science of Theology. In order that a man may enlarge the boundary of the known in his profession, he must be able to come up to that boundary; he must know what has been discovered before he can discover new truths; he must stand on the outmost limits of the discovered before he can reach into untraveled realms of thought and bring back grand truths for other toilers. The man who does not so advance inevitably retrogades. Every man, as we have said, needs in our day the best possible equipment for his professional work, and after he has entered that work he must constantly study to maintain his standing. The methods of treatment in medical science which were practiced even five years ago are in many cases discarded to-day. The man who keeps abreast of the advancing knowledge in any profession must be an earnest student.

To attain this high standing it is important that it should be kept before the mind as an object of worthy ambition. As are a man's ideals, so, to some degree, will a man become. The training of the college

Digitized by Google

and of the theological seminary is but the laying of the foundations on which a symmetrical superstructure may be erected. It would be worth much to the young pastor to give much time to the careful re-examination of the lectures heard in the theological seminary. He comes out of the seminary with a great mass of undigested knowledge. It is not yet assimilated to his mental and moral nature; it is largely unverified, and consequently largely unusable. These lectures also contain numerous references to recognized authorities. These authorities ought to be carefully examined. There is work along these lines for almost a life-time; certainly there is work for the first year of a young man's ministry. The character of his entire ministry will depend somewhat upon the foundations laid and the habits of study formed during the first year. There are ministers to-day who look back to the re-examination of their seminary lectures, as now indicated, as among the most helpful studies of their entire ministry.

In harmony with the above lines of study, we suggest that the young minister begin the work of each day by giving a little time to the study of some language other than his vernacular. Fifteen minutes given each morning to the study of a language would soon make an intelligent young minister, for all practical purposes, the master of that language. He might in this way learn a new language each year. He ought, at least, to be sufficiently familiar with German, French, Latin, Greek and Hebrew to read either, so far as his theological work may require. The minister who is a graduate of a college and of a theological seminary ought at least to be familiar enough with Greek to read the New Testament at sight, and with Hebrew to study his texts in the original, and to understand references and quotations in commentaries. We are not putting the standard as high as we might; we are simply demanding what each minister so graduated ought, at the lowest, to possess. A nip of Greek each morning is a wonderful intellectual eye-opener. The study of one's New Testament for a few minutes upon entering the study each morning will greatly stimulate all the dormant faculties for the work of the day. It has been found an excellent plan to commit to memory considerable portions of the New Testament in the original Greek. There are parts of the New Testament that are strikingly poetic in arrangement of syllables and in the sound of the words. Some of these parts, once committed to memory, will never be for-

Digitized by Google

gotten. We ought to be familiar with the Greek of the New Testament as it comes to us, not only through the eye, but also through the ear. It would be worth much if professors of Greek and Latin in our colleges obliged the students to commit to memory in those languages some of the short poems, and some of the grand descriptions in longer poems, of the great classical writers. This form of intellectual training, we are satisfied, is too much neglected in our colleges. Young ministers would also find it greatly to their advantage to review, soon after entering the ministry, their classical and historical college studies. All these suggestions mean work, and hard work; but God gives us no good thing in this world except as the reward of toil. Cost and worth are ever near neighbors, and the young minister is to be an example to his flock in industry as in other virtues.

We must also emphasize the value of singleness of aim in all departments of ministerial labor. "This one thing I do," said the apostle Paul. He was a man of one idea; but it was an idea so broad and high that it took in all other noble ideas. If a minister knew as much of law as the greatest lawyers, of philosophy, of history, of science, as the greatest experts in these departments of learning, he could use all in interpreting God's word and in winning men to the truth. This single idea must dominate all his studies and labors. Dr. Mathews has a striking chapter on "One Book," in his volume entitled, *The Great Conversers*. He refers to the fact that Demosthenes was so fascinated by the history of Thucydides that he copied the work eight times in order to master the style; that Sir William Jones read the works of Cicero each year, and that Leibnitz spent most of his leisure time on a few great authors. Similar remarks are made of Dante, Clarendon, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, Lord Chatham, Addison, Gray, Coleridge, and many others. It is barely possible that we read too many books; we are ambitious to read all that comes from the prolific press of our day. Much of our reading, therefore, is desultory, indiscriminate and so worthless; many become mere "helluones librorum." Did they take time to digest and assimilate a few great authors, they would be much more profited than by hastily skimming many volumes. Sir Walter Scott might devour all forms of history, poetry, and romance; but minds like his are the exception, and not the rule. Johnson rightly said, "Beware of the man of one book,

Digitized by Google

beware of the man who knows anything well, he is a dangerous antagonist." One secret of the oratorical power of the late John Bright, was his perfect mastery of a few great English classics. A scanty library, if it be well chosen, is not an unmitigated evil. We do not, of course, urge men to refrain from reading widely, but we commend to them the exhaustive study, the absolute mastery, of a few great books while they are giving partial attention to many books of less value. With these great writers they are to be so familiar that their minds shall become thoroughly saturated with the thoughts of these bravest and noblest writers. The young pastor must magnify his office as a preacher; he cannot unduly exaggerate the importance of clearness of thought and vigor of utterance. With some persons it is common to decry pulpit oratory, but their depreciation ought to depend upon their definition of pulpit oratory. Carlyle said, "silence is the stern duty of man," and "England and America are going to nothing but wind and tongue." Rather would we say with Luther, that "He who can speak well is a man," and with Cicero, "It is glorious to excel in that in which men excel all other animals." We may add that finished oratory is the consummate flower of all human culture; and that when that culture is consecrated to the glory of Christ, the preacher is "only a little lower than the angels."

THAT PERENNIAL "BIBLE QUESTION."

At the adjournment of the Bible Convention, held in Saratoga in May, 1883, it was commonly believed among Baptists that all the questions that had agitated the denomination for more than a generation, respecting the translation and circulation of the Bible, were amicably settled. There was, in that Convention, a majority and a minority. The views of either side had been presented in debate with great ability, and all the arguments, *pro* and *con*, had been duly weighed by the Convention, and a decision was reached, which, in the opinion of the members of that body, would constitute a *modus vivendi* for Baptists of opposing views for at least a generation. The resolutions adopted were of necessity something in the nature of compromise. The majority conceded the general principle for which the American Bible Union and American and Foreign Bible Society had long contended, namely, that

Digitized by Google

all new translations of the Scriptures should honestly render every word of the original into the vernacular. Having yielded so much, the majority of the convention understood that the minority on their part yielded two things: First, the maintenance of a separate Bible society for either translation or distribution of the Scriptures; and, secondly, all movements in favor of translating or revising the English Scriptures until the denomination should give distinct authority and approval of such work. These concessions on both sides were supposed by the great majority of those who composed the convention to be fairly expressed in the terms of the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, 4. While in the judgment of the Convention the work of revision *is not yet completed*, that whatever organization, or organizations, shall be designated as the most desirable for the prosecution of Home Bible work of American Baptists, should *now* circulate the commonly received version; the new Revised Version, with the corrections of the American Revisers incorporated in the text; and the translation of the American Bible Union, according to demand; and that all moneys specially designated for circulation of either of these versions should be faithfully appropriated in keeping with the wish of the donor.

It would be observed that this resolution states it to be the policy of American Baptists "now" to circulate certain specified versions and no others. No sensible man would pretend that "now" in the terms of this resolution could be fairly interpreted as meaning forever. The denomination as represented in that convention did not pronounce against any revision of the English Scriptures for all time; it did not make any definite deliverance for, or against, revision or translation, in general, or in particular. The evident intent of the resolution was to define the policy of the denomination until such time as it should be changed by some body having the right to speak for the denomination as the Saratoga Convention spoke for it.

The convention had hardly adjourned when the Publication Society adopted a series of resolutions with the professed intent of carrying out the Saratoga compact, in which they avowed a policy of seeking from the friends of the Bible Union funds to put in circulation copies of the New Testament version and to print editions of the Old Testament books. And also:

"*Resolved*, 5. That the Bible Committee be instructed to consider and report on the desirableness and best methods of securing a translation of the remaining books of the Old Testament; and also a

Digitized by Google

still more perfect version of the Bible Union New Testament; as soon as funds sufficient can be secured specially for these purposes."

In deference to very general and emphatic protests, these resolutions were repealed and the Society anew proclaimed the resolutions of the Saratoga Convention to be "the basis and the law of the Bible work of the Board of the American Baptist Publication Society." But subsequent events, in our judgment, are inconsistent with this repeal. It led the denomination to suppose that the Board had abandoned its former policy, while in reality they secretly went on to carry it out. Funds for the precise purposes mentioned in this resolution were given to the Board to be used as therein provided, and at some time previous to the meeting of the Society in Washington, in 1888, a contract for the work of revising the New Testament was made with Drs. Hovey, Broadus, and Weston, and the preliminary steps had been taken for securing the completion of the Bible Union translation of the Old Testament. A committee was appointed, on motion of Rev. S. L. Caldwell, D.D., at the Washington meeting, to investigate this action of the Society, and to report at the following annual meeting whether and to what extent this action contravened the conditions of the Saratoga compact. Dr. Caldwell was of course, made the chairman of the committee, and the other members were Rev. Thomas Armitage, D.D., Wheelock H. Parmly, D.D., Wayland Hoyt, D.D., and the Hon. James L. Howard.

When the report of the committee was presented at Boston, Dr. Caldwell found himself placed in a most embarrassing position. He was in a minority of one of his own committee. As chairman it was his duty to present the report, approved by the majority contrary to his own vote. This report recommended for adoption the following:

Resolved, That it is the judgment of this committee, reached after a very full investigation, that the interpretation and action of the Board of the American Baptist Publication Society concerning Bible distribution and revision are in agreement with the resolutions passed at the Bible Convention in Saratoga in 1883.

And also it is the judgment of your committee that the Board of Managers will best apply the principles laid down in the Saratoga Bible Convention, by adhering to the same interpretation in making all further translations and revisions.

Dr. Caldwell was then permitted to present a minority report, which he did, offering the following for adoption:

Digitized by Google

1. *Resolved*, That the Society hereby approves the action of the Board taken September 20, 1883, by which their previous resolutions adopted June 7, 1883, were rescinded, especially the resolution which contemplated further translation and revision of the Scriptures; and it especially approves and herewith reaffirms the resolution as adopted by the Board in the words following, to wit: "*Resolved*, That the resolutions adopted by the Saratoga Convention, so far as they relate to the Home Bible work, are the basis and the law of the Bible work of the Board of the American Baptist Publication Society."

2. *Resolved*, That the Society considers its work of revision to be limited by the action of the Saratoga Convention to the incorporation into the text of the Revised Version of the corrections made by the American Revisers; and that any further prosecution of the work of translation begun by the American Bible Union is excluded by that action.

3. *Resolved*, That the Society considers the fourth in the series of resolutions adopted by the Saratoga Convention to require that the Board should circulate now the commonly received version, the new version with the corrections of the American Revisers incorporated in the text, and the translations of the American Bible Union, according to demand, and no others.

Then ensued a long, able, and at times acrimonious debate, the result of which was the final adoption as a compromise measure of the following:

Resolved, That until the Board shall receive further instructions from the Society, it shall be understood that the Board is directed to prosecute the work of revision only so far as concerns the improvement of the translation of the New Testament, and the further improvement and translation of the books of the Old Testament, commonly known as the version of the American Bible Union, and in so far as money is donated for such purpose.

This action of the Society condones if it does not formally approve the previous action of the Board, and permits them to go on in the line of policy they have adopted up to a certain point. The only gain is that this resolution substitutes for the unlimited liberty of revision and publication claimed by the officers of the Society a year ago a strictly limited work of revision. Opinions may differ as to the value of this gain. Many of those present at the meeting thought it substantial enough to warrant them in voting for the resolution, although they had been all along earnest opponents of the Society's action. To them it probably will seem that the concession made is one of slight practical importance, and that no serious result is likely to follow the permission to use specially designated funds in this way. There was undoubtedly at Boston a strong desire for peace, to settle the question on a basis that

Digitized by Google

promised to be satisfactory to all, rather than to have a conflict reopened that was supposed to be happily settled six years ago. To some it has seemed that the concession made amounts to a practical giving up of that for which the majority contended in the Saratoga Bible Convention, so far as the translation or revision of the English Scriptures is concerned. All that remains now of the results of that convention is that the American Bible Union and the American and Foreign Bible Society have practically ceased their work and maintain only a formal existence for the holding of trust funds. But then how much has been gained by the practical extinction of these two societies if our American Baptist Publication Society has been transformed into an American Bible Union, and is to continue the work of that body under the supposed authority and sanction of the denomination?

It may be seriously doubted whether this Boston "settlement" will stay settled. Those who were inclined on the impulse of the moment, to regard it as a reasonable compromise find on reflection that it is revolutionary—that it surrenders the major part of the case for which the majority of the Saratoga Convention contended, and seems to commit the denomination to the Bible Union movement in a way that is contrary to the wishes and convictions of a majority of Baptists. No question is settled until it is settled on a basis of equity and fair dealing. It is our conviction, most reluctantly reached, that such a solution of the Bible question has not yet been reached.

REVISION OF THE STANDARDS.

The last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church North had a very animated debate on the question of revision of the standards. One year ago a single presbytery sent an overture requesting the revision of one chapter of the Westminster Confession. Little attention, however, was paid to the request. But this year no fewer than fifteen presbyteries sent a similar request, most, if not all of them, specifying the third chapter. There is no question that the Confession, with its positive statement that some "are fore-ordained to everlasting death," and its logical corollary, the damnation of non-elect infants, no longer commands the assent of the majority of Presbyterians. The only way in which orthodox Presbyterians manage to accept Section 3 of Chapter X. at all is by denying the necessity of the inference

Digitized by Google

that non-elect infants are lost. The denial does more credit to their hearts than to their heads. For if theological language means the same as ordinary language, when it is stated that elect infants are saved, it follows, of necessity, that non-elect infants must be lost, or that their fate is doubtful. Among the first, if not the first, of evangelical denominations to teach the salvation of all dying in infancy were the Baptists, and this doctrine is now universally accepted among evangelical Protestant bodies. But it is a doctrine irreconcilable with the Westminster Confession, and it is easy to see, therefore, why there should be a growing demand for a modification of the statements of the Confession.

A great many Presbyterian ministers, no doubt, who disagree with particular clauses and chapters of the Confession, still shrink from any revision on the ground that, a movement of that sort once begun, there is no telling where it would end. They reconcile their consciences to creed subscription by reasoning that acceptance of a system of doctrine as a whole does not necessarily involve a conviction that the statement of each particular doctrine is the best possible, and therefore they consider that disagreement with this or that statement in a creed is not inconsistent with acceptance of the creed as a whole. Without passing judgment on any who thus argue, it is easy to understand that there will be some not content with this device, and accordingly there is a party in the Presbyterian Church, perhaps, at present, not large in numbers, but certainly growing from year to year, and respectable on account of the character and scholarship of its members, which demands that the Confession be so revised that there shall be no difficulty in reconciling actual belief with professed belief. Whereunto this will grow it would not be possible at present to predict. But if one may judge from what Presbyterian ministers say, not only in private, but on some semi-public occasions, the party of revision will another year make a considerable showing in the General Assembly.

That body has been reproached with dodging the question this year, but the reproach was, we think, without adequate foundation. In a matter of so grave importance, and involving interests so numerous and weighty, it is certainly the part of wisdom to make haste slowly. Of all things, rash and ill-considered action is to be deprecated in such a matter as revision of the fundamental law of an ecclesiastical body

Digitized by Google

After all, but fifteen out of some two hundred presbyteries have asked for revision. It may be that many more favor it, but who can say so with much authority while the presbyteries themselves have not spoken? The Assembly took the moderate, sensible and safe course of consulting the presbyteries as a whole before proceeding further, and it requested each presbytery, during the coming year, to answer two questions: First, Is revision of the standards desired? Secondly, If so, in what respects and to what extent? It is true that the Assembly is the supreme legislative authority of the Church, and that the answers of the presbyteries do not bind its action. They will, however, give a valuable indication of the drift of public opinion in the Church. They will show how large is the party that favors revision, and on what scale this party desires the existing statements of the standards to be modified. It seems, however, that some of the conservatives in the Church have gone too far in demanding that the presbyteries, in the answer to the second question, should make distinct statements of the formulæ to be substituted for the existing statements of the standards. This is a duty which the Assembly did not lay upon the presbyteries, a duty that belongs to the Assembly itself. What that body professed to wish to know was the desire of the Church with respect to the general question of revision as a guide to its own action. The shaping of the formulæ and the practical work of revision the Assembly cannot commit to any other body, and the attempt ought not to be made to require the presbyteries to do the work for which the Assembly exists. It cannot be doubted that if Chapter III., for instance, shall be revised, the wisdom and scholarship of the Assembly will succeed in giving it better form than any single presbytery or any combination of presbyteries.

It is impossible for a Baptist not to congratulate himself, when he reads of these discussions with regard to revision, that his is a denomination that has no authoritative standard of doctrine except the Scriptures. In the ordinary sense of that term, Baptists have never had a creed—that is to say, there has been no system of doctrine to which subscription was required in order to church membership, to ordination, or to introduction into the pastorate of any church. There have been certain statements of faith put forth at various times by Baptists which have given, in brief and easily comprehended form, a sys-

Digitized by Google

tematic review of the teachings of the Scriptures as understood by our churches, and these statements or confessions of faith have obtained more or less currency among us. There has, however, never been any obligation on the part of any church or individual to accept these statements of belief. Each church is free to form its own articles of faith, or, if it so choose, it may have none. Each minister, when a candidate for ordination, makes his own statement of belief in his own way. Subscription to a creed has never been required, except in some few institutions of learning, in order to prevent endowments from being diverted to other uses than those contemplated by the founders. In short, there has been the utmost freedom in matters of doctrinal belief and statement among Baptists. And yet, it is the common testimony of all familiar with our history and church life that there is no body of Christians among whom there is a greater doctrinal homogeneity than there is among Baptists. Differences of view on many points there always have been and always will be. Differences of statement have not merely been tolerated but encouraged, and yet there is a surprising harmony in the general type and scheme of doctrine taught from all the Baptist pulpits of our land. A denomination that seems to the unthinking to be a mere rope of sand, without any bond of unity and with no preservative force against heresy, yet exhibits to the world the most surprising unity of belief and teaching.

What is the secret of this unity? We believe it lies in nothing else than this: that the Baptists are true to their foundation principle of accepting the Bible, and the Bible only, as an authority in matters of faith and practice. We do not defer to the Bible and the standards, or to the Bible as interpreted by the standards, but to the Bible itself. An independent, honest and fearless study of the Bible produces unity of doctrine and unity of life. To say this may sound to those of other faith like denominational conceit. But if any other cause can be assigned than this for the unity of Baptists in faith and doctrine, let those who suspect us of conceit name a cause adequate to account for the phenomena.

Digitized by Google

EDUCATIONAL NOTES.

At this season of the year the voice of the graduate is heard in the land. Both secular and religious papers are now crowded with reports of Commencements of schools and of colleges of all grades. In a few weeks a large number of graduates will be out in the world; the great majority, no doubt, to sink into obscurity, a few to rise to prominence. It is easy to make light of the wise essays and learned orations with which these young men and women favor a waiting world; but there is also a sympathetic and solemn side to the introduction into active life of so many young men and women. A Baptist minister or editor cannot but ask, what proportion of the entire number of graduates belongs to Baptist churches, or, at least, to Baptist families? Our growth as a denomination has been remarkably great. One hundred years ago, at the time of the inauguration of Washington as our first President, the population of the United States was but 3,750,000. At that time the whole number of Baptists was only 50,000; then, as now, the larger number was in the South. Taking the country as a whole the ratio was one in every seventy-five of the population; but taking the North only the ratio was one in ninety, and in the South it was one in sixty. We have just celebrated the first centennial of this inauguration, and the population of the country is now in round numbers 65,000,000, while the number of Baptists is in even figures 3,000,000. It will be seen by these statements that the population of the country has increased about seventeen-fold, but the numbers of Baptists have increased sixty-fold during this century of our national history. This growth is certainly as gratifying as it is remarkable. Ours is the most rapidly-populating country in the world; but the increase from immigration is not conducive to the growth of our denomination, nor to the increase of Protestantism as a whole. The progress, therefore, of the Baptist denomination is all the more striking and encouraging. There is now one Baptist to every twenty-two of the entire population. One of our denominational papers has recently given us more specific figures: "In the 14 Southern States with 20,000,000 souls, there are 2,225,000 Baptists, or 1 in 9 of the population; but the colored people therein number about 8,000,000, among whom are 1,100,000 Baptists, or about 1 in 7; so that among the 12,000,000 whites the proportion is 1 to 11."

Digitized by Google

In the Northern and Western States and Territories, where the population is so largely foreign, the proportion of Baptists to the whole number is but 1 in 58. It is thus safe to say that one-sixth of the entire population of the country is made up either of members or adherents of Baptist churches. We ought, therefore, to have in all our academies, colleges, professional and other schools, whether for men or women, one-sixth of all the students and professors. We know, however, that our proportion is very much smaller than one-sixth. We are certainly lacking at this point; for our proportion, unfortunately, is very much smaller than our numbers in the population might lead us to expect. As a consequence we are not sending into the world our fair proportion of educated men and women. This failure makes us weak at many influential points; we are not represented in the daily press nor in circles of magazine literature as we ought to be. Our views are, therefore, often misrepresented, or, at least, not fully presented through these channels. We are not represented in the professions of law and medicine as we might expect and hope. This, too, is a serious loss in the aggregate of our denominational forces; neither are we represented in political life as our numbers and influence in other directions would entitle us. Is one-sixth of the members of our State Legislatures, of the members of Congress, of the Senate, of the Foreign Ministers, and of the President's Cabinet Baptists? To ask this question is, unfortunately, to answer it with a decided negative. The fault, we believe, lies chiefly in that we have not sent our young men and women to our colleges in our fair proportion. This matter is one of the utmost importance. Baptist parents have not done their duty in this respect to their children, to their denomination, to their country and to their Lord. The time for a thorough reformation has come. Men of wealth have too often permitted their sons to go into business without taking a college course; they have not appreciated their privileges and their duty in this regard. Some of these men have given liberally toward colleges and toward the education of young men for the ministry; but they have not urged their own sons to secure the advantages of a college education. The young women of our Baptist families have not gone to women's colleges in the proportion which our numbers would suggest, and the result is that when professors for Baptist colleges are wanted it is difficult to secure them from the ranks of

Digitized by Google

our own women. The way to remedy an evil is to remedy it. Let parents begin to remedy this evil at once by urging their sons and daughters to enter this fall on courses of study in our various schools and colleges. We cannot longer neglect this duty without doing dishonor to ourselves, to the truth we hold, and to the Lord we worship.

It is almost impossible to over-estimate, in our denominational life and work, the value of academic instruction. It is a hopeful sign that so much attention has been given lately by our educators to the place of the academy in the educational system; it is also in harmony with the same tendency that men of wealth are giving their money to academies as to colleges. The higher we raise the standard in the college, the higher we raise it in the academy. Harvard and Yale necessitated the academies of high grade at Andover and Exeter. The character of the scholarship in the colleges must be materially affected by the trend given in the academies; and the academies, in turn, must place their standard as the colleges demand. Academies also perform important work in preparing young men for business and for professional life. In many communities the academy is the centre of intellectual life and power. But for its presence few, in certain localities, would ever have felt the awakening of intellectual desire. In a new country like ours there are many who ought to take a college course who are allured by the fascinations of business enterprise. The only education, therefore, they receive is what the academy gives. We need academies of high grade. It would be greatly to the advantage of the cause of learning if many of the institutions that are top-heavy with the name of colleges should be called simply academies. They are, strictly speaking, but academies; they ought, as a matter of common honesty, to be in name what they are in fact. A similar remark would apply to many colleges which bear the name of university; they ought either to become universities in fact, or cease to be universities in name. We earnestly hope that there may be a great increase in the attendance at our Baptist academies this fall. Many young men and women, going to the academy simply for an academic course, will have awakened in them a burning desire for a full college course. If we have our young men and women trained to enter upon professional careers, they will

Digitized by Google

the more readily interpret the providence of God which calls them to enter the profession of Law, Medicine, Pedagogics, or the Ministry. The ranks of the Ministry might easily be filled with our best young men if a larger number of them were prepared by a college course fitting them for this service.

The relation of college graduates to the learned professions is always an appropriate subject for discussion, and especially so at this Commencement season. There are ignorant persons who deny that a college education is an important element in professional success. There are, unfortunately, college graduates who are conspicuous failures; this we all admit. But their failure is not because they are graduates of a college, but in spite of that fact. There are men who are not college graduates who have been abundantly successful in life, but their success has been in spite of their educational disadvantages. If some men are so stupid, notwithstanding a college education, how astounding that stupidity would be had they not enjoyed these advantages! The Faculty of Wesleyan University, in a recent number of their *University Bulletin*, give many important figures on this subject. It is stated there that in the last two Congresses about 40 per cent. of both Representatives and Senators were college men, and that in the entire history of the country one-third of our national legislators have been thus educated.

Another writer, taking Appleton's Encyclopædia of American Biography as a criterion of success in professional life, finds that among surgeons, over forty-nine per cent. have been college men; among physicians, sixty per cent.; among clergymen, about eighty per cent. As is to be expected, in the profession of teaching, all the higher positions are occupied by college graduates. Success in life in our day can be won only by the best possible preparation before entering one's chosen vocation, and by the hardest kind of work after one has entered. The competition in our day is simply tremendous. No man, therefore, can afford to dispense with any possible element of power. He who would win the wreath of victory must run a brave race. A man may as well count the cost before he flatters himself with the hope of a certain and speedy triumph in his professional career. Ten out of a hundred graduates may hope to win a respectable success; perhaps

Digitized by Google

five out of a hundred a great success. Is a young man quite sure he will be ever one of the ten? Can he afford to neglect any element of power? How many really great orators have there been in the world? About one in each five hundred years. Is a man sure that he is to be one of the number? To step into the front rank to-day a man must have good natural abilities, various acquired attainments, and the only genius worth having, the ability and willingness to do tremendously hard work. Every man owes something to his profession; he ought to strive to enlarge its boundaries and to exalt its work. Let him not enter a professional life until he has made the best possible preparation; then let him use his best endeavors to pay the debt which he owes to his profession by exalting it before the eyes of the world.

All these remarks have a relation to the proposed great university. The BAPTIST QUARTERLY was the first, so far as we can learn, of our denominational publications to call attention to the desirability of establishing an institution of learning which should be a university in fact as well as in name. The idea is now receiving the consideration which its importance demands. To Dr. Augustus H. Strong we are all indebted alike for the suggestion of the idea and for its intelligent discussion. The establishment of this university would give a great impulse to our academic and collegiate work. Academies and colleges would then come into their appropriate place in the educational system. We shall never have academies and colleges of the highest grade, until we have a university of the highest grade. The existence of such a university would create a wholesome rivalry among the institutions of a lower standard. So far from interfering with their work and position, it would give recognition and dignity to both; it would also enable us to prepare professors and presidents for our colleges and professional schools. As matters now are, we are obliged to send our young men who desire to pursue an advanced course of study, to Germany and to other countries: or to take them when ill prepared for professional work. We believe that America is now ready to enter upon a greater educational career than has ever before been attempted in its history. This nobler career, if under Baptist direction, will bring to us honor worthy of our great number, of our glorious history, and of our bright prospects. It would place us in the foremost rank of the educators of

Digitized by Google

America. It would challenge the attention of the whole civilized world. We have already called attention to the fact that, in the strict sense of the term, there is not a university in America. Harvard is not, Yale is not, Columbia is not, Princeton is not. Johns Hopkins comes nearer to the high standard than any other institution in America, but even Johns Hopkins falls short of being a university. The institution we now advocate is one into which no one shall be matriculated who was not previously graduated from a college of recognized standing. The man who will give the money to establish this university will link his name with an institution whose glory will be as enduring as the Republic itself; he will receive the benedictions of scholars throughout the world, and he will hear the "Well done" of the Master himself.

The American Baptist Education Society has had a remarkable career. Originating about one year ago, it has already secured an influential and honored place in the councils of our denomination. We have long needed a centralizing and unifying organization in our educational work. A few comparatively irresponsible men have hitherto been able to start colleges according to their own sweet will, or their angry passions as the case might be. Colleges have thus been multiplied unduly. The granting of a site for a college is often a dangerous gift; in this way colleges have been multiplied in certain States to the detriment of all denominational interests. One has only to think of the States of New York and Iowa to have striking illustrations of denominational folly in our educational work. We have no more need of two colleges in each of these States than we have of twenty-two. Perhaps we cannot undo the egregious blunders of the past; but we can, at least, guard against them in the future. The Education Society will greatly help us at this point. It will also encourage wealthy givers to contribute to institutions which the Society endorses; and in a score of other ways such an organization may subserve great purposes amongst us. Its organization a year ago was opposed by some leading men amongst us; but its work for the year has not only justified its existence, but has awakened high hopes for its continued usefulness. We then spoke hopefully of its prospective work; we now speak gratefully of the secured results.

Digitized by Google

VII.

HOMILETIC DEPARTMENT.

THE MINISTER'S RELATION TO THE CHARACTER OF HIS PEOPLE.

The mission of the Christian ministry is so many-sided and comprehensive that it necessarily combines many offices and functions. But there is an ideal unity of purpose and end in which the manifold aspects of the ministerial vocation find their harmonious synthesis. The specific function of our high calling is that of spiritual education or character-building. We are to be winners of souls, to call men to repentance and to induct them into reconciliation with God only as a means to the great end of complete development into the divine image. "This is the will of God, even your sanctification." Holiness, in the sense of its Saxon equivalent *wholeness*, is the central thought of the Bible. To save his people from their sins, to redeem them from all iniquity, to render them *totus et heres* in moral and spiritual character is the supreme desire and aim of Jesus, the Mediator of the New Covenant.

To accomplish this sublime object God has not only given to his people the plenarily inspired word "that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" and the Holy Spirit to illuminate and apply that word, but he has ordained the great and responsible office of the ministry of the Word of Life. To care for the souls of men, to be spiritual physicians, to understand the science and the art of edifying the Body of Christ, of so teaching, nursing, feeding, organizing and leading the flock that they may grow up into the full stature of Christian manhood and womanhood is the specific business of our profession. Well does Paul enjoin that no novice be set apart to such a work as this. And how fittingly does he exhort young Timothy to study to show himself a workman that needeth not to be ashamed. Not only the incomparable grandeur of the end to be achieved and the appalling consequences of malpractice and failure, but the obstacles and difficulties which lie in the way of conducting sin-laden humanity to the heights of spiritual perfection call for a culture, range of knowledge, tact, power, and consecration such as are indispensable to no other calling.

There may be achievements which, as the world goes, are denom-

Digitized by Google

inated success that are not so to be estimated by a true and good minister of Jesus Christ. Great numbers may be attracted by the preacher's personal gifts and they may be so worked into the social organization of the church as to be permanently held, and yet these precious souls may be wofully neglected as to their spiritual training and edification. It is to be feared that more stress is laid by our ministry in general upon justification and upon the social amenities of life than upon the fostering of those specific graces of the spirit which are embraced in the Gospel word sanctification. Sainthood has been so wretchedly caricatured by an apostate church, and there have been so many fanatical vagaries of perfectionism in recent years, that the higher ranges of Christian character have been too much lost sight of. We are so environed by materialistic elements and ideals and so many optimistic euphemisms are in the air that the rage of the hour is rather for quantity than quality, or, at best, for intellectual and æsthetic rather than high spiritual attainments.

With editorial permission the writer will in another article indicate what are the requisites in the Gospel ministry to successful character-building. What he would here insist upon is the vast importance of the higher degrees of sanctification or spiritual culture. The great Teacher and Preacher himself in his model sermon sketches a glorious constellation of bright particular virtues and sums them all up in an exhortation to God-like perfection. Paul is inspired to pray for the Ephesians, that they may know the length and breadth and height and be filled with the fullness of God. And for the Thessalonians that they may in body, soul and spirit be sanctified wholly. Modern ministerial ambition scarcely dares or aspires to measure up to these altitudes. It is easier to cater in a sensational and sentimental way to the respectabilities or to shout the shibboleths of some secular reform.

The need of lifting up high standards of spirituality, commensurate with the full-orbed glory of Christian manhood, is in every way manifest. In no other way can the boasted progress of the age be justified. The supernatural genius of Christianity cannot be vindicated when both standard and attainment in character are hardly at par, even on the natural plane. The manifold temptations to low spirituality and the numerous immoralities prevalent in both Church and State call for vigorous treatment from the custodians of public and private conscience. A pure Church, of mature development, is the only source of spiritual power which can effectually move communities and assimilate and train young converts. A mass of chronic backsliders, calling for the annual spasm, is the standing reproach of much of our modern Christianity. A pure Church will be an increasing Church and the increments will come in a regular and healthful way. Our ministry is terribly crippled and retarded by a class concerning whom Paul wrote, "many walk, of

Digitized by Google

whom I have told you often and now tell you even weeping that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ." Many a church is cursed by members like the one for whom some one had the fortitude one night to pray—"O Lord, send brother Blank to hell; for thou knowest he would not be there six weeks before he would break up the whole institution." A certain old lady of my acquaintance used to proclaim the goodness of her three sons and especially H. N., she said, was the most Christlike of them all. Whereupon a man who made no pretentions to religion said, "Well, if H. N. —— is Christlike, I don't blame the Jews for crucifying Christ!" The Ethics of utility may well supplant that kind of character.

A. C. PECK.

Cherryfield, Maine.

THE PRAYER MEETING.

"*Being let go they went to their own company.*"—Acts 4:23.

And what did they do when they got there? The answer to the question will give us a glimpse into an apostolic prayer-meeting, and reveal to us the secret of their power. May it not also give us some suggestions as to how we can best conduct our weekly meetings? for we are persuaded that most pastors are more puzzled about these meetings than about their sermons. It is easier to preach than to make a prayer-meeting interesting. We call prayer-meetings the social and religious meetings of the church, when the fact is, like our church sociables, they are often very unsocial. Sociability, like the poet, is born, not made. Our attempts to be social often make us feel ill at ease. Those whose business it is to entertain and to be entertained must admit the truth of Byron's saying:

> "Society now is one polished horde,
> Formed of two mighty tribes, the bores and bored."

Sad to say these lines describe too many of our prayer-meetings. The pious brethren and sisters go to them expecting to be bored, but feeling that for the sake of the cause and the pastor it is their duty to bear this cross, it is evident that this apostolic prayer-meeting was full of life. Now what was the secret?

1. They told their recent experiences; "Reported all that the chief priests and elders had said unto them." Some good people have experiences of many years' standing, which they delight to tell; and it is well to tell them, but not too often to the same company. After they have been told once or twice the people know them by heart, but God's recent dealings with us are always fresh. "Come and hear, all ye that fear God, and I will declare what he hath done for my soul." The

Digitized by Google

great deliverance from sin we may never cease to speak of. Paul's story of his experience on the way to Damascus never grew old. But God does more than deliver us; he leads and feeds and comforts and strengthens and protects. Of these recent experiences let us not be slow to speak. "Ye are my witnesses saith the Lord," and a word of testimony as to God's faithfulness may have more force than a fifteen minute's exhortation.

2. *They prayed.* Not to fill up the time, but because they had something to pray for. Busy with their Master's work their faithfulness had provoked bitter persecution. They prayed for boldness; because they felt the need of it. They were more solicitous about the success of the cause they loved than about their own safety or comfort. The idea that the church is a mere training school for heaven, and not an organized army for conquest, paralyzes our prayer-meetings as it does everything else. Too many fancy that they belong to an institution whose duty it is to give them social and intellectual enjoyment, and to benefit them, whereas the idea in the mind of Christ, when he founded the Church, was to make it a channel of blessing to others, and it is itself blessed as it blesses others. It receives, only as it gives. "To minister, not to be ministered unto," is the genius of Christianity. Could we infuse that thought into our prayer-meetings, we would save them from lifelessness. And their prayers, it seems, were not too long. The one reported can be repeated in half a minute. Prayers are short in proportion to their earnestness. Men are not wordy, when they feel a pressing need. "Lord save, I perish," cried sinking Peter. Some one has truly said that if Peter's preamble had been as long as most of our prayers he would have been to the bottom of the sea before he got to the point. The Pharisee spun out his formal prayer, while the Publican poured his penitent soul into one sentence, "Bless mamma, and papa, and John, and Mary, and James, and everybody," prayed a little boy at his mother's knee. "If you had said everybody at first," said James, "you need not have made so long a prayer." And we agree with James when a good brother closes a ten minute's prayer with the petition, "Lord if we have failed to ask, fail thou not to give." If he had said that about six minutes sooner, he might have saved the life of a good prayer-meeting. God would have us be definite in our prayers, but definiteness does not demand length. And yet we have no sympathy with the notion that prayer is simply begging. Praise should always mingle with petitions, for God answers praise. Many prayers are powerless, because they do not praise God for what he has already done. Our Father expects at least a "Thank you," from his children, for gifts already bestowed, before he lavishes others.

"Gimme a cent," said an urchin on a street in New York. The gentleman to whom he spoke gave him the cent. "Gimme 'nother,"

Digitized by Google

was the quick response, and the gentleman almost wished that he had not given the cent to the ungrateful little beggar. Much of our praying is "Give, give, give," while God waits for some recognition of the gifts already bestowed. "In everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God."

3. *They quoted Scripture.* The Second Psalm expressed their feelings. A religious meeting, where God's word is not honored, will be a failure. "Did you have a blessing to-night?" asked a wife of her husband on his return from church. "No," was the curt reply. "There was nothing there for God to bless, for not a sentence of the Word was in sermon or prayer." If all would be careful to come to prayer-meeting with a text of Scripture and give it with or without comment, the interest and power of our meetings would be multiplied. Speak to God in prayer; let God speak to us through his Word, and blessings will follow, as we see they followed this apostolic prayer meeting.

