

WRITINGS OF JOHN A BROADUS

by John A. Broadus

A collection of theological writings, sermons, and essays by John A. Broadus, compiled for study and devotional reading.

84 Chapters

Table of Contents

1. 01.00.1. LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF PREACHING
2. 01.00.2. Preface to this Digital Module
3. 01.00.3. Copyright Information
4. 01.00.4. Preface
5. 01.00.5. Table of Contents
6. 01.01. Lecture I. Specimens Of Preaching In The Bible
7. 01.02. Lecture II. On Preaching In The Early Christian Centuries
8. 01.03. Lecture III. Medieval And Reformation Preaching
9. 01.04. Lecture IV. The Great French Preachers
10. 01.05. Lecture V. The English Pulpit
11. 01.06. Appendix
12. 02.00. On the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons
13. 02.01. LECTURE I. SPECIMENS OP PREACHING IN THE BIBLE.
14. 02.02. LECTURE II ON PREACHING IN THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CENTURIES.
15. 02.03. LECTURE III. MEDIEVAL AND REFORMATION PREACHING.
16. 02.04. LECTURE IV. THE GREAT FRENCH PREACHERS.
17. 02.05. LECTURE V. THE ENGLISH PULPIT.
18. 02.06 APPENDIX.
19. S. A Letter by John A. Broadus on Divorce
20. S. Ask and it shall be given you
21. S. Baptism And The Lord's Supper
22. S. Character Building
23. S. Christian Joy
24. S. College Education for Men of Business
25. S. Come unto Me
26. S. Delight in the Will of God
27. S. Education in Athens
28. S. First Four Professors Southern Baptist
29. S. God
30. S. He Ever Liveth to Intercede
31. S. He Ever liveth to Intercede
32. S. How The Gospel Makes Men Holy
33. S. Imitation Of Christ
34. S. In Jesus' Name
35. S. Intense Concern Salvation Others
36. S. Intense Concern Salvation Others
37. S. Jesus: Saviour
38. S. John Broadus on Landmarkism
39. S. Justification And Santification

40. S. Lessons for the Tempted
41. S. Let us have peace with God
42. S. Loving Jesus Christ
43. S. Man
44. S. Ministerial Education
45. S. Necessity of the Atonement
46. S. On Reading the Bible by Books
47. S. One Jesus
48. S. Outline of the Life of Christ
49. S. Paramount Permanent Authority Bible
50. S. Passages For Learning By Heart
51. S. Providence Of God
52. S. Regeneration
53. S. Repetance And Faith
54. S. Science and Christianity
55. S. Should Women Speak Mixed Public
56. S. Some Duties Of The Christian Life
57. S. Some Laws of Spiritual Work
58. S. The Atonement Of Christ
59. S. The American Baptist Ministry A.D. 1774
60. S. The Apostle Paul as a Preacher
61. S. The Duty Baptists Teach Distinctive
62. S. The Duty of Baptists to Teach
63. S. The Future Life
64. S. The Good Shepherd
65. S. The Great Invitation
66. S. The Habit of Thankfulness
67. S. The Habit of Thankfulness
68. S. The Holy Scriptures
69. S. The Holy Spirit And The Trynity
70. S. The Light of Life
71. S. The Lord's Day
72. S. The Lord's Prayer
73. S. The Mother of Jesus
74. S. The Pleasures of Piety
75. S. The Prayer of the Woman of Canaan
76. S. The Resurrection of Our Lord
77. S. The Saviour
78. S. The Saviour Praying for Us
79. S. The Sin of Unbelief
80. S. The Two Roads of Life
81. S. The Word Of God

- 82.** S. Worship
- 83.** S.The Inter-Biblical History
- 84.** The Epistle to the Hebrews

01.00.1. LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF PREACHING

Title Page

LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF PREACHING. BY JOHN A. BROADUS, D.D., LL.D.,
PROF. IN THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, GREENVILLE, S. C.
AUTHOR OF "A TREATISE ON THE PREPARATION AND DELIVERY OF SERMONS."

NEW YORK:

SHELDON & COMPANY, No. 8 MURRAY STREET.

1879.

***** This module is brought to you by www.DoctorDaveT.com For more Bible Study modules that are

conservative

evangelical

Bible believing

Christ honoring

make sure you stop by www.DoctorDaveT.com! We have hundreds of modules easily organized by topics, like these:

Old Testament Exposition (topic modules)

New Testament Exposition (topic modules)

Doctrinal Theology (topic modules)

Commentary Modules

Dictionary Modules

and a whole lot more! Please visit www.DoctorDaveT.com!

Dave

01.00.2. Preface to this Digital Module

Preface to this Digital Module

I've been using computer Bible study software since the days of MS-DOS - early 1990's. From the first time I did a "CTRL-S" maneuver, I've never cracked open a Strong's again! (And no regrets about that!) As a busy preacher, I've tried to assemble a classic research library inexpensively. Access to the free digital materials included in the Bible study software packages I used increased my study library in amazing ways. The amount of free stuff I've accumulated would have cost a small fortune. Then one day I realized that I owed a debt. So I started looking for public domain resources to convert to digital Bible study modules. Now my personal journey has come full circle: from the excitement of discovering free computer Bible software to the excitement of helping and being a blessing to others.

Thank you, Michelle, Jeremiah, Isaiah & Micah, for understanding my debt and graciously tolerating my near compulsive computer use for hours on end. Thank you, John Broadus, for converting your studies to eternal print. The text for this module comes from www.BibleStudyAids.net. And of course - most importantly - my thanks to the Lord Jesus who saved my soul for all eternity. This Edition There have been no changes to Broadus' work, except for the following:

1. Scripture references have been converted to Scripture hyperlinks using the "Format Scripture ToolTip."
2. A few obvious Scripture reference errors have been corrected, as well as some obvious spelling errors.
3. The copy and paste process has unfortunately removed most of the italicized print. While the words have not been changed, some of Broadus' emphasis may be missing. It is with regret that I have not taken the time to correct this. The sense is still accurate. [By the way - would you understand this paragraph without italics? Of course!] Also, the italicizing of the foreign words have been lost. It is my hope that the reader will be able to follow the flow regardless of these flaws. They - the flaws - are mine, not Broadus'.
4. I am quite sure my edition of Broadus' work is rather imperfect. I pray that, nonetheless, it will be productively useful in the study of God's Word.

Finally Feel free to contact me with comments. You can reach me via e-mail at doctordavet@gmail.com

If you convert a classic resource to be used with eSword or TheWord, send me your work! I'd love to utilize it! Also - make sure you stop by www.doctordavet.com - for more digital Bible study modules. May the Lord bless you as study His word.

Dr. David S. Thomason

Florida, USA

2012

01.00.3. Copyright Information

Copyright Information This book was originally copyrighted in 1879. It is now in the public domain.

01.00.4. Preface

Preface

These lectures were delivered at the Newton Theological Institution, near Boston, in May last. I had been requested to discuss subjects connected with Homiletics, and the place of delivery was the lecture-room of the church. It was therefore necessary that the lectures should be popular in tone, and should abound in practical suggestions. Under such circumstances, I could not fail to perceive the difficulty of treating, in four or five lectures, so vast a subject as the History of Preaching. For this history is interwoven with the general history of Christianity, which itself belongs inseparably to the history of Civilization. Yet I greatly desired to develop, however imperfectly, the leading ideas involved in the history of preaching; to show what causes brought about the prosperity of the pulpit at one time and its decline at another; to indicate the great principles as to preaching which are thus taught us. I trust that my attempt may be of service to those who have never made any survey of this wide field, and may stimulate some persons to study particular portions of it with thoroughness, and thus gradually to fill up the gap which here exists in English religious literature. The principal helps which are accessible, chiefly in other languages, are mentioned in the Appendix. While using them with diligence, I have scarcely ever simply borrowed their statements, and in such cases have always indicated the fact. Where not giving the results of my own study and teaching in the past, I have sought to test by personal examination the ideas and critical judgments of others, before adopting them. At some points my knowledge has of necessity been quite limited. If errors have arisen as to matter of fact, I shall esteem it a favor to have them pointed out. As regards the merits of particular preachers, there is of course much room for difference of opinion. The sketches of eminent preachers are usually very slight, but it could not be otherwise if space was to be saved for general ideas and for practical hints.