Baltimore, Md. A. C. DIXON.

THE PRAYER-MEETING IN THE SMALLER CHURCHES.

I choose to limit this article to the above heading, not because the suggestions might not be applicable to the larger churches nor helpfu to their pastors, but because I choose to write on that phase of the subject about which I know something. The prayer-meeting service, to a great many pastors, especially of these churches, is a bugbear. From the close of the service Sunday evening, he dreads it until the hour comes and breathes a sigh of relief when it is over. The average pastor's trouble is not something to say himself in these meetings, but to get others to say something, and the right something in the right way. Every true pastor well knows that the importance of this service cannot be over estimated. The prayer-meeting is to the church what the leaves are to a tree or the lungs to man. The lungs are to man his appartus for respiration. The foliage serves the tree for the same purpose. "The prayer-meeting of the church is the play of its lungs." In these services the church breathes and it must breathe or else it will die. It is very essential then that every pastor should make this an article in his creed, viz: that the keeping up of a warm, vigorous, living prayer-meeting is something vital to the continued existence of the church, vital to the maintenance of individual piety among the members of the church, and vital to his own personal spiritual interest.

Now the question is, how is this to be done in the smaller churches? The prayer-meetings in the larger churches with a church membership of from 600 to a 1000 within ten minutes of the place of meeting to draw from, are quite another thing from the prayer-meetings in the

Digitized by Google

smaller churches with a church membership of from 100 to 300, many of whom are not within an hour's drive of the place of meeting from which to draw. But, notwithstanding the odds against the smaller churches there can be and ought to be maintained a vigorous, living prayer-service in every one of them. Well how? The old answer one hears on every hand is the true one, keep things fresh and spicy and alive in the service. Do this and those who come once will come twice. Those who felt it their duty to come, but a burdensome one, will learn to regard it as their greatest privilege.

The following suggestions carried out, (some brought from the class room, others invented to meet the needs of the case,) have been found to largely conduce to this end.

The leader of the meeting should be both *the pastor and minister, not the minister alone.* The pastor to whose eyes and ears the hearts of his people are laid open should be a dominating element in the prayer-meeting. Thoughts and suggestions accumulated in this way must be used as delicately as ever they are in the pulpit. Much also depends upon the way the leader opens and upon his spirit and mood during the hour.

If he does not throw the ball with force enough, it will come down before the hour is gone. If he does not put on oil enough, the chariot wheels will drag before the journey is done. A member of my church said to me the other day, "I do not like to lead a prayer-meeting, for I could never seem to give it impetus enough but that it would all die out before the hour was gone. I never could get it started right and it is just like every thing else, if it isn't started right it wont go." A trouble not unfrequent with leaders. True leaders are born, but tolerable skill may be acquired. This thought cannot be emphasized too strongly, for in the writer's mind there is a settled conviction, that a vast majority of dead prayer-meetings, (and so dead churches,) were made so by dead leaders.

Again the leader should never bring other than *practical, important and living subjects for the consideration of his people.* Every topic brought up for study ought to have some practical bearing on an every day Christian life. The prayer-meeting is no place to study questions of science, history, literature, infidelity and the like. It is here that Christ's people come to meet their Lord. And if they do not get something that will help them, they have gained nothing but exercise in the fresh air by coming, and the spirit in which many of them go away will more than counteract the beneficial results from this. Would that this hand held some angel's pen that words might be written that would burn this thought into the minds and hearts of every pastor and prayer-meeting leader in the land!

The leader should keep these practical subjects *continually before*

Digitized by Google

his people. It will not do to simply publish them on a card three or six months ahead and formally request them to bear in mind the next subject on the card for the next meeting. Many of them have no card, and many that had them have lost them and half or three-fourths of the rest will never look at them nor think about the subject. It is a good plan to publish subjects a quarter ahead. But it is a better plan to give particular emphasis at the present meeting to the subject for the week, whether published or unpublished, better if published. Do this by deliberately announcing the topic and the passage of Scripture from which taken, then intimating very briefly the lines of thought you would have them pursue during the week. Do this at the Sunday morning service again. And speak to your members about it as you meet them one by one during the week. It will be just a little refreshing to do this. The crops, and business and household affairs, and gossip, and the weather will have a little season of rest. And they need it. If this is done there will be something else said than the old hackneyed phrases one hears so frequently in prayer-meetings. The world ridicules them. And it is doing its very best work when it does. There will also be some other prayer offered than the monotonous one we now hear, which deals with (it is feared in the same memorized phraseology,) everything from creation to the judgment day.

It has been found helpful in our meetings to now and then urge the people to spend a few minutes just before coming to the meeting in *earnest prayer and devout meditation.* Insist that they ought to fit themselves to meet their Lord by quiet communion with him, before coming to his sanctuary. It is so in our meetings that the latter part is always better than the first. It is not so in some parts of the world, but is so here. The attention of the people is called to this and the explanation of it given. It is simply that the heart of brother or sister is being touched by the voice of God in the heart of brother or sister. One torch is lighting another. Instead of getting ablaze in this way, they ought to feel that it is the duty of every one to be ablaze before coming. They ought to come to light torches, not to be lighted by others. Try this suggestion. But above all the leader should do this. Do not go to the meeting without a season of quiet communion with Christ. If you do, you go with no assurance that Christ will be with you.

The old suggestions of time and place are of special importance. Have a time to begin and a time to stop. Always commence at the time appointed and stop when the time comes to stop, unless there are very good reasons for prolonging the meeting. Have a room no larger than the average congregation. Better crowd the people than for the leader to have himself chilled by the vacant stare of empty seats.

Many suggestions of practical value have been omitted which ought not to be omitted in considering prayer-meetings in the smaller

Digitized by Google

churches. These are simply the general lines upon which the writer has worked with some degree of success. Our prayer-meetings have increased more than five fold in their attendance and their spiritual power has kept pace with their numerical increase.

E. W. STONE.

Carmel, N. Y.

WHY I PREACH AND WHOM I PREACH.

I preach because God has called me to preach. No man has any right to preach unless he *knows* God has called him to do so. The man who would enter into the ministry, as a profession he was at liberty to take up or lay down at will, is not called of God. Only the man who feels, "necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel," has "a dispensation of the Gospel commmitted unto him." Any other man is an interloper, an impertinence, an affront to God and man.

If any man appeared at the Court of St. James, England, of his own choice, as representative of this country, he would be rejected by England and repudiated by America. Only the man who is sent and who carries with him unimpeachable credentials has any right to appear and speak for this Government. Only the man who is sent of God, and who has divinely signed testimonials, has any right to appear as a public representative of Jesus Christ.

This is not a debatable question. God has shut off all debate in these words, "how shall they preach except they be sent." The first preachers took especial care to impress those to whom they preached, that they did so because God sent them. They prefaced their sermons by declaring that their preaching was not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead." This was the ground of Paul's appeal to men. "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." Every true minister is sent of God, commissioned by God, a minister of God's selection. He does not of his own choice rush into the ministry as a profession, as a respectable method of securing a living, nay verily, he enters it solemnly, prayerfully, obediently at the command of God.

Paul says, "he counted me faithful, *putting* me into the ministry." He also says, "But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood." I repeat then, that God has lifted the question of a divinely appointed ministry above the region of debate. "Apostles and prophets, and evangelists, and pastors and teachers"

Digitized by Google

are God's gift, "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." Every man who enters the ministry then, ought to do so in obedience to God's call. No other should dare to enter the ministry. The man who ministers at the Gospel altar, without God's appointment, is as much an offence to God, as the offering of Nadab and Abihu of old. Every man who preaches the Gospel, ought to preach it because God has revealed it to him, in order that he might preach it. Let every other stand aside.

But how is a man to be positive of his call? God don't speak with an audible voice to any man now, as he did to Paul. True, but he speaks with a voice just as real, as understandable and as authoritative as he did then. God, by his spirit, comes to men with an overmastering and impelling conviction of duty, so overmastering and impelling, that a man feels he must preach at whatever sacrifice. No matter what tempting opportunities may present themselves in literature, in science, in art, in politics or in business, they must all be denied for the sake of preaching the gospel. The minister, who feels he could engage in any other business, if opportunity and profit offered, had better do so at the earliest possible moment. The man into whose heart and soul God's call comes with authority and power, cannot, will not, do so. God's impelling power is in him and he cries out, "Necessity is laid upon me, yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel." No God-called minister can be in doubt of his calling, for God thrusts the call into his heart and soul, into his innermost consciousness. God *causes* him to understand.

When God calls a man to preach, he calls him to preach Christ. Not that he is shut out from any other line of study, no, no; he is to enter the historical, the biographical, the philosophical and the scientific, indeed, every legitimate field of study, gathering the gems of all and bringing them, lay them down at the foot of the cross, and use them to illustrate and enforce "the truth as it is in Jesus." "Jesus Christ and him crucified" is to be the one centre of the preacher's thought and preaching and life. The whole man is to be absorbed in Christ. A young man graduated with honors, and he preached, in his "home church," a few Sabbaths after his graduation. His sermon was logical, historical, and rhetorical. It was prepared and delivered for effect. His old, plain, untutored, farmer father listened to his sermon. They walked home together. The father was silent. The son was nervous. Why did not his father congratulate him? Unable to longer endure the silence, the son asked his father what he thought of the sermon. The reply was short and emphatic, "Son, it was no sermon." "Why was it not a sermon, father?" "Because there was no Christ in it," replied the father. "But there was no Christ in the text." said the son. "Son," said the old father, "Christ *is* all and *in*

Digitized by Google

all." All preaching is to be the lifting up of Christ. What a model Paul was in this respect. He was "not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ;" he was "determined not to know anything among men, save Jesus Christ and him crucified;" he cried aloud, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." Christ was the life blood of Paul's life and preaching. His preaching was *saturated* with Christ. It began with Christ, it continued with Christ, it ended with Christ. There was no drifting "Robert Elsmere," about Paul. His preaching was an illustration of his experience. "For me to live is Christ." Such preaching and such preaching only, will bring a lost world back to God; for, "no man cometh unto the father but by me," said Christ.

My young brethern in the ministry, preach as "Ambassadors for Christ," preach because you dare not do anything else, preach because the voice of God echoes away down in your soul, saying, "Go preach the preaching that I bid thee." Preach Christ as an atoning sacrifice, as a substitute for the sinner, as a surety for the believer, as a "King," as "all and in all," and your work will not "be burned," but "gold, silver, precious stones," shall be your reward.

R. B. MONTGOMERY.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE IDEAL AND THE ACTUAL IN THE PRAYER-MEETING.

Nowhere do the relations between the ideal and the actual require to be more clearly understood than in the conduct of the church's meeting for prayer. The ideal should in this case, as in all others, be a guide and a stimulus, and not, as when misemployed it may become, a source of delusion and discouragement.

The ideal prayer-meeting is a number of "spiritual" (1 Cor. 3: 1.) men and women, studious of the Divine word, earnest in the Divine service, sympathetic to the forces of that "Kingdom which is within us," who have met together in reliance upon the promise of Christ's presence, and upon the leading of the Holy Spirit in exhortation and in prayer: a sort of mystic Eolian harp composed of strings of varying pitch and timbre, but all lying responsive either to the "breath" (Ez. 37: 9.) of Heaven, or to its "rushing, mighty wind" (Acts 2: 2). For the weary soul to enter a meeting of this kind is as when the tired traveler leaves the jostling and the jangling of the sun-beaten street for the quiet sanctuary of some old Cathedral with its hush, and coolness, and subdued lights, and music whispering from its distant choir. Such a meeting is "the very gate of Heaven."

The prayer-meeting as it is usually found, falls far short of this description. It is a company hastily drawn together of those who have

Digitized by Google

been occupied in the most matter-of-fact way about everyday affairs. The duties of the home or counting-house have pretty well occupied both hands and mind. That "clause" which according to Herbert's well-known lines "makes drudgery divine" has been little present in their minds. After a hasty toilet these busy folk present themselves "where prayer is wont to be made." There has been no interval of meditative preparation, no deliberate putting off of the sandles stained in earth's common paths before entering on the "holy ground" of special communion with God. The Bible has been little studied. There is no freshly acquired truth which in the progress of the meeting, the Spirit may bring to the remembrance of the worshipper for his own help or that of others. Of the audience, some are there from habit, some from denominational zeal, some to avoid an unpleasant sense of unfulfilled duty, some from love to their pastor or the friends they usually meet there, most from a more or less definite longing after help and uplifting from an unspirituality of which they are dimly conscious, and some—the very salt and savor of such gatherings—are there in glad intelligent appreciation of the privileges they enjoy. This is the composition of the usual prayer-meeting. There are, of course, exceptions in which the ideal is much more closely realized than in the foregoing description. May these exceptions soon multiply so as to supplant the present rule.

Now though ministers commonly find themselves dealing with this type of prayer-meeting, they must not therefore ignore the ideal. To do so is to lose the only hope of improvement. Further retrogression is only prevented even if positive progress is not secured, by stress in the forward direction. This stress will not be exercised, if the ideal which suggests it is lost. Let every pastor, then, preserve a clear conception of the prayer-meeting as it should be. The vividness of his conception will impel him to press toward the mark. The "pattern seen in the mount" will guide his skill as he shapes to its characteristics the material with which he deals. Alas for the minister, who, in weariness and hopelessness, neglects his convictions of what ought to be, and, without inner protest or outward effort, permits everything to conform itself to the present spiritual estate of the church. He will obtain ease, but it will be stupid, inglorious, and fatal to improvement. He may allege in defence, "The ideal cannot be attained. Why follow an *ignis fatuus?*" The ideal in any department of church activity is indeed unattainable, but is not, therefore, a will-o'-the-wisp. Religion has its "doctrine of limits" as well as mathematics. Among quantities a "variable" cannot attain its "limit" on this side infinity, yet we may cause it to approach it indefinitely near. In spiritual things while the ideal cannot be arrived at on this side eternity yet no bound can be placed to our approximation to it. We must not give up "the limit" or we

Digitized by Google

shall cease to increase "the variable:" we must not give up "that which is perfect" or we shall cease our advances toward it.

A clear consciousness of an ideal sorely tries patience and temper in this mediocre world. Hence is it, that the votaries of the fine arts are an *irritabile genius.* And so in the case in hand. A minister, for instance, with his ideas of what a prayer-meeting ought to be, carefully prepares his heart for the occasion. He takes his place in a serene and elevated frame of mind. His hymns, his prayers, his address are all attuned to his high state of feeling. But when the meeting is "thrown open" there comes a woeful "flatting out," long pauses, inappropriate hymns, empty common-places, and perhaps the gambols of some enthusiast as he rides his hobby regardless of incongruity. "Is this the prayer-meeting I have longed for? How can I endure this stale, this flat, this unprofitable thing!" he says within himself.

As he muses the fire burns against the spiritual stupidity and torpidity so manifest. But let him beware. Such heat of heart withers up all the tender fruitage of the pure and peaceable spirit. Nor should he let this heat express itself in what is euphuistically termed "reproof" addressed to the delinquents. No attempt to force his ideal upon an unprepared people avails anything. Amid the awful spirituality of the Transfiguration glory Peter's devotion found expression only in purposes of tabernacle building.

But capacity can be developed. The spiritual senses can be exercised. A patient, prudent servant of God may do much to bring the prayer-meetings of his people nearer the ideal which he cherishes. Let him be thankful for the material presented to his hand by even the most worldly church. It is regenerate though crude, and by consequence its possibilities are unlimited. How then shall he proceed in the direction of his ideal prayer-meeting? Happy fellowship with God is the basis of all spiritual exercises. He will, therefore, impress upon his people those scriptures, such, say, as those in Ephesians and Colossians, which set fourth the elevated *status* of the Christian, and which summon him to the exercise of the prerogatives connected therewith. He will seek to remove those hindrances to service which arise from a sense of unworthiness by enlarging on the plentitude and presentness of pardoning grace. He will seek to banish from every bosom the repressive spirit of legalism, and foster in its stead "the spirit of adoption whereby we cry, Abba, Father." He will speak of a new and living way opened up into the presence of God, of the gracious readiness of the Holy Spirit to "help our infirmities when we know not what we should pray for as we ought," and of the sympathetic High Priest whom we have in the ascended Jesus, and by such considerations induce believers to come boldly to the Throne of Grace. When to any one these doctrines become living, bright realities, they unseal the lips

Digitized by Google

for prayer and testimony. In the conduct of the meeting itself, he will find that it sometimes conduces to the spirit of devotion if, after a few stanzas from suitable hymns have been informally sung, there is an interval of silence for self recollection and prayer. Much is often missed by not impressing upon ourselves with definiteness the intention of our presence at such a meeting and asking Divine help towards carrying it out. The Holy Spirit presides in the meeting, but he does so through the human intelligence. In the minister especially resides his "gift of governments" (I Cor. 12:28). How significant that plural. The function of government is to be varied, and never more so than in the prayer-meeting. In a spirit of tender solicitude for the welfare of all, the minister seeks to repress the heady, to remove difficulties from the way of the embarrassed, and to afford the amount of incentive needed by the timid. He keeps his personality as far as possible in the background, and employs it as unobtrusively as possible to help each member of the meeting to carry out his best impulses. He attempers his interference so wisely that no one when brought upon his feet in testimony or upon his knees in prayer, feels otherwise than that his action is perfectly voluntary. How repugnant to all this the conduct of a president, who, auctioneer-like, keeps up a running fire of, "speak right on," "don't let time go to waste," "that's good, another testimony like that," "be brief and to the point," etc. It sounds like the orders of a dancing-master helping his pupils through the intricacies of some figure. As the Paraclete hides himself in the powers of the soul which he energizes, so the minister should, as far as possible, render helps unconsciously to those whom he would introduce into the ministry of the prayer-meeting. Much good too may come from utilizing pauses. Pauses are not essentially bad. Yet most ministers and private Christians have a horror of their occurrence in prayer-meeting. Why should an intermission of vocal effort be dreaded so nervously? Is no language heard in Heaven but articulate speech? Pauses now and then may be naturally expected. The spiritual mind can well improve them by lifting the heart to God. There should be opportunities for silent prayer. When a matter is presented to the meeting for united intercession, an interval of silence with bowed head may be given in order that each may individually present it before God, and then may follow oral prayer. Requests for prayer should be encouraged as they give definiteness and reality to our petitions. Hymns and tunes should be simple, and those around which the best experiences of the church have gathered. Church temporalities should be as seldom as possible associated with the prayer-meeting. In the beginning to "serve tables" required, "men full of faith and the Holy Spirit," and the conduct of temporal matters should still be regarded as a branch of Divine service, but under our present limitations such discussions tre-

Digitized by Google

quently awake worldly instincts, and are, therefore, inimical to spirituality. At the close of the meeting it seeems fitting that there should be a brief interval of silent thoughtfulness and prayer just before the benediction.

The principle which underlies this brief and imperfect specification of details is simply the truth declared at the well of Sychar: They who worship God the Spirit, must worship him in spirit and in truth. And the pastor who seeks to place the minds of his people in happy, free, unbroken communion with the "Reconciled Father in Christ" is making a decided and satisfying advance on the way to the ideal prayer-meeting.

R. KERR ECCLES.

Salem, Ohio.

Digitized by Google

VIII.

REVIEW OF CURRENT LITERATURE.

A. THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

I. EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

Beitrage zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte, von Lic. PROF. DR. FRIEDRICH BAETHGEN. Der Gott Israel's und die Götter der Heiden, Berlin, Reuther: 1888, pp. 316.

The naturalistic hypothesis, regarding the origin of the Pentateuch, and the history of the religion of Israel, has of late received some severe blows at the hands of men of rare critical ability. It is by no means conceded that Kuenen, Welthausen and Stade have settled the question. The spirit and side of their opponents have been admirably set forth in such late works as those from the pen of König of Rostock and Kittel in his History of the Hebrews. These works refute and disprove the hypothesis that Israel's history contains nothing supernatural, that it is a mere outgrowth of natural causes and forces.

But a more careful investigation of many mooted points must be made before the majority of scholars, the lookers-on, shall be satisfied that the question is really one-sided and settled.

Higher criticism must base its results on the most careful and painstaking investigations of lower criticism. It is time to call a halt to the sweeping, almost baseless suppositions, propositions and assertions of the agitators of higher criticism. Let us have facts, clean, cold, hard facts.

Dr. Baethgen's monograph is a model of careful investigation. It is critical, and in its results antagonistic to the school of the naturalistic hypothesis regarding the origin of Israel's religion. The work does not treat of the history or development of Israel's religion, but with great care examines the words for the Deity in Israel, and those for the gods among other Semitic peoples.

The work is divided into three parts. Part I covering 120 pages, examines the existing evidences of gods among the heathen Semitic peoples. He begins with those peoples dwelling in territory adjacent to Israel's. His chief sources of information are the Bible, a few old works, and a large number of inscriptions discovered and deciphered within a few years. The peoples whose gods are here discussed are the Edomites, Moabites, Ammonites, Phœnicians, Philistines, Aramaeans, Nabathaeans, Arabs, Sabaeans and Ethiopians. Some of these peoples, *e. g.*, the Nabathaeans and the Sabaeans, have little significance for the study of Israel's religion. But the most important pantheon for the study of Israel's religious development and history is entirely omitted from our author's work. The study of the gods of Babylonia and Assyria without doubt will shed greater light on Semitic religious history than the pantheon of any other Semitic people. It is a serious omission, and one not to be atoned for by the statement that the author

Digitized by Google

was not at home in this department. Sufficient discussions of the Babylonian pantheon are now available, to aid in the solution of many philological and mythological difficulties, which ten years ago could not be met. The value of this part of the work does not lie so much in the supposable results, as in the completeness of the collection of materials for new research. At least, we may say, the result shows the intense polytheism of the Semites, with no tendency toward monotheism.

The second part of the work deals with Israel's relation to polytheism. It is the pith of the book. It takes up and develops throughout the entire history of Israel the idea, that Israel's religion was originally monotheistic. His result is exactly the other pole from that of the promulgators of the naturalistic hypothesis. He examines *Elohim*, but finds no evidence of polytheism in it. Not a trace of polytheism is discoverable in any antediluvian name, nor among the names of the patriarchs. In Israel's earlier proper names no traces of heathen elements are found. No proof whatever can be adduced that the Semitic people anywhere originally claimed that stones were their gods, as held by Kuenen. In fact, the Hebrew tongue has no word for goddess, no word to express the female of God. The song of Deborah, admitted by all critics to be one of the oldest documents of the Old Testament, contains not the least hint of any God besides Jehovah. The song throughout is a corroboration of the view promulgated.

The third topic discusses the unity in the midst of the manifoldness of the Semitic gods, and the monotheism of Israel. This part is hardly satisfactory to a careful reader. The author attempts to show that in the midst of the polytheism of these Semitic peoples, there was originally a divine oneness, from which all these gods are derived. That in later history there was a tendency to monotheism, is scarcely made out by the argument.

A valuable addendum on *El* and other names of God in the Old Testament, and an index complete the work.

Dr. Baethgen has done valuable service in this treatise. He has set an example for men who are not disposed to do close, careful work. But it is only by such monographs as this that we are ultimately to discover the truth in regard to a multitude of difficult questions in Israel's religious history.

IRA M. PRICE.

II. HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century. By F. LICHTENBERGER. Translated and Edited by W. HOSTIE, B.D. 8vo. pp. 629. New York: Scribner & Welford. $5.60.

The author of this volume is Dean of the Protestant Faculty of Theology at Paris, and the translator is an official of the University of Edinburgh. There is no room for doubt of the qualifications of either for the task attempted, or of the solid character of their united labors. Learning, research and diligent labor may be taken for granted. The spirit in which the work is done, however, is the most important consideration of all, especially for such as accept Neander's saying, *Pectus est quod theologum facit*, which is only another way of saying that spiritual things must be spiritually discerned; that only one whose eyes have been unsealed by divine grace can behold the mysteries of the Kingdom of God.

Digitized by Google

The spirit of the work before us may be best understood from a sentence or two in the translator's Preface:

> In the nineteenth century, as in the sixteenth, Germany has been the living heart and head of Protestant and progressive theology. In other countries the Christian tradition has been resolutely preserved, and somewhat purified and spiritualized; yet the first attitude of its representatives has been generally that of suspicion and distrust, and even in its greatest organization, of hostility and hatred towards the new theological aspiration and thought. But in the land of Luther and Melancthon, and even more than in the age of the Reformation, the religious spirit from the very outset of the century realized its Christian freedom and put forth its essential power. In consequence, the development of theology and the evolution of religious thought in Germany have largely responded to the needs of the time, and have presented a spectacle of progress which, when viewed as a whole, has had no rival or approach elsewhere. The vast learning, the indefatigable research and the intellectual energy of the German theologians have become proverbial, while their daring originality and speculative ardor have recalled the most fertile century in the dogmatic development of the Church, and have alternately dismayed, perplexed and subdued the more sober thinkers of the other divisions of Christendom. Taken all in all, the German theological development, as exhibited in its profound, penetrating and fertile results, must be considered to be one of the most distinctive, influential and characteristic elements in the spiritual work of the century.

This is a point of view from which no hearty believer in the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures can approach the study of German theology. But in order to comprehend the point of view, one needs to bear in mind the German use of the term "theology," which is wide enough to cover every book that bears in any degree on any religious question. A study of Hebrew tenses or Greek cases is a "theological" work equally with speculations on predestination or the atonement. In fact, the major part of German contributions to theology during the nineteenth century, both as to bulk and as to value, have been rather in the line of historical and literary criticism (including the science of hermeneutics or exegesis) of the Bible than in systematic theology or dogmatics. In historical investigation the German theologians easily had the world, for in this field the qualities most demanded are those in which they excel all other scholars, viz., inexhaustible capacity for plodding work and logical minds. The first insures plenty of material; the second makes its organization into a system an equal certainty.

But German scholars have the defects of their qualities. Their insatiable appetite for facts has sometimes resulted in a mental paralysis, accumulation having overpowered assimilation. The great danger of German scholarship, in fact, is that it will be swamped in the sea of its own vast learning. The other great defect is the extreme to which the passion for symmetry, for system, carries the professional investigator. One of the popular theories of Biblical criticism is known as the *tendenz* theory, *i. e.*, that each of the books of the Bible was written to support a peculiar view or opinion of the writer, and represents that purpose or aim (*tendenz*). But it might be maintained, with much greater plausibility, that every important work in German theology is a *tendenz* writing, having as its main object not so much the establishment of the truth as the support of the writer's original theory. And we may be

Digitized by Google

pardoned, perhaps, for suspecting that it is much more important in these days for a theory to be original than for it to be true. In the process of time almost all the hypotheses that have much visible evidence in their favor have been proposed, discussed, weighed, and finally passed upon either by acceptance or rejection. To discover a new theory and to make it plausible by means of newly discovered evidence, or by ingenious manipulation of facts already known, is necessary for the young scholar if he would make his way. It is evident that new theories in support of orthodoxy have, in process of time, become very difficult to discover, but it is comparatively easy to evolve a new theory, attacking something hitherto believed. Hence, by a sort of necessity of the case, ambitious and keen intellects among rising German scholars are impelled towards theories adverse to received beliefs.

This impulsion is greatly favored, or at least not at all resisted, by two other circumstances: First, that holding skeptical and unorthodox views is no bar to holding professorships in the universities, or even to high position in the State churches; and secondly, that the spiritual life of the established church is so low as to require no evidence of personal piety in its ministers. A man notoriously intemperate or unchaste might be debarred from preferment in university or church, but a man of average "good morals" would find no obstacle in his way, even though his heart were an entire stranger to the grace of God; even though he were an utter skeptic as to the religion of the Bible.

Any one who will read this volume, bearing these things in mind, remembering that the author writes from a point of view which no believer in the Scriptures can share, will find the book instructive. It records a very important and fruitful period of modern theological scholarship, by the results of which we may profit, though we reject its characteristic spirit and methods. The author tries to be moderate and impartial; compared with some scholars, he is even evangelical. He mildly rebukes an extremist like Strauss, but he comes far short of accepting the Bible, in the plain meaning of its text, as infallible authority. His results, therefore, demand constant scrutiny and testing, and the book is not a good one for those to read whose opinions are unformed, or whose knowledge of theological literature is scanty. The more advanced student will find in it much to reward his study, and still more to provoke his dissent.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

III. SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

That Unknown Country. Springfield, Mass.: C. A. Nichols & Co.

This volume is unique in plan and character. It consists of a collection of papers on the future life, from representations of all religious bodies. Such a collection depends for its value on its comprehensiveness and impartiality. In both these respects this book is beyond impeachment. This being conceded, the usefulness of the book is evident. Polemical theology is of very doubtful value, though it is a necessary evil. It may well be questioned whether polemics ever convinced a mind or converted a soul, or even strengthened a weak faith. But these articles are not polemic, or at least are very mildly so. It is impossible, of course, for a man to state his belief fairly without at the

Digitized by Google

same time giving reasons for not accepting opposing beliefs. But apart from this indirect polemic, there is no combative tone in most of this volume. It is what it purports to be, statements of beliefs, by representative preachers and theologians, in moderate and courteous tone.

The representative character of the book is evident at a glance. Of the fifty-one contributors, seven are Congregationalists, five Presbyterians, four Episcopalians, three Methodists, three Lutherans, two Baptists, two Unitarians, two Universalists, and two Roman Catholics; while the Christians, seventh Day Baptists, Moravians, Friends, United Brethren, Reformed Swedenborgians, and Jews, also are represented—at least seventeen different bodies without counting minor differences, such as that between the Presbyterians and the United Presbyterians. Two pastors of Independent churches also are included —Dr. David Swing and Dr. H. W. Thomas, both of Chicago. Twelve foreign contributors have been secured, of whom nine are English; one, Professor Godet, is a Swiss; one, Dr. E. De Pressensé, is French; and one, Prof. C. E. Luthardt, is German. Several students of heathen religions also have made contributions; *e. g.*, Professor Legge, upon Chinese beliefs; Stanley Lane-Poole, Esq., upon Mohammedanism; and Prof. T. W. Rhys-Davis, upon Buddhism. When we turn to the men chosen to represent the various denominations, the list of names is most satisfactory. Among the Congregationalists are Professor G. P. Fisher, Dr. Lyman Abbott, President S. C. Bartlett, Professor George Harris, Dr. Gladden and Dr. C. F. Thwing. Among the Presbyterians are Dr. Howard Crosby, Dr. W. H. French and Dr. Talmage. Among the Baptists are Dr. R. S. MacArthur and Dr. Angus, of Regent's Park, London; Bishop Huntington and Archdeacon Farrar represent the Episcopalians; Dr. Peabody and Dr. E. E. Hale speak for the Unitarians, Dr. Miner and Dr. J. C. Adams for the Universalists, and Dr. Buckley, Bishop Fowler and President Cummings for the Methodists. Others included are Dr. F. W. Conrad, Professor Gerhart, Rev. Chauncey Giles, Dr. A. S. Isaacs, Dr. A. H. Lewis, and President Augustus Schultz.

The plan of the book makes it, in some respects, the most valuable treatise in English on Eschatology. It lacks the unity of a systematic treatise on the subject, of course, but it has other advantages that more than compensate for this lack. It is gratifying to find that so many of the writers in this book defend the plain teaching of Scripture with reference to the future life, the eternal happiness of the righteous and the eternal misery of the wicked. It is true that there has been a great change in the way of preaching this doctrine since Jonathan Edwards delivered his sermon on "Sinners in the hands of an angry God." We no longer conceive of future retribution as consisting in physical torments, "hell" no more suggests visions of a lake of fire and brimstone, in which the wicked are plunged and remain to all eternity. Nor does the punishment of the wicked longer seem the arbitrary infliction of penalty on the disobedient, as an angry parent sometimes punishes his child. Sin is now conceived of as a violation of man's spiritual nature, and as followed naturally and inevitably by separation from God and consequent spiritual suffering. The possibility of persistent continuance in sin cannot be denied, if the soul is

Digitized by Google

immortal and the will free; and if there can be eternal sin, there can be eternal retribution. So cogent is this logic that there is but one real escape from it; and that is the denial of the natural immortality of the soul. This is the view avowed in this volume by such writers as Lyman Abbott, Leonard W. Bacon, De Pressensé, and Edward White, all of whom more or less clearly express the belief that only those who are united to God by faith in Christ will live forever, and that all who persist in wickedness will either perish at the death of the body or by persistence in sin will arrive at ultimate extinction of being. This view would furnish a consistent philosophical solution of the problem of evil, and suggest a possible theodicy freer from difficulties than many others, if it were not so utterly opposed to the teachings of Scripture. If the New Testament teaches anything with regard to the future life, it is that the righteous and the wicked shall be raised and judged together, and that the happiness of the one is no longer in duration than the misery of the other.

Another attempted evasion of the difficulty is the adoption of the doctrine of restorationism. This is the form of belief avowed by such writers as John Coleman Adams and Cannon Farrar. The former represents the more moderate and intelligent wing of the Universalists, who have given up their false exegesis of Scripture, their attempts to prove that there is no such thing as future retribution (which was the stock in trade of the Hosea Ballou type of Universalists) and have approached closely to the orthodox interpretation of the New Testament. In their favor, of course, are those passages that seem to represent the triumph of Christ at last as complete, when he has put all things under his feet and has become all in all. Taken by themselves such passages would warrant the conclusion that sin is at some time to become blotted out of the universe, and that all existing beings are to be willing servants of God.

There is still a third position, a compromise between these two—that of the "New Theology"—which admits that there may be such a thing as eternal sin, and therefore eternal retribution, but still holds that there is no reason for making death the limit of possible repentance. This is the view advocated by Washington Gladden and George Harris. It is merely a partial restorationism. It lacks the courage to say that all men will ultimately be saved, and so escapes being called universalism, but does assert that an indefinite number of those who die impenitent may be saved after death. Of all the deviations from orthodoxy, this has the least in its favor, whether we interrogate reason alone or examine the Scriptures.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

IV. PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

Baptist Hymn Writers and their Hymns. By HENRY S. BURRAGE, D.D., Author of "A History of Anabaptists of Switzerland," etc. Portland, Maine: Brown, Thurston & Co.

English Hymns: Their Authors and History. By SAMUEL WILLOUGHBY DUFFIELD, Author of "The Latin Hymn-Writers and their Hymns," "The Heavenly Land," "Warp and Woof: a Book of Verse," "The Burial of the Dead," etc., etc. Funk & Wagnalls. New York: Astor Place. London: 44 Fleet Street.

Digitized by Google

The Psalmody of the Church: Its Authors, Singers and Uses. By REV. WILLIAM H. PARKER. Chicago: Hack & Anderson, Publishers. 1889. Price $1.50.

Hymnology is now receiving something of the attention which its importance demands. The man who makes light of a hymn-book advertizes at once his inappreciation of poetry of a high order and of religious emotion of the tenderest character. The hymn-book is next to the Bible among religious books in its influence over mind and heart. Among the writers whose names appear in any standard hymn-book will be found some of the most honored names in all the various branches of the Church of God; indeed, the names of many of the greatest poets of literature will be found in this bright galaxy. Representatives of all Christian lands, and of nearly all centuries, will be found in such a collection; if it be a hymn and tune book we shall have also the names of the great masters of music whose brows bear immortal crowns. Whatever leads us more fully to appreciate our hymn-book is to be heartily welcomed. Often ten-fold interest attaches to a hymn where instructive incidents are known of the life of its author and of the circumstances in which it was written. We are almost all quite too unfamiliar with the hymn-book from which we sing God's praises in God's house. We are handling a volume with comparative indifference in which are found many of the choicest products of poetic genius, and many of the rarest experiences of consecrated hearts. Many of those hymns carry us to the sick bed of saints ripening for heaven; to the prison and to the stake of martyrs; to the battle field with its groans of the dying and its shouts of its victors; to the waters of baptism; and to the table of communion; to the bed of death; and to the chariot of complete victory going up to glory and to God. It is difficult to be patient with a man who sneeringly says: "It is only a hymn-book." The hymn-book contains the quintessence of the noblest hearts, the most cultivated intellects, and the purest souls that have ever lived, labored, suffered and triumphed on the earth. It brings us into the presence of the glorious Milton, the illustrious Dryden, the immortal Luther. It gives us, as Mr. Parker suggests, such names as "George Herbert and Bishop Ken; John Newton and John Berridge; Isaac Watts and Charles Wesley; Rowland Hill and Augustus Tapplady; Robert McCheyne and Horatius Bonar, and many others who rank among the grandest and truest men that God has created." We find in this noble company of sacred poets beautiful women as well as peerless men. We have "Charlotte Elliot, the Episcopalian; Phœbe Brown, the Congregationalist; Mrs. Van Alstyne, the Methodist; Anne Steele, the Baptist. Romanist and Protestant are found her side by side: the earlier centuries and the later join hands as a white. robed and crowned choir chanting the praises of God and his Christ. We ought fully to know and then we shall tenderly love our hymn-book; it ought to be our *vade mecum* at home and abroad, on the land and on the sea. Around it the mother and the children may well gather, making the home melodious with sacred song, learned from its almost inspired pages. Great congregations feel the inspiration of poetic genius and spiritual fervor, as in lowly chapel or lofty cathedral they sing the praises of God from their loved book of sacred song. From

Digitized by Google

the hymn-book and the Bible many otherwise uneducated preachers have learned their theology, their rhetoric and their fervid oratory. Let us give the hymn-book an honored place in literature and in music, in all the tender relations of the home, and in the sacred fellowships of the house of God.