Some further explanations will be found at the beginning and end of the closing lecture. The kind reception given to the lectures at Newton by a general audience of ladies and gentlemen, as well as by the Faculty and Students, has led me to hope that they may find readers who are not ministers, but who take interest in preaching, in Christianity, in history.

God grant that the little volume may be of some real use.

Greenville, S. C., Oct., 1876.

01.00.5. Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Lecture I. Specimens of Preaching in the Bible Lecture II. Preaching in the Early Christian Centuries Lecture III. Medieval and Reformation Preaching Lecture IV. The Great French Preachers Lecture V. The English Pulpit

Appendix

01.01. Lecture I. Specimens Of Preaching In The Bible

Lecture I. Specimens Of Preaching In The Bible

It is my purpose in these lectures to offer you some observations on the History of Preaching. The subject is obviously too vast to be treated in five lectures. You will please notice, therefore, that I shall by no means attempt a systematic discussion of the history of preaching, but shall only make observations upon some of its most characteristic and instructive periods. My general plan will be as follows:—While giving a brief account of the leading preachers in one of these periods, I shall concern myself chiefly with two inquiries; first, what was the relation of these preachers to their own time, and secondly, what are the principal lessons they have left for us. These lessons will in part be formally stated, but will often come out only in the way of incidental remark as we go on. I hope that we shall thus draw from the wide field of our contemplation some immediate instruction and stimulus for our own work as preachers, and also that you may become so far interested in the subject as hereafter to occupy yourselves, more largely than might otherwise have been the case, with the truly magnificent literature of the Pulpit. This first lecture will be devoted to Preaching in the Bible. I can only mention some of the most important examples, including one or two secular speeches which are of some interest. On the Old Testament it is necessary to be particularly brief, in order to discuss somewhat more fully the preaching of our Lord. The speech of Judah before Joseph, is unsurpassed in all literature as an example of the simplest, tenderest, truest pathos. And if you want to see the contrast between pathos and bathos as you will rarely see it elsewhere, just read the reproduction of this speech by Philo (Works, II, 73, Mangey), elaborated in the starchy fashion of the Alexandrian school—and do by all means read this as translated and expanded in worthy Dr. Hunter's Sacred Biography, ironed out and smoothed down into the miraculous elegance of style which belongs to the school of Dr. Blair. That two men of cultivation, one of them a man of eminent ability, should regard this vapid stuff as in any sense an improvement upon Judah's speech, is a phenomenon in criticism, and a warning to rhetoricians.

We have a Farewell Address from Moses, viz. the Book of Deuteronomy. And like many English and German discourses, the sermon ends with a hymn, composed by the preacher. Some students of Homiletics would at once fasten on the fact that this first recorded example of an extended discourse was a written sermon. Others would reply that in this case the speaker was aware that he was not, by training or by nature, an orator, but a man "slow of speech and slow of tongue." The one remark would be about as good as the other, each of them amounting to very little—as is the case with a great many other remarks that are made on both sides of the question thus alluded to.

There are two brief Farewell Addresses from Joshua, which are really quite remarkable, as might appear if we had time to analyze them, in their finely rhetorical use of historical narrative, animated dialogue, and imaginative and passionate appeal. The brief speech of Jotham (Jude 1:9) is noteworthy, for although a purely secular speech, it offers several points of suggestion to preachers. (1) He had a magnificent pulpit, standing high on the steep sides of Mt. Gerizim—and

some people appear to think the pulpit a great matter in preaching. (2) He had a powerful voice, for although beyond the reach of arrow or sling, he could make himself heard far below. This is not only an important gift for open-air preaching, but it will be indispensable for all preachers if we are to have many more of these dreadful Gothic churches, which are so admirable for everything except the proper object of a church, to be a place for speaking and hearing. (3) He employed a striking illustration, a fable. (4) He applied the illustration, in a very direct and outspoken manner, without fear or favor. (5) He ran away from the sensation he had made.

David possessed such unique and unrivalled gifts as a sacred poet, that we are apt not to think of him as a speaker. But in sooth, this extraordinary man seems to have been a universal genius, if ever there was one, as well as to have had that for which Margaret Fuller used to sigh, a universal experience. And his speeches to Saul (1 Samuel 24:1-22, 1 Samuel 26:1-25), with his reply to Abigail (1 Samuel 25:1-44), do seem to me, though so briefly recorded, to exhibit eloquence of a very high order, on which you would find it instructive and stimulating to meditate. We ought to notice, too, the singularly skilful and effective speech addressed to David by Abigail. Its tact and sagacity are truly feminine; some of the most destructive German critics have admitted that this at least is a genuine bit. Persons in search of Scripture precedents might in this case also imagine themselves to find one, by noting that we have here a woman speaking in public. But again there is an obvious reply, that this was not really a public address, but a petition addressed to one man, and that in behalf of her husband, because he was a “fool” and could not speak for himself. The address of Nathan to David, the winning and touching parable with which he stirs the king’s feelings and awakens his sense of right and wrong, and then the sudden and pointed application, and fierce outpouring of the story of his crimes, strikes even the most careless reader as a model of reproof, a gem of eloquence.

Solomon, at the Dedication of the Temple, made an address to the people, and then a prayer, the first reported prayer of any considerable length— a prayer strikingly appropriate, carefully arranged, and very impressive. The singular book of Ecclesiastes is a religious discourse, a sermon. Its mournful text is often repeated, “Vanity of vanities, all is vanity.” The discourse should be read as a whole, or listened to while another reads, its successive portions ever coming back, like a certain class of modern sermons, to the text as a melancholy refrain, sinking ever deeper into your heart with its painful but wholesome lesson, till at last the ringing conclusion is reached, “Fear God, and keep his commandments, for this is the whole of man”—the whole of his duty and his destiny, the whole of his real pleasure, the whole of his true manliness, the all of man. I think we ought never to repeat “All is vanity” without adding “Fear God, and keep his commandments, for this is all.” But the great preachers of Old Testament times were the Prophets. You are no doubt all aware that the New Testament minister corresponds not at all to the Old Testament priest, but in important respects to the Old Testament prophet. Alas! that the great majority of the Christian world so early lost sight of this fact, and that many are still so slow, even among Protestants, to perceive it clearly. The New Testament minister is not a priest, a cleric—except in so far as all Christians are a priesthood, a clergy, viz., the Lord’s heritage—he is a teacher in God’s name, even as the Old Testament prophet was a teacher, with the peculiar advantage of being inspired. You also know that it was by no means the main business of the prophets to predict the future—as people are now apt to suppose from our modern use of the word prophet—but that they spoke of the past and the present, often much more than of the future. The

prophets reminded the people of their sins, exhorted them to repent, and instructed them in religious and moral, in social and personal duties; and when they predicted the future, it was almost always in the way of warning or encouragement, as a motive to forsake their sins and serve God. The predictive element naturally attracts the chief attention of Bible readers to-day, and yet in reality, as things stood then, it was almost always subordinate, and often comparatively diminutive. The prophets were preachers. The earlier prophets have left us no full record of their inspired teachings. From Samuel we have a few brief addresses, wise and weighty; from the great Elijah, several single sentences, spoken on great occasions, and which are flashes of lightning in a dark night, revealing to us the whole man and his surroundings. Abrupt, terse, vehement, fiery, these utterances are volcanic explosions from a fire long burning within, and they make us feel the power, the tremendous power, of the inspired speaker. It is true of every born orator, that in his grandest utterances you yet feel the man himself to be greater than all he has said. And so we feel as to Elijah. You have doubtless observed that Elijah has given us a striking example of the use of ridicule in sacred discourse. He mocked the priests of Baal, before all the people. Idolatry is essentially absurd, and ridicule was therefore a fair way of exposing it. In like manner, all irreligion has aspects and elements that are absurd, and it is sometimes useful (if carefully done) to show this by irony and ridicule. In the book of Proverbs, irreligion is constantly stigmatized as folly, and frequently depicted with the keenest sarcasm. Slight touches of irony and scorn are also observed in the apostle Paul. We have then a certain amount of Scripture example for the use of ridicule in preaching. But it should be a sparing use, and very carefully managed.