We turn now with unqualified pleasure to the first volume named in this article, Dr. Burrage's *Hymn Writers and Their Hymns*. We have here an illustration of the great industry, the accurate scholarship, and varied knowledge of the honored author. Dr. Burrage has made the Baptist denomination, all the students of hymnology, and all lovers of literature, his debtors. He confined himself to the hymns written by Baptist authors. It was simply impossible to give in one volume an extensive treatment of the whole range of this broad subject. It was, no doubt, his desire to rescue from obscurity some honored Baptist names; it is certainly a great surprise, even to many intelligent Baptists to find that so many of the grandest hymns ever written and sung have Baptists for their authors. Dr. Burrage availed himself of the help of many of our most prominent brethren connected with libraries, theological seminaries, and of other learned pursuits in different parts of the country. We thus have chapters on Anabaptist, English, German, Swedish, Danish, Norwegian, French and Welsh Baptist hymn writers and their hymns; also on Baptist hymn writers in Spain, Mexico, Greece, India, Burma, Assam, China, Japan and Africa. We also have appendixes on American and German hymn-books and their compilers. We also have an excellent index of first lines of the principal hymns named in the volume, and also an alphabetical index of the authors. There are admirable steel engravings of John Fawcett, D.D., of Charles H. Spurgeon, Samuel F. Smith, D.D., Emily C. Judson and Dr. Basil Manly. It will thus be seen that Dr. Burrage has covered a wide field, and has rendered invaluable service to hymnology. If it shall yet be possible for him to cover the whole field, as he has covered that of Baptist hymns and hymn writers, he will perform a service of very great value to hymnology and literature generally. Were the space at our command we would like to give the first lines of some of the most famous hymns of Christian literature, showing that our denomination has the honor of having given them to the world. We commend the book most heartily to all Baptist pastors, to the members generally of our Baptist churches, and to all others who wish to study this important chapter in hymnology. The book ought to have a place at least in all our Baptist homes. Generations yet to come will rise up to thank Dr. Burrage for this scholarly, devout and altogether admirable volume.

We come now to the second volume whose title we have given, that by Rev. Samuel W. Duffield. This volume was published about three years ago. We refer to it here not only because of its important subject, and its intrinsic worth, but also because of our warm friendship for its now sainted author. Once a week month after month and year after year, the writer was accustomed to meet him in the home of Rev. Dr. Charles S. Robinson, to whom the volume is dedicated. Many portions of the volume were the subject of delightful conversation at these Monday meetings; and every time the book is now opened, the manly form, the intelligent face, and the kindly voice of the author are

Digitized by Google

present again. The origin of this book was, in a sense, accidental. Mr. Duffield was engaged in the study of Latin hymns, intending to publish a volume on that subject; while so engaged this book grew in his mind and he felt forced to give it to the public. His special thought, however, was all the while on the Latin hymns; as he himself said, he looked upon this work "only as the *adytum* or vestibule to that cathedral of ancient praise." The author selected Dr. Robinson's *Laudes Domini*, the latest and certainly one of the noblest collections of hymns ever given to the Church, as the basis of his work; this plan somewhat restricted the scope of the work while, on the other hand, it had its positive advantages. Particular attention was given to American hymns and hymn writers. Mr. Duffield never claimed more than that he had "picked a few flowers from the outer limits of that great garden of Christian biography wherein grows Solomon's rose, Christ's lily, Chaucer's daisy, and Robert Robinson's saffron crocus." Before Mr. Duffield finished all that he intended to do in connection with his Latin hymn writers and their hymns he went to join the nobler choir which chants the praise of Christ in his immediate presence. He closes his preface by making the following quotation from the language of an unknown writer of the last century.

"I'll trim my lamp the while,
And chaunt a midnight lay,
Till perfect light and gladness come
In glory's endless day."

He trimmed that lamp and chanted that midnight lay, experienced that perfect light and gladness, and entered the glory of that endless day before his work seemed half done. One of the charms of heaven is that possibly the incomplete tasks of earth will there have a nobler completion than the most consecrated minds and hearts could give them here.

We do not think that the alphabetical arrangement of first lines which Mr. Duffield adopted is the best possible in a work on hymnology. It, of course, has its advantages, but it gives a fragmentary, arbitrary and unphilosophical development to a work on this subject. The book bears on every page evidences of careful study. No pains have been spared to make it accurate. The author had access to an unusually large collection of hymnologies, and to hymn-books in their original editions; and he also had the assistance of distinguished hymnologists in various parts of our country. The work is lighted by gleams of genuine humor, by passages of rare eloquence, and by striking literary conceits and historical suggestions. The value of this volume in itself, and the tender memories connected with its author, would lead this reviewer to dwell upon both at considerable length; but the book has already been before the public and both its merits and its occasional defects are not unknown. It contains a valuable chronological table of English hymn writers, classified according to the centuries, coming down to a very late date; and also of American hymn writers classified in a similar way. There is also an index of authors and an index of hymns annotated or mentioned and arranged in alphabetical order; and also an index in Latin, German, French,

Digitized by Google

Danish, Swedish and Greek, of the first lines in these respective languages of hymns translated into English. There is also a useful topical index. The book is a monument of the wise scholarship, the poetic instinct, the literary culture and the Christian consecration of the lamented author.

We now come to the latest of these three volumes on hymnology—*The Psalmody of the Church*, by the Rev. W. H. Parker, a Baptist minister. In the preface of the volume of which we have just spoken Mr. Duffield remarks: "I trust there is yet more light to break across this hymn-country, this Beulah land, from which the towers and palaces of the New Jerusalem can be seen." In this last volume the light has begun to break across this Beulah land of sacred song. Mr. Parker has given years of earnest study to the subject of hymnology. His purpose was to write a racy and readable book upon this instructive theme; and he has succeeded. Without the varied scholarship which the two volumes already reviewed possess, and without the marked literary finish of Mr. Duffield's volume, this book possesses excellences of its own which cannot fail to commend it to every thoughtful reader. It will do much toward giving a popular knowledge of the "service of song in the house of the Lord." It opens to the average reader the mines of wealth contained in our best hymn-books. Always catholic in its spirit, it is often eloquent in its utterance. While it is fitting that volumes should be written, as Burrage's is, on Baptist hymns, and still other volumes on the hymns of other religious bodies, it is at the same time fitting that there should be hymnologies covering the whole field of sacred song, without respect to denominational lines. The plan adopted by Mr. Parker is peculiar, and many of the facts and incidents which the volume contains are for the first time made accessible to many readers. The volume contains twenty-four chapters; the simple statement of the subject of some of these chapters will give an idea of the range and spirit of the discussion. We have in the list: "Music and Song;" "Hebrew Psalmody;" "Psalmody in its Relations to the Life of Christ;" "Psalmody in the Apostolic Church;" "Mediæval Hymns, or Songs of the Midnight;" "The Puritan Psalmody of New England;" "The Dawn of English Hymnology;" "Hymn-Books, their Contents and Usage;" "Praying Mothers;" "Love, Courtship and Marriage, or, Lessons Suggested by the Experience of some Hymn Writers;" "The War Songs of the Church;" "Songs of the Border;" "How to Use the Hymn-Book," etc. Mr. Parker has certainly produced an attractive volume: one which contains interesting anecdotes, quaint bits of history, examples of eloquent writing and of devout and tender feeling, while gleams of humor radiate from almost every page. We should be glad to see this volume in every Christian home. It would give ten-fold attractiveness to many of our popular hymns and would invest those less known with a gentle charm. It is sufficiently large to give the main facts connected with the leading hymns and hymn writers, but not so large as to repel even the less interested readers. It will prove a wonderful help to pastors who conduct praise services Sunday evenings in their churches. Such services, with the aid of this volume, might be held at least once a month and be of help and profit to all.

It will also prove to be a great help to all pastors in conducting

Digitized by Google

their prayer-meetings; from its pages they may learn incidents connected with the characters and history of the writers of the hymns or with the circumstances under which the hymns were written, which will give a new zest or additional tenderness to the singing of the hymn. The book is warmly human; the heart of a living man throbs in its pages, and thus it gives life and reality to the writers of the hymns whose story it tells. It contains many interesting incidents which we have not found in a similar volume, incidents which perhaps some writers consider too trivial to mention, but which for that very reason give a new and tender meaning to many hymns. Whatever brings us nearer to some of the great singers who sat at the feet of him "Who inhabiteth the praises of Israel" is worthy of our consideration. A great hymn is the most enduring form of literary immortality: better be the author of such a hymn than of the ablest volume in philosophy or in history. But a hymn whose author is unknown loses half its charms; it is like an orphan crying in the night. When the author is known the orphan becomes a child at home, singing with the approval of a mother's smile or encouragement of a father's embrace.

Perhaps the most interesting chapter is the one entitled: "Hymn Books, their Contents and Uses." The author, in the judgment of this reviewer, shows his good judgment when he selects the *Calvary Selection*, published by the Century Co. as a subject for careful analysis. He kindly says: "We believe this book will fairly represent the best of our hymnals." He further adds: "The book contains the choicest productions of the choicest minds, and is made up of the most precious gems of poetical excellence that can be gathered in the mines of human thought." He tells us that the volume contains one thousand and eighty-six hymns, written by three hundred and twenty-eight authors, who wrote the original hymns. He suggests the gathering together in one place of these three hundred and twenty-eight writers and the eight translators. As he shows, these writers would be gathered from all countries and from far-off centuries, and they would differ as widely in creed as in age and country. The first would be Clement of Alexandria; then Ambrose, Bishop and singer of Milan; then Gregory the Great; then Robert the Second, King of France—and thus he fills his air-castle with men from every country and of every creed, and with women of saintly character and poetic genius. This is a remarkable chapter. His description of the entrance into the castle, of the "great magicians of sound"—Handel, Haydn, Beethoven, Mozart, Mendelssohn, Bach and others, is as beautiful in execution as it is poetical in conception. This chapter alone is worth more than the price of the entire volume. We have read the book with great interest—we shall re-read it more than once. Mr. Parker has rendered good service to all God's children by teaching them to appreciate more than ever the songs of Zion—these grand and immortal hymns of the Divine Lord and his redeemed Church.

ROBERT S. MACARTHUR.

Digitized by Google

THE

BAPTIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL XI. OCTOBER, 1889. NO. 44.

I.

THE PRESENT DRIFT IN ESCHATOLOGY.

I WRITE, not so much to give my own views of doctrines and conclusions on a great subject, but as an observer, to give what seems to me to be the drift of Christian thought on this great question, or such part of it that concerns the doom of the unsaved after death. I shall not burden the article with references to authors and books; for works on the subject are so familiar and accessible to readers of the *Review*. The great interest of people in this subject, as manifested in the newspaper, the novel, the sermon, and magazine discussions, is evidence of the deep and unconscious faith men have in a personal immortality after death, as the pebbles and shells on the sand are incontrovertible proofs of the in-rolling waves from the vast and mysterious ocean.

The fact that different views and conclusions do now exist and always have existed among the good, the great and the learned on the question should preclude all from being intolerantly dogmatic; there is a learning venerable and consecrated that is at variance with the teachings of evangelical churches—that the retribution of sin is endless in the consciousness of the lost sinner. Thoughtful Bible students, men profound in the history of Christianity, take issue with us on this conclusion. This fact shows conclusively that the

Digitized by Google

testimony of Scriptures (the only source of light) is not so clear on the controversy as to be beyond all possible doubt. Hence the need of charity and catholicity of toleration. Reverent, unobtrusive doubt ought to place no one outside the pale of Christian character. Not in all circumstances should this belief be made a test of church membership. I could conceive of conditions where it ought not to be made a test of fitness for an ordination to the Christian ministry, or an appointment to the missionary field.

I will name a few of the trunk lines of various beliefs that prevail this day and the favor in which they are considered by the Christian public.

Modern Universalism.—Old-fashioned universalism has in later years taken upon itself a new hue named *restorationism.* I say *hue*, for it seems to be a change of color, or of veneering, rather than a change of heart or of substance. Old universalism, as advocated by the New England Ballous at the beginning of the century, implied the universal salvation of men *at death*, whatever might have been their character during life. Death was the strait gate and narrow way that entered into life. The pains of dissolution were the Jesus that saved the soul, and not the Jesus of Bethlehem and Calvary. The dying sinner takes a draught of Lethé, and at once is relieved from the memory and guilt of sin, and he enters Elysium. So contrary to Scriptures, so repugnant to reason, and repellant to every instinct of justice and holiness was that teaching that it is no longer a recognized tenet of universalism. Indeed, it was but the extreme swing of the pendulum from the Edwardian eschatology of New England as expounded in part by the famous sermon, "*The sinner in the hands of an angry God*"—one about as repellant as the other.

Restorationism qualifies universalism. The unrepentant spirit at death enters hell; this is not a prison for the criminal, but a kind of a graded reform school, where, under new

Digitized by Google

masters, with new discipline and in better environments, the guilty soul is educated, disciplined, and at last redeemed. Time is no element in this disciplinary course. It may be an æon or an hour, for they have the eternities to draw from, and it will be a constant, progressive process of purification and elevation. The final results will be absolute redemption into holiness and joy. All will be saved.

Comments on Restorationism.—1. It never has taken a deep and universal hold on the conscience and consciousness of the Christian world. It has always succeeded into popularity in the measure an unreasonable opposite extreme had prevailed. Thus it has been a vigorous protest rather than a deep constructive and aggressive faith.

2. The express teachings of the Scriptures are not favorable to it, as Theodore Parker himself averred. There are sporadic passages and phrases torn from their contexts that might be construed to its support. Hence, the great majority of its advocates are disbelievers in the Scriptures as an infallible authority in Christian doctrines; others call the doctrine extra-Biblical, an evolution of the human consciousness. It is a growth of the sentiment and hope of the human heart, rather than a deduction from reason or revelation.

3. It is contradicted by every analogy in the material and physicial world, wherein violations of laws are venial only to a certain point; beyond that suffering is not remedial, but fearfully retributive. Illustrations: sins against the brain, the vitals, etc. The reply made that it is not competent to argue for spiritual conclusions from material data is abundantly answered by such a book as *Natural Law in the Spiritual World.* The *moral* and spiritual world are certainly identical, and we see the principle terribly illustrated in the moral nature—the character of man making for fixedness in its progress, changing only with intensification.

Digitized by Google

The principle is recognized even in the common law in the very phrase, *unreformed criminals*. The great poets—Dante, Milton, Shakespeare, Goethe, the last two indirectly but powerfully—recognize the principle. Iago is the unreclaimable human fiend. Faust is a spirit sold unto and absolutely possessed by sin, and is irretrievably ruined.

4. Belief in this doctrine is generally associated with a low estimate of holiness and a light estimate of the great guilt of sin.

5. As Joseph Cook says, it cuts the nerve of missions by making salvation unimportant, and sin an error and misfortune rather than a moral crime bringing deep guilt.

6. It is not an evolution of piety, but a positive devolution. It is always in opposition to all religious awakenings and efforts. The "liberal" pulpits are often the apologists of Ingersoll, and always the merciless critics—*cynics*, indeed—of Moody and his work.

7. The implications and indirections of this doctrine are injurious to moral and religious work; for if souls are not saved here, though living in the tropical glow of God's love in the Gospel; with all light, help, warning, they die unrepentant; if they are saved beyond, it must be that there are better environments, greater light, a mightier love and a stronger Christ; for here Christ, the Holy Spirit, labors of love, and all right and loving influences, failed to bring them to repentance. It is a positive encouragement to the selfish sinner to say, "My redemption here means struggle, agony and self-immolation; the whole current of my soul is against it; I'll wait until the help becomes more powerful, the motives stronger, and then the gate will not be as strait nor the path so narrow." This atmosphere generated by the doctrine makes the liberal church barren of converts; she never bears; her family are those she adopts from the "strayed, lost, or stolen" of evangelical homes and churches.

Digitized by Google

8. The Christian conscience has no practical confidence in this doctrine; that is, the conscience that accepts Christianity as an inspired truth. Was it ever heard of an universalist clergyman comforting a dying man with the assurance that though he was then certainly unsaved, but not to worry himself, he would presently have a better chance! Or was it ever heard of such a man himself, conscious of the near approach of the mysterious change, conscious also that he hated what God loved, and loved what God hated, believing in his personal immortality, and rationally concluding with himself: "I know my peace is not made with God; the guilt of my sin fills my soul, and conscience stings into my very heart; I have only a few days, or hours, to live; but I cannot consider the momentous question of salvation now; I'll adjourn it until after death, and in more advantageous environments I will consider the matter." Amid all the "deathbed" promises and conversations recorded, was such a one ever known? Rather, when wicked men come to die with their mind clear, their conscience awakened, their sense of God and eternity and sin clarified and intensified, when such men have spoken, has it not been to plead for salvation *now*—for a present, immediate forgiveness?

While many devoted evangelical Christians profess this faith or sentiment, and many more privately cherish it, still it seems to be held as an alternate of a harsh dogma rather than a revealed truth laying hold of the inmost consciousness of people. Evangelical Christians who hold it apply its benefits to the unrepentent dead rather than to the godless living. They *hope* for the lost, but not for worlds would they have a man die unsaved on the plea that he would have a chance beyond.

The masses *profess* to believe it, but they cannot be induced to trust it, nor risk much on its gilded sentiments; hence the churches advocating it are not attended by the masses. It always has prevailed more or less in Christian

Digitized by Google

communities; it always will so long as the heart of man has the power to hope even against unwelcome evidence.

In the great task of converting men from sin this doctrine is a positive hindrance, in that it belittles the wickedness of sin, minimizes its consequences, and leaves untouched great motives of action God has put in the human soul—viz., self-love, self-preservation and fear. These are far from being the best motives, but they *are* motives; and the instruction that destroys them can never be acceptable to men who appeal to *every* right motive to redeem man from sin.

"The New Theology" is a kind of an *annex* of universalism, or, to change the figure, an eddy in the vast sweep of Christian thought. Epitomized, it is this (so far as it bears on this subject): Those who have not heard of Christ in this world, and for that reason are lost, shall have an opportunity after death; hence, there is future probation for the heathen.

"The New Theology" can have but a brief life, it seems to me, for these reasons:

1. It has taken no hold on the Christian consciousness of the day.

2. What is "new" in it is found in a broader and less illogical form in the "liberal" churches; hence, it is unnecessary.

3. It is based on the unreasonable, unscriptural and un-Christian hypothesis that all who have not heard of Christ by that name are damned. The condemnation of the soul is based not on *un*belief, but on *dis*belief. "This is the condemnation"—not that men have not *received* the Light, but *having received* it, they do not accept it; more still, they "*love* darkness rather than the Light." "*Love*"—what does that mean? It implies knowledge, deliberation, choice, and a bent of the heart itself, rising from the fact "that their deeds are evil." The heathen are not without the Light

Digitized by Google

(the most universal and catholic title of the Son of God), for "He lighteth every man coming into the world." This Divine Light cometh to some with greater glow and clearness than to others; but in some way, under some name, it cometh to every man born with sufficient clearness to make him responsible for "loving" it, or its opposite, darkness; and every man will be judged and his condition determined by his rejection or his choice and love of the Light—Jesus Christ—in this world. Hence, there is not needed a second probation for the heathen. Like Christians, they have heard of and seen the Light, and their future is settled by their treatment thereof. Hence, while the "liberal" churches care nothing for the New Theology, for they have it, much more with it; evangelical churches must reject it as unnecessary; "not 'new' in what is good; not good in what is 'new.'"

THE "ORTHODOX" VIEWS AND CONCLUSIONS.

The man that comes to death unrepentant is irretrievably and eternally lost; this lost condition will be one of endless, conscious and unutterable anguish and torment in hell. No mercy can be offered, and even if it were offered, the very capacity of the soul to profit thereby is destroyed. This hell is not so much a provision of divine justice, but the wilfully chosen, self-banishment of the soul from God. It is hell because he is out of harmony with his Environments—namely, God. No one can be lost, but he who wilfully and out of a perverse heart rejecteth Christ. Hell is both retributive of sin and exhibitive of divine justice in the defense of righteousness, hence, subjective and objective in its elements.

The ideas of the *methods* and *nature* of future retribution —"lake of fire," "brimstone," etc.—must be eliminated from the modern orthodox teaching. They are the offspring of a bygone literalistic, materialistic age, and of the legal and

Digitized by Google

Latinic Church in distinction from the spiritual Greek Church; and they are associated the present day with orthodoxy by its adversaries for the sole purpose of caricaturing and making it a ridicule before the public. That some orthodox people believe in those lurid details is sure; but no party should be judged of its principles by the extravagances and frenzies of a few of its least representative adherents, nor by the caricatures of its opponents.

It is a fair and full statement of the view of the great majority of the evangelical Church—and the Roman Catholic Church—that the doom of the lost soul is to be irretrievably lost to holiness and heaven, and a condemnation to endless, conscious misery and anguish, changing only with the change of progress and intensification in that condition.

Comments. 1. Does the word of God teach it? It certainly *appears* so to an increasing multitude of its most zealous and devoted friends. Revivals, missions, the impassioned efforts of Christian workers, are largely quickened, inspired, and intensified to the white heat of self-sacrifice by the dread belief.

2. But there is a large number of holy, devout Bible lovers who earnestly believe that the passages usually quoted as teaching this conclusion are capable of other and different constructions and meaning.

3. However literally and logically those conclusions are deduced from Scriptures and great unwritten laws, there is an unsuppressable rebellion against them in the human heart and reason—the intuitional intelligence of man.

Look at it! think a moment on its dread meaning: The lost soul [numbered by countless millions] is condemned into a condition where, by virtue of an irreversible law in his nature and in the universe, he becomes more perverted, depraved, and guilty with every throb of his life; farther and farther from God and holiness he drifts; becoming more infernal and satanic in ambition, passion, appetite—more

Digitized by Google

hateful toward God with every breath of his existence—bloating with anguish and ever-increasing torments—this process going on for one year, for a century, for ten thousand years—ten millions; let each second in that period represent an æon of eternity, and each æon so long a period as those years—and the lost soul is only on the threshold, careering into the eternities. If at the close of a million times that period we could discern a gleam of light hinting that in the illimitable future beyond there was an END to the foaming, gurgling misery of the lost—what comfort and hope would be inspired—but no! the darkness is denser and murkier as we advance into the eternities. All this for the glory of our Heavenly Father and the satisfaction of a justice of which Himself is the ideal and embodiment!

Would you—*do* you preach this doctrine in its full meaning and import? When you do—*if* you do, do your hearers believe it? Do you succeed in making them believe that *you believe* it? And if believe, realize it?

"Drifting" may be due to the wind, which changeth often—to ebb and tide, ever coming and going—so drift in doctrine is no assurance of the character of the doctrine—it may be true or false, scriptural or profane for all the drift; hence I express no estimation of the scripturalness of this doctrine when I say that there is a drifting away from it. The pulpit is timid of urging it on the pews; for it seems to strike against a doubt about it. Revivalists do not appeal to it as did Edwards, Swan, Knapp. Moody seldom ever makes minatory appeals. In cold written controversy it may be logically and is stoutly maintained; but in the living message of the pulpit, the Sabbath school teacher and Christian worker it is held as a "background of mystery." This timidity about it gives to its opponents boldness to characterize it as the hateful product of the Latinic Church.

Annihilation has a strong hold on the minds of men as a

Digitized by Google

solution of this great question. Man is *endowed* with immortality. God alone has immortality (1 Tim. 6:16) inherently and naturally. Man's assurance of immortality at creation was conditioned on his harmony with God; that lost, he died; the body dies because separated from the spirit, its quickener; the spirit dies because sin separates it from God, its preserver and life. Christ came to restore to mankind the possibility of attaining that lost life; by repentance, faith, and regeneration men are brought into union with Christ, and His life becomes their life. Thus the lost immortality is found in Christ; for they who believe in Christ though they are dead they shall yet live. Sin is corruption and death; the soul that sinneth shall die. Natural death destroys the body, and the soul unredeemed from sin will go into the other world under its dominion; sin shall work death in the soul. This destroying process of sin will go on weakening, devouring, and annihilating the powers of the soul—which will be its hell of anguish and suffering —until at last it is utterly and absolutely annihilated, and with it its sin—for sin is but the life of the sinner. Hence there is coming a time, or an eternity, when sin shall be abolished; for sin has no entity as an objective substance; it is, as defined above, the *conduct* of a preverse soul; when all such souls perish forever, sin will be no more. It will be cast into the bottomless pit of annihilation; that is the "second death." Then righteousness shall fill the universe as the waters cover the deep. Every tongue shall confess God, and every knee shall bow to Him. "Then cometh the end, etc." I Cor. 15: 24-26.

Strong, and to many, convincing appeals from Scriptures are made to support this conclusion. It is *aionion* punishment, or *Κόλασις*; measure the loss by the thing lost and it is an *eternal* loss, for eternal life is missed. If *aionion* be construed as commensurate in time with the life of the obect, then the lost soul suffers *aionion* punishment—or during

Digitized by Google

its existence, as the redeemed soul enjoys *aionion* heaven, etc. Annihilation avoids on the one hand the enervating heresies of restoration, and on the other the terrible forebodings of endless conscious punishment, and the crushing strain they place on the human heart to accept them as revealed truth.

This view prevails widely in England, particularly among the Congregationalists, and by them it is not deemed inconsistent with a membership in the ministry. It is spreading in this country among clergymen, a kind of a private speculation rather than a pronounced faith.

The last utterances of Mr. Beecher on this subject partake strongly of this conclusion. In a sermon printed in the *Christian World's Pulpit* (London, Nov. 17, 1886) I find these words: Text: "Be not deceived," etc. (Gal. 6 : 7–9). "He that lives to the flesh shall of the flesh reap curruption —*shall.* It is sure to come. What shall it be? Future torment? No, I do not mean that. I mean that he that cultivates his lower, mere animal nature, with the animal perishes [*annihilation*]. Or if there be a hope that there are yet germs in him, capable by replanting of a better development, through whatever dimness, toil and suffering he may go, is it not reasonable to suppose that there may be an intermediate probationary period? [A mixture of Universalism and Roman Catholic purgatorial scheme.] This was the doctrine of the primitive Church, and not only of the Church, but of that part of it which had the missionary spirit, believed in revivals of religion, and was the most spiritual. They held that men dying in their animalism must perish forever, but that those who had a germ worth replanting went into a period where, by pain and suffering—rigorous self-discipline, they were developed into a higher condition, and were finally salvable; whereas those who had overcome themselves, and had obtained their victory in this life, were taken immediately into the presence of God and

Digitized by Google

the holy angels. That, as near as I can tell, is about the way my own mind rests. . . . It is, to my mind, a relief that if a man never rises any higher than the animal life he never will rise any higher, and that the universe will never see a God enthroned that looks down upon the infinite and prolonged torments of unconceived number of men shut up simply for the purpose of suffering. If there be anything more infidel than that I don't know what it is, or anything that more effectually blots out the possibility of respecting and loving any God than this, continuing to create men with a sure foresight of their perpetual suffering."

Even Professor Felix Adler's mind is drawn to a conclusion kindred to this, for in a recent lecture in New York he declares that there are men who are naturally incapable of religion, which, of course, makes them incapable of the crowning blessing of religion—eternal life. The end of such men must be *death*—destruction. In that statement and conclusion there is a large ingredient of materialistic disbelief.

With those various theories contrast the sublime awfulness and simplicity of Christ's teaching on this subject; and he speaks as having authority, and not as do theologians and theorizers. Indeed, on his teaching solely the whole doctrine rests. The epistles only echo his words. He certainly did not teach that the symbols he used were to be construed literally, nor did he use particular descriptive words about the *methods* and *nature* and *duration* of future punishment, but he stood under the "cope of the eternal world." None of his great sermons did he close without moving the curtain and pointing beyond to the sublime dread of the two great facts of *Rewards* and *Retribution*. He did not attribute the great facts to natural laws, he did not argue about them nor explain them, but declared them to be verities in the constitution of God himself. Future

Digitized by Google

punishment was so real to him that it thrilled him with consuming anxiety for men, as a mother in the presence of a burning house sees the face of her child in the window of an upper room, around which already shoot the tonguey flames, and she is frenzied to deliver him. Jesus taught that the penalty of sin is so great and the peril of the soul so imminent that he laid aside his eternal glory, and came down, *down* to earth, to toil, to shame, to suffering, to the bitterest death. What for? To teach theology? to build a church? to reveal some hidden truths? No! but to *seek and to save the lost.* This was the deep undertone of his whole ministry. He did teach sublime morals, gave new ideals of manhood; he revealed the Fatherhood of God, and established a blessed religion, but all this to save men from sin and its inexpressible perils. And he sent out his disciples—of whom we are—to carry out the same mission.

I believe all Christ has said on this subject. Is the punishment of sin eternal? Yes, *eternal.* How do you explain eternal? I don't explain it. Is there probation and restoration after death? Christ gave me no message of that nature to deliver, and it *would seem* to conflict with the one he did give. Is penalty endless *torments?* I hope not. Will sin at last—after, like a consuming fever, it reaches a crisis—utterly destroy (*απολυειν*) the very identity of the sinner, and as natural death scatters the body to the soil, the wind and the clouds, so spiritual death will destroy the spirit? *I do not know.*

It seems to me that a vital element in the sublimity, awfulness and dread of future retribution *is the mystery that surrounds it,* like a fiery sword, keeping the curious and presumptuous away.

In the measure men presume to explain its nature, method and duration, they make the dread truth familiar and contemptible. When we emphasize the awful wicked-

Digitized by Google

ness and guilt of sin, how that Jesus came from heaven, suffered and died to save men from it and its consequences; when we recall to men that the tender, compassionate, loving Christ declared time and again, with tremor in His voice, tears in His eyes and anguish in His Great Soul, that the consequences of sin, to the sinner, after death are terrible, mysterious and eternal, *men believe us.* Scripture finds an echo and endorsement in their conscience, and the very mystery and uncertainty about its nature, duration and method makes it still more dreaded. Every pulpit is consciously strong—strong in the belief of the people, strong in truth—when it declares:

"For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in the body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad; knowing, therefore, the terror of the Lord, we persuade men." II. Cor. 5 : 10, 11.

H. O. ROWLANDS.

Elgin, Ill.

Digitized by Google

II.

BROWNING ON IMMORTALITY.

IT is no mere coincidence that the world's great poets should agree in holding out to man the assurance of a destiny beyond the grave. The three greatest of the moderns, Dante, Shakespeare and Goethe, have chosen the future life, the one as the theatre of his action, the others as the background of their grandest scenes. Just in proportion also as a poet's grasp upon this central truth has been nerveless and unassured has his power over the human heart been superficial and transitory. Mathew Arnold, for example, seemed to sing the requiem to his influence with his "Dover Beach" lament, and apparently lost confidence in his own poetic gift before middle life.

The poet is, of necessity, a teacher and prophet of the spiritual world. And that realm, once postulated above the merely material and spacial relations of life, inevitably also over-spans the bounds of time and spurns every limitation. It may be said that the shadowy land, as an "undiscovered country," appeals to the imagination and gives it free scope; just as all the border-ground of mystery and dream outside the mapped and measured fields of scientific investigation is ever furnishing favorite themes for poetic treatment.

But more than this, the poet is seeking for the largest and grandest view of life. At one time he desires a magnificent arena and fit audience for his characters. At another he needs an under-swell and chorus to give compass and diapason to a song. Again, to employ still another figure, he wants a fit standing ground, unassailed by the

Digitized by Google

waves or storms about him, from which, with self-poised repose of spirit, to search for order and purpose amid the drifting masses of human life. These and many another situation demand an element to give depth and power to his work which only the thought of immortality can supply. His spiritual vision gains clearness and calm as it steadies itself upon the infinite horizon, and gazes long into the unfathomable heavens of another world.

True, our greatest poet can add no new facts to our sum of knowledge. He, no more than the rest of us, can summon witnesses from the silent land. He can only re-group and emphasize the truths we ought already to know. But he is able to do most of all men to remove the film from our spiritual vision gotten amid the dust and cloud of unworthy life. He can so rouse the emotions, and quicken the sensibilities, and enlarge the heart, that the grandest faith shall seem to us the truest. The poet is the true optimist, and so honors God by expecting from him all that man's deepest soul calls good.

Then, the poet is the revealer of man's spirit to himself. If he cannot pierce the veil that hides the future, he can find fore-gleams and intimations in the human heart that suggest its necessity and somewhat of its character. He listens to longings that earth will not still. He himself helps awaken desires that earth can never satisfy. He conceives for man a ravishing beauty which demands a heaven to realize. He sets up a standard and scale for human life which leave it "cribbed, cabined and confined" in its present sphere. He pictures a golden age, an ideal justice, a full harmony of being with action, of action with environment. And thus, out of heart-hunger, out of unrest, out of imperfection and decay, he builds, in sympathy with the Scriptures, the everlasting hope of the Gospel of personal immortality.

It speaks much for the real earnestness and receptive

Digitized by Google

spirit of our age, with all its talk of materialism, that its most characteristic poet should be pre-eminently a teacher of the doctrine of immortality. More than almost any other thinker of our time has Robert Browning occupied himself with this grandest of themes. His one principal argument is that always fundamental assumption to the poet that perfection must be found somewhere, or as Clough puts it:

"What here exists not must exist somewhere."

and all the incompleteness of this life is but evidence of a probation, and so a prophecy of an ampler one. All the strong passions and great moments of earthly existence require heaven to make them perfect. As "Abt Vogler," the musician sings:

"On the earth the broken arcs, in the heaven a perfect round."

In the present paper we shall simply, in the first place, select some of the great forces that sway Browning's characters, and observe how, as they reach their height, they inevitably cry out for another life, and afterward venture a brief examination of Browning's philosophy of life as a probation in view of an eternal future.

I.

The first theme of the popular poet is, almost necessarily, love. The mode of his treatment of this master passion is a sure touch-stone of a poet's quality. With Browning, love in its manifold forms and grades, is always considered as a mode of action rather than as a satisfactory contemplation. Love evolves and kindles the dormant forces of the soul. The soul, as a product of love, not love itself, is commonly the *motif* of his poetry.

It is a characteristic of Browning, as of most other poets of our time, not altogether healthful in its tendency, to

Digitized by Google

abandon the thought for the nonce to a single force, and consider it as supreme; to magnify it so that it fills the whole horizon, utterly reckless as to the symmetry of truth and the relative claims of different passions and duties. When love is uppermost, love is all. Love domineers over all life; its claims are first; its success, its free development, are all of glory, and excuse forgetfulness of the rest of man's life. Considered coldly and rationally, such treatment seems to involve a flavor of idolatry, almost, at times, the orgastic phrensy of paganism; or, if not quite that, at least an element of questionable morality. His lovers ever exult to have known that supreme:

> "Love that was life, life that was love."

One of his "Dramatis Personæ" cries:

> "Let me get
> Her for myself, and what's the earth,
> With all its art, verse, music worth,
> Compared with love found, gained and kept?"

Says Norbert, in the passionate drama, "In a Balcony":

> "Let me fulfil my fate;
> Grant me my heaven now. Let me know you mine,
> Prove you mine, write my name upon your brow,
> Hold you and have you, and then die away,
> If God please, with completion in my soul."

In the same play the queen, in love with Norbert, having tried all earth's other gifts first, exclaims:

> "There is no good of life but love—but love;
> What else looks good is some shade flung from love;
> Love gilds it, gives it worth. Be warned by me,
> Never you cheat yourself one instant, love,
> Give love, ask only love, and leave the rest."

In "Christina" the lover boldly asserts, in a philosophic

Digitized by Google

tone, that the true purpose of this life is just love between the sexes:

"Doubt you if, in some such moment,
As she fixed me, she felt clearly,
Ages past the soul existed,
Here an age 'tis resting merely,
And hence fleets again for ages;
While the true end, sole and single,
It stops here for is, this love-way,
With some other soul to mingle?

"Else it loses what it lived for,
And eternally must lose it;
Better ends may be in prospect,
Deeper blisses, if you choose,
But this life's end and this love-bliss
Have been lost here."

When we turn to any other controlling passion, we find that it, in its turn, has its hour and dominates all the thought. So that we have here not so much a philosophy of love as a style of poetic treatment. Love is not all of life any more than art is or learning, or any other of man's over-mastering pursuits.

That which has often been quoted as Browning's ethical creed reduces itself, on examination, to a kind of poetic license, an exaggeration for dramatic effect:

"If you choose to play—is my principle,
Let a man contend to the uttermost
For life's set prize, be it what it will.
* * * * *
And the sin I impute to each frustrate ghost
Was, the unlit lamp and the ungirt loin,
Though the end in sight was a crime, I say."

To return. Love, when it lightens the entire sky of life, reveals not only the immediate present, but unveils the remoter distances of the future life. The passion grows too vast for Time's boundaries; it demands eternity.

Digitized by Google

The lovers in "By the Fireside" have found that perfect unity of spirit that makes earth blessed, and then discover, almost to their surprise, that it needs heaven too:

"Think, when our one soul understands
The great Word which makes all things new,
When earth breaks up and heaven expands,
How will the change strike me and you
In the House not made with hands?

"Oh! I must feel your brain prompt mine,
Your heart anticipate my heart;
You must be just before, in fine,
See and make me see, for your part,
New depths of the Divine.

"But who could have expected this
When we two drew together first,
Just for the obvious human bliss,
To satisfy life's daily thirst
With a thing men seldom miss?"

In the story of blighted hopes called "Dis Aliter Visum," the frustrated spirit cries out for the higher world which love made perfect would have opened into:

"Was there naught better than to enjoy?
No feat, which done, would make time break,
And let us pent-up creatures through
Into eternity, our due?
No forcing earth teach heaven's employ?

"No wise beginning here and now,
What cannot grow complete (earth's feat),
And heaven must finish there and then?
No tasting earth's true food for men,
Its sweet in sad, its sad in sweet?

"No grasping at love, gaining a share
O' the sole spark of God's life at strife
With death, so sure of range above
The limits here?"