Notice now the prophets from whom some connected teachings are preserved — what we call books of the prophets.

Some of these were highly educated men, perhaps trained, as some writers think, in the Theological Schools begun by Samuel, “the schools of the prophets.” Yet others were destitute of all such training. Amos says expressly (Amos 7:14) that he was “no prophet nor a prophet’s son,” i. e., not trained in the schools as one of the so-called “sons of the prophets,” but that he was a shepherd and gardener. Accordingly, many of his illustrations are rural, and they are fresh, as we sometimes find now in a gifted but uneducated country preacher. The prophets frequently quote each other, as is well known, and besides quotations, they often exhibit such similarity in leading thoughts and favorite expressions as seems to indicate that they had studied in the same schools. At any rate, they did carefully study the inspired discourses of their predecessors and contemporaries. Take now a few examples. From Jonah, we have apparently only the burden or refrain of his preaching in Nineveh, and can learn very little in the rhetorical sense, but we catch right impressive glimpses of his character and feeling. You see him (1) Shrinking from his task—as has been since done by many a preacher, young and old. (2) Desponding when the excitement of long-continued and impassioned preaching had been followed by reaction; ready to take unhealthy views of his preaching and its results, of God and man, of life and of death. (3) So much concerned for his own credit—more, in that morbid hour, than for the welfare of man or the glory of God. The most eloquent of all the prophets, the one from whom most can be learned as to preaching, is obviously Isaiah. Isaiah was the very opposite of Amos, the shepherd and gardener. He lived at court during several reigns, and in that of Hezekiah was high in influence. He was a highly educated man, a man of refined taste, and singular literary power and skill. He enjoyed in the best sense of that now often misused term, the advantage of Culture, with all its light and its

sweetness. His writings, like all the other inspired books, take their literary character from the natural endowments, educational advantages, and social condition, of the man. They exhibit an imperial imagination, controlled by a disciplined intellect and by good taste. This imagination shows itself in vivid and rapid description, as well as in imagery. The careful and loving study of Isaiah has educated many a preacher's imagination to an extent of which he was by no means conscious, and few things are so important to an orator as the real cultivation of imagination. True, the book of Isaiah presents the poetic oftener than the strictly oratorical use of this faculty. But the two shade into each other; and we also, when we become greatly excited, and our hearers with us, do naturally use in speaking such imaginative conceptions and expressions as generally belong only to poetry. In Part I of the book of Isaiah the oratorical element very distinctly predominates—it is direct address, aiming at practical results in those who hear. Sometimes the style even sinks into quiet narrative, but oftener it rises into passionate appeal. And in Part II (from the 40th chapter on), the orator is lost in the poet. The prophet's soul is completely carried away by imagination and passion, till we have no longer an inspired orator directly addressing us, but a rapt seer, bursting into song, pouring forth in rhythmical strains his inspired and impassioned predictions. He is like the angel that appeared to the shepherds, whose message soon passed into song. Besides the yet higher blessings which have come to the world from the devotional and practical, the predictive and theological contents of this grand prophet's writings, who can estimate how much he has done in training servants of God for the highest and truest forms of religious eloquence!

Jeremiah, whom the Jews of our Lord's time regarded as perhaps the greatest of the prophets, has in modern times been much misunderstood, the popular term "jeremiad" representing him as a doleful and weak lamenter, like some of the "weeping preachers" we occasionally see, whose chief capacity seems to lie in the lachrymal organs. But Jeremiah uttered his "Lamentations" upon such great and mournful occasion as might make the strongest man weep, if truly patriotic and deeply pious. And his discourses, like his personal history, recall no tearful weakling, but a statesman and preacher of strong character and intense earnestness, tender in pity but resolute of purpose. Such a man's bursts of passionate grief are a mighty power in eloquence. Jeremiah is also an example in the way of preaching unwritten discourses, and then, by divine direction, gathering them up into a book, with the hope of thus renewing and deepening their impression on the popular mind (Jeremiah 36:2-3).

Among the other prophets I can only say a word as to Ezekiel. His high-wrought imagery has little power to develop our imagination (compared with Isaiah), because mainly very far removed from our modes of thought and feeling. But as to the spirit of the preacher he offers us singularly valuable instruction. E. g., "And go, get thee unto the children of thy people, and speak unto them and tell them Thus saith the Lord Jehovah, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear." "When I say unto the wicked, O wicked (man), thou shalt surely die; if thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way, that wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand." Nor are there any sadder words in all the Bible for a preacher, any that more touchingly appeal to a common and mournful experience, than the following: "And they come unto thee as the people cometh, and they sit before thee as my people, and they hear thy words, but they will not do them: for with their mouth they show much love, but their heart goeth after their covetousness. And lo, thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice,

and can play well on an instrument: for they hear thy words, but they do them not.” Alas! how often still, they come and hear, they are entertained and pleased, they go off with idle praises, and that is all!

We cannot stop to speak of Ezra, and his grand expository discourse “from the morning until midday;” nor of Malachi, with his sharp common sense, and his home-thrusts of question and answer; nor of that curious production of the Inter-biblical period called the 4th Book of Maccabees, really a sort of sermon by a Jew who had become a Stoic philosopher; nor of much else that might have some interest—for we must come at once to the New Testament.

John the Baptist, the herald of Messiah’s approach, presents several good lessons as to preaching. Consider (1) His fearlessness. The Pharisees and Sadducees represented the culture and wealth, the best social respectability and religious reputation of the time, and yet when their conduct demanded it, he boldly called them a ‘brood of vipers.’ He was braver than Elijah, who faced Ahab but was so frightened by one threatening message from Jezebel that he ran the whole length of the land, and a day’s journey into the desert, and wanted to die; while the new Elijah declared Herodias an adulteress, though he knew her character and must have foreseen her relentless wrath. (2) His humility—always turning attention away from himself to the Coming One, testifying of him on every occasion, willing to decrease that he might increase. (3) His practicalness. He brought a grand and thrilling announcement, but brought also a practical injunction, for which it was to be the motive. “The reign of heaven has come near—therefore repent.” And you have noticed his remarkable directions in Luke 3, to the people at large, to the publicans, to the soldiers, indicating to each class its characteristic fault, hitting the nail on the head at every blow. (4) His striving after immediate results. He did not say, go off and think about it, and in the course of time you may come to repentance; he said, repent now, profess it now, and show it henceforth, by fruit worthy of repentance. (5) His use of a ceremony to reinforce his preaching, and exhibit its results—a ceremony so solemn to those receiving it, so impressive to the spectators. Many a prophet had preached that men should repent, i. e., should turn from their sins, many had enforced the exhortation by predicting the coming of Messiah (though they could not declare it to be certainly near), but here was a striking novelty; this prophet bade them receive, and at his hands, a most thorough purification, in token that they did repent, and did wish to be subjects of the kingdom of God. This striking and novel ceremony gave name, among all the people, to the man and his ministry. John the Baptizer, he was universally called, as we see from the fact that he is so named in the Gospels and Acts, and in Josephus too. And when Jesus in the last week of his ministry asked the chief priests and scribes a question about John, he did not say, the preaching of John—nor, the ministry of John—nor, the work of John—but, “the baptism of John, was it from heaven, or of men?” That represented to the people his whole mission. Now apart from all its significance in other respects, we can see that this ceremony had an important bearing on his preaching, as picturing what the preaching demanded, and as an appropriate action by which the people promptly set forth the effect which the preaching had produced on them. Many of the measures employed now, by which hearers may show that they are impressed, and profess their purposes, are but appeals, more or less wise, to these same principles of human nature to which John’s baptism appealed. The central figure of Scripture, for our present purpose as in all other respects, is the Saviour himself. We can but touch a few of the many points that here present themselves. Our Lord as a Preacher, is a topic that has waited through all the ages

for thorough treatment, and is waiting still.

(1) Every one observes that as a preacher our Lord was authoritative. You know that the tone of the ordinary Jewish teachers at that time was quite different from this. If some question was under discussion in synagogue or theological school, an aged man with flowing white beard and tremulous voice would say "When I was a boy, my grandfather who was a Rabbi often told me how R. Nathan Bar Tolmai used to say—so and so." For them nothing was weighty till sanctified by antiquity, nothing could be settled save by the accumulation of many ancient opinions. But here came a teacher who spake 'as one having authority,' who continually repeated, 'Ye have heard that it was said to the ancients, but I say to you;' in a way which no one could think of calling egotism, which all recognized as the tone of conscious and true authority. Of course our Lord was unique in this respect, but in truth every preacher who is to accomplish much must, in his manner and degree, speak with authority. And do you ask how we may attain this? For one thing, by personal study of Scripture. What you have drawn right out of the Bible, by your own laborious examination, you will unconsciously state with a tone of authority. Again, by personally systematizing the teachings of Scripture, or at any rate carefully scrutinizing any proposed system in every part before accepting it, so that you feel confident, as a matter of personal conviction, that it is true. Further, by personal experience of the power of the truth. And in general, by personal character. And the authority drawn from all these sources will be every year augmented by the usefulness already achieved, for the French proverb is here profoundly true, "There is nothing that succeeds like success."

(2) I shall not dwell upon the originality of our Lord's preaching. This has been sufficiently treated by various popular writers. In fact, I think they have insisted too much on this point, and I prefer to urge,

(3) That although so original, he brought his teachings into relation to the common mind. He did not startle his hearers with his originality, but employed current modes of thought and expression. E. g., The Golden Rule was not wholly new to the world. Confucius, Isocrates and others had taught the negative side of it; our Lord states it as a positive precept, thus making the rule much more comprehensive, and more widely important. Moreover, the essential principle was really contained in Leviticus 19:18. So the Golden Rule was not presented as something absolutely new. Again, the thought of the Fatherhood of God was not alien to the heathen mind, and was sometimes taught in the Old Testament. Christ brought it out clearly, and made the thought familiar and sweet. Furthermore, he taught much that had to be more fully developed by the apostles; since men could not understand any full account of certain doctrines till the facts upon which they were to rest had taken place—for example, atonement and intercession. And he acted upon the same principle in his mode of stating things. He used proverbs and other current modes of expression. He drew illustrations entirely from things familiar with his hearers. And what they could not then understand he stated in parables, which might be remembered for future reflection.

I repeat, then, that our Lord tempered his originality, so as to keep his teachings within reach of the common mind. If you are teaching a child, you do not present thoughts entirely apart from and above the child's previous consciousness; you try to link the new thoughts to what the child has thought of before. Thus wisely did our Lord teach the human race. But unreflecting followers have felt bound to insist that his ethical as well as his theological teachings were absolutely original; and

superficial opposers have imagined they were detracting from his honor when they showed that for the most part he only carried farther and lifted higher and extended more widely the views of ethical truth which had been dimly caught by the universal human mind, or had at least been seen by the loftiest souls. What they make an objection is a part of the wisdom of our Lord's preaching.

(4) His teachings were to a great extent controversial, polemical. He was constantly aiming at some error or evil practice existing among his hearers. You remember at once how this principle pervades the entire Sermon on the Mount. His strong words as to wealth and poverty were addressed to the Jews, who believed that to be rich was a proof of God's favor, and to be poor was a sure sign of his displeasure. "No man can come to me except the Father which sent me draw him," was said to the fanatical crowd who imagined they were coming to him and following him because they were gaping at his miracles and delighted to get food without work. Like examples abound. In fact, there are very few of his utterances that have not a distinctly polemical character, aimed at his immediate hearers; and we must take account of this, as affecting not the principles but the mode of stating them, or we shall often fail to make exact and just interpretation of his teachings. The lesson here as to our own preaching is obvious, though very important. Truth, in this world oppressed with error, cannot hope, has no right, to keep the peace. Christ came not to cast peace upon the earth, but a sword. We must not shrink from antagonism and conflict in proclaiming the gospel, publicly or privately; though in fearlessly maintaining this conflict we must not sacrifice courtesy, or true Christian charity.

(5) Our Lord's frequent repetitions are remarkable and instructive. I shall mention some examples, of course not giving mere parallel accounts from the different Evangelists of the same occasion, but cases in which the same saying is recorded as repeated on different occasions. The Son of man is come to save that which was lost, was spoken twice, Matthew 18:11; Luke 19:10. If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, etc. (3), Matthew 17:20; Matthew 21:21; Luke 17:5. Whosoever shall confess me, etc. (3), Matthew 10:32; Luke 12:8; Luke 9:26. He that finds his life shall lose it, etc., (4), Matthew 10:38-39; Matthew 16:24-25; Luke 17:33; John 12:25. Take up his cross and follow me (4), Matthew 10:38; Matthew 16:24; Luke 14:27; Mark 10:21. Whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased, etc. (3), Matthew 23:12; Luke 14:11; Luke 18:14. Except ye become as little children, etc. (2), Matthew 18:3; Matthew 19:14; and other modes, besides these two, of inculcating the same lesson of humility (2), Matthew 20:26; John 13:13 ff. (comp. Luke 22:24, ff.) The servant is not greater than his lord (4), Matthew 10:24; Luke 6:40; John 13:6; John 15:20, where he refers to the fact that he had told them this before. In two other cases, John 13:33 (comp. John 7:34; John 8:21), and John 10:26, he speaks of having before told them what he is now saying again. Where I am, there shall also my servant be (3), John 12:26; John 14:3; John 17:24. To these examples of short sayings (and there are others) add the fact that considerable portions of the Sermon on the Mount, as given by Matthew, are also given by Matthew and the other Synoptics as spoken on other occasions. E. g., The remarkable exhortation to take no thought, etc., ten verses of Matthew 6:1-34, is reproduced with slight alteration in Luke 12:1-50, the former in Galilee, the latter probably long afterwards, and in Judea or Perea. The Lord's Prayer, Matthew 6:9-13, was given on a later occasion, Luke 11:2-4, in a greatly shortened form (according to the correct text), but with all the leading thoughts retained. So likewise the instructions to the 70 disciples (Luke 10:1, ff.) closely resemble those previously given to the twelve apostles (Matthew 10:5, ff.) The lament over Jerusalem was made three times, and our

Lord foretold his death to his disciples five times. The parable of the pounds (Luke 19:1-48) was reproduced a few days afterwards in the parable of the talents (Matthew 25:1-46), with only some special features omitted.

There are numerous other examples. And that so many should occur in the four extremely brief memoirs we have, the fourth, too, being almost entirely different from the others, is very remarkable. These repetitions may for the most part be classified as follows: (1) Different audiences, being similar in condition and wants, needed some of the same lessons. (2) Some brief, pithy sayings would naturally be introduced in different connections. (3) Some lessons were particularly hard to be learned, as humility, cross-bearing, etc.; and so as to the great difficulty the twelve had in believing that the Messiah was really going to be rejected and put to death. And what instruction do we find for ourselves in this marked feature of our Lord's preaching? Here was the wisest of all teachers; in him was no poverty of resources, no shrinking from mental exertion. He must have repeated because it was best to repeat. Freshness and variety are very desirable, no doubt; but the fundamental truths of Christianity are not numerous, and men really need to have them often repeated. And many preachers, carried away by the tendencies of the present age, our furious 19th century, when the chief reading of most people is newspapers and books called emphatically novels, and the $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\tau\epsilon\rho\tau\iota$ of the lounging Athenians pales before the eagerness with which we rush to bulletin boards to catch the yet later news that has just girdled the world,—many preachers go wild with the desire for novelty and the dread of repetition, and fall to preaching politics and news, science and speculation, anything, everything, to be fresh. Let the example of the Great Preacher be to us a rebuke, a caution, a comfort. A preacher should be a living man, and strive to get hold of his contemporaries; yet nearly all of the good that preachers do is done not by new truths but by old truths, with fresh combination, illustration, application, experience, but old truths, yea, and often repeated in similar phrase, without apology and without fear.