In the "Last Ride Together" nothing seems so natural and fitting as that life and love, at their highest point,

Digitized by Google

should blend at once, as it were unconsciously, into the light of heaven's new day:

> "What if heaven be that, fair and strong
> At life's best, with our eyes upturned
> Whither life's flower is first discerned,
> We, fixed so, ever should abide?
> What if we still ride on, we two,
> With life forever old yet new,
> Changed not in kind but in degree,
> The instant made eternity,
> And heaven just prove that I and she
> Ride, ride together, forever ride?"

Even love forbidden in this world is bold to rely on God's permission for a new career hereafter. Mildred, in "A Blot in the 'Scutcheon," in spite of the stain upon her name, when her brother comes to her with the farewell words of her lover, whom he has just slain in a duel, exclaims, almost in triumph:

> "You loosed my soul of all its cares at once;
> Death makes me sure of him forever. *You*
> Tell me his last words! *He* shall tell me them,
> And take my answer—not in words, but reading
> Himself the heart I had to read him late,
> Which death * * *"

Pompilia, the murdered and dying child-wife of "The Ring and the Book," ignoring all prohibitions of law or church, claims her priestly deliverer for her husband in the new life to which she is going:

> "O lover of my life, O soldier saint,
> No work begun shall ever pause for death!
> Love will be helpful to me more and more
> I' the coming course, the new path I must tread,
> My weak hand in thy strong hand, strong for that!
> * * * * *
> Marriage on earth seems such a counterfeit,
> Mere imitation of the inimitable;

Digitized by Google

In heaven we have the real and true and sure.
* * * * * *
So, let him wait God's instant men call years;
Meantime hold hard by truth and his great soul,
Do out the duty."

When we ascend to the highest aspiration of the poet himself, addressed to his own wife, the secret of the other life, as of this, is still love:

"Other heights in other lives, God willing,
All the gifts from all the heights, your own, Love."

Again, just as love requires a future life for completion, so joy, love's natural fruit, cannot abide as a fruition, but must live in hunger and thirst for deeper joys in another life. Cleon, the poet, having mastered all arts and intellectual achievements, finds their whole contribution to his soul-life to be that of raising him to an elevation from which to look out toward the future:

"Say * * *
* * * That every day my sense of joy
Grows more acute, my soul (intensified
In power and insight) more enlarged, more keen;
While every day my hairs fall more and more,
My hand shakes, and the heavy years increase.
* * * * *
* * * It is so horrible,
I dare at times imagine to my need
Some future state revealed to us by Zeus,
Unlimited in capability
For joy, as this is in desire for joy,
To seek which the joy-hunger forces us.
That stung by straitness of our life, made strait
On purpose to make sweet the life at large—
Freed by the throbbing impulse we call death,
We burst there as the worm into the fly,
Who, while a worm still, wants his wings."

Another of Browning's characters, in one of his later poems, confirms this sentiment:

"Pleasure must succeed to pleasure, else past pleasure turns to pain,
And this first life claims a second, else I count its good no gain."

Digitized by Google

All achievements of learning and art alike clamor for a freer field of work hereafter. Andrea Del Sarto expects, like Michael Angelo, to paint in heaven, with more room and vaster walls to fill :

> " In heaven, perhaps, new chances, one more chance;
> Four great walls in the new Jerusalem
> Meted on each side by the angel's reed,
> For Leonard, Rafael, Angelo and me to cover."

Here is a picture from " Easter Day " of Angelo actually at work in that more inspiring air of the upper life :

> " * * * Think, now,
> What Pomp in Buonarroti's brow,
> With its new palace-brain where dwells
> Superb the soul, unvexed by cells
> That crumbled with the transient clay.
> What visions will his right hand sway
> Still turn to form, as still they burst
> Upon him? How will he quench thirst,
> Titanically infantine,
> Laid at the breast of the Divine?"

The Grammarian of the Renaissance is content to consume a life-time studying the Greek particles and conjunctions, hoping to have ample time and opportunity in heaven to finish work so minutely and accurately begun :

> " Still, before living, he'd learn how to live—
> No end to learning.
> Earn the means first—God surely will contrive
> Use for our earning.
> Others mistrust and say, 'But time escapes,
> Live now or never.'
> He said, 'What's time? Leave Now for dogs and apes!
> Man has forever.' "

Once more, just as success and attainment in this life are never perfect without eternity to crown them, so, on the other hand, defeat and failure find sure consolation in the thought of more favorable opportunities hereafter. The young David, with his magnificent hope of redemption for

Digitized by Google

Saul through the yet unknown Christ, sees all his king's life-mistakes here below possibly turned to victories up above. He asks his own heart if he would not if he could, and so if the Saviour will not:

"Save and redeem and restore him, maintain at the height
This perfection—succeed with life's day-spring, death's minute of night?
Interpose at the difficult minute, snatch Saul, the mistake,
Saul, the failure, the ruin he sees now, and bid him awake
From the dream, the probation, the prelude, to find himself set
Clear and safe in new light and new life—a new harmony yet
To be run, and continued, and ended—who knows?—or endure!
The man taught enough by life's dream, of the rest to make sure;
By the pain-throb triumphantly winning intensified bliss,
And the next world's reward and repose by the struggle in this."

Abt Vogler, the musician, has caught from the tones of his organ secrets of the spiritual life, and rises from an hour of thrilled and rapt improvisation with a triumphal song proclaiming the ultimate success of all honest failure in some larger sphere:

"The high that proved too high, the heroic for earth too hard,
The passion that left the ground to lose itself in the sky,
Are music sent up to God by the lover and the bard;
Enough that he heard it once; we shall hear it by and by.
And what is our failure here but a triumph's evidence
For the fullness of the days? Have we withered or agonized?
Why else was the pause prolonged but that singing might issue thence?
Why rushed the discords in but that harmony should be prized?
Sorrow is hard to bear, and doubt is slow to clear.
Each sufferer says his say, his scheme of the weal and woe,
But God has a few of us whom he whispers in the ear;
The rest may reason and welcome; 'tis we musicians know."

The following from "Dramatis Personæ," offering to all failure a second trial, has a savor of final restorationism with which some of our author's other poems do not seem to accord:

"It's wiser being good than bad;
It's safer being meek than fierce:
It's fitter being sane than mad.

Digitized by Google

My own hope is, a sun will pierce
The thickest cloud earth ever stretched;
That, after last, returns the first,
Though a wide compass round be fetched;
That what began best can't end worst,
Nor what God blessed once, prove accurst."

II.

We come now to Browning's argument for the future life from the probationary element in the present one; implied of course more or less in many of the passages already quoted. All the darker side of this life, its brevity, its mystery, its sorrow, doubt, decay, confusions, are to be explained on the theory that this world is but a trial ground, a testing time, in a word, a probation; and hence all enigmas and limitations look forward to a heavenly day which shall resolve and complete them. The references to this view are frequent in all his volumes.

"Old Pictures in Florence" contains the artist's conception of this truth:

"When a soul has seen
By the means of Evil that Good is best,
And through earth and its noise, what is heaven's serene—
When its faith in the same has stood the test—
Why, the child grows man, you burn the rod,
The uses of labor are surely done.
There remaineth a rest for the people of God."

Norbert in "Men and Women" calls Constance to witness his determination to prove his worth, adding as his theory of life:

"I count life just—a stuff
To try the soul's strength on, educe the man.
Who keeps one end in view makes all things serve.
As with the body—he who hurls a lance
Or heaps up stone on stone, shows strength alike,
So I will sieze and use all means to prove
And show this soul of mine you crown as yours,
And justify us both."

Digitized by Google

The entire poem "Rabbi Ben Ezra," is devoted to an attempt to explain the problem of life with the idea of probation as its key.

The following stanzas are representative of the whole:

"For more is not reserved
To man, with soul just nerved
To act to-morrow what he learns to-day:
Here, work enough to watch
The Master work, and catch
Hints of the proper craft, tricks of the tools' true play.

* * * * * *

"All that is at all,
Lasts ever past recall;
Earth changes, but thy soul and God stand sure:
What entered into thee,
That was, is, and shall be:
Time's wheel runs back or stops; potter and clay endure.

He fixed thee mid this dance
Of plastic circumstance,
This Present, thou forsooth, would'st fain arrest:
Machinery just meant
To give thy soul its bent,
Try thee and turn thee forth, sufficiently impressed."

"A Death in the Desert" depicts St. John in his old age discoursing on the meaning and value of life with love, as usual, as its key note.

"For life with all it yields of joy and woe,
And hope and fear—believe the aged friend—
Is just our chance of the prize of learning love,
How love might be, hath been indeed, and is;
And that we hold thenceforth to the uttermost
Such prize despite the envy of the world,
And, having gained truth, keep truth: that is all.

* * * * * *

* * * This gift of truth
Once grasped, were this our soul's gain safe, and sure
To prosper as the body's gain is wont—

Digitized by Google

Why, man's probation would conclude, his earth
Crumble; for he both reasons and decides,
Weighs first, then chooses: * * *"

The Pope in "The Ring and the Book," called upon to decide upon the case of Guido who has murdered his innocent wife, is led into a discussion of the nature of life as a probation, which may fairly be taken as containing the author's own thought. He inquires:

"Is this our ultimate stage, or starting-place
To try man's foot, if it will creep or climb,
'Mid obstacles in seeming, points that prove
Advantage for who vaults from low to high
And makes the stumbling-block a stepping-stone?"

Struggle is desirable, temptation only a stimulus to deeper living, pain has an elevating power:

"Why comes temptation but for man to meet
And master and make crouch beneath his foot,
And so be pedestalled in triumph? Pray
'Lead us into no such temptations, Lord.'
Yea, but, O Thou whose servants are the bold,
Lead such temptations by the head and hair,
Reluctant dragons, up to who dares fight,
That so he may do battle and have praise."

His final advice to Caponsacchi, the heroic young priest, who has yet dallied somewhat with forbidden passions, is:

"Go!
Never again elude the choice of tints!
White shall not neutralize the black, nor good
Compensate bad in man, absolve him so:
Life's business being just the terrible choice."

The beautiful poem called "Easter Day," relates the self-conflicts of a mind unwilling to yield to Christianity because the evidence is not more logically overwhelming, and tells how the narrator, after such a mental struggle, once had a dream of the end of the world and the coming of the judg-

Digitized by Google

ment day. The dreamer is brought before the bar of God and realizes that he is doomed as having chosen the world:

"In very deed
(I uttered to myself) that Day!
The intuition burned away
All darkness from my spirit too:
There stood I, found and fixed, I knew,
Choosing the world.
* * * * * *
A voice
Beside me spoke thus, "Life is done,
Time ends, eternity's begun,
And thou art judged forevermore."
* * * * * *
"This world
This finite world thou hast preferred,
In disbelief of God's own word,
To heaven and to infinity.
Here the probation was for thee,
To show thy soul the earthly mixed
With heavenly it must choose betwixt.
The earthly joys lay palpable--
A taint, in each, distinct, as well;
The heavenly flitted, faint and rare,
Above them, but as truly were
Taintless, so, in their nature, best.
Thy choice was earth: * * *"
* * * * * *
Thou art shut
Out of the heaven of spirit; glut
Thy sense upon the world: 'tis thine
Forever—take it!

The guilty soul is at first only delighted, thinking the joy and beauty of this world all-sufficient; but he soon discovers that all the present uses of the world are suited alone to probation, and become a torment to the spirit, when made a final doom.

"He filled, did not exceed, man's want
Of beauty in this life. But through

Digitized by Google

Life pierce—and what has earth to do,
Its utmost beauties appanage,
With the requirement of next stage?
Did God pronounce earth very good?
Need must it be while understood
For man's preparatory state;
Nothing to heighten nor abate:
Transfer the same completeness here
To serve a new state's use—and drear
Deficiency gapes every side!
The good, tried once, were bad, retried."

After finding that earthly beauty, truth and love all help to form a hell, when separated from God and from the probationary conditions, the speaker at last gives up his case and implores one more chance, the hardest form of trial, if necessary, provided that it leave a hope of heaven at the end:

"Let that old life seem mine—no more—
With limitation as before,
With darkness, hunger, toil, distress:
Be all the earth a wilderness!
Only let me go, go on,
Still hoping ever and anon
To reach one eve the Better Land!"

Here heaven has pity on him, and he wakes to find it Easter day.

Browning's later poem, "La Saisiaz," is more distinctly based upon the subject of the future life than perhaps any other of his longer pieces. It also seems more burdened with personal feeling, and savors more of autobiography than most of his works. The poet has climbed a mountain in southern France with a lady friend, and enjoyed the magnificent prospect from its summit. They make another appointment for the succeeding day, to repeat the same ascent. The lady failing to keep the engagement, her friend takes the walk alone, and wonderingly returns to find that almost without warning she had passed away from this life,

Digitized by Google

during the night preceding. Some days after the funeral, the narrator makes still again the sad journey to the mountain top, where his musings are naturally full of his departed friend, and the question agitates his mind as to that world whither she has gone. The train of thought is that of an argument for immortality, though with much intervolved reasoning on kindred themes. The theory of a probation is the only one that brings real comfort to his spirit and satisfies his questioning heart. It is somewhat difficult to select single passages which convey the whole argument, and our impressions will be far more distinct if we study the poem as an entirety. We venture but the following:

"I have lived, then, done and suffered, loved and hated, learnt and taught
This—there is no reconciling wisdom with a world distraught,
Goodness with triumphant evil, power with failure in the aim,
If—(to my own sense, remember! though none other feel the same!)—
If you bar me from assuming earth to be a pupil's place,
And life, time—with all their chances, changes—just probation—space,
Mine, for me,

* * * * * *

"Only grant a second life, I acquiesce
In this present life as failure, count misfortune's worst assaults
Triumph, not defeat, assured that loss so much the more exalts
Gain about to be. For at what moment did I so advance
Near to knowledge as when frustrate of escape from ignorance?
Did not beauty prove most precious when its opposite obtained
Rule, and truth seem more than ever potent because falsehood reigned?
While for love—Oh how but, losing love, does whose loves succeed
By the death-pang to the birth-throe—learning what is love indeed.

* * * * *

Grant me (once again) assurance we shall meet each some day,
Walk—but with how bold a footstep! on a way—but what a way!—
Worst were best, defeat were triumph, utter loss were utmost gain."

Browning has been called "the poet of incompleteness, but of an inexhaustible suggestiveness." If this be a true

Digitized by Google

characterization, then it is not strange that he has given us no more satisfying nor detailed pictures of the nature of the other world. He is not the poet of detail, but of bold outlines. He is not often characterized by tranquil contemplation, but by tumultuous energy. His themes are usually life in action, thought in process of development, character in struggle. Hence the working value, the practical leverage which the hope of the future life gives men in trying to elevate themselves is more germane to his purpose than any idle fancies or vagrant speculations regarding particulars.

But who can estimate the moral inspiration which this the greatest thinker and poet of our age, has given to all the deeper faith of his time by conceiving man's lot in the larger light of an endless destiny, and by plying man's spirit with the incentives of immortality? His whole use of this grandest appeal to men is illustrated by this characteristic passage with which we conclude:

"Where he stands, the Arch Fear in a visible form,
Yet the strong man must go:
For the journey is done and the summit attained,
And the barrier's fall,
Though a battle's to fight ere the guerdon be gained,
The reward of it all.
I was ever a fighter, so—one fight more,
The best and the last!
I would hate that death bandaged my eyes, and forebore,
And bade me creep past.
No! let me taste the whole of it, fare like my peers,
The heroes of old,
Bear the brunt, in a minute pay glad life's arrears
Of pain, darkness and cold.
For sudden the worst turns the best to the brave,
The black minute's at end,
And the element's rage, the fiend-voices that rave,
Shall dwindle, shall blend,
Shall change, shall become first a peace, then a joy,
Then a light, then thy breast,
O thou soul of my soul! I shall clasp thee again,
And with God be the rest!

JAMES W. WHITE.

Digitized by Google

III.

THE TRIPLE BALLOT ESSENTIAL TO REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT.

Society is inevitably progressive.—SIR JAMES MACKINTOSH.

The world as it is is growing somewhat dim before my eyes; but the world as it is to be looks brighter every day.—HARRIET MARTINEAU, *Last View of the World.*

The people's government, made for the people, made by the people, and answerable to the people.—DANIEL WEBSTER.

There is what I call the American idea. . . . . This idea demands, as the proximate organization thereof, a democracy; that is, a government of all the people, by all the people, for all the people; of course, a government of the principles of eternal justice, the unchanging law of God; for shortness' sake I will call it the idea of Freedom. —THEODORE PARKER.

That this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.—ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

Christianity by itself no more teaches female suffrage than it does republicanism or free trade. But it throws into human society that sentiment of equality before God, that principle of equal rights and equal responsibility, and of universal brotherhood, which all lead logically to these results.—CHARLES LORING BRACE, *Gesta Christi.*

Nothing, however, can be more certain than that the man who takes upon himself the responsibility of founding and rearing a family, has a double responsibility, compared with the single and unmarried man, and should have a double vote. . . . The Household and Homestead Suffrage would place the voting power in our Republic where it was in the beginning, and where it should forever remain—not in the floating vote of homeless, houseless, unmarried men, crowded in great cities and towns, but in those men who are "Heads of Families," who reside and preside in the millions of happy, free and independent homes all over this broad land.—J. R. DOOLITTLE.

The Triple or Three-fold Ballot recognizes the right on the part of manhood, womanhood and the family to a voice in government. It includes male, female and household suffrage. It is, in short, universal suffrage.

Two ideas, closely related, have been brought forward in the advocacy of the Ballot in the political history of

Digitized by Google

English-speaking peoples. These are the ideas of protection and representation. A man with a ballot in his hand has a shield. He is thus the better able to defend himself against all who seek from whatever purpose to invade his domain of personal rights, whether it be monarch, priest, aristocracy, landlord, employer or usurper. Undue influences, as intimidation, bribery, corruption, have been and are still in vogue; but the legislative acts making them punishable serve, as a writer on the subject says, as an "expression of national opinion against all interference with individual judgment." Representation goes with protection, but is a higher idea. It shows the voter in a new light as a creative element. He does something toward making laws and enforcing them; he contributes toward a public policy and helps to build the fabric of the state.

Manhood Suffrage. This is, in theory at least, established in the American Republic. The rapid growth of the population from nations where the true nature of the ballot is not understood has partially demoralized public sentiment on this subject. But the American theory is right so far as it goes. Where the real character of the ballot is appreciated, manhood and government are both invested with new dignity and power. The present condition of the ballot is, confessedly, not what it should be, but retrogressive steps toward limiting it are not likely to be taken. A man learns to swim by swimming. He learns to use his freedom by being free. He learns to govern by governing. Society learns how to vote by using the ballot. To restrict manhood suffrage by a property qualification is based upon the doubtful idea that a man of property in land, etc., has more at stake than one who has comparatively little property of that kind. This is by no means an axiom. Extremes of wealth and poverty may both be inimical to the public good. While there are examples of enlightened philanthropy and public spirit among wealthy members of society, these per-

Digitized by Google

sonal and civic virtues are not always associated with property. Enlightened men know they have many interests involved in good government. That is sufficient. General enlightenment must be sought; in it lies the true path; the property qualification is a mere makeshift. The educational restriction, also, is objectionable. Under the idea of protection the poor and untaught are entitled to the defence of the ballot. Evils that have arisen are not owing to these causes so much as to the indifference of selfish though intelligent men and to the evil designs of men with enough mental training to be dangerous factors in civil society. Universal manhood suffrage is, at length, triumphantly established. The objections urged are not against the principle, but on points such as the character of the voter, the methods of election, matters likely to improve with the progress of civil society. The development of society has given manhood a firm grip of the ballot which is not likely to be surrendered.

> "A weapon that comes down as still
> As snowflakes fall upon the sod;
> But executes a freeman's will,
> As lightning does the will of God."

Womanhood Suffrage. It is difficult to see how persons conversant with the ideas that underlie the ballot hesitate to grant it to woman. The protective idea, by virtue of which the ballot is regarded as a shield, must apply to woman equally with man; nay, if woman is the weaker, does it not affect her more than man? The ballot is the defence of the weak as much as the prerogative of the strong. If the female sex is inferior to man in strength, that is an argument for investing woman with the ballot and putting a new defence about her weakness. The idea of representation and of creative power in shaping the government of society touches both sexes alike. The considerations of numbers, intelligence and moral qualities also have

Digitized by Google

weight. A representative government should give just recognition to the main elements of society. It cannot fit itself to their true needs unless it reflects in legislation and executive functions its great constituent elements. Manhood suffrage alone neither does nor can do this. Man, even if he had always the disposition, has not the knowledge in all governmental ways to speak for woman.

It is urged sometimes that woman is really a potent factor in the sphere of government as well as elsewhere, exerting her power upon manhood in numberless ways. This is doubtless true, but it only indicates that she is already, in a measure, a creative power in the State. The use of the ballot, therefore, in its highest form, would be nothing foreign to her.

There are questions in government which are clearly as much questions for woman as for man. War is such a question. Before a nation is plunged into war, it is woman's right to speak as well as man's. Her interest is as real and deep. She is as competent to judge of the call which summons a husband, son, father, or lover to do battle as is man himself. She is as much interested as man in the abolition of war, except as the direct necessity. When such occasions have arisen, woman has not failed. In an old poem, the nut-brown maid says to her knightly lover—

"Right well know ye that woman be
But feeble for to fight;
No womanhede it is indeed
To be bold as a knight;
Yet in such fear if that ye were
With enemies day or night,
I would withstand, with bow in hand,
To grieve them as I might,
And you to save; as women have
From death men many one."

Some claim no final disposition of the questions between government and the liquor power is likely to be made

Digitized by Google

until woman is free to add her influence to a better policy of government. Opinion may be divided as to whether men alone should legislate on divorce, and alone sit on juries in trials involving the property, liberty, or good name of woman. It may be said that legislation which is just and even favorable to woman may readily be secured. But whose right is it to judge of this? In the discussion of the Women's Suffrage Bill in the British House of Commons in 1871, Mr. Gladstone declared there were many laws which give to women "something less than justice." Herbert Spencer says that in the United States women have reached a higher status in the social structure than anywhere else. The history of woman, as she is treated in Roman, Teutonic, Old English law and comparatively recent legislation, shows how slow society has been to yield her a just due. And to-day there are burdens put upon her which, under better rule, would be lighter or wholly removed. Right legislation, in order to be effective, must be intrusted to proper executives, and such executives must be representative. Every idea that has been urged for manhood suffrage applies with equal or greater force to woman. The conservatism on this application of the ballot is a phenomenon in political history. It is difficult to see how, in the movement toward a more truly representative government, woman can be much longer totally excluded from suffrage.

James Mill, in his plan of representative government, at a time when the great body of British manhood had no vote, advocated unlimited manhood suffrage, but he excluded women from a share in government on the ground that she was represented by man as husband, father and brother. Macaulay sharply says that Mill thus "placidly dogmatizes away the interests of half the human race." The marvelous development of popular rule in recent decades has weakened such dogmatism. A clearer analysis of society and a more intelligent conception of the intent of the ballot may be ex-

Digitized by Google

pected to obliterate such as assumption altogether, and to invest woman with her civil rights.

Household or Family Suffrage. Mr. Barrows, in his excellent work on "Oregon," says: "Three persons, and no less, can carry agriculture, manufactures, trade and civil government into a wilderness and make it over into neighborhoods of good society; and those three are the husband, the wife and the child. Only the honorable and honored marriage tie can hold that society from turning back into savage wilderness. Without the sacred alliance implied in those two noblest and strongest words in language—husband and wife—there is no civilization to man." The family is the social unit. Society is as much a collection of families as of individuals, perhaps more. Or, rather, it is both a collection of families and of individuals.

The old idea of freeholder or household suffrage seemed to point to a certain property or household idea as requisite to the unit in government. Within the last few decades the tendency of government has been individualistic, and has embraced manhood alone. It may be claimed that this tendency is in part right, but womanhood cannot justly be overlooked, nor can the fact be set aside that the social unit is both the individual and family, and both are entitled to a place in representative government.

The fundamental ideas of the ballot affect the family as truly as they touch either manhood or womanhood. Take the intent of protection; to this the family is entitled. The same advantage which the ballot brings to manhood, it should bring to womanhood, also, and the family, namely: a shield and protection. The higher conception of representation and creative power in government are the just portion of the family also. Infancy, childhood, youth, that large portion of humanity which has not reached mature years, is included in the family. Heads of families, as such, are entitled to representation in government as direct as it

Digitized by Google

can properly be made. Ex-United States Senator J. R. Doolittle well says, in a recent paper on "The Land Question":

"The Constitution of each State should provide that every householder and head of a family who should live with and support his family in such separate homestead for such time as the Legislature shall prescribe, in addition to the one vote to which he is now entitled at any election, should have an additional vote to represent his family; so that every such permanent householder, occupying a homestead, shall have two votes—one to represent his manhood, and one to represent his family and household. . . . Nothing can be more certain than that the man who takes upon himself the responsibility of founding and rearing a family has a double responsibility compared with the single and unmarried man, and should have a double vote.

"The Household and Homestead Suffrage would place the voting power where it was in the beginning, and where it should forever remain—not in the floating vote of homeless, houseless, unmarried men, crowded in great cities and towns, but in those men who are the heads of families, who reside and preside in the millions of happy, free and independent homes all over this broad land."

The advantages of introducing the family to such civil rights are many and obvious. An investment of the household with the ballot is in full accord with the original idea of protection and the conception of representative government. In building a fairer social fabric, the influence of the family is indispensable. Like the influence of other factors of society, it should be brought to bear directly upon all functions of government.

Good and practical results would follow quickly upon the adoption of household suffrage. The cruel and merciless power termed the "Saloon in Politics" is, in its essence, demoralizing and destructive. It is the foe of the home.

Digitized by Google

It both impoverishes and desolates existing homes, and prevents new homes, so far as its direful influence can go. Put the ballot into the hand of the family, and it will protect itself against this ancient foe of social order. The human nest is entitled to protection as truly as the nest of a bird. This provision will go far to rid society of the shameful spectacle, so common, of the liquor trafficker placing his hand on every department of government, from the police to the legislature and judiciary.

Public education is principally a question for the family, and in its direction and control the family should have a voice. That power of expression can be given in no other way so direct and effective as by the ballot. The care of minors, the settlement of estates, the tenement-house evil, divorce legislation and many other interests, are matters which would be better cared for if the families of the land contributed their just part to shaping law and its administration, as they are unable to do under the present defective system.

The social evil stands confessed as an evil scarcely overmatched by the drink evil. There are innumerable men and women who ought to marry and found homes, yet they are deterred by various causes from such a step. Family life, to some extent, is at fault. While there are right-minded households which seek to live in a plain and rational way, the tide of extravagance is in, and a fondness for pomp and display has too often withered the simple, domestic life of the people as a frost nips the flower. Many households run a mad and foolish race, vieing with one another in a spendthrift way. They provide the necessities of life, they add comforts and luxuries, and press on in a feverish effort to outdo others in lavish wastefulness. The style of living of many wealthy families in great cities of our own and other lands is without defence, and must be pernicious in its effect upon family and social life. At the other extreme are im-

Digitized by Google

poverished homes, whose daily anxious inquiry is, "What shall we eat, what shall we drink, and wherewithal shall we be clothed?" and we may add, "How shall we be housed?" To equalize these vast disparities is clearly an intricate problem. To claim that one pet theory or plan will do it in a transient or permanent way smacks of quackery. But clothe the family with its right measure of civil power, defend it by the ballot, and thereby also make it a creative element in the development of society, and these interests will get a measure of attention they can in no other way receive. The tendency will be favorable to a simpler, more rational family life. This will be good for both extremes of society, the opulent as well as the poor, for riches and poverty alike may make life meaner than it should be. With the prevalence of more just ideas as to simplicity and economy, it will be possible for many to marry who are deterred from it as things are. Marriage is the true remedy for the social evil.

A triple ballot, as indicated, would secure a truly representative government. And it would represent humanity; that, rather than property, is the first thing to be considered. When it is rightly regarded, other features fall into their true places and proper relations. Humanity which needs to be reflected in government is most complex. No poet, politician, philosopher, or prophet has fully described or fathomed this deep and shoreless sea. Philosophies like that of Adam Smith, touching the economic relations of man, have only partial glimpses of humanity. Adam Smith's assertion of selfishness* as the first and chief motive in man's economic relations has tended to a one-sided and, to some extent, false view of life and man. It has, in truth, given life in its meaner aspects. Man is confessedly selfish, but

* It is disputed whether Adam Smith taught this doctrine, but Mr. Buckle attributes to him the teaching of the "passion of selfishness" as a ruling motive, and such is a very popular conception of Adam Smith's economic philosophy.

Digitized by Google

he is something more; he is also unselfish. Love, sacrifice, worship, noble and heroic virtues, are illustrated in humanity as well as base and groveling ways. In the science of government, the complexity of human motives and social necessities has led to the proposal of all kinds of remedies; but, so far as government can meet the case, the idea of a truly representative government, the mirror of humanity, is in the line of the civil development of the race, and seems to be the only path of promise. The industrial features of this age bring into prominence questions of work, but work is merely a part of man's experience. Life is a work-shop; it is, besides, a play-ground, and it is a temple; in it many things enter. Work frequently comes to the front, but in industrial conflicts we may recognize something deeper, even the strong conviction that life is more than work, man more than a drudge—

> "'Tis life of which our nerves are scant,
> O life, not death, for which we pant,
> More life, and fuller, that we want."

The Communist thinks he has a solution in the division of property; the idea is absurd and inadequate; not property, but humanity, is the uppermost thing. Socialism proposes a gigantic interference with personal liberty in a system starting with the idea of distributing the results of labor. Here, too, it is evident that a beginning is attempted at the wrong point; humanity, humanity, is the initial point of right government. The epigram of an absolute ruler coined by Louis XIV., "I am the State," is, of course, of a past age. The taking phrase, "That people is best governed which is least governed," condemns the paternal theory of government; aside from that, it may be used to express caution, ignorance, or despair in government. The police theory of government, "to protect person and property," may be compressed or expanded according to the

Digitized by Google

meaning you choose to attach to it. Social Utopias from Plato down to Bulwer have conceived the ideal society to lie in systems imposed from without, in scientific progress, or Arcadian simplicity. The Angel of Truth deserves a welcome reception from whatever direction she comes; the surest progress and the fairest hopes, however, seem to be attainable in pursuing the historic lines toward true representative government—a government which is the product of human experience, at once the shield and creation of humanity.

To such a form of society we may apply the immortal words of John Milton: "Methinks I see in my mind a noble and puissant nation, rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks; methinks I see her as an eagle, muing her mighty youth, and kindling her undazzled eyes at the full midday beam, purging and unscaling her long-abused sight at the fountain itself of heavenly radiance."

WALTER SCOTT.

Digitized by Google

IV.

THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE MORAVIAN CHURCH.

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVEN years ago a band of exiles from Moravia felled the first tree for the building of a house in what was described as "an extremely wild and marshy spot, overgrown with bushes and briars, at the declivity of the hill called the Hutberg, and on the high road between Löban and Zittan (in Saxony), and at times impassable for carts and wagons." Looking over the landscape from the top of the Hutberg now, one sees in every direction fertile fields, highly cultivated; groves of forest trees; rounded hills, some heavily wooded, others cleared and tilled to their very tops; villages with church spires and factory chimneys; the whole valley inclosed like a picture in a frame by surrounding hills and mountains, the most distant and imposing being the Giant Mountains of Bohemia.

The village at the foot of the Hutberg, showing its roofs of red and brown tiles among the green foliage, is Herrnhut, founded by the Moravian exiles. Its houses are stone built and large; its streets paved and scrupulously clean; bright flowers bloom on many window ledges; beautiful gardens, with shade trees or arbors, invite the passer-by to rest or enjoyment, while outlying groves or charming walks tempt one to new surprises without weariness.

All streets lead up to the open square in which stands the church, facing nearly east, and forming one side of a

Digitized by Google

block of buildings with four fronts. On the front, looking to the west, this inscription appears:

Am 12 Mai 1724
war die Gründung
Dieses ersten Betsaals
in Herrnhut
D. 12 Mai 1824.

It was here that the early brethren worshipped, using this hall, with frequent enlargements, for a century, though the congregation was often obliged to find standing room on the pavement outside.

As one turns from reading this inscription, a similar tablet will be seen just across the square, which marks the first house built in 1722. Across the street, to the right of the new church, is the Sisters' House, and on the corner, to the left, is the Widows' House, in the Prayer Hall of which the General Synods of the Unitas Fratrum, or Moravian Church, have been held for a century.

It was in this hall, on the 27th of May, 1889, that delegates from the German, English and American provinces, together with the bishops, who are members *ex-officio* of the Synod, and missionaries summoned from Africa, the West Indies and from Surinam gathered. A graceful decoration, with "100" as a center-piece, emphasized this as a centennial Synod. One hundred years before, Bishop Spaunenberg sat where Bishop Wm. Taylor, of England, was presiding, supported by Bishops Miller and Levering as Vice-Presidents. Bishop Miller, born in Greenland of missionary

Digitized by Google

parentage, does not captivate one at the first glance, nor yet with his first words of official welcome pronounced by him as the President of the Unity's Elders' Conference. But this man, whose kindly face lights with a smile as often as he extends his hand to the brethren, or is so serious with weighty thought, to which he gives wise and forceful utterance, grows hourly upon one, until, like another Jonathan, one would strip off one's armor and put it upon him, though he is fully panoplied in his own.

The desks to the right and left of the President are occupied by members of the Unity's Elders' Conference, the highest Governing Board of the church, elected at each General Synod, and controlling the mission work and all affairs of the Unity in the intervals between. Among them, on opposite sides of the President's table, are two faces that attract attention—two strong personalities, who, as the days go on, are found upon opposite sides of nearly every question. Both heads are massive, both faces clean shaven. One is from Switzerland originally, republican in principle, progressive and radical in all his views. His fervent piety breathes its warmth in his prayers. He is gentle as a woman, bold as a lion, championing measures against odds that might well frighten another, for he must contend against the conservatism of a century, strengthened by the habits of thought, customs and forms of the country, nearly all his colleagues against him, and most of them giants. But Bishop Richard was leader of an enthusiastic following on the floor of the Synod.

The other is Brother Burkhard, whose eagle eye, ringing voice, crystalline statement and merciless logic compel a hearing, if they do not carry conviction. Here is a Bismarck, one feels, though without the brutality of the Iron Chancellor; an iconoclast, if need be, who will not fear to strike an idol, whether it is the beer-drinking habit or a cherished mission field. He holds ecclesiastical titles in

Digitized by Google

contempt, measuring men by their brains—a cold man, apparently, by contrast with the warmth of fraternal love dominant in that "large upper room," but not insensible to it. Near him sits Bechler, whose seventeen years in Africa and long service in the Mission Department of the Elders' Conference make him, even now in feeble health, the encyclopædia of missionary facts, figures and general information. Next is the saintly Connor, an Englishman, from whose lips the most elaborate and finished German rolls as from a printing press. Even the casual observer would readily select the polished and lovable Erxleben as the Berlin Prediger among whose auditors the old Emperor Wilhelm, Von Moltke and Waldersee have been noted; or, hearing the voice of Wunderling, believe him *the* preacher of the German Moravian Church. A blind man, not knowing where he was, might readily believe himself listening to noted Methodist preachers. None, catching the glow of the faith of these men in prayer, or the fire of their eloquence in the pulpit, will wonder at that which still abides among the followers of the missionary to Georgia who met up with a Peter Böhler.

Almost in front of the President sat Bishop Reichel, for more than fifty years in active service, and who, though seventy-six years old, was the most radical member of the Synod, in sharp contrast with the characteristic conservatism of the German mind, which moves slowly, very slowly, and not always surely, toward change.

Seated directly behind was one of the younger members—Hassè, of the English delegation, whose equal fluency in English and German, and wonderful aptness as interpreter, made him almost indispensable in a body of men among whom two languages were spoken, the majority of whom understood only German. His alertness, readiness in debate, general information and strong individuality would make him a marked man in any assembly. Buchner,

Digitized by Google

strong and earnest, the only German preacher who has the temerity to wear a mustache, in spite of the rigid laws which prescribe the cut and quantity of hair on the clerical face, was the leader of "Young Germany." But "Young Germany" comes to the fore in the forties, and therefore is neither rash nor foolish.

"Where are you located?" asked a German delegate of the writer.

"At ——."

"Not as the pastor of the congregation?"

"Certainly. I have been in charge of congregations, as pastor, for seventeen years."

"Seventeen years! Happy man! We think that we are doing well to be pastors or to hold independent positions at forty."

Among the measures occupying the time and attention of the Synod, the first to be brought to successful issue was the dropping from the *Synodal Results*—the law-book of the church—the chapter regulating the use of the lot, and all mention of the lot in any connection, where it has stood from the very beginning of the church. Petitions requesting this change had been sent up to the General Synod from the Synods of the German, English and Southern Province of the American Moravian Church, and was supported also by the delegates of the Northern Province. Strange as it may seem, there were not wanting, even at this late day, those who warmly advocated this means of ascertaining the will of the Lord with reference to nearly all questions of church work or service requiring a decision on the part of the individual or of Church Boards. But the mind of the Synod was set strongly against its continuance, and a large majority—a two-thirds vote, indeed—laid the lot to rest as a part of our church machinery. Hitherto, for example, the names of candidates for the episcopacy were sent to the Unity's Elders' Conference. These names were

Digitized by Google

submitted to the lot. Acceptance of office, or of a call to any service, was submitted to the lot, or to the decision of the Lord by the lot. For the first time in the history of the church the newly elected Unity's Elders' Conference accepted office without the use of the lot at the Synod of 1889, and a bishop elected by that body also announced his acceptance of the office in like manner.