(6) There is no real conflict with all this when we add: Consider the wonderful variety of our Lord's methods of teaching. Variety as to place. He preached in synagogues, courts of the temple, private houses; in deserts, on the mountain side, by the lake shore, from the boat; to crowds, or to single persons; anywhere, everywhere. Variety, too, as to occasion. Some of his discourses were deliberately undertaken, it would seem, with reference to certain conjunctures in his ministry, as the Sermon on the Mount, the instructions preceding the Mission of the Twelve (Matthew 10:1-42), the discourse on the Mount of Olives, the Farewell Address to his disciples, etc. But most of them appear to have been suggested at the moment, by particular events and circumstances, as the visit of Nicodemus, the woman coming to Jacob's well, the message of John the Baptist, the application of the rich young man, the story of the Galileans whom Pilate had slain, etc. And variety as to modes of stating truth. He employed authoritative assertion, arguments of many kinds, explanation, illustration, appeal and warning. He also used striking paradoxes and hyperbolic expressions to wake up his hearers, and make them listen and remember and think, e. g., "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Let us pause a moment, and consider. Many persons have been perplexed by this saying of our Lord, many have misunderstood it, but one thing is certain, no one ever forgot it, when once read or heard, and no one ever failed to reflect that it stands in, the strongest antagonism to our natural feelings of resentment and revenge. Now remember. Our Lord was for the most part a street preacher and a

field preacher. He had to gather his audiences and hold them, to awaken their minds, to lodge some leading and suggestive truths permanently in their memory. When we recall these conditions of his teaching, together with the fact that many of his hearers were indifferent and not a few were hostile, we may perceive why he should have somewhat frequently used what we may fairly call extravagant hyperboles, sayings which will mislead if taken literally, but which understood as they were intended are in an unrivalled degree instructive and suggestive, sure to be remembered, weighty and mighty. In thus using pithy, and paradoxical or hyperbolic statements, our Lord was suiting himself to the customs as well as the wants of his hearers. There are scores of the Proverbs of Solomon, that are really of the same character. E. g., what does this mean? 'When thou sittest to eat with a ruler, mark well what is before thee; and put a knife to thy throat if thou art given to appetite' (Proverbs 23:2). Better cut your throat than eat greedily before his excellency. And so with many other sayings of the uninspired Jewish teachers, as recorded in some of the Rabbinical books. *

"But are not such expressions hard to interpret, and likely to be misunderstood?" Yes, they require care, breadth of view and sound judgment to interpret them. And I think it absolutely necessary, if we would interpret aright the teachings of our Lord, to remember that he spoke not as a scientific lecturer but as a preacher, a preacher for the most part to the common people, an open-air preacher, addressing restless and mainly unsympathizing crowds. In fact one will be all the better prepared to interpret these discourses if he has himself had experience of practical preaching under similar conditions. Some of our Lord's paradoxical and hyperbolic sayings have been often and grievously misunderstood. Interpreting them literally, some good people have tried, for example, to refrain from all self-defence, to give to all beggars, etc.; and other good people, seeing that these things were impracticable, have sadly despaired of living in any respect up to the requirements of him who has so earnestly urged us to hear his sayings and do them; while many opposers have sneeringly said that the morality taught by Jesus is impossible, and therefore really unwise. Misunderstood—yes, I suppose our Lord has been worse misunderstood than any other teacher that ever spoke to the human race. But what of that? All powerful things are very dangerous if improperly handled. That which can do no harm though misused, can it do any good? Our attempts at usefulness in this world may always be represented as to their results by this simple algebraical formula: + So much good done—So much harm done = So much. It is our duty, as far as possible, to diminish the harm as well as increase the good; but :an we ever reduce the harm down to zero, without reducing the good to zero too? If we are too painfully solicitous to avoid doing harm, we shall do nothing. The notions of our "sensation preachers" contain an element of truth. And to find that true and good and mighty something which they grope after in darkness and do not reach, we have but to study the preaching of Jesus Christ.

(7) I add but a word as to his tone and spirit. These cannot be fully analyzed, but we must seek to imitate them as far as we can apprehend, or can catch by sympathy. We must meditate on his perfect fidelity to truth, and yet perfect courtesy and kindness; his severity in rebuking, without any tinge of bitterness; his directness and simplicity, and yet his tact—wise as the serpent, with the simplicity of the dove; his complete sympathy with man, and also complete sympathy with God—bringing heaven down to earth, that he might lift up earth to heaven. And so in him we see, as we see in all his more worthy followers, that materials of preaching are important, and methods of preaching are important, but that most important of all is personal character and spirit.

I have time for but a few words as to the preaching of the Apostles. I regret this, because we may find in their discourses a greater number of practical lessons as to preaching, than in other parts of Scripture. But it is also easier to find those lessons here than elsewhere, and one who is interested in the matter will have comparatively little need of help. The apostolical Epistles were not in general expected to be read by all or by many of those to whom they were sent, but were written addresses, designed to be read out in meeting, and listened to. Most of them are really written sermons, not written to be read by the author himself, but sent to some distant church to be read there by another person. Especially is this true of 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, Colossians, and the Circular letter or address which we call Ephesians; also of the discourses sent out by James, Peter, Jude, John. Most of all is it true of the epistle or discourse to the Hebrews, which has every mark of being a sermon, and concerning the origin of which I decidedly prefer the theory of Clement and Origen, that it was a sermon preached by Paul, and reported by some other person, perhaps by Luke, who has reported so many other discourses of his in Acts. However that may be, it is clear that many of what we commonly describe as epistles are really sermons. Nearly all of those to whom they were originally addressed got their knowledge of them not by reading them but by hearing them read, as it is said in the Apocalypse, "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear," etc. It is important to recall this fact for several reasons. (1) In the enthusiasm which is now rightly and nobly felt for popular education, there is danger of our imagining that the ability to read is indispensable to one's being a Christian. Certainly it is eminently desirable that the freedmen of the South, for example, should learn to read, and we must all labor for this; and yet some of them are not only sincere but somewhat intelligent Christians, simply by hearing the Bible read, as among the early Christians. (2) If the apostolical discourses were originally designed to be read aloud to congregations, do they not err who suppose that there is little need now of publicly reading the Scriptures, because "everybody," as they phrase it, can now read the Bible for himself? Still is the saying true, "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear." (3) What we call the Epistles can often be better understood by studying them as discourses than as in the strict sense epistles. And useful lessons can be drawn from them as to the best methods of preaching.

Besides these great discourses, written verbatim after the dictation of the inspired authors, we have in Acts brief and usually condensed reports of other discourses, chiefly addresses by Peter and by Paul. From all these there is really much to be learned as to methods of preaching. Especially do the discourses, both in Acts and in the so-called Epistles, of the great apostle Paul, furnish a rich field for homiletical study.

How profitable it would be to examine narrowly his argumentation, as in Galatians, Romans, Colossians, Hebrews. Also to study his bursts of passionate feeling, and vehement exhortations, as in 2 Corinthians, Romans, Ephesians, Hebrews. How instructive would be the collection and classification of his illustrations, which are not often drawn from nature (as in James), but chiefly from the practical life of men, their business, their amusements, etc. And his style is singularly rich in rhetorical lessons—a style consisting not in quietly earnest and straightforward talk, like practical Peter, and not poetic, pictorial, vivid like James, but logic set on fire—a ceaseless stream of argument and earnest appeal, often swelling into a torrent which bears everything along, confusedly, perhaps, but with mighty force, resistlessly. You see in the various addresses and epistles of Paul the style of a many-sided man—here a Boanerges in passionate vehemence, and

there as tender as a woman's love—hesitating not to break sentences in twain by sudden bursts or digressions—piling strong words upon each other, like Ossa upon Pelion, in the struggling effort to reach the height of his great argument, to give fit expression to his swelling emotion—scorning the 'wisdom of words,' the strained and artificial energy and elegance in which the degenerate Greeks of the day delighted, and yet producing without apparent effort a gem of literary beauty not surpassed in all the world's literature, that eulogium upon love, which blazes like a diamond. on the bosom of Scripture. As I said of Isaiah, so it may be said of Paul, that thousands have unconsciously learned from him how to preach. And how much richer and more complete the lesson may be if we will apply ourselves to it consciously and thoughtfully.

One point as to the great apostle's preaching I must not omit to mention—the striking adaptation of every discourse to the audience and the occasion. You have noticed that in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia he spoke as a Jew to the Jews, arguing from Scripture and from their national history. At Lystra, among ignorant and barbarous idolators, he utters the simplest truths of natural religion, while at Athens those same truths were brought out with varied, profound and skilful argument, and with a courtly grace of expression which came spontaneously to the lips of a cultivated and refined man in addressing such an audience. Similar examples of adaptation are seen in the great series of Apologies, before the fanatical Jews who had been trying to kill him in the temple court, before the Sanhedrim, before Felix and Festus, before Agrippa, and to the Jews at Rome. No one of all the apostle's discourses recorded in Acts would have been suitable to take the place of any other. So likewise as to his Epistles. Think of sending Romans to Corinth, or Colossians to Rome—and so of the rest.

There is here a surpassingly important lesson for preachers. Every discourse ought to be so carefully and precisely adapted to the particular audience and occasion, that it would not suit another occasion or audience without important alteration. Very rarely is it allowable, if ever, to make a sermon so general that it will suit all places equally well, for then it does not exactly suit any place. If you do not attempt to imitate Paul in anything else as to preaching, be sure to follow his example in this—that you try to adapt every sermon to that time, that place, that people; and if you repeat it elsewhere, search eagerly beforehand to find out at least some points of specific adaptation to the new occasion and congregation. Even though these points be sometimes very slight in themselves, yet they may act like the delicate tendrils which hold the vine to its supports, and are essential to its fruitfulness.

I close with one general inquiry. When we note how many specimens of eloquence the Scriptures present, and see how instructive they are, even upon a hurried glance, are we to conclude, as some virtually maintain, that the Art of Preaching should be learned exclusively from the Bible? I answer, No, by no means. Men think they put honor upon the Bible by maintaining this, and by insisting that Homiletics shall be regarded as essentially distinct from Rhetoric. In like manner some are very unwilling to admit that Christian sculpture is inferior to that of the ancient Greeks; and I remember an American book in which it is earnestly contended that the model of the Parthenon must have been derived from Solomon's temple—through the Phenicians, to be sure. Justin Martyr, who lived in Palestine less than a century after the crucifixion, told Trypho that Jesus, in his carpenter-life at Nazareth, made ploughs and ox-yokes, and there is nothing improbable in the statement. Would you suppose that he made ploughs of a new pattern, greatly better than those in use there before? Why should he not introduce all our modern improvements

in ploughs, yea, and all those of the ages yet to come? You answer, our Lord came into the world to teach moral and spiritual truth, and not to introduce mechanical inventions. Precisely so as to architecture, then, and sculpture, and all the arts, including the art of Rhetoric. In speaking, our Lord and the prophets and the apostles have left us noble and highly instructive examples, from which we ought lovingly to learn. But they employed the methods common in their time, and natural to the Shemitic races. And we are really following their example, in the spirit of it, if we employ the methods best suited to the Aryan races, and to modern thought and modern feeling.

End Notes * My attention was called to this last fact by my colleague, Dr. Toy.

01.02. Lecture II. On Preaching In The Early Christian Centuries

Lecture II. On Preaching In The Early Christian Centuries The ascension of our Lord, according to the most probable Chronology, was in A. D. 30. Now in A. D. 430 was the death of Augustine, the last great preacher of the early centuries. We thus have a period of exactly four centuries. If we divide this, the year 230 will fairly represent the life and work of Origen (died 253), who forms the transition from the earlier to the later style of Christian preaching.

We have first to deal, then, with the two centuries from 30 to 230, from the Ascension to the time of Origen. For the greater part of this first period, we know very little of Christian preaching, after the close of the New Testament itself. The few works that remain to us from the so-called Apostolic Fathers, are related to preaching just as were the Epistles of the inspired Apostles. They are letters, but designed to be read in public, and some of them showing oratorical feeling, though they have not the oratorical form. Still more is this true of Justin Martyr, particularly in his Apologies; you feel that here is a thoroughly oratorical nature. Ignatius, Justin, Polycarp, must have been vigorous, impassioned, powerful preachers; and so with some of the other "Apologists" (besides Justin), whose writings in defence of Christianity remain to us. But from none of them does anything remain that could be called a sermon, nor from any one else before Origen, except two small fragments of homilies from the famous Gnostic Valentinus (preserved by Clement of Alexandria), which are of curious interest, but not homiletically instructive. Irenæus was a man of great earnestness and force, but not even in the references to his lost writings is there any mention of sermons. The writings of Tertullian amply show that he was a born orator. His penetrating insight into subjects, his splendid imagination, his overpowering passion, the torrent-like movement of his style, heedless of elegance and of grammatical accuracy, his very exaggerations, and his fiery assaults upon his antagonists, all seem to show the man born to be a speaker. A lawyer in his youth, it is natural to suppose that he exercised himself much in oral Christian teaching, and his great familiarity with the Bible qualified him for the task. But none of his writings approach the form of a sermon. We should not even know from his own works, that he ever became a presbyter, though Jerome states that he did. For this almost entire want of sermons remaining from the first two centuries, there are several reasons, which we need not go far to seek. The preaching of the time was in general quite informal. The preacher did not make λόγοις, discourses, but only ῥηματα, homilies, that is conversations, talks. Even in the fourth century, there was still retained, by some out of the way congregations, the practice of asking the preacher many questions, and answering questions asked by him, so as to make the homily to some extent a conversation. And in this period it was always a mere familiar talk, which of course might rise into dignity, and swell into passion, but only in an informal way. The general feeling appears also to have been that dependence on the promised blessing of the Paraclete forbade elaborate preparation of discourses. And this feeling would prevent many from writing out their discourses after they were spoken, as the same feeling appears to have prevented the German Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, and many American Baptist ministers a century ago. But we must by no means imagine there was but little preaching during the two first centuries,

because no sermons remain. In fact preaching was then very general, almost universal, among the Christians. Lay-preaching was not an exception, it was the rule. Like the first disciples the Christians still went everywhere preaching the word. The notion that the Christian minister corresponded to the Old Testament priest had not yet gained the ascendancy. We find Irenæus and Tertullian insisting that all Christians are priests. We learn from Eusebius (History VI. 19) that Origen, before he was ordained a presbyter, went to Palestine, and was invited by the bishops of Cæsarea and Jerusalem to “expound the sacred Scriptures publicly in the church.” The bishop of Alexandria, who was an enemy to Origen, condemned this, declaring it unheard of “that laymen should deliver discourses in the presence of the bishop.” But the bishop of Jerusalem pronounced that notion a great mistake, appealing to various examples. It was still common in some regions, though now unknown in others, to invite laymen who could edify the brethren, to do so; and this even when sacerdotal feeling was growing strong. In these first centuries, then, almost all the Christians preached. Thus, preaching was informal, and therefore unrecorded. Even of the presbyters at that time, few were educated or had much leisure for study. And when some able and scholarly man became a Christian, however he might occupy himself with profound studies, and the preparation of elaborate works, as Justin or Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus or Tertullian, yet when he stood up to preach, then like Faraday in the little Sandemanian chapel in London, he would lay his studies aside and speak impromptu, with the greatest simplicity.