Three fields of labor engage the energies of the church as a whole, and necessarily called for the attention of the Synod, viz.: the Foreign Mission Work, the Mission Work in Bohemia and Moravia, and the Leper Hospital in Jerusalem. The last named was adopted by the Synod as justly claiming the prayers and gifts of the whole church, its every congregation and every members. It is the youngest and it may well be called the "sick child" of the Moravian Church, for whose care the church must needs train moral heroes. No less than twelve persons answered the call for volunteers to enter this trying field of labor.

The Mission Work in Bohemia and Moravia, the ancient seats of the Unitas Fratrum, was inaugurated by the General Synod of 1869, in accordance with petitions from three provinces, sent without previous consultation or agreement. It was natural, therefore, that this cause should claim due attention. Several years since an act of toleration on the part of the Austrian Government recognized the Unitas Fratrum, and granted liberty for her work. There are still annoying restrictions which hamper its prosecution. During the session of the Synod at which the report of the Bohemian Committee was heard, the announcement was made that our missionary, Brother Hartwig, and his daughter, were at that very hour to answer at court the charge of having tried to proselyte the children attending school at the orphanage over which they preside. Though the charge was dismissed, it shows the closeness with which every movement is watched, and the

Digitized by Google

carefulness necessary on the part of the missionaries. The Synod resolved to continue the prosecution of this work with all possible vigor, especially in Prague, as the evangelization of the nation must proceed from the capital. The time will come when the Bohemians and Moravians will turn to their old national church, which the false-hearted bigot, Ferdinand II., stamped out with fire and sword in the anti-Reformation during the early part of the seventeenth century.

With reference to the Foreign Mission Work, the main effort of the Synod was directed to the missions in the West Indies. Here the difficult problem of self-support is being solved amid difficulties and obstacles rendered almost insuperable among negroes recently manumitted, and at a time when repeated failure of crops and earthquake shocks have added to the poverty and distress incident upon great social changes. The Report of the Mission Department of the Unity's Elders' Conference was an exhaustive document covering the condition of the various missions. Repeated invitations to enter new fields were necessarily, though reluctantly, declined for want of means. Before the close of the Synod the cheering announcement would be made that the deficit in the mission accounts for the previous year had been wiped out, and that several generous gifts had been received for new work in India or in China. In the light of such providential leadings, it seems anomalous that a church which entered upon the work of carrying the Gospel to the heathen in simple obedience to the command "Go preach," by sending two men to the island of St. Thomas with only a few marks between them, must needs decline to enter any neglected or unoccupied field.

The separation of the Unity's Elders' Conference from the German Provincial Conference was a measure proposed by the Synod of the Northern Province of the American Moravian Church. A word in explanation of the constitu-

Digitized by Google

tion of the Unitas Fratrum may be welcome at this point. The congregations of Germany, Switzerland, Holland and Russia constitute the German Province, those in England, Ireland and Scotland the British, while the churches in North America are divided into two provinces. Each province has its own Synod, electing its own Provincial Elders' Conference, and also delegates to the General Synod. Provincial Synods meet triennially or less frequently, General Synods every ten years. The General Synod, in its turn, elected heretofore a Mission Board of four members, which, with the Boards of Education and of Wardens, composed of four members each, elected by the German Synod next preceding the General Synod, constituted the Unity's Elders' Conference. From each of these two Boards one member was again elected, who, with the Mission Board or Department, according to Moravian phraseology, constituted the Unity's Department, having especially in charge the maintenance of fraternal relations between the provinces. But the whole Board of twelve was at the same time the Provincial Conference for the German Province. This arrangement arose, doubtless, from the fact that the missionaries were, for the most part, from the German Province, and that the funds for the carrying on of the mission work, for the education of the children of missionaries, and the support of superannuated missionaries and widows of missionaries were created and administered by the German Province.

The preponderance of the German element was manifestly too great. "Young Germany," too, felt that the official element in their Provincial Synods—the presence and vote of the twelve members of the Unity's Elders' Conference—not wholly conducive to provincial freedom.

The proposal to make a Unity's Elders' Conference to take charge of the work of the missions, and to care for the fraternal relations and organic unity of the provinces, en-

Digitized by Google

tirely separate and apart from any German Provincial Board, was too radical a measure for the German mind to grasp in even a five weeks' session of Synod, despite the fact that the German Province was entitled to the same independence as the British and American Province. Independence is not characteristic of German life and government. It is the vital breath of the Englishman and the American. In a body in which the German vote outnumbered the English and American vote combined, only a step towards so radical a change was possible, but that was a long step as Synodal enactments measure up. A compromise, carried with but one dissenting vote, took from the German Synod the four votes of the members of the Mission Department, and from the General Synod the votes of the members of the Conference elected by the German Synod into the Education and Wardens' Departments. These appoint one of their number as representative to the Synod. Prizing as we do the organic unity of our church, we would not mar nor impair that unity. But with a membership in the United States and in England largely outnumbering that in Germany, the Directing Board of the Unity should more strongly reflect the character of its English and American elements. As the church is no longer a unity of German Brethren only, its Directing Board cannot continue so essentially German.

Many difficulties, more imaginary than real to an American mind, are raised when questions involving any change in the form of government come up. Chief among these may be noted the fact that the estates of Count Zinzendorf have passed into the possession of the church of which he became the patron, and in which he served as pastor, missionary and bishop. His position over against the Saxon Government as the patron of the refugees who came from Bohemia and Moravia after the Thirty Years' War, and who insisted upon organizing a communion neither

Digitized by Google

Catholic, Lutheran, nor Calvinistic, was made the more delicate because the Peace of Westphalia, which gave religious liberty and peace to Europe, recognized only these three forms of worship and faith. It was no time for irresponsible parties to experiment with the newly acquired religious liberty. Lutheran and Calvinist could be intolerant as the Catholic had been. Hence, as the patron of the Unitas Fratrum, Zinzendorf, who was a statesman as well as a preacher, sought to shield this new and weak body of believers by keeping them entirely upon his own estates. When necessity drove the brethren and himself out of his ancient family possessions, he bought new tracts of land for them to locate upon. In consequence, his estates became bankrupt, and after his death his heirs proposed to make over the property of the family to the church, if the church would assume the indebtedness. With such consummate skill was the work of settling the estate managed, and with such blessing was it attended, that an indebtedness of a million and a quarter was extinguished, and, in addition, funds established for sustentation of retired ministers and missionaries, for educational and other purposes. But the Unity's Elders' Conference became the legal successors of Count Zinzendorf by this arrangement, and continue to this day lords of the manor. To this Conference belongs, as formerly to Zinzendorf, the naming of the candidates from whom the pastor of the Lutheran State Church at Berthlesdorf must be selected by the Government; and he, when settled, must pay his respects at once to the President of the Conference as to a living Count. It is also incumbent upon the Conference to send printed copies of the enactments of General Synod to the Governments of the countries in which the churches of the province are located, or in which its work is carried on, as in Austria.

The overshadowing presence of the State Church has made the brethren unduly cautious, not to say timid, in the

Digitized by Google

direction of church extension, and greatly desirous to maintain the harmlessness of the dove both in Synodal legislation and in active evangelization, while exercising, at the same time, the wisdom of the serpent as the administrator of landed estates and other property, for this ecclesiastical Heerschaft hangs measurably on the favor of princes.

Under these circumstances the spirit of liberty among the brethren was the more remarkable. Full often it appeared impossible that any ground of agreement could be found, so divergent were the views advocated. These differences were not idle whims, but convictions moulded by diverse national characteristics, and growing out of a common desire to promote the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. Still, the "unity of the spirit in the bond of peace" was sweetly prevalent. For, after all these discussions, there were no heart-burnings, nor out-cropping party spirit, nor dissentions, but only this one sentiment: "We be brethren."

On every hand, as the work of the Synod drew to a close, were heard words of regret at the inevitable parting. Business men said: "How good that we can meet together at least once in ten years to learn to know each other as brethren. The Synod is worth all that it costs, if nothing else were accomplished."

This thought found frequent utterance. On the morning of the final adjournment the writer was hailed by several citizens of Herrnhut, hurrying to overtake him. Said one:

"It is too bad that the Synod is over. We have learned so to love the brethren. Those from England we have known, but you Americans have stolen the hearts of half of Herrnhut."

Bishop Reichel's farewell was very touching, recalling the fears and suspicions felt toward the measures of the American brethren in 1857, and now again in 1889. "Yet

Digitized by Google

we find them to love the Unity as sincerely as we do, and now we dread the parting far more than we did the meeting."

To those to whom the unity of the brethren had been a beautiful ideal, that unity became a reality. A single sad memory casts its gloom over this bright experience. One of our American delegation was stricken with paralysis in June. He lingered through July at Berthlesdorf, the guest of Bishop Richard. On August 10th he died there, full of faith and hope, going from the delightful fellowship of those early Summer days to "the assembly of the just made perfect." Earthly ties were severed, but the Unity of the Brethren received no shock. For—

> "One army of the living Lord
> In earth and heaven we bow;
> Part of the host have crossed the flood,
> And part are crossing now."

And though he never set out upon the return journey to his native land, the good brethren of Herrnhut, according to their beautiful custom, will write upon the tombstone of Bishop A. A. Renike, of New York:

* "HEIM GEGANGEN."

W. H. VOGLER.

* Gone home.

Digitized by Google

V.

PSYCHICAL INFLUENCES IN CONVERSION.

THE question suggested in our title is a profound one, and we have no expectation that our plummet can sound its depths. Its importance and general interest, however, must awaken frequent and earnest thought in many minds.

A little definition may be useful at the outset.

By conversion is meant that action of the mind in which the sinner turns from sin and turns to Christ. Viewed in its first or negative aspect, it is repentance. Considered in its second or positive aspect, it is faith. It is the human side of that great change which, regarded from its divine side, we call regeneration. It is the voluntary, moral, spiritual Godward activity of the man. In its supreme and saving quality it is the operation of the rational and spiritual nature, quickened by the spirit of God.

"Psychical" used to be synonymous with "psychological," and hence meant "pertaining to the human soul." Psychology is the science of the human mind. Sir William Hamilton defines it as "the science conversant about the phenomena of the mind, or conscious subject, or self, or ego." In this sense, evidently, there is no theme for discussion in our topic. Its first and last terms contain identical ideas. From first to last, whatever else it may be, conversion is at least psychological.

Recent metaphysicians, however, use "psychic" and "psychical" in a different sense from the foregoing. They use it to mark the difference between *psuche*, the living principle in man, and *pneuma*, the rational and spiritual part of his nature. Such a distinction exists in usage and

Digitized by Google

in fact. Without intending to indorse any trichotomous theory of human nature, for we do not think the Scriptures or other sources of knowledge give sufficient foundation for such a theory, we can perceive a distinction of powers and susceptibilities in man which concerns all his voluntary acts. We are material. Of the dust we are made, to the dust we must return. Like the unorganized stone, or like the organized, living, though unfeeling, unperceiving plant or tree, we have a body, a *sōma*. Farther than this, we have a possession kindred to the brutes. We have an animal nature. We have senses, nerves, desires, immoral affections, appetites, passions in common with the beasts. Accompanying this is the faculty of perception, a certain amount of intelligence, feelings approaching shame and regret, and the power of voluntary action under the influence of motives appealing to these sensibilities and powers. We are sentient beings, possessed of a sentient principle. This is what, in the Pythagorean and Platonic philosophy, was termed the *psuche*, and it is to this sphere of phenomena that, consonant with recent usage, we apply the epithet "psychic," or "psychical." Beyond or above this lies that spiritual capacity and energy which reasons, intuits, perceives the nature and obligation of right, is conscious of merit and demerit, feels remorse, repents, aspires for heavenly things, apprehends Christ and communes with God. In all these mental operations man is dealing with the super-sensible world. To these is the Gospel's primary appeal. With these, conversion is chiefly concerned. This is the realm of *pneuma*. True religion is most profoundly concerned to influence the pneumatic man.

But is this a sufficient statement of the phenomena of conversion? Is appeal to the *pneuma* alone commonly effective in religious work, or rather is it the only legitimate appeal?

Are there in true conversion influences by, or in, or on the

Digitized by Google

psychic element of man? This is the question with which we are concerned, and the importance of which we shall attempt suggestively to point out.

It is our conviction that such influences are common, in some degree perhaps universal, in conversion, and that they are legitimate in accordance with the divine plan.

We judge this from the very nature of the case. For purposes of comparison it is very convenient to cut man up into various faculties and powers. But it is always important to remember that, however sharp and logical our divisions, they have not a strict counterpart in nature. Man may have powers somatic, psychic, and pneumatic, but "a man's a man for a' that." He is not two or three, but one. His personality is single. It is all concerned in his voluntary acts. Luther is said to have remarked that a man needs a threefold conversion, in head, heart, and purse. In true conversion the whole man moves. His spirit may be supreme, but his soul, and even his body are influenced. Most assuredly a regenerate spirit, converted to Jesus Christ, manifests its new life in a purified soul and an obedient, consecrated body. If the converted *pneuma* thus uses *psuche* and *sōma* as channels of its new life, why may not *sōma* and *psuche* be avenues of approach to the convertible *pnuema*? Why also may they not be used by the pneumatic human agent in effecting the conversion of the one whom he would win?

The records of Scripture seem to sustain our position. The nature of the Biblical evidence is general, and its pertinence may by some be questioned. Yet most careful students will, we think, assent to our affirmations. When we read that as Paul reasoned of righteousness, self-control, and judgment to come, "Felix trembled," we receive an impression that there was something more here than a mere inward spiritual shudder. The spiritual man effected the animal man. The inward thought wrote itself on the visible countenance. The tremor of conscience caused tremor

Digitized by Google

of nerve. Felix, the whole man, was excited. In his solemn appeals, too, Paul's manner and words were addressed to and impressed his hearer's sentient being. We suspect that by a psychic as well as by a purely moral avenue, entrance was secured for the truth into Felix's mind.

We are similarly impressed as we read the Gospels, particularly that of Mark, in their record of Jesus' ministry. Who can examine the account of his preaching in the synagogue at Nazareth, his passing safely through the mob that would have hurled him from the precipice, his look on Peter, his withering treatment of the Pharisees, his cleansing of the temple, his meeting of the soldiers come to arrest him in the garden, without a certain nervous thrill which is as much antecedent to, as consequent of, the deeper and only permanently valuable impression on our moral and spiritual being? What we experience psychically, in connection with the use of the printed page, and by the power of partly sensuous imagination, can be but a tithe of what was felt by those who by immediate perception saw the face, heard the words, and felt the presence of our incarnate Lord.

The miracles of Jesus were an appeal to man's psychic nature. It is true that such an appeal was wholly subsidiary to their spiritual intent. But these mighty works addressed the senses. They were signs, wonders. They startled. Their design in part was by an extraordinary appeal to men's sensuous perceptions to awaken attention, prompt enquiry, reach the spirit, and lead to right action.

In short, without particularizing in this direction further, we may say that the whole plan of diffusing truth and building up the kingdom of God, as it is presented in Scripture, supports the view which we are taking. Why is it that the Word becomes incarnate? Why is it that men are commissioned to herald the Gospel message? It is not an abstract organization, it is not an invisible truth, or a disembodied spirit, it is not a manuscript page which is to be the agency

Digitized by Google

in building up the church. It is incarnated truth. It is ideas and, or better, *in* men. It is the message, so to speak, *personalized.* The reason why a printed sermon never can be the same as a spoken sermon, the reason why the press never will displace the pulpit is that through the spoken word, by real preaching, the man, somatic, psychic, and pneumatic, in all his personality, addresses his hearer. This element of personality, so clearly recognized in all God's dealings with his people of old, is not a mere pneumatic element. It is not the realm of mere conscience and reason. It is warm with life. It pulses and glows with feeling. It abounds in enthusiasm. It is full of sentiment which, when analyzed, yields no small proportion of psychic force. The emotion is that of a sentient as well as a spiritual being, and it moves men.

Thus philosophy and Scripture allow and suggest a place for sensationalism in the pulpit. A cultivated and over-sensitive age has sometimes treated slightingly what God affords and blesses. Let us not be misjudged at this point. We do not endorse exaggeration. We most heartily despise deliberate violations of taste, incongruous associations of the sublime and ridiculous, artificial strainings and devices for momentary or mere dramatic effect. But in winning men to the love and service of Jesus Christ there is needed a proclamation of truth that impresses. It must first get the ears of people. To benefit it must interest. We are not afraid of the preacher who can thrill his hearers. One avenue to the heart is through the nerves. Magnetism may be a stepping stone to conviction of sin.

At least, *observation and the history of generations seem so to teach.* There are certain types of character, contemplative, unexcitable, which are apparently brought to the Saviour by mere reflection. We have known of persons won by a single word of Scripture long held in memory unemphasized by any friend's or preacher's personal appeal.

Digitized by Google

But such is not the common experience. Many, indeed the majority of persons, are active by nature and necessity. Their lives are full of cares. The world is constantly appealing to their sentient powers. Religion with them gets its first effective approach to the will through the psychic man.

We recall a sermon which we were privileged to hear from the lips of a great Southern preacher. It was on the Duty of Complete Consecration to God. No discourse before or since has so moved us, or has been spiritually so abiding and fruitful. But as we analyze the experience of that blessed hour we discover distinct psychic elements. There was a fascination, an indefinable, mesmeric, magnetic, psychologic, power—a something, call it what you please—that was inferior to the spirit, was indeed the organ of the spirit, a psychic, nervous, animal force subsidiary to the purely intellectual and moral force, but opening up most marvellously the way of approach and mastery for moral and religious truth. Clearly the Holy Spirit had touched the preacher's spirit. But the human spirit was working also by the human soul, and this stirred the hearer's soul, and prepared the hearer's spirit for devotion to the hearer's God. Through the lower man of each the best man of each came face to face and both were with God.

And is not such force recognized in every department of the secular life? Who are the natural leaders in war, in legislation, in politics, in business, in commerce, in all active pursuits? Usually men of superior psychic as well as intellectual force. If psychic influence is so effective in leading to action in wordly things, may it not be as effective in leading to that voluntary religious decision which constitutes conversion?

The Pauls, Luthers, Wesleys, Whitfields, Edwardses, Moodys, Varleys, Earles, men blessed above their fellows in w nning others to personal decisions for Christ, in per-

Digitized by Google

suading men to give their wills to God, have been endowed with unusual psychic power. God has used that force in breaking down the opposition of foes or winning the active consent of unconfessed friends.

In unnumbered cases the will is the seat of all the difficulty in conversion. The judgment is convinced, conscience imperatively commands repentance and faith, but the will does not move. We have seen a glass of water full and heaped above the rim. It only needed a little shake of the hand to make it overflow. A watch may lie on the jeweler's desk, cleaned, repaired, and already to run. It needs some one to lift and shake it, and then straightway you hear it going "Tick, tick, tick." What pastor does not know scores of such people? It is not more truth or more appeal to the moral sense which is needed. Humanly speaking, there is need of more of that subtle, persuasive force, that ability to lead men and to persuade them to do what you wish, which certainly is, in great part, psychic in its nature, and which, for short we may call psychic influence.

If the views we have presented are true they answer *the question whether this psychic power is to be coveted by the worker for souls.* Of course it is to be desired. It is the secret, humanly speaking, of some men's extraordinary success in winning converts to Christ. Other men with better minds, with as consecrated hearts, with as earnest desires for a fruitful ministry do not reap in such measure.

We notice that the physician often reaches the body of his patient through influencing his mind. Conversely, the healer of human hearts may be able to benefit the spirit of his hearer through some inferior psychic powers.

The simple fact is this: We are here in the body, we have animal or psychic functions consisting in part of perception and volition. Our bodily and psychic states condition the spirit's receptivity of truth. We seek to have fresh air, quiet, seclusion, pleasant surroundings, inspiring sing-

Digitized by Google

ing, attractive preaching. These influences are as important in conditioning the spirit's use of truth, or activity in voluntary choice. They condition conversion as truly as they condition understanding and conviction.

Hence, we go so far as to say that the possession of some measure of this power is included in the divine call to preach. The work of an editor, a theological professor, a religious secretary, may necessitate little or no psychic power. Such laborers have a peculiar mission and a peculiar sphere of influence. But the pastor must rally men. He must engender enthusiasm for himself, for the truth, above all, for Jesus Christ. He must build up men in religious knowledge, indeed, but he *must win souls*. He must have the God-given power of getting men to act. If he is to be a truly successful preacher, he must make things move. To accomplish this he needs psychic as well as pneumatic power.

We are not prepared to say how far such power is capable of conscious cultivation. No doubt it is, in part, inherited. It is also, like other talents, given to some, and, except in very slight measure, withheld from others. We surely would not go so far as to encourage studied introspection for the purpose of noting its presence or measuring its degree. Yet we would commend attention to those conditions which seem adapted to its presentation and increase.

If by the studious care of his health the preacher can preserve or develop this force, which is often so dependent on bodily conditions, he owes such care to his Lord. If by a change of theory concerning its value he can come to let it pour forth freely and naturally, it behooves him to change his theories. If by confinement to manuscripts, needless proprieties, or purely technical studies, the juice of his *psuche* is oozing out, the quicker he revises his methods the better will it be for his work. If he has despised so much

Digitized by Google

of "muscular Christianity" as is necessary to develop a sound body as the home of a sound mind, let him forsake his evil ways, buy a bicycle, go to a gymnasium, or begin horse-back riding. If he has been morbidly denying himself things within his reach, and helpful to somatic and psychic vigor, such as good food and abundant sleep, let him mark the divine law, and conform to what we have seen is the divine method. Let him do this, not for personal comfort or glory, or for superficial attainments, but that he may convert men to Christ and glorify God.

Certain remarks seem necessary, lest some may mistake the nature or emphasis of our views.

We have been considering a very dangerous force. We tremble for him who is conscious of possessing it in great measure, or encourages such consciousness. It is most useful in that religious worker who is little aware of its exercise, and depends never on its ultimate sufficiency. It is apt to deteriorate in quality, if not diminish in quantity, when it becomes the specific object of conscious possession, use and cultivation. But in its ability to misuse it is akin to all power. Every force of life is dangerous. Dynamite is useful, but dangerous. Electricity is blessing humanity, but with vast attending dangers. Knowledge may be prostituted to basest uses. One may pride himself on intellectual strength, and forget the necessity of moral power. Even conscience may be a snare, and, too much trusted, may deter one from leaning enough on God. Of course, the artful man may use psychic force to enlist the mobile sympathies of the unreflecting. Of course, unprincipled men may viciously allure weak wills even into sin. They who are thus endowed are in special danger of lapsing into sin. They are peculiarly liable to neglect a strict, accurate estimate of their deeds before the bar of God's holy law. They may mistake tears for godly sorrow, and genuflexions for surrender of will. They may confound a fleet-

Digitized by Google

ing sentiment with a solid conviction. They may be led to a censorious opinion of other brethren who possess equal piety, but less power in moving men. They may think unction is unctiousness. We are forgetful of none of these dangers; but it is enough to lift the danger signals. In warning off the rocks, we need not forbid the ocean's bosom nor decry the heaven's breezes.

We have been considering an entirely subsidiary force. As we said at the outset, conversion, in its supreme and saving quality, is the operation of the rational and spiritual nature. If the *pneuma* does not move, will, repent, believe, there is no saving faith in Christ. Hence the *pneuma* is the aim of true religious endeavor, and the truth is the chief instrumentality in conversion. Whatever place, therefore, psychic forces, may hold in religious work they are wholly subordinate to the needs of the spiritual man. We would encourage no eccentricities, we would emphasize the absolute necessity of the presence and work of the Holy Ghost in successful religious work. "Not by might nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord." Divine regeneration must underlie human conversion. It is to to be feared, we freely admit, that this relation is not always sufficiently recognized in so-called Gospel labor. Is it not a sad fact, observed by every experienced pastor, that Christendom is strewn with the wrecks of mere psychic conversions? Is there not a tendency, necessitating most vigilant watch-care, to confound an impression on the sensibilities with a working in the conscience? Have not those religious movements, technically known as "revivals," fostered a tendency of this kind? Every man, the pastor included, has his special temptations. Are not evangelists, hurrying from place to place, knowing little of their hearers, and under high pressure to secure immediate results, possessing, as the successful ones usually do, large psychic resources, by circumstance predisposed to confuse the op-

Digitized by Google

erations of the *pneuma* with those of the *psuche?* We would indulge in no uncharitable judgments of our loved brethren who are engaged in evangelistic work, but the query we have proposed is one which we have been forced to ask in witnessing the methods and studying the results of some evangelistic and pastoral work.

The final test of the value of all influences in conversion must be the fruits in conduct. Does the change issue in a righteous and godly life? or does it seem to spend its force in a mere sentiment, a temporary glow, an enthusiasm, a nervous exhilaration? The fruits of the spirit are love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, self-control. Conversion to such a life is clearly pneumatic, however psychic some of the influences may have been that promoted it. The merely psychic conversion, on the other hand, is a conversion to moods, to dependence on special efforts, to reliance on the excitement of numbers, to innumerable "testimonies," and to all the mechanics, extended almost *ad infinitum* and surely *ad nauseam*, devised for getting people to manifest their presumed religious interest. It forsakes few or no vices. It uproots no evil tempers. It is unacquainted with self-sacrifice or the profounder spirit of Christian missions. It is froth, not substance. It is the work of man, and not the work of God through man. It is psychic, not pneumatic.

May the God of peace make us instrumental in converting men wholly, that their whole spirit and soul and body may be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

RICHARD MONTAGUE.

Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Digitized by Google

VI.

FULFILLED PROPHECY—A STANDING MIRACLE.

Prophecy is peculiar to the Christian religion. There is nothing corresponding to it in the Koran, in the Persian, the Chinese or Indian Scriptures. The word "prophecy" is a great deal larger than prediction. A prophet is one who stands for, represents God. A man may be a true prophet of God and predict nothing concerning the future.

Is there a supernatural knowledge of the future in the Scriptures? Coleridge says: "No." He says: "The hypothesis of prognostication is in irreconcilable oppugnancy to our Lord's declaration." W. Robertson Smith says: "What seem to be predictions in detail are usually free poetical illustrations of historical principles which neither received nor demanded exact fulfillment." Rev. Dr. Williams, in the Essays and Reviews will grant one Messianic prediction in Zechariah, one in Isaiah and one in Deuteronomy foreshadowing the fall of Jerusalem. All the rest are given up—these three are held to provisionally. Rationalists start with the axiom: "There can be nothing supernatural in the Scriptures."

God's Word has two antagonists—one denying miracles in the realm of Nature, the other denying miracles in the realm of knowledge. We need have no fear that any science will exile God from his own universe. Science is a child of the Almighty—not a Satanic foe. The church has two defences for revealed truth—miracles and prophecy. Science has been so clamorous for years that the Church of Christ has almost forgotten prophecy. Miracles are con-

Digitized by Google

fessedly past; prayer is a power; God lives; but in the strict sense of the word, miracles are not of to-day.

We believe in the resurrection of Lazarus from the dead upon the testimony of those who were honest eye-witnesses. But eighteen centuries are between the witnesses and ourselves. The scoffer says: "Give me a miracle of to-day and for to-day." The Church of Christ can answer: "I will do it." If there be, in documents of acknowledged existence before the days of Christ, predictions clear, definite, a series of predictions that have come to fulfillment—whose fulfillment is in the presence of men to-day—what is this but a standing miracle? Every element that the prophecy ever had we have to-day. And we, to-day, are as fully competent to see whether the prophecy unfulfilled has become a prophecy fulfilled as if we had lived centuries ago. The great objection urged by Hume to a belief of miracles entirely disappears in the case of prophecy. We are not dependent here upon testimony for events entirely past. The fulfillment of a prophecy is not buried under the *debris* of centuries—but is here to-day encamped in this nineteenth century. What is this but a nineteenth century miracle which the Church of Christ possesses?

If a man believe in a personal, living God, there can be no *a priori* objection to predictive prophecy. Two antagonists only will there be. The anti-supernaturalist will, of course, deny its possibility because he shuts God—if there be a God—out of Nature. Some Arminians put up a fence so high that God cannot see over into his possessions. Dr. McCabe published a volume denying the possibility of God foreknowing the acts of free agents. Logically this denies God's foreknowledge and predictive prophecy. A prediction is simply God's mind concerning the future laid bare to men.

These five elements must exist in any real prophecy:

1. There must be a foretelling with clearness. There must be an outline—the absence of fog and mist.

Digitized by Google

2. It must be of such a nature as to be beyond human sagacity or conjecture. If natural shrewdness could have begotten the mention of the death of Jesus Christ then Isaiah would have been simply a Jewish Venner, not a prophet.

3. The prophecy must precede the fulfillment, at such a distance, also, that the event was not already casting its shadow beforehand.

4. The fulfillment must have come without any collusion or conspiracy.

5. A real fulfillment must be shown to have taken place. The olden-time prophecy and the present-day fulfillment must be seen to be indentured into each other.

The presence of these five elements in conjunction with each other must lead every mind to make this creed—I believe in predictive prophecy.

It is not to be doubted that these Old Testament prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, claimed to make announcements concerning the future. It is not to be doubted that the people to whom they spoke believed that they made these claims. It is not to be denied that these prophecies are so interwoven into the texture of the Old Testament writings that to take them away would be like removing miracles from the Gospels. Prior to any investigation of the subject we place the character of the prophets as a reason for believing in prophecy. Account for it as we may, Greece and Rome produced no men like them. They have dramatists, poets, necromancers—but no prophets. Why did not Euripides and Lophodes prophesy? Why did not even Plato rise to moral purity? The prophets were sublimely moral men. Micah gives the moral keynote of the prophets—"What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?"

Isaiah was a stern Puritan in his denunciations. That such men could be deceivers and impostors is a moral im-

Digitized by Google

possibility. Let us take four lines of thought to see whether prediction was an arrow shot at random or the revelation of Almighty purpose and omniscient mind.

I. Prophecy bearing upon other nations of the world.

Are there predictions in the Old Testament, the fulfillment of which is written upon human history? In Gen. 16:12 are these words concerning Ishmael: "And he will be a wild man; his hand will be against every man and every man's hand against him." In these words is a condensed history of the Arab race. Centuries of life were bound up in them. There centuries ago is the prediction, here to-day is the fulfillment. There are predictions in the writings, as they now stand, against Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Tyre. To this the Rationalist makes answer: "They are happy guesses, shrewd forecasts, or the events were coming to the birth, or they were written after the event. From Porphyry to Iowett we have the last answer. Hence the name Cyrus in Is. 44:28 fixes the date of the book. Daniel, outlining an accurate history down to the mad Antiochus, is placed at 162 B. C. But even granting this (which no one who has read Pusey's Daniel would dream of admitting) by what prescience did Daniel describe that fourth terrible iron kingdom diverse from others and crushing kingdoms and peoples under foot. Put Daniel where they may, prophecy is bound up in him by Divine appointment, and not even a naturalistic date can stop his prophesying a history yet to be. Knobel—an unexceptionable Rationalistic witness—puts Nahum 711 B. C. In this book is the foretold fall of Nineveh. By what mind could an obscure Hebrew see the fall of that mighty empire? Even skeptical criticism refers (Is. 14:24–27) to Isaiah. In this is the announced breaking of the Assyrian power. The fall of Babylon is foretold 150 years before the event by Isaiah. If criticism assert that there are two Isaiahs, the answer is:

Digitized by Google

"Make as many Isaiahs as you wish, this prophecy is found in the acknowledged first part; its genuineness has never been questioned by the wildest criticism. The prophecies are found in the book—the fulfillment is in every history in our libraries. This is not a dead miracle, but a living miracle. The witnesses are living to-day, to be examined by men.

Let a man read Micah, Nahum, Jeremiah; let him see these predictions lying alongside the noblest utterances; let him notice how naturally and unconsciously they are given; given not for display, not even as evidences of God's knowledge, but in connection with the bringing in of God's kingdom and the punishment of idolatry—and there will be in the writings themselves a certain self-evidencing power. Professor Jowett says: "The failure of a prophecy is never admitted, in spite of Scripture and history." But he cites no case of a failure. There is insinuation, but no proof.

II. Notice the prophecy concerning the Jews.

Moses foretold the dispersion of the disobedient people and their preservation in the midst of the nations. Later prophets take up the theme. Bishop Butler, in the 7th chapter of the Analogy, speaks of "the standing miracle in the Jews remaining a distinct people in their dispersion." Even the Essays and Reviews speaks of a chapter in Deuteronomy possibly foreshadowing the final fall of Jerusalem. If any one put Deuteronomy in the time of Ezekiel we answer even then this prophecy cannot be displaced or covered. A prophecy 600 B. C. must be as much Divine as one 1500 B. C. It requires a God to look through 600 years.

Frederic the Great said: "Give me in one word a proof of the Divine origin of the Bible." The answer was—a volume in a sentence—"the Jews, your majesty." Deut. 28:37, Amos 9:9 are prophecies concerning the Jews. The

Digitized by Google

fulfillment we have in every land upon the globe. Ground between the upper and lower millstones, burned, imprisoned, buffeted, maligned in prose and verse, this people lives when Nineveh, Babylon, Egypt, the oppressors have been buried. If this people had been absorbed in the great world's life, criticism might have said: "Where is your fulfilled prophecy?" If the Jewish people had eagerly welcomed the Cross as did the Germanic nations, and thus had become absorbed by other peoples, unbelief might have said: "What is the meaning of that prophecy, 'Thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb and a by-word among all nations whither thy Lord shall lead thee?'"

The prophecy is 1500 B. C., the fulfillment is of to-day, a standing miracle. If the Church of Christ has no risen Lazarus to show unbelievers and enquirers, she has a miracle in the preservation, as a distinct people, through hundreds of years of six millions among fifteen hundred millions. This people has not been killed by jail, stake, torture, exile. There is nothing akin to it in 6000 years and more of recorded history. In rejecting God's Jesus Christ they all unconsciously bear testimony to the truth of the Word and all that Word is in witness to Jesus Christ. There is a God revealed in prophecy—there is a God revealed in history, the same God in predicting and in making history, and, therefore prophecy is neither a failure nor a fraud.

III. As to Messianic Prophecies.

Even the Essays and Reviews concede a few passages that are properly Messianic. There has been a wonderful change in the current of skeptical opinion on this point. In the eighteenth century it was the fashion to say that there was no Messianic predictions in the Old Testament. Collins, representing the whole century, affirmed that neither Isaiah nor any other prophet referred to any single person or descendant of David, who thence came to be looked for as the Messiah.

Digitized by Google

He affirmed that no clear or consistent expectation of such person could be found in the line of Jewish tradition for any period worth naming before Christ. But David Strauss, the very high-priest of critical doubt, said in his "New Life of Christ," in 1864, "While the prophets painted this better future after the model of the good old times which the people had enjoyed under David, there was connected with this hope the expectation of a ruler of David's style, of David's line, who should exalt his people from the depth of their present fall to a height of power and prosperity surpassing the days of David of old." We do not thank Strauss for admitting a truth, but it is a cause for rejoicing that criticism is forced to admit so much.

Look at the order of divine procedure in the revelation of the divine purpose. There is a conflict foretold between the seed of the woman and the serpent. A promise is made to Abraham that through him all the nations of the world shall be blessed. Who could foretell twenty centuries before Christ that the religious faith of this wandering Hebrew should be a blessing to the peoples of the earth. This ruler shall be of the tribe of Judah. He shall be of the line of David. He shall come from a fallen dynasty of David, a sucker springing from the decayed stumps of David. He shall spring out of Bethlehem. He shall lighten the country about Galilee. Upon this light in Galilee Ewald and Riehm accept as "quite unassailable by historical criticism the surprising accordance of New Testament fulfillment, Matt. 4: 13, with the Old Testament prophecy, Is. 8: 23." He should come before the sceptre should depart from Judah. He should come before the seventy weeks should come to an end. Whenever Daniel wrote, whether 600 B. C. or 162 B. C., the argument for a divine element is equally strong.

The Messianic hope widens and pervades the Scriptures from Genesis through Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Eze-

Digitized by Google

kiel, Zachariah, Micah, Malachi. The Jewish writings were full of this Messianic hope. In Edersheim's "Life of Christ," Vol. II., is found a list of Old Testament passages referred by the Rabbins to the Messiah or Messianic times. They amount, all told, to 456. Of this number 75 were in the Pentateuch; 243 in the Prophets; 135 in the Hogiographa. If a Jew to-day reject Jesus Christ or reject even a supernatural element in the Hebrew Scriptures, we appeal from him to-day to the faith of the fathers. It would be a strong appeal to the Jew of to-day if all these passages were put in one volume, the creed of hope of the pious Jews without exception in the days of their glory, the creed of centuries, at a time when there could be no motive to misinterpretation. This hope of the Jew ran over, and Virgil felt its glow and prophesied of a golden day, and grave Tacitus spoke of a wide hope that pervaded the East.

The prophets outline a victorious Messiah, a king reigning in righteousness, before whom the nations bow. He would be the Prince of Peace with the government upon his shoulder. They portray also a suffering Messiah, one rejected by men, with a form mangled, with a visage worried. The Rabbins could not understand this conflicting portraiture. They made two Messiahs—one a sufferer, one a conqueror. Jesus Christ solves the problem. All passages combine in him in one harmonious, yet unlooked-for solution. It was against the thought of that age, of all the ages before Christ, and even of the men that walked with Jesus—that he should suffer.

Jesus Christ was not the creation of the uninspired thought of that or of any age. When men could not construct out of the seemingly antagonistic Scriptures any intelligible idea of the Messiah, Jesus became a living commentary. Now, for the first time, the words of the prophets were set forth in their real meaning, a meaning so clear, so simple, so straightforward, and yet so consistent,

Digitized by Google

that we now wonder that any other interpretation could have been put upon them. "The prophecies contained in the Old Testament are so numerous, so consentient with each other, and yet so contrary to the whole tenor of Jewish thought, so marvellously fulfilled in Christianity, and yet in a way so different from every anticipated fulfillment, that while it is unscientific to refuse to listen to the proof of their reality because of any *a priori* supposition, it is even worse than folly to speak of them as mere forecasts and anticipations."