It is a favorite and just idea of recent writers on history, that the historian should not confine himself, as was so long common, to men in high places, and to single great events, but should try to reproduce the life of the many, and the numerous forces affecting that life, and gradually preparing for the great events. This, however, can never be fully done, and the shortcoming is of necessity particularly great in the history of preaching. Yet let us at least bear in mind that the early progress of Christianity, that great and wonderful progress to which we still appeal as one of the proofs of its Divine origin, was due mainly to the labors of obscure men, who have left no sermons, and not even a name to history, but whose work remains plain before the all-seeing eye, and whose reward is sure. Hail, ye unknown, forgotten brethren! we celebrate the names of your leaders, but we will not forget that you fought the battles, and gained the victories. The Christian world feels your impress, though it has lost your names. And we likewise, if we cannot live in men’s memories, will rejoice at the thought that if we work for God, our work shall live, and we too shall live in our work. And not only are these early laborers now unknown, but most of them were in their own day little cared for by the great and the learned, most of them were uneducated. Throughout the first two or three centuries, it continued to be true that not many wise according to the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, were called to be Christian ministers or Christians at all. It was mainly the foolish things, weak things, base things, that God chose. And what power they had through the story of the cross, illuminated by earnest Christian living! There is a famous passage of Chrysostom (Homily xix. on the Statues), in which he bestows generous and exuberant eulogy on the country preachers around Antioch, many of whom were present that day in his church. He says, in his high-wrought fashion, that their presence beautified the city and adorned the church, and describes them as different in dialect (for they were Syrians), but speaking the same language in respect of faith, a people free from cares, leading a sober and truly dignified life. He says they learn lessons of virtue and self-control, from tilling the soil. “You might see each of them now yoking oxen to the plough, and cutting a deep furrow in the ground, at another time with their word cleaning out sins from men’s souls. They are not ashamed of work,

but ashamed of idleness, knowing that idleness is a teacher of all wickedness. And while the philosophers walk about with conspicuous cloak and staff and beard, these plain men are far truer philosophers, for they teach immortality and judgment to come, and conform all their life to these hopes, being instructed by the divine writings." Not only in the first centuries, then, but in Chrysostom's day also, there were these uncultivated but good and useful men; and such preachers have abounded from that day to this, in every period, country and persuasion in which Christianity was making any real and rapid progress. Our first period is divided from the second by the work of the celebrated Origen, probably A. D. 186–253. He was truly an epoch-making man, in Biblical learning, in ministerial education, and in homiletics. Everybody knows what an impetus he gave to Biblical learning. All Christian scholars in the next two centuries, and many in every subsequent century, drew largely from the vast stores of learning gathered in his great works. The zealous studies of the present century in Text-criticism, present Origen as facile princeps among the Fathers in that respect, and give constantly new occasion to admire the scholarly accuracy and iron diligence of the Adamantine student. He was also the great educator among the early Christians. For nearly thirty years, beginning when a precocious youth of seventeen, he was chief Catechist in Alexandria, or as we should say, Theological professor, aided, after a time, by one of his distinguished pupils. And when banished from Alexandria, and living at Cæsarea in Palestine, he there taught as a private instructor, but with students from distant lands, and with great éclat, for about twenty years more. During a great part of this time, from youth to age, he also preached every day, while at the same time laboring over his varied and immense works, so large a portion of which have long ago perished. Some glimpse of the subjects and methods of study in his theological school, we shall be able to get before we close. He was not only it teacher of preachers, but also a teacher of teachers He had had predecessors in Alexandria, as Clement and his teacher Pantænus, but it was Origen that made the Alexandrian school the chief seat of Christian learning for many generations to come. And his private teaching at Cæsarea gave occasion for the founding of a public school there by the famous Pamphilus, the friend of Eusebius. But in respect to methods of preaching also, Origen made an epoch. As to interpretation of Scripture, he dignified and appeared to justify the practice of allegorizing. It is an utter mistake to say, though a mistake often repeated, that he was the father of this practice. His teacher, Clement, gives us instances of it; Justin Martyr has specimens as wild as anything in Origen, and the Epistle ascribed to Barnabas contains much allegorizing that seems to us absurd and contemptible. In fact, Origen's great master in this respect was Philo, the Alexandrian Jew, who was a contemporary of our Lord. Origen did but apply to the New Testament, and to the Old Testament in a Christian sense, those methods of allegorizing by which Philo had made the Old Testament teach Platonio and Stoic Philosophy, Celsus, the shrewd and vigorous unbeliever, made it an objection that the New Testament did not admit of allegorizing. Origen resented this as a slander, adducing several passages in which Paul himself had used allegory, and doubtless feeling all the more called on to show by his own allegorical interpretations that the Christian books did have those deep allegorical meanings which the Jews claimed for their books, and the Greeks for theirs. Allegorizing had long been the rage at Alexandria. Porphyry pretended that Origen had only learned it from the Greek mysteries. Philo himself did but carry out more fully and ably the method of Aristobulus, his predecessor by a century and a half. Indeed, recent Egyptologists tell us that fifteen centuries before Christ, the Egyptian priests were disputing as to the true text, and allegorizing the statements, of their Book of the Dead, or Funeral Rites. But while Origen by no

means originated allegorizing, he did do much to recommend it, by presenting the striking, though delusive, theory, that as man is composed of body, soul and spirit, so Scripture has a threefold sense, the grammatical, the moral, and the spiritual, and also by actually working out a spiritual sense for a great part of the Old and New Testaments, with perverse and absurd ingenuity. In this way he injured preaching. Men who held to a deep, esoteric sense, which only the few could understand, who, like the Gnostics, regarded themselves as a sort of spiritual aristocracy, would not only neglect to bring forth and apply the plain teachings of Scripture, but they habitually made light of these teachings, and cared mainly for such hearers as could soar with them into the "misty mid-regions" of allegorizing. Now it is very well as a general principle that we should preach with some reference to the wants of the highly cultivated, and should deal in profound thought, but after all it is the plain truths of Scripture that do the chief good, to cultivated as well as uncultivated. One who begins to regard himself as distinctively a preacher for the intellectual or the learned, will spoil his preaching as rapidly as possible. At a later period, all Christians became accustomed to the methods of allegorizing, and it ceased for the most part to be an esoteric affair, and became almost universal, with the exception of Chrysostom and his associates, in all the subsequent centuries till the Reformation. But Origen did good in teaching men to bring out the grammatical and the moral sense, though he understood these. In his early youth a teacher of grammar and rhetoric, he had a feeling for language, an exegetical sense, and his homilies and other works form the first examples of any pains-taking explanation of Scripture, or approach to accurate exegesis. As to the form of Christian discourses, he first, so far as we know, made them discourses indeed, and not a mere string of loosely connected observations, dependent for their connection on accidental suggestion or the promptings of passion, and he first made series of homilies on entire books. This was a great advance, and prepared the way for future improvements. Yet still the homily was without unity of structure. Origen does not take the fundamental thought of the passage, and treat every verse in relation to that, but he just takes clause after clause as they come, and remarks upon them in succession. Not till a century later was this fault corrected, and only partially then. In fact this lack of unity is still the commonest and gravest fault in ordinary attempts at expository preaching. But such feeling does not now prevail, and it is more hurtful now than formerly, for the modern mind demands unity in all discourse. If you would succeed in expository preaching, let every such sermon have a genuine and marked unity.