The question then confronts us, as a fresh and living question—did Jesus Christ fulfill in himself the predictions of the Old Testament? This enquiry is not of the dead past, but is open for every man to settle for himself. What answer will come if an enquirer shall place the New Testament life of Jesus, the admitted facts of history, alongside the Old Testament? Even Strauss admits that there is a wonderful conformity between the prophecies and the facts of the life of Christ. But he says: "Here was a Messianic conception, Jesus meditated upon it—became full of it —strove to realize in himself the conception." He ventured in his enthusiasm—as Renau says—to claim to be the Son of David, the Messiah.

To this charge the answer is plain. (1). Jesus did not fill the conception of his age or of any age before him. If he had done so he would have been a Jewish Judas Maccabaeus, and not a Redeemer. (2). It was not possible for any genius of that age to have brought all the converging lines of prophecy upon himself. No one could have constructed a Messiah to meet all the demands of the Old Testament. (3). No one could compel a fulfillment who could compel the Roman Empire to put him to death upon the Cross. (4). The character of Jesus is a complete refutation of any conspiracy or seeming fulfillment. Of Jesus Goethe said: "Advancement is possible on all sides save

Digitized by Google

one. Beyond Jesus Christ moral advancement cannot go." Of him Renau said: "Whatever may be the surprises of the future, Jesus will never be surpassed." Of him John Stuart Mill wrote: "No man can get a better rule of life than this—so to live that Christ would approve the life."

As to the fulfillment of prophecy in Jesus Christ, the whole matter is settled by Jesus himself for those who accept his authority as final. "These are they which bear witness of me." The character of Jesus is a proof to all unbiased minds.

And what is all this but a standing miracle, a miracle which men to-day can look at and handle for themselves.

Let any one further compare Christianity, which is Jesus Christ organized, with the teachings of the Old Testament Scriptures.

The Old Testament predicts that the covenant then existing would be superceded by a better. Christianity came out of Judaism. How did Jeremiah know that one system of faith would give birth to a larger system? That miracle is here to-day.

The Jews as a people were intensely ritualistic. Hell was not strong enough, in the common belief, to hold a circumcised Jew. The Hebrew Scriptures predict a time coming when the Ark, holding the holy tables, would not even be mentioned; when the earth should be a holy temple. How did the prophet know of the introduction of a spiritual religion? That miracle is here to-day.

The Jews were narrow-minded, intensely exclusive. A proselyte could not be admitted to full equality until the fourth generation. Yet the prophets speak of the bestowal of a common Saviour, the founding of a universal church in which Gentile and Jew should dwell. That the church of a common brotherhood should spring out of Judaism, with its contracted views, seemed almost as impossible as the changing of the multiplication table. That miracle is here to-day.

Digitized by Google

The Jews were despised. They had no place in history. Yet the prophets speak of all nations coming to them for a faith, a creed. They speak of the mountain of the Lord's house lifted up, and all nations coming to it. Who would have imagined that this despised people would give the creed to the mighty peoples of the earth? That miracle is here to-day.

The Jewish people were not a missionary people. It was hard work to make Peter and his fellow Apostles look beyond the Jewish commonwealth. But the prophets speak of light and salvation going out from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth. Who could foretell that that narrow-mindedness should give place to world-mindedness? That miracle is here to-day.

The entire Old Testament, with its prophecies, its history, its sacrifices, make one great prophecy, all linked together. The only Man who can explain the Old Testament is Jesus Christ. He is its fulfillment. Attacks have been made upon almost all the prophecies, one by one. Professor Payne Smith says: "I have never read nor expect to read any attempt to explain, upon naturalistic grounds, the combined force of this, the grand teaching of prophecy as a whole." This has never been attempted. Even if we concede two Daniels, two Isaiahs, three Zechariahs, they were centuries before Christ. If naturalism would do anything effective by way of answer, it must put Isaiah and kindred prophets one, two, three centuries after Christ.

IV.—The Prophecies of Jesus.

Jesus was himself the Great Prophet, the one like unto Moses. He alone revealed God. He also made predictions, and appealed to their fulfillment as a reason for belief in him. (John 13 : 19.) He foretold the fall of Jerusalem. He foretold the permanence of his Church. Who could have foretold, on natural grounds, that the assembly that

Digitized by Google

gathered around Jesus would be perpetuated, that no persecution could kill it? Jesus foretold the widespread diffusion of his Gospel. (Matt. 26 : 13.) Who would have imagined that a Jewish carpenter and Jewish fishermen would establish any system of faith that would go out of Judea and fill the world?

Jesus said his words would be more fixed than the laws of nature. Who would have dreamed on Friday morning, April 7, A. D. 29, that this Man upon the Cross, between two robbers, would be the great name of the world? How calmly and constantly Jesus spoke of the future of his cause, his people, his Church. The widespread extension of the name of Jesus, his power among men, the existence of the Church, the Lord's Supper, the burial in water of the believer—these are so many fulfilled prophecies. They are so contrary to the natural course of events that they become standing miracles.

Why should Prophecy be studied by the Church of Christ and by the teachers of the Church?

1. Because prophecy is one of the two supports and witnesses of divine revelation. The Church is never so strong that she can afford to forget or neglect any one of her defences.

2. Because prophecies fulfilled are present day miracles. Hume saw the force of a prophecy, if it be conceded that it come to fulfillment. His words are: "All prophecies are real miracles, and only as such can be admitted as proofs of any revelation.

3. As a witness, prophecy is stronger than a miracle. Dr. A. H. Strong says: "Prophecy possesses two advantages over miracles: 1. The proof, in the case of prophecy, is not derived from ancient testimony, but is under our eyes. 2. The evidence for miracles cannot become stronger, whereas every new fulfillment adds to the argument from prophecy."

Digitized by Google

4. It will strengthen the confidence of the Church. It will add to the power of the Bible. It will, by so much as prophecies are seen to have been fulfilled, give a strong probability that there is place for the supernatural element in nature.

5. It will give the assurance that any prophecies not yet come to fulfillment will in due time prove to be true. The prevalence of the principles of Christianity, the conversion of the Jews, the resurrection of the dead, the second coming of Jesus Christ, are not simply words lying in the Bible, but words having in them all the potency and knowledge of Almighty God. They are unripe, uncompleted prophecies. The unfulfilled prophecies have a future, because God has breathed into them the breath of truth.

Why the prophecies have largely, in recent years, been ignored.

1. No age is large enough to keep a fresh and firm hold upon all truths. This age has been filled up with the scientific defence of the faith. But prophecy is too large a truth to be ignored.

2. There has been a feeling that prophecy was simply a foretelling, arising from an excessive use of predictive prophecy in a former age. This is only half the truth. The prophets spoke to their own times as well as to future times.

3. There has been a representation of prophecy as a kind of fatalism, rushing on, propelled by Almighty power, irrespective of character. Nothing could be more false. It was Jonah's indictment of the Almighty that he did not smite even when Nineveh repented. Jeremiah declares, in Jehovah's name, just before Jerusalem fell, that if Zedekiah would repent God would spare the city. There must be a conditional element in prophecy arising from God's unalterably holy nature.

Digitized by Google

4. More than all, there has been the feeling that the study of prophecy begets vagaries, theological cranks, Millerism. It is true that an unballasted study of any subject will make one-sidedness and possible danger. It is true that many associate the study of prophecy only with the little horn, the number of the beast, the return of the Jews to Palestine. It is true that many falsities have passed as axioms, as that a day stands for a year.

If the Old Testament prophets were to make any predictions, it must, of necessity, be by using Old Testament figures. Forgetting this, many, in order to make the prophecies hold good, have resorted to an intensely literal explanation. Some interpreters build a new temple at Jerusalem, put up an altar, put upon it the sacrifice. These writers make the last chapters of Ezekiel destroy, in reality, Christianity, take down Jesus from the Cross, put out the New Testament light, and give us again an ox upon the altar. Not so did Paul reason. Who is the Jew? Paul answers: The Christian. Who is the circumcised man? The man whose heart is circumcised through Jesus Christ's spirit. Who is the child of Abraham? The believer in Jesus. To whom is the promise? To Abraham and his his seed—that is, Christ—and through him the Christian and the Church. What is Mount Zion? The Christian Church. Who is the priest? The New Testament believer. Who is the High Priest? Jesus Christ. Where are the tables of the law? Written upon the heart of the believer. The Church of Christ to-day stands heir to the promises of God in the Old Testament. Looking upon Old Testament forms as holding New Testament truths, we get the Pauline idea of prophecy.

Concerning the study of prophecy, we need as much as possible open-mindedness. We need frankness, an inquiring spirit. We need to free ourselves from pre-conceived views. There is prevalent an anti-Romanist spirit that sees

Digitized by Google

the pope everywhere, an intensely literal system that crushes out the real meaning. We ought not to feel, in coming to the home, that we must understand everything. The student of the Bible ought to be willing very often to say, "I do not know." If the teaching be dark, or too large to comprehend, do not feel that you must have an explanation for it. Hang it up for the future to throw light upon. Sir William Hamilton said: "The highest reach of human science is the scientific recognition of human ignorance."

Even to the prophet come the words: "Seal it up until the time appointed." What God seals, man cannot open. But time and prayer and study will, as to Daniel, open sealed writings.

It is dishonoring to Jesus Christ and the inspired writings to say the study of the unfulfilled prophecies brings only confusion and darkness. It is *ours* to read, to study, to pray, to wait. It is *His* to give the blessing that comes from reading and studying, and the explanation in his own time that comes to patient waiting.

O. P. EACHES.

Hightstown, N. J.

Digitized by Google

VII.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

FALSE INFERENCES FROM A BAPTIST PRINCIPLE.

BAPTISTS have an honorable history as defenders of civil and religious liberty. For this principle our forefathers made great sacrifices and endured bitter persecutions. We should be unworthy descendants of so honorable an ancestry if we proved unfaithful to this principle. That all men everywhere should be free to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences, without interference by the State or any human power, responsible to God alone for their use of this freedom, is a cardinal Baptist belief. It is, indeed, a necessary corollary of the belief that every man's salvation is determined by his personal relation to Jesus Christ, and that no one is to be received into membership in a Christian church who has not, by an act of personal faith, accepted Christ as Saviour and King. Such faith, being a personal matter between each individual soul and God, cannot be compelled or enforced by civil law or physical force, and the lack of such faith cannot be consistently punished by physical pains and penalties. Complete religious liberty follows as a matter of course. The consequence of complete religious liberty is that no alliance in any form between State and Church is possible. Anything resembling interference with its concerns on the part of the State, or favors granted to one form of religious belief that are withheld from others, is opposed to the principle of religious liberty, and so meets with the uncompromising hostility of Baptists.

There are, however, two types of legislation still found in the statute-books of most of our American States whose consistency is warmly disputed. The one consists of laws made with respect to the observance of the first day of the week; the other is those statutes that exempt from taxation property used strictly for religious purposes. In

Digitized by Google

the name of Baptist consistency and devotion to the principle of religious liberty, protests are just now made with much insistence against both classes of laws. They are declared to be relics of the union of Church and State, inconsistent with the equality of all men before the law, so far as religious belief and practice is concerned, and therefore demanding repeal. These protests seem to rest on a mistaken notion both of what constitutes religious liberty and of the nature of the legislation in question.

There is nothing inherent in civil legislation for the observance of the first day of the week that is of the nature of persecution, or that in any way contravenes the principle of religious liberty. Some statutes in some States are doubtless so drawn as to be, if rigidly enforced, persecuting. Such statutes are in so far indefensible, and should be promptly amended. These defects are, however, by no means inherent in Sunday legislation. Whatever the idea of such laws used to be, the idea now inspiring them is not religious, but civil. No statute now extant compels any one to the performance of any religious act upon the first day of the week. No one is required under penalties to attend some place of worship. The manner in which the day shall be spent is left entirely to the choice of each citizen, with this one exception—that secular labor is forbidden on that day in order that the rights of all to one day's rest in seven may be secured. Plainly, this is not a religious but a civil ordinance; not an ecclesiastical law, but a police or sanitary regulation. It is certainly not questioned by any sound physiologist that a rest of one day in seven is beneficial to every man. It is not questioned by any reputable sociologist that the effects of one day's respite from grinding toil, with leisure for mental and moral culture, has a lifting, refining effect upon any people. Wholly apart from all religious questions, it is for the best interests of the community that a weekly day of rest be maintained, and this fact is recognized by large numbers of men who acknowledge no obligation to observe Sunday in any religious way.

The workingmen of the United States, through their labor organizations, are coming more and more to demand a cessation of such work as is now required of them on Sundays by railroad and other corporations, and some of the most influential of these corporations have voluntarily led the way in suspending a large amount of unnecessary

Digitized by Google

Sunday labor that has hitherto been performed. The men who thus demand their weekly rest day are very few of them actuated by any religious motive. Most of them, it is to be feared, are seldom seen within the doors of any Christian church. They value Sunday as a day of rest, of leisure, a time when they can read and visit their friends and enjoy themselves. And even when no better use than this is made of Sunday, it is an institution of great value to a people. Seven days of every week spent in toil and sordid money-getting would soon eliminate from any nation all the finer feelings and better instincts of humanity, and reduce them to the level of the beasts that perish, or transform them into mere money-getting automata.

It is true that Christian men and women value Sunday chiefly for other and higher reasons. The State as such, however, takes no cognizance of these reasons. It ordains the day of rest as a social institution of proved value to mankind. It chooses the first day of the week, not because it specially values any supposed sacred character in that day, but because that is the most convenient day; one already fixed upon by custom for the general cessation of labor. A large part of the population would observe that day, in any event, by ceasing from ordinary labors, whatever law might be upon the statute-books, or if no law at all were there. Such being the case, it is evidently wise that this day should be chosen as the weekly rest day for all. But where any considerable portion of the community is actuated by conscientious reasons to observe some other day as a day of rest and worship, it is proper that the laws should be so adjusted to this state of things as to permit these persons to pursue their ordinary avocations on Sunday, provided that by so doing they disturb no one else. This is evidently just, as it places all men on a footing of exact equality as regards their religious belief and practice, and subjects none to the hardship of being compelled to lose two days of the week, one of which they are compelled to observe by conscience the other by the law. Where this provision is made for a dissenting minority, it is evident that Sunday legislation in no wise interferes with every man's religious liberty. It is, in fact, religious legislation in no conceivable sense. It neither imposes a religious duty nor interferes with a religious obligation. It is purely secular in its nature, as much so as any police or sanitary regulation.

Digitized by Google

The stringency of the Sunday laws cannot be relaxed, but within the due limits already indicated should be rather increased, and for this reason: The legislation has, or should have, for its object the protection of the rights of the poor. It is possible that the rich would not suffer physical or mental deterioration if they ceased to observe a weekly day of rest. They have many opportunities for rest and recreation—more, probably, than it is good for them to have. It is the poor man, who is dependent upon the labor of his hands for his daily bread, that needs to be protected. The privilege of a day of rest for some can only be secured by making abstinence from labor obligatory on all. It follows, therefore, that if one admits that it is for the interest of the working man to have his Sunday for rest and for such mental and spiritual culture as he desires, the working man cannot secure this day of rest without the help of legislation. In the ideal state of society and human nature, all men would do that which is best for them, and no man would oppress another for his own gain. But it is too evident that we do not live in an ideal state of society, and that human nature has not yet reached the ideal of its development. There are plenty of men who are ready to take advantage of a brother man's weakness, and to make their gain by the sweat of his brow. The greed of employers, against which orators who speak for the working man are always ready to declaim, manifests itself in no way more unmistakably than in requiring their employés to labor on Sunday whenever Sunday labor is greatly profitable. The Sunday newspaper and the Sunday excursion are maintained, not out of any philanthropic desire to benefit the community, but because the publication of a newspaper and the running of excursion trains and boats are profitable on Sunday far beyond any other day of the week. In order that these things may be done many men must work harder on Sunday than on any other day. If, now, all legislative restraints were abolished, and the question of Sunday rest were left entirely to individual choice, there are employers of labor in large number who would insist on running their shops seven days in the week instead of six, having no religious scruples to hinder them, and still less being restrained by any consideration regarding the good of their employés. It would not be long before the working man would have no day of rest, and certainly no greater calamity than this could well befall him. One of the few precious privileges that still

Digitized by Google

remain to the man who must gain his bread by daily labor, is the right to rest one day in seven from this grinding toil.

Sunday as a legal institution is merely a weekly holiday. But it is found necessary to protect all holidays by legislation. Does anybody believe that if the observance of the Fourth of July and Thanksgiving Day and Christmas, and the other holidays of the year were entirely left to individual choice, that they could long survive the fierce competition of modern business life? The greed for gain would lead first one man and then another to continue his business on holidays, and in self-protection others would be obliged to follow, until at length the holiday would practically disappear. The history of the early-closing movement on Saturday in this State shows how necessary legislation is to secure the working man a holiday. For several years by a concerted action some few large firms in the same lines of business adopted a system of early closing during the Summer, but the practice was by no means general, and it had no sure basis until a statute made Saturday afternoon a legal holiday. When all banks and public offices closed at noon on Saturday, it was found not only practicable to close private offices and shops, but of little use to keep them open, and so the half-holiday became assured as a Summer institution, and is more and more generally observed with every year. All experience, as well as logic and common sense, sustains the necessity of Sunday legislation to protect Sunday rest; but such legislation should be strictly secular, and should leave the question of the religious observance of the day to the decision of each man.

The idea is equally unfounded that the exemption of certain property from taxation on the ground of its use for exclusively religious or charitable purposes is an infraction of the theory of complete separation between church and State. Those who suppose this antagonism between exemption and religious liberty ignore some of the fundamental principles of taxation. The general principles on which all taxes are laid is that the expense of government shall be assessed upon citizens in accordance with their ability to pay. Taxes are assessed upon real estate in part because of convenience and in part because that species of property is either actually or potentially productive of profit to the owner. Religious and charitable institutions of all kinds have a distinct tendency to lessen the burden of taxation by diminishing the chief

Digitized by Google

burdens of society — the support of the improvident or unfortunate and the confinement of criminals. If there were neither paupers nor criminals in the community, the expenses of government would be reduced to a minimum. Every church and charitable institution exists for the direct purpose of reducing pauperism and crime. Hence it is good public policy, from a purely secular point of view, to encourage the establishment of churches and charitable organizations of every kind by refraining from imposing upon them financial burdens. So long as this encouragement is extended equally to all institutions without regard to the special faith or want of faith professed by those who have them in charge, there is no infringement of the principle of religious liberty. That principle demands the equal treatment of all men whatever their religious belief. It does not prohibit the equal encouragement of all by the State. To extend the same favor to all is to show partiality to none. Moreover, the maintenance of every religious and charitable organization is in itself of the nature of a tax upon the incomes of the people. To tax a tax is contrary to the principles of economics. Property that from the very nature of the case can produce no income but demands outgo is properly exempted from taxation on purely economic principles. If churches and charitable societies ought to pay taxes upon their property, it is impossible to resist the conclusion that on the same principle municipal and other property held for public uses should also be taxed, which is absurd. Anyone who will read a good treatise on taxation and master its fundamental principles, will be speedily freed from the notion that fidelity to the principle of religious liberty requires Baptists to protest against the exemption of church property from taxation.

ECCLESIASTICAL COUNCILS.

Much has been said and written upon this subject, but the subject is by no means exhausted. Churches seem determined not to heed the suggestions of writers and speakers, and not to learn the lessons which painful experiences so often and emphatically teach. On so important a subject we need line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a great deal. Councils, as often called and conducted, are worse than useless, and sometimes they are painfully farcical. It

Digitized by Google

is, therefore, of the utmost importance that greater care should be taken regarding the methods by which they are called, and regarding their own modes of procedure when they are in session. While these remarks are true of ecclesiastical councils in general, they are especially true of councils called to decide as to the propriety of ordaining brethren to the Gospel ministry.

A few suggestions, though some of them may have been made before in articles in this QUARTERLY, are not out of place. We suggest, in the first place, that all the churches of the Association to which the church calling the council belongs should be invited to send delegates. This is an important matter; there is danger that an ecclesiastical council may be so called as to carry out the will of the church calling it, whatever that will may be. If there is danger that the will of the church should be thwarted if a large council is called, there is a temptation to call a small council, and one that is in sympathy with the ends which the church desires to secure. In order to avoid even the suspicion of a collusion of this sort, it is greatly wise to invite all the churches in the Association. Councils must be so called and conducted that no one can say that they were "packed" in the interest of any church or man. There must, of course, be a limit somewhere, and perhaps there is no better limit than the Associational limits which we have now suggested. A council thus called is widely removed from even the suspicion of being called in the interests of any special ends which any particular church may desire to subserve.

Another point is of great importance. Letters missive should be sent out at least one month previous to the time of meeting appointed for the council. Two good reasons can be assigned for this course. First, an opportunity can thus be afforded all the delegates for making necessary inquiry concerning the character and training of the candidate asking ordination. At times such inquiries may be unnecessary, but at other times, as we all well know, such inquiries are of the utmost importance. Delegates should go to a council prepared to act intelligently, whether they vote to recommend or to postpone the ordination of the candidate appearing before the council. But another reason is of equal importance. Many churches have but monthly church meetings. If the meeting has just been held, there is no opportunity for appointing delegates except a special meeting be called for that purpose. Many

Digitized by Google

churches are afflicted by a multiplication of business meetings, but other churches carefully avoid calling special meetings. It is not fair that such churches be asked to depart from their usual methods of transacting business because of the indifference or stupidity of other churches. The multiplication of church meetings is often a clear device of the enemy of churches and souls. The fewer church meetings, as a rule, the better. The larger and more wisely conducted churches, those which have the wisdom to arrange their business chiefly through an advisory committee, are accustomed to spend but little time for the actual transaction of business in the church meeting. Two or three illustrations have recently come to our notice of the folly of the present mode of calling councils. Churches have been invited to send delegates to a council a week or two after their church meeting had been held, and no other church meeting was to be held for two or three weeks more. The result was that in some cases the invitation lay unnoticed, and in other cases a few brethren appointed themselves delegates and attended the council, trusting that the church would endorse their action after the council had adjourned. Churches ought to decide not to recognize a request that comes to them with so little regard for the proprieties of the case and for the interests of the churches invited. The whole subject of ecclesiastical councils ought to be carefully re-discussed. We ought either to refuse to hold them, or to make them more authoritative and in every way more worthy of the careful consideration of all the churches.

In the case of ecclesiastical councils called to advise as to the propriety of ordination, it will often be found greatly wise for the church calling the council to hold a preliminary examination of the candidate—an examination before the council is called. The church could invite three or four brethren in whose judgment entire confidence is reposed to act as this preliminary committee of examination. Sometimes an examination of this sort would prevent the calling of a council, and thus save the candidate from some degree of humiliation, and the church from inconvenience, and the entire denomination from criticism. Candidates who are clearly not prepared to pass a careful examination should be discouraged from appearing before a council, and the church should be discouraged in its desire to call a council. This mode of procedure commends itself to all right-minded persons.

Digitized by Google

When the council has met, in any case, the consideration of all the subjects brought before it ought to be much more thorough than is ordinarily the case. A man who is a graduate of a college and of a theological seminary ought to submit to an examination in the original languages of the Scriptures and in church history, especially as it is related to our own denominational life and polity. There should also be a careful examination in the system of doctrine and church order which we, as a denomination, hold. Such an examination might properly be extended through several days. If all the council could not remain, as very probably would be the case, a judicious committee could be appointed, whose business it would be, after such examination had been held, to summon the council to hear the report and to advise regarding the course to be pursued. Not a few of our brethren are disposed to absent themselves entirely from councils as they are ordinarily conducted. They are hurried, superficial, characterless, although involving the most serious consequences.

Still another point is to be carefully considered. No arrangements for ordination ought to be made until the council has recommended that ordination take place. To make arrangements for the public services of ordination in the evening, while the council is called to meet in the afternoon, is to render the council a farce, pure and simple. It is an imposition upon all the delegates, their churches, and upon the community generally. Councils ought to counsel; and, except they have this function, they had better not meet at all. The time has come for us to speak in no uncertain tones regarding this entire subject. The churches must take the matter into their own hands, and refuse to send delegates, as one church has repeatedly done, except some of these principles of sound common sense are observed in the method of calling the council, and in the conduct of the examination after the council has assembled.

THE EPISCOPAL GENERAL CONVENTION.

This body, which represents all that is scholarly and influential in the most stately and ornate of the Protestant bodies, has lately held its triennial session in New York. We ought to beg the pardon of the august body, or of a considerable portion of it, for intimating that it is Protestant. To be sure, the official name of the religious organization

Digitized by Google

that the Convention represents is "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America." To every word of this title, however (excepting the single word Church) there are vehement objections made. It is not a Protestant body, we are told, because its chief distinction as compared with the sects is, that it is a branch of the visible Catholic and Apostolic Church, that is the only body fitly designated as a Church. All who do not belong to this Church, while they may be very good people, are schismatics and heretics—they are "sects," denominations, what you will, only *not* a Church. The word Episcopal is superfluous, for the Church has had bishops since the Apostolic age. The "Church *in* the United States" is objectionable also, as it should be "Church *of* the United States"; the former phrase might admit that there are other Churches, while the latter is exclusive. In a word "The American Church" is the only title sufficiently broad and descriptive to suit the case. Unfortunately—or fortunately, as one looks at it—the Convention did not take kindly to these views of the case, and no action was taken looking towards a new name. This is a sensible conclusion, for nothing would cause a greater outburst of ridicule, nothing would do more to hinder its growth, than the haughty assumption by the numerically weakest of the principal Protestant bodies that it was the sole representative on American soil of the Apostolic Church. Even by the terms of the "Catholic" theory, the Roman Catholic Church has an indefeasible title to be regarded as a branch of the American Church, and the Protestant Episcopal Church has no such theoretical supremacy as some of its members would claim.

We have thus touched upon one of the "burning questions" that engaged the Convention. Another was the question of a Hymnal. A committee has been at work on a Hymnal for a long time, and during the past year the results have been before the Church in a tentative edition. The battle over this has raged fiercely in the Church newspapers and periodicals, and it waxed hotter in the Convention itself. The whole subject was finally re-committed, several experts in hymnology being added to the editors, and the whole battle is to be fought over again in the future. We Baptists sometimes bewail our lack of centralization and in certain moods imagine that if we had some strong legislative body certain things at least would go better. But the centralized churches seem to fare no more smoothly than we in our ex-

Digitized by Google

treme independency. The making of a Hymnal is one of the things for which a large committee, and, still more, a legislative assembly, is unfitted, from the nature of the case. One man, or at most two men, who have a practical knowledge of music and hymnology, can make a better collection than seven men; and seven men can do far better than two hundred. It is a case where efficiency and numbers are in inverse ratio to each other. The only safety for a Church bent on having an official Hymnal is to appoint a small committee of thoroughly competent men, in whom confidence is felt, and to adopt or reject their work as a whole. If adopted it will doubtless have defects, like everything human; but the defects will be as nothing compared with a Hymnal voted on hymn by hymn and made up according to the caprice or ignorance of a miscellaneous convention. Such tinkering may easily spoil a good collection, but it can never make one.

More than half of the Convention's time, we should judge from the reports, was spent in attempts to amend the Prayer-Book. Though a very conservative body, and much averse to innovations, especially when they are proposed without disguise as innovations, there had come to be a strong sentiment in the Church in favor of revision. Those who favored changes were by no means united in theological beliefs or in practice. The fact is not generally known, even to Episcopalians, that there has been super-added to the written law of the rubrics an unwritten law of custom in each parish, slowly growing by the changes introduced by succcessive rectors, until in place of the uniform worship contemplated by the Prayer-Book there is really almost as much diversity as can be found in the non-liturgical Churches. It was the wish of not a few that customs not sanctioned by existing rubrics, but very generally accepted, should receive formal authorization.

It is amusing to mere schismatics and heretics to note how propositions of this nature were fought. For example, the Convention listened to the singing of an anthem during the offertory—a thing customary in many churches but not authorized by a rubric—without a thought of protest; but when it was proposed to authorize this in the rubric there was a long and hot debate, and the proposal was defeated. In numerous instances changes were voted down that would have simply expressed the prevailing custom in the churches. According to the rubric, the singing of the "Gloria in excelsis" is optional at morning

Digitized by Google

service after the reading or singing of the portion of Psalms for the day. It is the practice, however, in all but very low-church parishes to sing the "Gloria in excelsis" only in connection with the celebration of the communion. But a proposition to make the rubric correspond with this practice was defeated by a large vote.

Other proposed changes were intended to enrich the service and make it more flexible. Such as were adopted will have the effect of making worship still more lacking in uniformity. As the matter now stands, no one can tell on opening the Prayer-Book where the minister will begin or what will come next, so much of the service is left to his discretion. This is no objection from our point of view, but it is quite inconsistent with the liturgical idea. If it is worth while to have a liturgy at all, it certainly seems desirable that it should not be confusing to the worshipper by reason of its complexity and needless variety. In connection with these perplexing changes, the Convention voted against the one change proposed that would really have enriched the Prayer-Book. A "Short Office for Special Occasions" had been prepared, for the use of missionaries and others on occasions when the morning or evening service would be too long or complicated. This was simple, serviceable, and free from every objection that does not lie against any and every liturgical form. Many regret its defeat exceedingly.

But while the Convention was so particular about admitting changes that custom sanctions and reason approves, it came dangerously near admitting some things that are theologically detestable. A prayer for the souls of those who have died after being baptized—a bit of unadulterated Romanism—had powerful advocates, and failed of adoption by the narrowest of margins, since a change of five votes would have added it to the Prayer-Book. It is not agreeable to see such a body so careful about the mint, anise and cumin of religion, yet unmindful of the weightier matters of the law.

One who goes carefully over the reports of the Convention's work on the Prayer-Book and compares the meagre results reached with the vast amount of time and eloquence expended in reaching them, will be amused or vexed according to his temperament. If he has a healthy sense of humor, he will smile, and if he still remembers a little of his classics he will murmur to himself:

"*Laborant montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.*"

Digitized by Google

VIII.

HOMILETIC DEPARTMENT.

PASTORAL HINTS.

THERE are three great endowments for the minister and preacher. The first is deep and cultured piety. These adjectives express the quality of the piety required better than the adverb and adjective, deeply cultured. Piety should be profoundly rooted among the faculties of the soul, and then nourished, guarded and trained to healthful exercise and wise ends.

The second requisite to a very effective ministry is intellectual power; and the third, oratorical genius.

Hamerton has an essay addressed to "A young man of brilliant ability." It is not to such that these brief rules are written, nor to those who have one or more of the gifts which insure eminence in the pulpit.

Let us speak to the average man, who can least afford to overlook those little details which, combined with ordinary ability, will render a pastor particularly acceptable, and possibly may conceal his defective training or meagre endowments.

Be sincere in all expressions of interest in people. A word of commendation is better than censure. Indiscriminate praise will do no good, for folks have some judgment as to their merit. Flattery is wicked, and, what is almost as bad, weak. Insincerity, too, will destroy one's moral fibre. It is possible to discover one good thing in every case as a basis for sincere comment. Speak cordially of that; about the rest keep silent. Sincerity is required in all pastoral work.

Be cheerful. Is there a man, woman, or child who can look on a cheerful face without feeling that the Divine is near? The angels always said to their hearers, "Fear not." Some faces confer a benediction, others always call upon you to fear. "Put on a good countenance," said Disraeli, "no one has a right to appear anxious but him who has no anxiety." Edersheim says beautifully of Christ: "He carried the look of heaven on his face, and the peace of God on his lips."

Be careful of your word in small matters as well as great. Multifarious demands are made upon the pastor. These often come when

Digitized by Google

he is busiest. The easiest way to liberty is to promise attention or assistance in the future. He will call, will write a letter, will investigate a question. It is easy to forget such promises. Scrupulous observance of them will bring a return of trust that will be sweet and valuable.

Be a gentleman in manners and dress. There is a happy medium between the manners of a court and democratic independence and bluntness. Dignity with approachableness is necessary. A judge once said, with reference to a certain clergyman of studied address: "I do not like to feel that I must brush my coat every time I speak to a minister." As to wardrobe, it costs no more to be appropriately dressed than slovenly attired.

There is no calling in which open, seeing eyes are as necessary as in pastoral work. Our Lord's lips are studied more than his eyes, but these might be studied with great profit. Absent-mindedness even for a second may cause deep regret.

Be prompt. Attend once more to this familiar counsel. Idle neglect in private life is really the most laborious habit. Procrastination in beginning services destroys all method and repels busy people.

Be brief in public services, in prayer-meetings. After all that has been said, how few pastors observe this rule. It is a fact that most prayer-meetings go into Winter quarters for the first half of the allotted time, and then at the end wonder why they have not had a more active campaign, more firing, more warmth. At funerals, be brief when it is cold for the sake of those who are compelled to wait outside; be brief when it is warm for the sake of those inside. In prayer, be brief for the sake of directness and the maintenance of worship on the part of the audience and of yourself. King Solomon offered the longest prayer recorded in the Bible. We are not kings, nor are congregations our subjects.

Do not exaggerate either in statement of facts or in estimating your work. People not Oriental and not extremely Western like careful statements, and respect a man whose judgments are generally found to be correct.

The man who, every Monday morning, thinks he never had such a large congregation as the day before, and never preached as good a sermon as the last, ought to increase in physical avoirdupois, but his pleasing self-satisfaction will not really support the work a great while.

Read the Scriptures intelligently and correctly. A study of the original texts will show where the emphasis should be placed. The use of light thus gained will relieve the verses of the sound they get in common reading, and add a new charm. At the same time, the truth will be conveyed more correctly.

Digitized by Google

In elocution, do not use the humid voice, suggesting wailing, except when feelings are positively beyond control. It is not often that a man is as profoundly moved as that tone would indicate. Even a simulated tone is a blemish in a preacher.

Avoid using the address "beloved" so often that it would be refreshing to the audience to hear you use Mr. Hobbs's term, "bejiggered," or some other honest, less canted phrase. The use of this term of endearment stamps a man at once as a professional of a certain profession. Use it if it seems wise to address such a superlative epithet to a promiscuous assembly, but do not use it repeatedly and habitually. It may be regarded as a matter of taste, but taste should not lead to what is tasteless.

There may rarely be found pastors who can endure the cost of inattention to such suggestions as these, which many an intelligent layman would make if he dared. With pastors the question should not be, how much power can I afford to lose? but what increment can I gain in effectivenes in the highest of callings?

If every one of these qualities, expressed or implied, is not absolutely necessary, they are all very desirable, perfectly legitimate, and easily attainable even by those who vainly strive for the more dazzling gifts.

CHARLES A. REESE.

Rutland, Vt.

THE PRAYER-MEETING—ANOTHER "EXPERIENCE."

As all knowledge is relative, it is also individual. Especially is this latter true when that knowledge has been gained, not from books, but by experience. If the knowledge thus gained be small, it compensates by being accurate and trustworthy. In a peculiar and valuable sense, it is yours. In this, and from the intrinsic importance of the subject, must be found my apology for following so soon in that pathway of thought traversed by Dr. Hobart. As his comprehensive and discriminating contribution to the subject was helpful to me, so I shall be delighted if this shall aid another brother.

The history of the prayer-meeting is known, as all things else are, better to God than it is to us. Doubtless its history runs parallel with the history of the race. Our Saviour certainly had reference to a meeting of this character when he said, "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven." The meetings recorded in Acts were more of this nature than of any other of the meetings held by the Christian Church. Pliny, in the year 103, writing to the Emperor, dissuaded him from the enforcements of the edicts upon Christians, upon

Digitized by Google

the ground that they were a harmless people, "chargeable with no offence, only they were in the habit of meeting together to sing songs and worship Christ as God."

In the prayer-meeting, therefore, we are going back to New Testament models—to a meeting in the truest sense of the *Church*. And just in proportion as this is true, is the meeting important. It is the pulse indicating the spiritual life of the Church. Dr. Cuyler says, "a cold prayer-meeting is at once the cause and the effect of spiritual declension."

These things being true, we come to the time-worn question, "How can we have a good prayer-meeting?" It is not our purpose to enter largely into the subject, but we promise one thing—no less true because always insisted upon—the presence of God's spirit—the heart must be in sympathy with the things of Jesus Christ.

> "In prayer, the lips ne'er act the winning part
> Without the sweet concurrence of the heart."

Blessed is that meeting into which the thought "what makes a good prayer-meeting" never comes—a time when God and his people meet, where the prayer-meeting is only the unthought of means and occasion of a fellowship divine; where individual privilege and individual relation to God is the supreme thought—where these things are there is always a good prayer-meeting.

Among its other helpful features, I should expect the prayer-meeting to be *the prayer-meeting of the Church*—that is, the Church in all its membership should participate. The ideal meeting is one in which each has a part, but how to secure this—"Aye, there's the rub." To accomplish this, I have found the use of topic cards most helpful. These accomplish two things, they invite and assist to a previous preparation of mind and heart, and they stimulate thought by their very definiteness. There is, however, with these a danger. They form a mould: but the spirit of times objects to moulds. To obviate any objection arising from this, let it be frankly stated by the leader of the meeting that if the thought of any individual be not in harmony with the subject assigned for that meeting, let no attention be paid to that subject. More is wanted, however, than topic cards—you need a live subject. Not necessarily a sensational subject (if you are so happy as to know what "sensational" means), but a subject in which thinking people are interested. On a card before me I note the subject, "What to you are the best evidences of the truth of the Christian religion"—illustrating one sort of topics. Then, too, no better or more interesting subjects can be found than doctrinal ones. They must always form the staple of religious thinking as long as man remains as he is. But topic cards and interesting subjects are by no means an "open sesame" to

Digitized by Google

a good prayer meeting. We have the machinery—we need steam to make it go. There now comes the effort of the leader to interest the people in that prepared. Public announcements and admonitions seem in their effect like echo answering echo. There must be a more direct method. It is laborious, but I know nothing that yields as good results as a previous word to each one thought of as a participant. Not merely expressing a hope that they will "have a word to say," but assigning them a definite part of a definite topic—asking a direct question to be answered in the public meeting. If the information you ask for is not accessible to them, supply it on the card by which you make your request. One must say, "this is machine work." It might be so termed, but it is none the less valuable. It assists to the time when the young Christian, or old, can do without the machine. "Is it worth the trouble?" Yes, anything that perfects Christian character is.

The prayer-meeting should be a place for the spiritual development of the young Christian. Not long since, I had occasion to ask one of our young men to publicly address a meeting of Christians. He hesitated. He desired to, but was timid. I spoke of my desire that he might be efficient in every respect, including this, in Christian service. He replied that he desired to but did not know how to accomplish it. I wanted to aid him. How could I do it? I determined, as far as possible, to make the prayer-meeting for him, and others like him, a stepping stone to higher public efficiency. Now young men are associated with me in the opening service of the meeting. A certain one, designated beforehand, is expected to read the evening Scripture and announce the several opening hymns; this much is expected. Beyond this, he is invited to offer a short prayer and make a few remarks on the topic of the meeting—this last feature is optional with the young man. To this same end, the development of the Christian usefulness of the young, arrangement is made, in our provision of the prayer-meeting schedule, for several meetings during the year, conducted entirely by the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor. The young people arrange for their own subject and mutually stir one another up to participation and good work. This arrangement has the advantages of familiarizing the young people with the conducting of a meeting larger than their own, of bringing them into the church prayer meeting, and of strengthening the bond of sympathy between both these branches of the Christian Church.

Another thing the prayer-meeting offers—that is, *a grand opportunity for the religious education of the membership.* A member of the church for five years ought to know considerably more of religious truth at the end of that time than at the beginning. The time has passed when intelligent minds can be satisfied with religious platitudes.

Digitized by Google

They demand definite knowledge. They have a right to know. Knowledge in religion is the handmaid of faith to a Christian mind. In missions it is the forerunner of enthusiasm and zeal. This religious education should be systematic. It should advance. Its definite object should be to impart, as completely as circumstances permit, a somewhat careful knowledge of the Bible, its books, writers, circumstances of writing, contents, etc., of the doctrines usually embraced in treatises on systematic theology, and last, but not least, a survey of the work accomplished and in progress in the world's mission fields.

This may appear a very large conception of what the prayer-meeting may accomplish, but from experience it has been proved both possible and profitable. . . . The meeting is now open. Let participation be general.

BENJ. L. HERR.

Tarrytown, N. Y.

THE SECOND COMING OF JESUS CHRIST.

The second personal appearance of the Lord Jesus Christ is distinctly taught in the New Testament. But we must guard against the common error of supposing that in every case in which *a coming* of Jesus Christ is spoken of, reference is made to his final personal appearance. In the Bible, as well as in other books, we have to examine the connection in which words stand, in order to know what is the idea intended to be conveyed.

I. There are passages in which Jesus Christ promises to bestow special personal blessings, in which he uses the definite statements, "We will *come*," "I will *come*." See John 14:23; Rev. 3:20.

II. In the letter to the church in Ephesus, Jesus threatened to remove opportunities from them, and in that to the church in Pergamos, he threatened to manifest his displeasure; and in both cases he used the expression, "I will *come*." See Rev. 2: 5,16.

III. Luke 12:40, "Be ye therefore ready also, for the Son of Man *cometh* at an hour when ye think not," is usually quoted as if it certainly referred to the final coming. But what are the facts in the case? In answer to a request made to him, Jesus Christ spoke of the danger of covetousness, and then gave the parable of the rich man to whom God said, "Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee." It is evident that this refers to the sudden *death* of the man. Jesus then continued talking to his disciples on the importance of due attention to their spiritual well being, and the necessity for constant watchfulness, and he closes with the injunction above quoted. In this way, Jesus urged upon his disciples the importance of living in constant preparation for *death*, and spoke of that event as his *coming*. And I think that John 14:3 refers to the same event, and that Jesus was tell-

Digitized by Google

ing the disciples of something for their speedy personal comfort, in that he would *at death* receive them to himself, rather than directing their attention to an event which was many centuries distant. And I think this view accords with the statements of Paul 2 Cor. 5:8: and Phil. 1:23.

IV. In Matthew 16:28, Mark 9:1, and Luke 9:27, we have three different versions of a statement which Jesus Christ made to his disciples. Although the wording differs, there is no real discrepancy. Jesus speaks of something which would occur while some who heard him were still alive on the earth, and therefore he *could not* have referred to his second personal appearance. I think he did refer to the manifestations of the Holy Spirit, on the day of Pentecost, and the proclamation and the triumphs of the Gospel after that.

V. In Matthew 24:30, Mark, 13:26, and Luke, 21:27, we have a prediction of "the Son of Man *coming* in the clouds;" and it is thought this must certainly mean his final coming. It appears that on this occasion the disciples had directed the attention of Jesus to the building of the temple; and according to the concurrent testimony of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, he said in reply, "There shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." Whatever may have been the exact words of the apostles, it is evident that they inquired about the event which Jesus had predicted, saying, according to Mark 13:4, "When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled?" And Jesus answered this question, telling, as all admit, about the events preceding the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, and then speaks of the darkening of the sun, and of the moon ceasing to give light, etc., which according to Mark 13:24 was to be "*In those days*," after that tribulation, *i. e.*, the trials preceding the destruction of Jerusalem; and according to Matthew 24:29 "*Immediately* after the tribulation of those days." And that he had no reference to his final second appearance is further proved by the fact that Matthew, Mark and Luke each tell us (with a very slight variation in the words used), that Jesus distinctly affirmed, "This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled."

VI. Notwithstanding the fact that so many passages of Scripture which refer to *a coming* of the Lord Jesus Christ have been misunderstood and misapplied, there can be no doubt that the New Testament does distinctly and positively teach that Jesus Christ will *personally* appear on the earth a second time. I think Jesus referred to this, John 5:28-29; 6:40, and Matthew 25:31,46. And it is more distinctly declared, Acts 1:11, where after the ascension of Jesus, the "two men . . . . . in white apparel" said to the disciples, "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go

Digitized by Google

into heaven." And after this it is very frequently referred to in the epistles. See Phil. 3: 20, 1 Thess., 1: 10, 4: 16,17, 2 Thess., 1: 7, Titus 2:13, Heb. 9: 28. These passages speak distinctly of the coming from heaven, and the appearing on earth of the Lord Jesus Christ; and they indicate that it will be at the end of the world, in connection with the resurrection of the dead, the final judgment, and the reception of the righteous into a state of eternal blessedness.

WM. HURLIN.

Antrim, N. H.

READING OF SCRIPTURE AND HYMNS.

THE church service should be harmoniously beautiful and solemn; every part should contribute to the inspiration of a spirit of true, earnest worship. Entirely too much is required of the sermon; and the sermon often has a very difficult task to counteract the influence of, or the want of interest, in other parts of the service. A sermon goes for all it is worth only when the audience is prepared for it by the preliminary reading and singing and praying. And then it has its wonted effect only when the parts of service immediately following it clinch its thought and add to its power. The value of the prayer cannot be over-estimated. The man who is to preach should make the prayer. But too little attention is given to the reading of the Scripture and hymns.

The Scripture is shamefully abused in the pulpit. The word is made to mean what it does *not* mean, and often made to mean nothing at all intelligible. A fine voice is not essential to excellent public reading; it is important, but not essential. Knowledge of what the Scriptures mean is essential. Then there must be a spiritual conception of the truth, with the emotion which attends it. With these the reader pays very little regard to the painfully inconsistent punctuation and division of the verses, and furnishes, without an added word, a clear, forcible exposition in the character of his reading. Many a minister would better spend the time given to "jotting down a few thoughts" for prayer-meeting in acquainting himself with the chapter to be read and the manner in which he will read it. God's thoughts already jotted down are precious to his saints. They like to hear them pure and simple. The man who can really read the Scriptures to an audience is a man of power and a great preacher of the Word. He takes hold of the book in a solemn, dignified, yet pleasant and earnest manner, and announces the portion to be read in a way which says, "This is God's sweet and holy message of grace to us. It is our Father's voice we are about to hear. What good thing will He say to us to-day?" and every ear is ready for the truth. Then he reads naturally, slowly and easily, avoiding a certain familiar tone which he adopts in reading human

Digitized by Google

authors. As he reads passages familiar to the people, countenances lighten, or grow solemn and thoughtful, as the inflection or punctuation brings out truths which they never dreamed were underneath those simple words. In company with a friend, I listened to one of our most noted preachers as he read the Scriptures before preaching. My friend said: "He can read better than that. He is reserving all of his force the sermon." What an error! The chapter was worth a great expenditure of nerve force. The sermon preached was good, but the chapter skimmed bristled with beautiful truths, which, if they had been given all their force, would have made the sermon tenfold more powerful than it was. The Scripture reading should be preparatory to the sermon both in its selection and in its rendering. No man is really a good public reader of the Word who is not often overwhelmed and carried entirely out of himself as he reads, and weary and weak when the chapter or passage is ended. It takes nerve force; it requires mental and spiritual power to take God's thoughts upon the mind and heart, and hand them down to the people.

Hymn reading is another vitally important feature of the service. The mumblings and mutterings, and gyrations and intonations and inflections of this part of the service are often ridiculous. They are unnecessary. Some men ought never to try to read a hymn in the pulpit, because they don't know how. The hymn may be carefully and solemnly announced without reading it, and the habit of reading one stanza, or two or three lines, is silly. Many hymns cannot be read at all by anybody with good effect. They were not meant to be read, but to be sung. Short and peculiar expressions occur which are beautiful when set to appropriate music, or beautiful in their poetry, which fall with flat unmeaningness when attempt is made to read them in the hymn. Repetitions often occur which are impossible to be read with any good effect. There can be but one rule for hymn reading which will surely prevent the habit from some time or other making discord in the service. That rule is, never to read the hymn at all nor any part of it. The only proper rule to follow is to study the hymns as one does the Scripture to be read, and then use common sense and all possible training, and read those or parts of those in which the reading will impress the truth they teach, and enable the congregation to sing with the spirit and with the understanding.

When the entire church service becomes something in which the full importance of the smallest part is recognized, instead of regarding the Scripture and prayers and hymns as "preliminary services," more attention will be given to learning to read. Men who stand high in scholarship and pulpit ability are culpably ignorant of the art of reading. It is not genius which makes readers: it is careful training and practice. If a man has a well trained head and a warm heart, and does

Digitized by Google

not learn to read effectively, he does wrong as a minister of Christ. His power is not more than half what it might be. There are men in the pulpit whose "natural gifts" as readers of Scripture and hymns are highly spoken of who read as poorly as most ministers do until they paid two dollars a lesson for a year or two for those "natural gifts." What is the use of reading poorly all one's life when, by a year of earnest study of the subject, and five years of thoughtful, careful practice, almost any minister of Christ may at least double his pulpit power, and a majority may increase it a hundredfold?

IRVING F. DAVIS.

Jersey City, N. J.

INTEREST IN CHURCH AFFAIRS.

It should always be understood that when anyone joins a church he places himself there to do a work. Too many Christians are influenced by the spirit of indifference when they first unite with a church. When they have been baptized and the hand of fellowship extended to them, many seem to think that the greater part of their work has been accomplished. If we understand what our Saviour meant when he said: "Go work to-day in my vineyard," the work has just begun when he places himself in fellowship with the children of God. In order, therefore, to influence members to take more interest in church and denominational affairs, perhaps it may be well to resort to the following methods:

First, let the pastor himself be in full sympathy with the work. To a great extent a church is influenced by the life of the pastor. If a pastor shows himself to be careless and unconcerned about the work of the church and denomination the people will very soon be inclined to follow in his footsteps. The same may be said about his bearing toward mission work, both Home and Foreign. If the pastor is in full sympathy with these great causes, will give liberally toward them himself, will occasionally preach a stirring sermon showing the condition and the needs of the fields, his people will be induced to give their means for the support of such work. I am much persuaded to think that this is one of the great reasons why many of our churches do not read more religious papers and books and give themselves more information on these subjects than they do, from the fact that the interest of such work is not often brought before them. So with reference to the Sunday-school, the prayer-meeting and other church work. That pastor who turns a cold shoulder to the Sunday-school on Sunday morning, leaving the work to be done by a few faithful brethren and sisters, will easily find a number of his members who will gladly consent that

Digitized by Google

the Sunday-school is of little importance, and will not give it their support.

Under such circumstances it is not a wonder that the Sunday-school is soon put to death. If you will examine the best churches of our country, both in the North and in the South, you will find that they are managed by that class of ministers whose hearts are full of sympathy and love for the very best interests of both denominational and church work. They believe in mission work; they believe in Sunday-school work; in denominational work of all kinds; and, when occasion demands it, they put forth every effort for the advancement of the cause. This, my brethren, is a great blessing to any church when the pastor will thus lay the foundation and open up a way for individual members to become more interested in denominational and church affairs. Without this help of the pastor the church loses one rich blessing that a church cannot well aford to lose.

But permit me to call your attention, in the second place, to another method that may arouse some interest in this work: Impress on the minds of the members the fact that this interest must be taken and this work must be done by them. Too many churches sit down and wait for the pastor to do all the work—wait for him to build up the interest in the Sunday-school, the prayer-meeting, the evening and morning service; wait for him to visit the sick, the infirm, the widow and the orphan; wait for him to lead every soul in the town or community to Christ; thus depending on him to do the work, when Paul, who was inspired by the Holy Spirit, said that "we are laborers together with God." He did not mean that simply the pastors of churches are laborers together with God—no, not by any means—but all who know Christ as their personal Saviour are laborers together with him. Oftentimes, however, the churches are not to be blamed so much as the pastors, for they do not always give opportunity to do this work.

Pastors, it is well, if possible, to give each individual member a work to do.

Train certain members for certain work. There is no doubt but that every individual can do his respective work best. Every talent should be developed in its own natural way. Some have special ability in controlling the young lambs of the flock; some in watching over the small children of the Sunday-school; some in teaching certain classes; some in visiting the sick, and some in visiting the stranger; others for bringing about special interest in the prayer-meeting and Sunday-school services, while others may do their best work in keeping the financial welfare of the church in proper condition. It should be understood in connection with this work, that he who may be instrumental in baptizing many souls and bringing them into the Church, is

Digitized by Google

not always regarded as being the successful pastor. But that pastor who sees well to the training of those who are brought under his care, is more entitled to the honor.

Be sure and seek out the many hidden talents that may be found in a church, and see that they are developed to the greatest extent, and by so doing it will be found that our members will often be enabled to give others great encouragement in their many difficult duties of life. Thus in giving individual members work to do, they cannot help but take interest and be successful in their respective spheres if they have any love of Christ to constrain them. By this means many members can be influenced to take interest in church and denominational affairs who would not do so otherwise.

The third method to which I refer is by circulating religious literature.

Dr. J. B. Simmons, who has been one of the most successful pastors in the North, says that he has made it a point to keep something in the tract form before his people all the while, and that he would frequently put out two or three hundred copies on the same subject during one day, and the Sunday following he would preach a sermon bearing along that line. When they had thoroughly digested that subject, he would follow it up with something else in the course of a few days or weeks, and he said it was most wonderful to see some of the results of such work.

If we can only put good religious tracts and our best denominational weekly papers before the people, and get them interested in reading them, there is no doubt but that great good can be accomplished. Secure tracts for them, get them interested in reading them, and have them distribute those that are most helpful among the weak members of the church, and also members of the congregations who are not Christians. By this means they will be compelled to be interested, and at the same time uplift someone else. It is safe to say that if an examination could be made in every church, that not more than twenty-five per cent. of the members read religious newspapers and tracts. Often secular papers and magazines of all descriptions, from *Harper's Weekly* down to the *Texas Siftings*, can be found in their homes, but from these they have no opportunity to learn the condition of the church and denomination, hence their interest cannot be very great.

Let us sow good seed in good ground and cultivate it in God's way, and in the fulness of time a great harvest will be garnered.

J. C. BURKETT.

Taylor, Texas.

Digitized by Google

IX.

REVIEW OF CURRENT LITERATURE.

A. THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

I. EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

The Hittites. The Story of a Forgotten Empire. By A. H. JOYCE, LL.D. The Religious Tract Society. London, 1888. Pp. 150.

This is Vol. XII. of the series entitled "By Paths of Bible Knowledge." Some of the earlier historical volumes were, "Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments," by Joyce; "Babylonian Life and History," by Budge; "Egypt and Syria," by Dawson; "Assyria: Its Princes, Priests and People," by Joyce; and the "Dwellers by the Nile," by Budge. This is an exceedingly instructive and interesting series of books for everybody who has a liking for ancient history or Bible history.

Professor Joyce introduces us at once to the Hittites of the Bible—a people whose very existence has been denied by some extreme critics of Old Testament history. Within ten years we have learned definitely not only of their existence, but of their great power among the nations of antiquity.

The monuments of Egypt and Assyria bring united testimony to the great influence and power enjoyed by the Hittite empire before and about 1000 B. C. They seem at one time to have possessed nearly the whole of Asia Minor, and to have held at bay both Egypt and Assyria. Rameses II. was glad to make a treaty with them, and in it to grant them surprising concessions. Their great stronghold on the Euphrates was Karkemish, for several hundred years the successful opponent of the Assyrian hosts.

But by 1000 B. C. the Hittite power began to wane. The people, however, were found among almost all nationalities. Palestine had its share. Abraham bought the cave of Machpelah from Ephrar, the Hittite (Gen. 23 : 10). Solomon dealt in Egyptian horses, which were also sold to the Hittites.

Within the past decade a large number of Hittite inscriptions have been discovered in southeast Asia Minor, but as yet no attempt at translating them has been even moderately successful. They are almost entirely hieroglyphic in character, revealing in a rude way the religion and art of these primitive peoples. Their real value will never be known until these are read.

The Hittites occupied a prominent place in the trade and various industries of their time; but our information on this point, as on most others, must be gathered from contemporaneous documents.

Digitized by Google

Professor Joyce is a very easy writer, and uses a good, plain style; but occasionally he is rash in his inferences, drawing conclusions from false premises. This little book, however, will be of value to all Bible and Oriental students.

IRA M. PRICE.

II. HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

The Petrine Claims. A Critical Inquiry. By RICHARD FREDERICK LITTLEDALE, LL.D., D. C. L. 16mo, pp. 363. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

The chapters that compose this treatise were originally published as a series of articles in the *Church Quarterly Review* between the years 1878 and 1884. They comprise a very interesting chapter in polemics, for though in substance historical, they are in form controversial. The subject discussed is one of comparatively little speculative or dogmatic interest for Baptists, but the historical questions involved are worthy of so scholarly a scrutiny as that to which Dr. Littledale has subjected them.

The claim of the Church of Rome, first announced by Boniface VIII. in his Bull *Unam Sanctam*, and carried to its theological conclusion by the decrees of the Vatican Council of 1870, is that this Church is not merely the largest, most ancient and most authoritative portion of the Christian body, but that she is the whole Church, and that other Christian societies are mere sects and schisms. This claim rests upon a series of assumptions dogmatic and historical. These assumptions Dr. Littledale examines one by one and refutes. We shall be able only to glance at his arguments and give a few of their salient points. Those who wish to see the subject thoroughly discussed must examine the book itself.

The first series of assumptions ostensibly rests on the Scriptures. The Roman theory implies these two points to be made out clearly from the New Testament: That St. Peter was given a primacy or sovereign jurisdiction over all the other apostles; and, secondly, that he had authority to confer this power upon his successors. An examination of the Scriptures does indeed show, as Dr. Littledale admits, that Peter had a sort of primacy among the other apostles, but it was one of honor and influence only. He was, in some respects, the strongest man of the original twelve, and he took the place among them to which his force of character naturally entitled him. But Dr. Littledale conclusively shows that Peter had no such jurisdiction, no such ecclesiastical authority over his fellow apostles as the Roman theory demands. If there were no other evidence on the subject, the facts regarding the so-called Council of Jerusalem would be decisive. Over this council James presided, not Peter. It was James who proposed the solution of the difficulty that was adopted by the council as its decision, and the record was sent forth, not in the name of Peter, as it would have been had he been the head of the Church, but in the name of "the apostles, and elders, and brethren." The lack of such authority as the Roman theory attributes to Peter is also marked by numerous passages in the writings of Paul, as where, in I. Cor. 1 : 10-13, he pronounces it a

Digitized by Google

mark of schism to adhere particularly to Peter (Cephas); and still more positively in Gal. 2 : 7-14, where he indicates himself as having co-ordinate authority with Peter, and as on one occasion, at least, having withstood Peter to the face because of the latter's temporizing and vacillating policy with regard to the Gentile converts.

But even if it were admitted that to Peter, during his life-time, was committed some sort of primacy among the apostles, there is absolutely not a suggestion in the New Testament that authority was given him to transmit this power to his successors. It is true that in urging this point Dr. Littledale not only annihilates the fundamental theory of the Papacy, but also the High Church doctrine of apostolic succession, according to which the bishops of the Church are the successors of the apostles. There is no more suggestion in the New Testament of authority given to all the apostles to transmit their powers to the bishops than there is of authority given to one apostle to transmit his supreme power to a line of successors. The same consideration that is fatal to the Papacy is fatal to the High Church theory. We do not know, however, that Dr. Littledale belongs to the High Church party. If he does not, he is theologically consistent.

The Roman theory likewise demands that, as a matter of fact, the Apostle Peter should be proved to have transmitted his alleged right of primacy to his successors; that he was himself the first Bishop of Rome, and that the Popes are, therefore, his historical successors; and that this right of primacy on the part of Peter, and this transmission of his right to the other Bishops of Rome, was recognized in the early Church. Not one of these points can be made out from early ecclesiastical history. It cannot even be proved that Peter was ever in Rome, much less that he was ever a bishop of the Church at Rome. The names and orders of his alleged successors in that office are in doubt, which could not have been the case had the importance of the succession been recognized in the early Church. It is absurd to suppose that if the mere fact of being Bishop of Rome carried with it the right of primacy over the whole Church, the names of the bishops and the order of their succession would not have been made matters of most careful record. Moreover, in early Church literature there is an absolute lack of any recognition of the supreme jurisdiction and infallible character of the Bishops of Rome. It is true that the existence of a right does not depend upon its acknowledgment, but the fact that an alleged right is neither acknowledged nor denied, but is simply ignored in a given historical period, is valid proof that at that time the alleged right was never claimed. The most that any Roman Catholic controversialist can urge, if he candidly acknowledges the indisputable facts of early Church history, is that the Scriptures show that Jesus conferred a primacy upon Peter and his successors, but that this right remained in abeyance for several centuries before it was practically exercised or even seriously claimed.

But while the early Church is silent with regard to the Papal claims, there was anything but silence in the Church when these claims first began to be made. Contemporaneously with the assertion on the part of Bishops of Rome that to them belonged the rightful primacy over the Church Catholic were protests, and resistance, and rebellion.

Digitized by Google

The doctrine was everywhere treated as an invalid and unheard-of claim, and was resisted until political and other events so increased the power of the Roman bishops that they obtained the primacy *de facto* which had never been conceded to them by the Church *de jure*.

But even when this primacy of the Bishop of Rome became an acknowledged fact, and he was recognized as the head of the Church through Western Europe, the Church was still far from conceding to him that infallible character which the Pope afterwards claimed, and which was conceded to him by the Vatican Council of 1870. Indeed, the acts of councils during the Middle Ages are entirely irreconcilable with any theory of absolute Papal supremacy and infallibility. For example, before the meeting of the Council of Rome in 963, Pope John XII. had been accused of simony, adultery and other grievous crimes, and he was by that council deposed from his office. The Council of Sutri, in 1046, found confronting it three rival Popes—Benedict IX., Sylvester III. and Gregory VI.—one of whom must have been the lawful claimant; but the council condemned Sylvester as an impostor, degraded him from holy orders, imprisoned him for life, and compelled both of the other claimants to abdicate. The Council of Pisa, in 1409, adjudicated upon the conflicting claims of Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII., one of whom must have been the true Pontiff. But it deposed, condemned and excommunicated both of them, electing in their stead the Pope known as Alexander V. The Council of Constance, in 1415, had before it the claims of the two Popes deposed at Pisa, together with those of the actual Pope, John XXIII. It finally deposed the latter, disallowed the claims of Benedict and Gregory, and elected a new Pontiff under the title of Martin V. These are only a part of the instances in which Popes, some of whom must have been lawful occupants of the office, have been deposed, degraded and excommunicated by councils. This is a practical assertion on the part of the Church of the superiority of councils to Popes, which cannot be set aside by the decrees of the Vatican Council. The two are, in fact, an irreconcilable conflict.

But, after all, this is not the worst. The condemnation of the letters of Pope Honorius by Pope Martin I., and the first Council of Lateran, in 649, is an absolutely insurmountable obstacle to those who maintain the theory of Petrine primacy and infallibility. The occasion of the letters was that heresy known as monothelism; that is, that in the person of Christ there was but one will—a sub-form of monophysism, or the theory that Christ had but one nature—both of which are opposed to the Catholic doctrine that in the person of Christ are indissolubly united two natures and two wills, yet so that there is but one personality. The leader of the heretical sect wrote to Pope Honorius, setting forth his view of the matter and asking for the Pontiff's decision. It was a most serious theological controversy, involving ultimately the reality of the atonement. In his reply Honorius committed himself definitely to the cardinal doctrine of monothelism, saying: *Unde et unam voluntatem fatemur domini nostri Jesu Christi*—"We confess one will of our Lord Jesus Christ"—and he added also, towards the close of his letter, these words: "These things your fraternity will preach with us, as we preach them in unanimity with you." He wrote

Digitized by Google

these letters as Pope, declaring what should be the teaching in the Church, and, accordingly, his letters were *ex cathedra* decrees on matters of faith, and hence, in accordance with the terms of the dogma of infallibility, they must have been without error. Nevertheless, these letters were condemned by Martin I. and the first Council of Lateran as "most impious," and were ordered to be burnt as profane and hurtful to souls. It has since been contended by Catholic writers of the Ultramontane school that these letters of Honorius were orthodox. This is evidently false, but the peculiarity of the case is that it is equally destructive of Ultramontanism, whatever view be taken of the theology of Honorius; for an Ultramontane is confronted with this dilemma: If Honorius was orthodox, he was unjustly condemned by a subsequent (infallible) Pope and council, and if he were justly condemned, he was, though infallible as Pope, heterodox. Whichever horn of the dilemma is chosen, one must conclude that a Pope erred in an *ex cathedra* utterance regarding the faith; for both Honorius and Martin I. cannot possibly have been right, since one denied what the other affirmed.

Dr. Littledale has still another argument in reserve, and that is, that if there ever were such a thing as Petrine primacy and a power to transmit it, the succession was irretrievably lost during these mediæval conflicts. It is a principle of canon law that the election of a Pope is illegal unless he is chosen by properly qualified electors; and conversely, that an illegally elected Pope cannot appoint to any position, his acts being null and void. It is demonstrable that during over sixty years not one lawfully elected Pope ascended the Papal chair; none of them could lawfully appoint to any dignity in the Roman church; consequently, it is certain that at the close of the sixty years' anarchy there was not a single properly qualified clerical elector in the Roman church, and therefore a legal election had become impossible. The Petrine line, if it be conceded to have ever been a reality, ended in the tenth century. The later Popes may conceivably be Bishops of Rome in some sense, but they have no more connection with the older line than the Napoleonic dynasty has with the Carolingian line, though both ruled France and were called emperors.

There are at least half a dozen points in the chain of proof needed to support the Roman church in its claim of primacy where the argument is fatally defective. Any one of these defects would invalidate the whole argument; taken together, they simply make it ridiculous.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

William George Ward and the Oxford Movement. By WILFRED WARD. 8 vo, pp. 462. London: MacMillan & Co.

The face that looks out at one from the engraved frontispiece of this volume is an unusually handsome one. The expression of the mouth and the contour of the chin indicate a character in which amiability and sensitiveness are prominent traits; while the forehead, broad rather than high, while it justifies no expectation of mental weakness, is such as one associates with a fine æsthetic nature rather than with great powers of thought. The face is that of a perceptive, rather than

Digitized by Google

of a reflective, man. One would say, without knowing anything further about him, that this is a man whose convictions are subject to his sentiments—a good man probably, but almost certainly erratic; an active leader, no doubt, but by no means a safe one.

Most American readers will make the acquaintance of the subject of this biography through reading the book. Who was William George Ward? will be their first question. But as they read they will find the first impressions, derived from study of the engraved portrait, confirmed by study of the man as self, revealed through his writings. For Mr. Ward's son wisely permits his father in large part to speak for himself, through liberal extracts from his letters, journals and other literary remains. Though William George Ward is so little known in this country, and though even in England his fame was confined to a comparatively small circle, he played a great part in one of the most important religious movements of this century. What is known as the Tractarian movement in the Church of England had four leaders who may be said to have towered above the rest. Of these probably John Henry Newman and Edward Bouverie Pusey are perhaps best known, though John Keble might dispute the palm with them. The fame of Keble, however, rests rather upon his well known cycle of poems called *The Christian Year* than upon his relations to this movement. Mr. Ward was a younger man than the other leaders, and during the early period of the movement was rather a disciple than a leader. But after the publication of the famous tract No. 90, which marked the culmination of the agitation within the English Church, both Newman and Pusey recoiled from the effect produced by it. In Pusey's case the recoil was permanent. He had never contemplated the possibility of a separation from the Church of England, nor the adoption of the distinctive tenets of the Roman Church; and when he saw the movement proceeding to such a point that it could not logically stop short of Rome, he not only refused to take a further step, but even retraced some of the steps that he had taken. The recoil of Newman was but temporary. He had gone too far to return, without abandoning his most cherished convictions, but for the first time he then saw clearly whither he was going, and being of a cautious temperament he was fain to commune with himself for a while and weigh maturely the consequences of each further onward step. Keble, by his remoteness from Oxford and his essential unfitness for the rôle of leadership—although his influence had done much to propagate Tractarian principles and to strengthen the movement, and even to secure its acceptance in many quarters—was neither able nor willing to step into the place vacated in turn by Pusey and Newman. Ward, however, was a man of different metal. Not so great intellectually as Newman, not so scholarly as Pusey, not so austere in character as Keble, he had in his nature something of the qualities of all three, joined to others that they all lacked, namely, the most absolute confidence in the righteousness of his opinions, and the most fearless determination to promulgate and defend them in season and out of season. Without assumption, or conceit or immodesty, he therefore naturally stepped at once into the leader's place, and during the few remaining years before the party entirely broke up he was recognized as its representative man.

Digitized by Google

Like many other men of great fervor of conviction, Mr. Ward passed through a checkered experience of religious belief, at each stage of which he was thoroughly confident of his infallibility. He began while an undergraduate to be, and for some years after his graduation continued, a partisan of Arnold of Rugby, the leader of the Broad Church party. This party stood for a national church, which was to be made broad enough to include men of every sort of faith. Nothing less than denial of the Trinity would have excluded a man from the Church under their principle, and even with regard to the doctrine of the Trinity, Arnold himself and some of his disciples certainly departed very widely from the orthodox standards. For a time this theory entirely satisfied Mr. Ward, but his intellect was of a severely logical order. He could not long away with a policy that was from the necessity of the case illogical and inconsistent. The Arnold movement looked first of all and chiefly to the preservation of the legal establishment, the destruction of which seemed to him to be an irreparable calamity. The Tractarians, on the other hand, declared war against this Erastian ideal of the Church, for to them it seemed an intolerable innovation of her rights that Parliament should rule her affairs. They believed her to be the lineal descendant of the Church of Gregory and Augustine, and through them of the Apostles, and therefore her formularies were sacred. Complete dependence on the State was the ideal perfection of the Church, in Arnold's view, while in the view of the Tractarians this was a sacreligious notion, impairing the sacredness and authority of apostolic institutions. The Tractarians had no objections to such a union of Church and State as would leave the former independent of all save financial support. They scouted the proposition, dear to every Englishman who pays taxes, that if Parliament gives money from the public purse, Parliament may of right regulate its expenditure.

It was not long before it seemed to Ward that the position of Arnold was untenable, and that the other movement conducted by Pusey and Newman on exactly the opposite principle was consistent and logical, and rested on a sound basis. He soon cast in his lot with them, though in joining their party he had no conception of the goal whither he would be led. His was not a nature in any case to weigh coldly and carefully the consequences of an opinion or course of action. What he deemed right he undertook with a light heart, with no reference to results. But his logical mind, his fervid temperament soon not merely led him to complete acceptance of the views taught by his leaders, but made of him a more consistent and uncompromising Tractarian than they all.

After the publication of the famous Tract No. 90, Ward proceeded to develop his views further. He avowed opinions not only in advance of anything before that time spoken aloud, but seemingly irreconcilable with honest subscription to the formularies of the Church of England. His view, like that of all his party, was that the formularies adopted in the time of Edward VI., when the Reformation reached its climax, were of the nature of a compromise, intended to be mutually inconsistent and to promote the holding of views greatly dissimilar within the bounds of the church. Consequently he urged that it was not only possible but allowable for a priest of the Church of England to hold all the

Digitized by Google

distinctive teachings of the Church of Rome as to doctrine, and still remain loyal to the church in which Providence had placed him, by interpreting the articles in a "non-natural" sense.

This phrase, which was Ward's own pet invention, at once became famous. He, for the first time frankly admitted what others began to see, that it was impossible to reconcile the doctrines taught in Tract 90 with the natural sense of the Articles or even of the Prayer-Book. This fact Newman and Pusey were unwilling to acknowledge, even to themselves, much less to the world. But Ward refused to shut his eyes to the truth. To him it was plain that his views and the Articles, could not be reconciled by any ordinary process. He accordingly advanced the theory that the Articles were not intended, and never had been intended to be taken in the strict sense of the words, but were to be interpreted loosely, or, as he put it, in a "non-natural" sense. His remedy was heroic, but it was seen at once, of course, that this would never do. By "non natural" interpretation anything can be made to mean anything. The decrees of the Council of Trent may be interpreted in a "non-natural" sense to teach good Protestant doctrine. Ward's theory was also shown by English scholars to be historically absurd, and was generally condemned. The natural result followed. Being already a Romanist in doctrine, though outwardly loyal to the Church of England, he went to his own place. Newman followed him very soon, and the Tractarian party entirely collapsed.

It is not the purpose of this biography to give a history in all its details of this movement in which Mr. Ward took so prominent a part. The idea is rather to trace his own mental and spiritual development, and to show the extent and quality of his influence upon his contemporaries. This work is thoroughly well done. There is no tendency to depreciate the service of others in order to exalt that of Mr. Ward. What is more gratifying still, there seems to be no tendency to impute bad motives or bad character to those who were most earnest and active opponents of Mr. Ward and his co-reformers. At the time, accusations of bad faith, of "Jesuitism," were bandied back and forth with considerable freedom, but years enough have elapsed to make it clear past all question that the motives of the leaders on both sides of this fierce controversy were upright and honorable. It is greatly to the credit of Mr. Wilfred Ward that he has embodied in his book no second-hand animosities, no ill-timed echoes of the hard things that were said when the conflict was raging.

Another excellence of the book is the very vivid impression that it gives us of the personality of Mr. Ward. He was a man of striking, not to say eccentric, qualities and appearance. He was tall, stout, rather clumsy in his movements, and yet of striking presence, his clear-cut features had great mobility of expression, and his joyousness of manner was infectious. A friend says of him:

> When serious, his face expressed a remarkable combination of intellectual power with gentleness. His voice was powerful and musical in speaking as well as in singing, and "his laugh mighty." His speech was always downright, straightforward, and frank to a fault. His statement was clear and direct, and there was no escape from him in argument. He always went straight to his point without conventional preamble. He would meet a friend out walking, and accost him in the same breath with "How d'ye do?—what do you think of

Digitized by Google

Newman's answer to Fausset on such a point?" . . . He could not bear pretence of any kind in others, and still less could he endure that others should credit him with good qualities which he did not believe himself to possess. He loved a startling opinion and in its most startling form, and he delighted in perplexing every one by the abrupt statement, or rather over-statement, of an undeniable truth in the most unacceptable words conceivable. "My impression of him generally at that time," writes the late Dean Scott, of Rochester, "was that partly from an honesty of mind which could not endure that his friends should not know of him what they would think the worst, and partly from a playful fondness for displaying his dialectics in conversation, a great discount was to be allowed on all that was most startling in what he used to blurt out. He had a mischievous delight in making the 'moderates' stare." The brusqueness of manner of which his school-fellows speak, seems to have become less pronounced at Oxford, as his taste and opportunities for intellectual conversation grew; though it still found occasional expression in abrupt and somewhat Johnsonian rejoinders. For example, there was a story current of his sitting at dinner next to a clergyman, who had been preaching at St. Mary's as select preacher. Ward had been present at the sermon, and had condemned it to his friends as one of the worst he had ever heard. The preacher, in all unconsciousness, began at once referring to his sermon, and asked Ward if he had heard it. As the conversation proceeded, the difficulty of speaking of it at length without implying his view of its quality increased. Ward had been all the afternoon boiling over with indignation at such a sermon being tolerated in Oxford; and now malicious fortune had placed him in a situation in which he had to keep on saying civil things to the offender. Struggling still to keep on safe ground he asked: "How much do they pay you for these sermons?" "Five pounds," was the reply; and after a pause, "Don't you think that enough?" The answer which suggested itself was irresistible. "I don't know," Ward replied; "I wouldn't have preached it for fifty."

Mr. Ward was a man who never did anything by halves, either speech or action, and the frank and unconventional way in which he sometimes expressed himself was quite likely to shock those who did not understand his ways. Of this trait his son says:

His love of paradox betrayed itself in his conversation constantly, not only on lighter topics, but in discussing the most serious problems. Even when the conclusion he wished to express was most real and important, he would often throw it into a startling form. Thus, in discussing the question of equivocation, as to how far it is lawful on occasion, he maintained, as against those who admit the lawfulness of words literally true but misleading, that the more straightforward principle is that occasionally, when duties conflict, another duty may be more imperative than the duty of truthfulness. But he expressed it thus: "Make yourself clear that you are justified in deception, and then lie like a trooper." So, too, in reference to his pet aversion, the typical churchman of those days—the dignitary of moderate views and immoderate income, with his want of enthusiasm, his serene self-satisfaction, his selfishness, his love of place and power—he would say: "If any man be called 'moderate' or 'venerable,' beware of him; if he be called both, you may be sure he is a scoundrel."

Professor Jewett, now master of Balliol College, contributes some reminiscences, in which he relates the following characteristic anecdote:

His fine voice and his great love of music were expressive of the joviality of his nature. Things serious and profane lay near together in his mind, but they were not confused. He was never in the least degree either coarse or profane,

Digitized by Google

though he might sometimes be misunderstood by persons who do not themselves understand a jest. I admit, however, that he was not indisposed to startle those who were of a different temper from his own—he had a sort of pleasure in doing so. He once took me, on a Sunday evening in the middle of Summer, about the year 1839, when his change of opinion was still recent, to Mr. Newman's church at Littlemore, where he was to preach. We drove out after dinner, and walked home. Two things I remember on that occasion which were highly characteristic of him. The sermon which he preached was a printed one of Dr. Arnold's, but with additions and alterations which, as he said, it would have driven the author mad to hear. This indeed was true, for the intention of them was to change the spirit of the discourse from Low or Broad to High Church, retaining what was common to both. We walked back to Oxford in the twilight, along the Iffley Road. He was in high spirits, and sang to me songs out of "Don Giovanni" and other operas, with which his capacious memory was well stored. He was not the less serious because he could pass an hour or two in this way.

To the same authority we are indebted for the following sketch of Ward's personal appearance and manner of life:

As some of your readers may wish to know what manner of man he was in personal appearance, I will endeavor to describe him. He was about five feet nine in height, dark, but of a cheerful and handsome countenance, readily breaking out into a smile, ungainly in his movements, and uncommonly stout for his age. He was very disorderly both in his dress and his apartments. The tables in his room, never well-furnished, were covered with books, pamphlets, papers, tea things, writing materials, etc. Once or twice he made an attempt, like other disorderly persons, to clear his Augean stable, but it only resulted in sending to the binder a few loose books and papers, which were bound up together without regard to their subjects, and labeled "Sermons, Operas, etc." These labels were declared by one of his friends to be symbolical of himself.

It was a somewhat curious fact that Ward was able to keep on terms of intimate personal friendship with men who were his warmest opponents in theological and ecclesiastical matters. Some of his old friends were temporarily estranged by his leaving the Church of England, but with most of them, a few years later, he renewed his intimacy. There was, for example, Dr. Goulbourn, the present Dean of Norwich. The ice between them was broken by the characteristic passage at arms which the biographer describes thus:

Goulbourn wrote proposing a meeting, and naturally assuming that Mr. Ward's Anglican orders remained valid—on the principle once a priest always a priest—addressed his letter, "The Rev. W. G. Ward." Ward's reply was as follows: "*My Dear Goulbourn*—I observe that your letter is addressed to the Rev. W. G. Ward. I believe that the usual rule of courtesy is that you should address a man, not by some title which you think he ought to assume, but the title which he himself claims. Acting on this principle, I have addressed you as the Rev. E. M. Goulborn. If, however, you consider that you should address me by the title which you think I ought by rights to claim, by all means let us both act on this principle. You will then be perfectly justified in addressing me as the Rev. W. G. Ward. I, on the other hand, shall be obliged to address you as E. M. Goulbourn, Esq."

It is easy to believe that this correspondence was the occasion of a hearty laugh on both sides, and that they renewed their friendly meetings with greater gusto than ever.

Digitized by Google

The author hints, in his closing pages, that as he has followed his father's history only down to the time that he entered the Roman church he may give the world another volume, in which the remaining years of his life shall be described. It can hardly be possible that the second volume will be so important a contribution to the history of religious thought, or so interesting for the personal traits disclosed in it, as is this book, but certainly no one who has read this will be sorry to renew his acquaintance with a character so unique.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

B. GENERAL LITERATURE.

Memoirs of Napoleon Bonaparte. By LOUIS ANTOINE FAUVELET DE BOURRIENNE, his Private Secretary. Edited by Colonel R. W. Phipps. New and Revised Edition, with Thirty-four Full-page Portraits and Other Illustrations. Four vols. Crown, 8vo. New York: T. Y. Crowell & Co.

George Washington. By HENRY CABOT LODGE. "American Statesman Series." Two vols. 12mo, pp. 341, 399. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

We have placed these two works together, not because they have anything in common except in belonging to biographical literature, but because the consecutive reading of them offers a valuable opportunity for the study of character. Napoleon and Washington are, in some sense, the representative men of their respective peoples. They represent not merely two distinct nationalities, temperaments, policies, but two absolutely opposed standards of public and private morality, two irreconcilable ideals of conduct.

No better book for the understanding of Napoleon's character can be found than Bourrienne's *Memoirs*. It is not a little curious that no cheap edition of so important a book has ever before been published in English, and that, in fact, for a considerable time they were not translated into English. From their first appearance they have enjoyed a high repute among statesmen and men of letters. The author had unusual opportunities of knowing Bonaparte well. They were schoolmates at the military academy, and there Bourrienne would have been pronounced by most observers the more likely of the two to make a sensation in the world. The friendship between the young men was kept up after school life, and when Napoleon had begun his career as general of the army of Italy, he sent for Bourrienne to become his private secretary. In that capacity Bourrienne continued until a short time before Napoleon began openly to manifest his design to make himself absolute ruler of France. The break between them was not the fault of Napoleon. The one offense that he could not endure, either as general, Consul, or Emperor, was financial corruption. He had not long been First Consul when he discovered that Bourrienne had been engaged in more than questionable transactions for the purpose of feathering his nest. The result was the secretary's dismissal in disgrace, and though he was afterwards employed in diplomatic labors, he was never again admitted to Napoleon's intimacy and confidence.

This treatment must have had its effect on Bourrienne's estimate of

Digitized by Google

Napoleon, and must be allowed for as we read his *Memoirs*. Besides, apart from any coloring of this kind, they are, of necessity, very unequal in value. A considerable part of them depends purely on personal knowledge; here the only deductions to be made are such as may be suggested by suspicion of the writer's candor. But another large part of the work is confessedly written more or less at second-hand, from such information as Bourrienne could collect from those who professed to know the facts. Here the deductions to be made are numerous, and they seriously affect the competence of the testimony of the *Memoirs* in more than one case. In short, while the book is one to be read with much interest, and while it undoubtedly throws great light on the character and policy of Napoleon, it demands more careful sifting than any book of its class with which we are acquainted. Those who take Bourrienne's account of Napoleon at its face value and insist on its utter credibilty and accuracy, are critics with whom the wish is father to the thought—like Metternich, for example, who hated Bonaparte, and therefore called this rather disparaging portraiture "the only authentic *Memoirs* that have as yet appeared."

It is interesting to note that Bourrienne by no means agrees with the estimate of Napoleon given us by Madame de Rémusat. This sprightly lady hated Napoleon as only a Royalist and an aristocrat could hate a *novus homo* who had failed to appreciate duly the social importance of her family. She will not allow him the possession of ordinary good breeding, or admit that he commonly displayed ordinary courtesy in intercourse with others. She makes him appear an incredibly rough and boorish man, not only without native delicacy, but without the conventional polish of a gentleman. Doubtless Napoleon did not shine in state displays; he had higher aims in life than to cultivate the airs and graces of court pageantry; and this shortcoming, which an American finds it very easy to forgive, Madame de Rémusat thought the unpardonable sin in a ruler of France, and treated it accordingly. Bourrienne gives us an entirely different impression regarding Napoleon's personal characteristics. He could be perfectly charming when he chose, and he very often did choose. His manners in general were abrupt and brusque rather than rude, the manners of a man who has accustomed himself to go straight to the mark every time, and to waste neither time nor words on useless circumlocution. This may not be a wholly admirable type of character, but it surely is not despicable.

The astonishing quantity and quality of Bonaparte's endowments were never more clearly set forth by any writer than by the author of these *Memoirs*. It is far from his intention to flatter. Indeed, if we mistake not, he takes a malicious pleasure in telling anecdotes that set the Emperor before the world in anything but an amiable or fascinating light. If he had said to himself, before sitting down to write, "Go to, now, I will do my best to destroy this spirit of hero worship that has invested Napoleon with more than human attributes of intelligence and goodness," he could not have done his work better. But even his desire to place in bold relief all the unfavorable facts known to him, cannot hide from the reader the truth that Napoleon was one of the most remarkable men in the history of the world. No man has been

Digitized by Google

his equal in power to originate great schemes, in conjunction with the capacity to provide the means in detail for carrying them to a successful execution. These two talents are often seen in different individuals developed to a high degree. It is no uncommon thing to find the man who can plan great schemes, magnificent undertakings, if only they could be realized. It is also not very uncommon to find a man who is a great administrator, because of his capacity to grasp a multitude of details and guide subordinates in their work of executing them. But to find both these qualities developed to the highest extent in one individual, is what has happened not more than two or three times in the history of mankind. Julius Cæsar was such a man as this, equally great in conceiving plans on a vast scale and in devising the means for carrying them into practical effect. Napoleon Bonaparte was such a man. If there has been a third, worthy to rank with these, we should not know whom to name—unless possibly Oliver Cromwell, and even he hardly seems to belong in this rank. Genius has been defined as nothing more than the capacity of taking infinite pains with details. It is evident that this definition is not exhaustive, for under it the late Sir George Cornewall Lewis would necessarily be pronounced a genius. But his was a mind utterly commonplace, incapable of elaborating great schemes, though quite equal to the task of working out in detail a great scheme furnished him by a more fertile intellect and imagination. In genius such as Napoleon's there was something more than the capacity of taking pains, though that was an indispensable element of his genius, the one thing that separated it from mere moonshine and futile dreaming. He was neither a builder of castles in Spain, on the one hand, nor a mere machine for grinding out details on the other, but a combination of both capacities raised to the *n*th power. The chief interest of Bourrienne's book, to the thoughtful reader who has a soul above mere gossip, is the testimony that it reluctantly and unconsciously bears to this fact.

Of this particular edition of these *Memoirs* nothing but praise can be spoken. The volumes are of a very convenient size; the type is clear and sufficiently large, while still compact; paper and press-work are excellent; and the binding tasteful and neat. The illustrations demand a word by themselves; they consist of a large number of portraits, with a few *fac-similes* and other interesting side-lights on the text. The portraits have all been engraved on wood, at great expense, and their artistic quality adds much to the value of the book in the estimation of those who know and appreciate good workmanship. The editing has been careful and capable. The doubtful and worse than doubtful statements of the text are not suffered to pass without challenge, but extracts are given with wise profusion from contemporary authorities to show how often Bourrienne was misled by false information or by prejudice. These correctives are invaluable to the reader, who might otherwise be led to repose a confidence in the author's statements that they by no means uniformly deserve. And finally, a full index has been prepared that makes the information contained in the four volumes accessible in a moment to any reader.

The reader will not fail to gather from Bourrienne that Napoleon's greatness was wholly intellectual, that he was a moral monstrosity, a

Digitized by Google

man of egoism so colossal that he deemed the moral law to be suspended or non-existent in his case. In Mr. Lodge's biography we come in contact with a different man—one who was by no means weak in intellect, but whose chief greatness was moral. The author has tried to remove from our literature the reproach brought against it by Mr. McMaster. "General Washington is known to us, and President Washington. But George Washington is an unknown man." To make this unknown man known is a sufficient apology for adding another to the already numerous biographies of Washington. It is not too much to say that every one of these conspicuously fails to satisfy one's ideal of what a biography should be. We have the hatchet-and-cherry-tree style of biography, which attempts to represent Washington as a faultless being, but really succeeds in depicting him as a prig, and we have the stately biography, like Irving's, from which all semblance of humanity has been well-nigh effaced, and we have had, unfortunately, the funny man's biography. But we have never had the story of Washington's life told in such wise as really to help us comprehend what manner of man he was, in what elements of character he differed from his contemporaries, what constituted his greatness, and wherein, like other men, he was weak. This is the task that Mr. Lodge has attempted, and he must be awarded praise of having, on the whole, very successfully achieved what he set out to do. Certainly, to one who reads these volumes, Washington seems more like a living personality and less like a lay figure.

The biography opens with a chapter describing the society in which Washington was born and brought up, a society that has long been utterly extinct. Half of the people of Virginia at that time were slaves, and of the other half a large percentage were indentured white servants, convicts, and poor whites. It was from this class that Patrick Henry sprang. But above these was an aristocracy composed principally of the large land-owners and planters, to which were added a few clergymen, lawyers, and physicians, who constituted the small professional class of the community. Even these, unless they had some property, were hardly the equals of the Virginia planter. This aristocracy, though but a small fraction numerically of the State, did its thinking for it, and ruled it. The Virginia planter was ordinarily a man of robust frame, fond of field sports, especially such as involved a spice of danger, a man whose every-day life was quiet, but whose training fitted him admirably to deal with affairs in an emergency, and who was always ready to fight for his rights. Set apart by his birth, color, and hereditary privileges, the Virginia planter was as truly an aristocrat, and as proud and exclusive, as the aristocracy of England or of any continental nation.

It was from this class that Washington sprang. He had all of its virtues; he had some of its defects, among which we may count chief an imperious temper and a high sense of his own social dignity and importance. It was this latter feeling that controlled Washington's style of living during the Presidency, a style closely resembling that of a court, to which no other President has ever ventured to approach. It was this pride of birth and station that produced the formality of manner and coldness of speech for which Washington was noted among his

Digitized by Google

contemporaries, by which he kept all men at a distance from himself. At his Presidential levees he stood with his hands behind him, and bowed to all who approached, but never took an offered hand and still less did he offer his own—a sharp contrast to these days, in which the humblest American citizen thinks himself aggrieved if he does not have the privilege of shaking his President by the hand.

Washington's prominence in the colonial period was due quite as largely to his wealth and family influence as to his personal qualities, great as these undoubtedly were. He inherited what was for the time a large fortune, which was doubled by the property that came to him at his marriage with Mrs. Custis, and when the Revolutionary war began he attracted the eyes of Americans to himself as the most suitable leader, not merely because of his military experience, which was really no greater than that of Putnam and several other officers, but because he was the richest and most influential American. It may be doubted whether he would have reached, by the sheer weight of his character and abilities, the leading place in the American revolution, if his wealth and family connections had not powerfully reinforced his other claims to distinction. Mr. Lodge, therefore, is right in laying great stress upon the society from which he sprang. No man ever owed more to his environment for what he was and what he became than Washington.

In fact, although Mr. Lodge pours out wrath and scorn without measure upon those who hold this view, Washington was in tastes, in manners, in social ideas, in moral standards, and in the general conduct of life an English country gentleman who chanced to be born and live here instead of old England. The exigiencies of politics made him a rebel against George IV., just as the exigencies of politics made Hampden a rebel against Charles I. But the rebellion in either case was a political act, and not an expression of personal character. In a sense, of course, Washington was a genuine American; for, as Mr. Lodge very properly says, to be an American is to believe in America and the American people. It is to have an abiding and moving faith in the future and in the destiny of America, to have a high conception of what this great new country should be, and to follow out that idea with loyalty and truth. In this sense many immigrants are true Americans before they set foot on American soil. But what we mean by saying that Washington was English rather than American, is that in type of mind and character he corresponds more to the English than to the true American type. Of the genuine American type in colonial times, no two men were better representatives than Patrick Henry and Benjamin Franklin. But Washington was a very different type of man.

Mr. Lodge is more satisfactory in treating of Washington's personal characteristics than in criticising those who do not happen to agree with him. He finds in Washington an exceptional soundness of judgment and accuracy of perception. His capacity to read and understand men was developed in a very high degree. A single anecdote given by Mr. Lodge illustrates this capacity:

"Colonel Meade, loyal and gallant, a good soldier and planter, said Hamilton did the headwork of Washington's staff, and he the

Digitized by Google

riding. When the war was drawing to a close, Washington said one day to Hamilton, 'You must go to the Bar, which you can reach in six months.' Then turning to Meade, 'Friend Dick, you must go to your plantation; you will make a good farmer and an honest foreman of the grand jury.' The prediction was exactly fulfilled with all that it implied in both cases."

Though his education was limited, Washington was a fairly well-read man for his time, though in no sense a scholar. Like many other men of his time, he never fully mastered the intricacies of English orthography. The idea that we get from so many of Washington's biographies that he was a man of cold, unsympathetic nature, very correct in conduct, but also very dull and uninteresting, is not justified by the facts, but is simply one of the Washington myths. His usually calm exterior concealed a volcanic temper, and there are not a few instances on record when the fires within burst through the outer crust. Jefferson has left on record in his writings one or two instances of Cabinet meetings in which Washington's self-control entirely gave way. When his passions did burst forth they were terrific, and it was only by being constantly on his guard that he was able to keep them under. Nor is it true, as one might suppose from many accounts of his life, that Washington had no sense of humor. He was not a witty man, it is true, but many of his letters that are preserved are playful in style, and show that he appreciated fun as well as other people. On one occasion during his military life, he saw General Putnam riding into Cambridge with an old woman clinging behind him, and their ludicrous appearance sent him off into peals of inextinguishable laughter. There are other instances on record of a similar kind, sufficient to show that his enjoyment of the ludicrous was quite equal to the average. There is in many of his letters a vein of worldly wisdom, and sometimes of keen sarcasm, which shows that the essence of the sense of humor—namely, the perception of incongruities—was by no means denied him. A good example is his writing to Gouverneur Morris during his presidency, when he was maligned on every hand by opponents:

"The affairs of this country cannot go amiss. There are so many watchful guardians of them and such infallible guides that one is at no loss for a director at any turn."

When Mr. Lodge comes to the treatment of Washington's public career, he does his work very satisfactorily. One may gain from his book a thoroughly adequate notion of the surpassing value of Washington's labors. Nothing is more certain, so far as men can weigh possibilities, than that the American colonies would not have achieved their independence but for his services as commander-in-chief of the armies. It is related of Franklin that to somebody who said, as the members of Congress were signing the Declaration of Independence, "Well, we must all hang together now," he replied: "Yes, for if we do not, we will all hang separately." But it was only the influence of Washington that prevented the jealousies and bickerings that rose from time to time from being fatal to the cause. It was he who persuaded the people, as well as the army, to "hang together." This service was quite apart from his military achievement, and rendered that possible. Washington was not a captain of the first rank, like

Digitized by Google

Napoleon, but the man capable of planning and executing the attack on Trenton was above mediocrity as a general. The times demanded a safe rather than a brilliant man. The winning of great victories was not possible; what could be done was to wear the enemy out. This demanded a leader of inflexible purpose, unconquerable fortitude in defeat, unwearied patience under every trial, and the power of inspiring confidence and even devotion in his followers. These qualities Washington possessed and used. England was tired out rather than beaten, and surrendered the colonies she could no longer hold save at the bayonet's point. Then, when he might have made himself a dictator, as Napoleon did in France, he laid down his sword and retired to private life.

After independence was won the Articles of Confederation that bound the colonies together proved to be no more than a rope of sand. The need of a stronger and more permanent union was keenly felt, but how to secure it was the great problem. When the Constitutional Convention was called for the purpose of submitting a plan, Washington was the unanimous choice for presiding officer, and but for his wisdom, firmness and tact the Convention would never have framed a Constitution to which the members would have put their names. The people ratified the Constitution, not because they were satisfied with it, but because the approval of Washington gave them assurance that the practical working of the new form of government would not be followed by the evils that so many apprehended. It is not too much to say that but for him we should not have had a stable and strong Government, that the colonies would have split up into independent States, and this country would now be repeating what we see going on in Europe today. The blessings of union and peace, with the consequent free field for development of natural resources, and our present greatness as a people, we owe, under God, to Washington. His work as the organizer of the new Government was equally great in its results. By what he did himself, and through what was done by those whom he called about him, the foundations of our Government were laid once for all. As an administrator, Washington has had few equals among the Presidents who have succeeded him.

An interesting chapter in Mr. Lodge's book is his discussion of "Washington as a party man." He began his administration President by a unanimous vote, and with a very strong idea that the President was to be above and beyond party, and a representative of the whole people. He was loath to believe that any party divisions could arise during his Presidency. But he soon found that the measures of his administration, especially the financial measures which were essential to the establishment and continuation of the Government on a firm basis, provoked opposition, and even in his own Cabinet he found the leaders of two parties that naturally were organized, the one to support and the other to oppose the measures of the administration. He used all his influence, however, to compose those difficulties, and certainly there is no more satisfactory evidence of Washington's greatness of character than that he succeeded so long in maintaining comparative peace between two men so able, so uncompromising in holding and enforcing their fundamentally opposite convictions as Jefferson and Hamilton.

Digitized by Google

In the course of his second term as President, Mr. Lodge contends that Washington was obliged to take ground quite distinctly as a Federalist, and this, from the nature of the case, because he was obliged, of course, to maintain his own administration, to support and defend its policy; and while this policy was supported by the Federalists, it was vehemently opposed by the Republicans under the leadership of Jefferson. It was, however, in his own despite that Washington became a party man, and there is no feature more prominent in his farewell address to the American people than the solemn warning which he pronounces against the danger of party spirit.

Of Mr. Lodge's study of Washington the general, and Washington the President, we need only say that it is painstaking, comprehensive and accurate. His biography, as a whole, is the best popular account of the life and services of Washington. Those who wish a more detailed documentary work will still be compelled to consult the volumes of Sparks and Irving, but for most readers this will be far more satisfactory.

There were other men of his generation superior to Washington in mental ability; there were other men as good as he; there was no one with his peculiar balance of faculties, no one his peer in soundness of judgment, firmness of purpose, unselfish patriotism, and absolute incorruptibility. If the stiffness of his manners and the stilted rhetoric of his state papers and private letters seem a little priggish to this generation, let us remember that these were the fashion of his day, and that while they envelop they do not conceal his real manliness. Washington's ability is often underrated. We forget that there is no quality rarer, or more in demand in all practical affairs, than sound judgment. There are plenty of men that will evolve you a dozen plans for accomplishing a certain thing, each plan having an appearance of brilliancy, but they cannot for the life of them tell which one will work. Their fertility is inexhaustible, but their judgment is worthless. The man who is wanted at the head of things is a man who can select from the mass of plans certain to be offered him that which will accomplish the end sought, and that kind of man is the rarest in the world. Washington was a man of that type.

"G. Washington," said Artemus Ward, "never slopped over." The brilliant, showy man always gets his full meed of praise, often more than he deserves. The man who is underrated is the quiet, self-contained, well-poised, considerate man, who never says a foolish thing and always does a wise one. Such was Washington, whose qualities were none the less admirable because they lacked the sparkle of superficial natures, whose gifts of mind and heart were so finely balanced—

> "And the elements
> So mixed in him that Nature might stand up
> And say to all the world, 'This was a man.'"

HENRY C. VEDDER

Digitized by Google

The Federal Government of Switzerland: An Essay on the Constitution, by BERNARD MOSES, Ph.D., Professor of History and Political Economy in the University of California. Oakland: Pacific Press Publishing Co.

This is a work that may not inaptly be compared to Professor Bryce's treatise on *The American Commonwealth*. That is to say, though it deals with a subject less important, and is a book one-tenth the size of Professor Bryce's, it belongs to the same class. It is scholarly, thoughtful, and thorough. Its political philosophy is of the soundest. These qualities give the book unusual value, especially as it deals with a subject about which Americans know comparatively little. Switzerland is a country whose system of government should be unusually interesting to an American, as well on account of its differences from our system as because of the many close correspondences.

Like the United States, Switzerland has to contend with a conglomerate population. There are four languages commonly spoken: German, French, Italian, and Romansch. There are 1,352 German communes, 945 French, 291 Italian, and 118 Romansch. Or, to put it in another way, German is the language of fourteen cantons and parts of others. French is spoken wholly in three cantons and in parts of three others, while Italian is confined mainly to one canton, and Romansch to one. The problem of Switzerland, however, is simpler than that of the United States in one respect: its four nationalities mingle on terms of political and social equality and freely intermarry. There is no race that by reason of color is considered inferior to the others. Consequently no such feeling obtains as is felt in this country against the negro and the Chinaman. Such social distinctions as exist depend on descent from feudal families, or on wealth and culture, and not upon color or nationality; they are, in short, strictly social and not caste distinctions. In spite, therefore, of its conglomerate population, Switzerland may be regarded on the whole as possessing a homogeneous society, and the problem of self-government is greatly simplified by this fact.

The present Swiss constitution dates only from 1874. This constitution, however, in its main features, is the same as that of 1848; and the principle of federalism has prevailed more or less thoroughly among the Swiss cantons from the year 1291, when Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden united in a league for protection against their common enemies, and to forward their common interests. In 1332 Luzern joined the confederation, in 1351 Zurich was added, in the following year Glaurus and Zug, and in 1353 Berne. With varying fortunes and numbers, the cantons have maintained a connection with each other ever since; but a firm union was never formed until 1848. In that year a constitution was adopted that welded the cantons together into a solid nationality, and there is little probability that it will ever be broken again, unless by the application of superior external force. A powerful country like Germany or France might subjugate Switzerland by force of arms, and overthrow the government; but unless some such shock as this happen, it seems stable enough to stand for centuries.

Digitized by Google

The first thing, in examining the Swiss constitution critically, is the distribution of power. Up to 1848 the separate cantons were regarded as politically independent and sovereign bodies. Their confederation was simply an alliance for certain purposes. The confederation, as such, was not a political body, and possessed no sovereignty; in other words, it was a league of independent States. The constitution adopted in 1848 constituted for this a federal union, in all essential principles the same as that of the United States, each canton (State) retaining its original powers for certain purposes, and delegating forever to the central government its sovereign functions for all purposes relating to the common welfare. Switzerland is therefore now a nation, not a collection of political units. It may be described, in words that have been applied to our own government, as an indissoluble union of indestructible States. The Federal Government is invested with strictly limited and delegated powers. It is prohibited from exercising powers that are not expressly or impliedly granted to it by the written constitution, all other rights being reserved to the people of the several cantons. This is the common principle of federal governments—a principle that has been disregarded in but one case, namely, the Dominion of Canada. By the constitution of the Dominion, found in the British North America Act, it is declared that "it shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of Canada in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the Provinces." In the Dominion Government, therefore, it is the central government that is primarily sovereign, and the provincial legislatures which possess delegated power. Should the project to form a federal union of Great Britain and her colonies ever take substantial form, this will no doubt be the kind of federalism that will obtain. In theory the Parliament of Great Britain possesses the supreme sovereignty, and would continue to possess this in the federated empire, delegating such powers as it should see fit to England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, and to the various colonial dependencies. All of these federated States would elect their representatives to the imperial parliament, which would make all laws for the common welfare. American jurists, however, will not be slow to see that the American and Swiss principle of federation gives the better security for the independence of the members of the federation, and is the only effective barrier against undue centralization.

The distribution of power receives further elucidation in connection with the author's detailed examination of the federal government. This is divided, as in the United States, into three nominally distinct departments—legislative, executive and judiciary. The Legislature consists of two chambers: a Senate composed of two representatives from each canton, one being elected by the people of each half-canton; and a National Council, elected on the same principle as the American House of Representatives, the number of councillors that each canton has depending upon its population. To this legislature is committed by the constitution the right to regulate federal elections, and to legislate in all matters pertaining to the federal government,

Digitized by Google

such as the creation of permanent offices, the determination of salaries, etc.; it forms alliances and makes treaties with foreign states; it declares war and makes peace; it guarantees the constitutions and territory of the cantons; it takes measures for the internal security of the country; it has control of the federal army, and determines the annual budget; it has control of the federal ports, and deals with all questions of jurisdiction between federal authorities. Dr. Moses does not state whether coinage, post-offices, railways and telegraphs are controlled by the federal government or not, but from other sources one learns that such is the case. The power of the legislature is, however, seriously limited. A law, when passed by the majority of both houses, is not necessarily operative; thereafter, if 30,000 active citizens, or if eight cantons acting through their local governments so demand, this law must be submitted to popular vote. The expediency of this *referendum* is seriously questioned by many of the Swiss. It is too soon to declare whether the effect of its working is, on the whole, good or bad.

The executive of Switzerland differs from that of all other federal governments. The German Empire has as its executive the King of Prussia, who is ex-officio emperor. In the case of the Dominion of Canada, a governor-general, who is the personal representative of the Queen of Great Britain, is the head of the State. Other federal governments have presidents elected by the people. The executive of Switzerland is a Federal Council, composed of seven members, elected for a period of three years by the two legislative bodies in joint session. Any Swiss citizen eligible to the lower house may be chosen a member of this council, but not more than one member shall be taken from any canton. While in office, members of the council are not permitted to follow any business or profession, or to have any other employment either in the service of the federation or of a canton. One member of the Council is named by the electing assembly as its President and another as Vice-President, but neither has any power greater than that of the other members, all decisions being made by a majority vote at the meetings of the Council. The administrative affairs are distributed by the Council itself among the several members, one taking the affairs of the interior, another justice and the police, another war, another the treasury, another commerce and agriculture, and another post-offices and railways. This division is, however, only for convenience in transacting business, the Council considering and deciding as a whole, all important questions of the administration. It will be observed that this executive approaches much more nearly to the English than to the American model. It is, in fact, a British Cabinet with the added element of stability. A British Cabinet may be turned out of office at any moment by an adverse vote in the House of Commons, while a Swiss Federal Council has a certain tenure of office for three years, except in the case of crime or such official malfeasance as would demand impeachment.

In the early stages of the Swiss federal government, disputes arising between the cantons were settled by arbitration. These courts of arbitration had no power to enforce their decrees, but the Diet generally enforced them when necessary. Such a method was not satisfac-

Digitized by Google

tory, and in 1848 a Federal Court was created, consisting of eleven judges, elected by the assembly for three years. Since 1874 the number of judges has been reduced to nine, and the term of service to six years. The court is still seriously defective in independence, the judges being dependent for continued service on the will of the assembly, and therefore under constant temptation to render decisions that shall be popular, even if inequitable. The necessary safeguard of a supreme Federal Court is life tenure of office, subject to removal by impeachment for cause, as the Swiss will yet discover. But the having a court of this kind, even open to this serious criticism, is so new a thing and so great an advance on the former lack of authoritative judicial interpretation of the constitution and decision of intercantonal disputes, that the defect of the plan is not yet seriously felt.

This is sufficient to indicate in outline the nature of Dr. Moses's study of the Swiss constitution, and also to describe the main peculiarities of the system. The rest of the book is given to an account of the practical operation of the system and its results on the internal peace and prosperity of the country. Under the new constitution, Switzerland is making rapid strides forward, and if no foreign power interferes will make good its claim to be the foremost nation in the world of its size. Its recent spirited resistance to German aggression indicates that in any case it will not submit easily to foreign interference. The spirit of Tell and Winklereid is not dead, and the love of liberty is still as strong in Switzerland as when her sons fought against the tyranny of the Hapsburgs.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

Digitized by Google

PUBLISHER'S DEPARTMENT.

THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY REVIEW,

FOR 1889.

Each year's numbers of the REVIEW now make a volume of nearly 600 pages. Many commendations have been bestowed by the press on it, and many pages would be required to give the kind and appreciative words that have come to us in business and personal letters. For these tokens of confidence we are profoundly grateful. We are encouraged yet more confidently to appeal to all Baptists for a liberal support of their only Quarterly, not as an eleemosynary institution, but as a periodical abreast of the times, and worthy of the patronage of intelligent ministers and laymen. Everybody says that Baptists ought to have a Quarterly Review equal to the best. But this they cannot have unless they give such a periodical a generous and hearty support. Let those who thus believe show their faith by their works.

For the present year the REVIEW will be as much better than it was in former years as the Editors can make it. Special pains will be taken to secure the adequate discussion of themes of current interest. The pledges already made, our readers themselves being the judges, have been more than fulfilled.

The department devoted to Review of Current Literature, which was begun in July, 1885, has been received with general favor. From the whole list of our subscribers but two dissenting voices have come, while words of approval have been received by the score. It is our purpose to make this department as fresh, comprehensive, and able as the best scholars and pastors in our denomination can make it. We have already had the coöperation of a large number of them, and are promised help from some whose other engagements have thus far prevented them from responding.

Digitized by Google

Dr. MacArthur will continue to give the Homiletical Department his special attention. We are promised in this department also help from a large number of pastors, as well as from the men who fill the Chairs of Pastoral Theology in our Seminaries. It is our belief that this will be very helpful to the younger ministers among our readers.

Now, let every reader who thinks that the best is none too good for Baptists, aid us in making the best possible Review by giving us their hearty support in a practical manner. We ought to have FIVE HUNDRED new subscribers at once.

If your subscription is not paid for 1889, forward it at once. Subscribe for another copy for some minister or layman who would appreciate the REVIEW, but cannot afford to pay for it. Talk it up among your friends, and induce them to subscribe.

☞**There is but one price for the REVIEW, and that is $2.50 in advance; if not paid within the year, the price will be $3.**

Single numbers will be hereafter 75 cents. Any single year, after 1885, except the current year, $2.00 *net*. We cannot, at present, supply single numbers or complete volumes, prior to 1885, but we have a few complete sets, unbound, which we offer at $25 each, *net*.

Money may be sent *at our risk* in drafts, checks, money orders (not postal notes, which are no safer than bank-bills), or registered letters. All remittances, and all business communications, should be addressed to "THE BAPTIST REVIEW ASSOCIATION, 41 Park Row, New York." Other communications should be addressed, "Editors of THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY REVIEW, 41 Park Row, New York."

*** *The Editors will do their best to return rejected MSS., but cannot guarantee their safety.*

Digitized by Google

THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY

Read What is Said of It.

At last we have a REVIEW worthy of the name.—*Religious Herald.*

Let those who are interested in having the Baptists at the forefront, help to sustain this publication.—*Vermont Baptist.*

We have examined this REVIEW with care, and are prepared to commend it to our brethren. We wish that every preacher, at any rate, would take and *read* it.—*Central Baptist.*

Two new departments and its general make-up place it alongside the *Bibliotheca Sacra* and the *Presbyterian Review* in general character and quality. We wish it the highest prosperity.—*The Congregationalist.*

The REVIEW is certainly, under its new management and enlarged and improved appearance, worthy of a very wide circulation not only among ministers, but laymen as well. We heartily commend it to our brethren generally. —*Christian Secretary.*

It will be seen that the editors intend to make the REVIEW in every way creditable to the denomination. It should have, therefore, the best support of the Baptists of this country. Every pastor and many thoughtful laymen should take it.—*Zion's Advocate.*

It is exceedingly neat in its appearance and typography, and its contents are varied and inviting. The editors are possessed of literary skill and energy, and are understood to be backed by ample capital, and will unquestionably demonstrate a success.—*The National Baptist.*

We hardly see how any pastor can be "thoroughly furnished" with the means of keeping abreast of the live Baptist thinkers of the day without this excellent quarterly. It covers a wide range with the sweep of both exact scholarship and practical knowledge of matters of special interest to the denomination and Christian world at large.—*Christian Herald.*

It ought to be extensively read by the thinking people ot our churches, and to pastors especially it will be found helpful both in the study and in the practical work. Messrs. MacArthur and Vedder have discerned the living and important currents of thought now in progress and have given us a magazine well abreast of the present needs.—*Canadian Baptist.*

What was good before is now better still. . . The Review of Literature consists of signed articles on various works, all of them discriminating and careful, by such scholars as Professor Osgood, Dr. Strong and others. This is a very valuable feature. The Editorial Department is strong and fresh. Our Baptist friends will make a mistake if they do not give this Quarterly a prompt and liberal support.—*The Christian Intelligencer.*

Digitized by Google

JAMES PYLE'S

PEARLINE

The Most Effective

WASHING COMPOUND

EVER INTRODUCED

For **KITCHEN, LAUNDRY** and **for all Cleansing Purposes.** Sanitarians will find in it a most desirable agency for the promotion of their theories. Managers of *Hospitals, Asylums* and *Prisons* will do well to test it for themselves, for which purpose samples will be gladly supplied.

MANUFACTURED ONLY BY

JAMES PYLE,

Cor. Greenwich and Vestry Sts., New York.

Horsford's

ACID PHOSPHATE.

Prepared according to the directions of Prof. E. N. HORSFORD.

ESPECIALLY RECOMMENDED FOR

Dyspepsia, Nervousness, Exhaustion, Headache, Tired Brain,

And all Diseases arising from Indigestion and Nerve Exhaustion.

This is not a compounded "patent medicine," but a preparation of the phosphates and phosphoric acid in the form required by the system.

It aids digestion without injury, and is a beneficial food and tonic for the brain and nerves.

It makes a delicious drink with water and sugar only, and agrees with such stimulants as are necessary to take.

Descriptive pamphlet free.

Rumford Chemical Works, Providence, R. I.

BEWARE OF SUBSTITUTES AND IMITATIONS.

CAUTION:—Be sure the word "Horsford's" is printed on the label. All others are spurious. Never sold in bulk.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

89076981919

b89076981919a

Digitized by Google

NON-CIRCULATING

Digitized by Google

B89076981919A

Digitized by Google