Origen's fame as a Biblical scholar, has overshadowed his merits as a preacher. And in general the exegetical element is more prominent in his homilies, than the oratorical. Yet he has occasional passages that are truly eloquent. Our second period of two centuries is from A. D. 230 to 430, or from Origen to Augustine. This again may be divided into two parts, for the year 330 will roughly represent to us the time of Constantine. Of the first half, from 230 to about 330, there is comparatively little to say, but the last of our four centuries is the time when Christian preaching springs into exuberant growth, and blossoms into glorious beauty. From the time of Origen, a much more considerable portion of Christian ministers must have been educated men, for there were now several theological schools, religious libraries began to be formed, sermons were taken down in short-hand and circulated, and (though the persecutions had not yet ended) there was an increasing number of intelligent people among the Christians, who would appreciate and desire an educated ministry. And yet almost no sermons of that period are now in existence. The celebrated controversial writer Hippolytus, a contemporary of Origen, is said to have been very eloquent. One homily and some fragments now remaining, are represented as showing considerable oratorical

skill. Gregory, afterwards called Thaumaturgus, to distinguish him from the famous Gregories of later times, was a pupil of Origen, and a most enthusiastic admirer. His panegyric on Origen, delivered when leaving the theological school, is a really eloquent production, possessing much curious interest. But the few extant homilies ascribed to him are not probably genuine. It is evident that many sermons must have been written down during this period. It may be that most of them perished during the great persecution under Diocletian, when so great an effort was made to destroy all Christian writings. In the west, among the Latin-speaking Christians, we still find no sermons at all that have come down to modern times. Cyprian, in Carthage, while not an original thinker, but an avowed imitator of Tertullian, had yet very fine oratorical gifts, and spent his early life as a popular teacher of rhetoric. The style of his writings is very pleasing, but he left no sermons. Novatian, the heretic at Rome, (with whom some of our Baptist brethren are zealous to establish a denominational affinity,) is represented by Neander as “distinguished for clearness of Christian knowledge ... and for a happy faculty of teaching,” but the works now doubtfully ascribed to him, and even the list of his works given by Jerome, comprise no sermons. But now we approach a new period. The grand effort of Diocletian had failed, and it became evident that Christianity could not be destroyed by persecution. Constantine adopted Christianity as the main plank in his political platform. Being successful, becoming sole ruler of the world, and favoring the Christians in every way, he wrought a most sudden and complete change in their position, a change having the most varied and important results for that age and for the ages to come. Yea, all Christendom is agitated to-day, by the consequences of Constantine’s grand stroke of policy. In no respect were the immediate results more important than in regard to preaching. The young men who were looking to the ministry of the gospel could now without difficulty avail themselves of all the best educational facilities in the great University cities, before attending their Christian theological schools. They could now enjoy, not only undisturbed quiet in Christian life, study, and work, but the best social advantages. O the power for good or evil, in every age and country, of social position, and social influences. Before this time Christians could scarcely anywhere be received into the best society, and if thus received they would be frequently met by heathen customs in which all were expected to take part. But now fashionable society smiled on Christians, and greatly courted those who were influential. It became the fashion to attend church. It was a passport to imperial favor, that one should be a very zealous Christian. And fashionable people in Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and hundreds of smaller towns, began to speak, (so Chrysostom intimates,) almost as enthusiastically about the favorite preacher of the hour, as they spoke of the favorite horse in the races, or the reigning actor of the theatre. The number of real Christians who were intelligent rapidly increased; and when to these was added the fashionable world, there arose a great demand for preachers who were literary, and eloquent. And if the preacher was a deeply pious man, his soul would be stirred by observing the crowds of professed Christians, many of whom had nothing of Christianity but the name, and he would be moved to the most earnest and passionate warnings and appeals.

Besides, all Christendom was rent by the great Arian controversy. Now that the outside pressure of persecution was removed, the Christians would not hesitate to throw their whole soul into controversy. While a skeptical modern historian may sneer at a world-shaking dispute over one letter, the difference between $\mu\omicron\iota\omicron\sigma\omicron\nu$ and $\mu\omicron\sigma\omicron\nu$, yet such a subtle distinction was well suited to the genius of the Orientalized Greeks, and Hellenized Orientals. And although the controversy was largely carried on by political manoeuvring, and courting favor with successive

Emperors, favorites and governors, still much might be, much often was accomplished by able and eloquent sermons on the various aspects of this great question as to the Divinity of Christ, which touched the very heart of Christianity, and could be so presented as mightily to stir the souls of all susceptible hearers. Many of the Arian preachers too, were very able, highly educated, acute in argument, and passionately earnest in advocating their ingenious and plausible theory. Such rivalry must have powerfully stimulated the orthodox preachers.

Moreover, Christian discourses could now be freely published, and widely circulated. Thus the sermons of the more eloquent preachers speedily became a model and a stimulus to other preachers everywhere, and also helped to create a demand for attractive and impressive discourse, on the part of such private Christians as read the publications.

These glimpses of the situation may give us some conception of the conditions under which Christian Preaching blazed out into such splendor, and such real power, in the century which began with Constantine and Eusebius, and ended with Chrysostom and Augustine.

Eusebius himself, the justly famous historian, had in certain respects good gifts for preaching, and has left some homilies, besides his extravagant and over-wrought panegyric on Constantine; but he occupied himself chiefly with his extensive historical and chronological studies and treatises. From Athanasius, the great Trinitarian leader, we have no genuine homilies remaining. His style of writing has directness, simplicity, and native force, a vigorous and manly eloquence, such as one seldom meets with in that age of stilted rhetoric. Gregory Nazianzen, his eulogist, declares that Athanasius had no literary culture. But this is probably like Ben Jonson's saying that Shakspeare had small Latin and less Greek, because he had not been a lifelong student like himself. It is, however, worth notice that in his two remarkable treatises on the Incarnation, written in all probability when he was between twenty and twenty-five years old, Athanasius shows the same excellencies of style as in his later works, which seems to prove that these excellencies were mainly native. I think that the more Athanasius is read, the more it will be regretted that he has left us no sermons. As to Cyril of Jerusalem, it must suffice to remark, that his well-known sermons to those about to be baptized, and to those recently baptized, while not of remarkable ability, are suggestive examples of a practice which, with due modifications, might with great advantage be more largely pursued among us. The name of Ephraem the Syrian, who died in 378 (five years after Athanasius), has in a singular manner become familiar to all of us, though we may not have looked at his works. A MS. of the New Testament, written in the fifth century, was about the twelfth century written over with some works translated from Ephraem, and is now known to critics of the Text as the MS. C, or the Codex of Ephraem the Syrian. His is the great name among the Syrian Christians, and he is represented as one of the leading Christian orators of the century of which we are speaking. As a rare peculiarity among those great preachers, he was what we call a self-made man. Yet like all such men who really accomplish much, he was educated by the ideas and influences of the age, by books, and by personal contact with gifted contemporaries. He knew little Greek, yet enough to correspond freely with Basil the Great. I have never yet found opportunity to read much of his writings, but I notice that he is very highly eulogized by Villemain, and described, by him and others, as a highly emotional preacher, sometimes intensely solemn. The portions I have read also show a truly Oriental fondness for imagery. He was at the same time a poet, the earliest Syriac hymns being from his pen. Shall we give a moment to Macarius, the Egyptian monk? His homilies are without teat, desultory, familiar talks to the monks, and often to a

considerable extent made up of answers to questions which they ask, thus being literally homilies. They are crazy with allegorizing, and wild with mysticism, but very sweet and engaging in tone, and urging to all the monastic virtues, prayer, silence, humility and self-mortification, in a very impressive manner. Certainly monasticism was a sadly one-sided thing, but its one side of Christianity has been beautifully exhibited by some of the earlier and medieval monks, both in precept and example. Are we not inclined to be one-sided too, caring only for thought and practical activity, and neglecting the cultivation of religious sensibility, and of the passive virtues? It would do most of us good to read some of the best of the early monastic writers, as every body agrees is true of the 'Imitation of Christ,' and the medieval Latin Hymns.

I must mention one other of the less famous preachers of the time, one scarcely ever mentioned in works of Church History—for we know almost nothing of his life, and his sermons take little part in the great controversies—but who deserves a very warm commendation. It is Asterius, bishop of Amasea in Pontus. Of his copious writings, we have left about ten homilies believed to be genuine, and some fragments of others, but these are admirable, some of them really charming. The subjects are moral or historical; he has fine descriptive powers; the style is marked by exquisite richness of expression, and not overwrought. His allusions show that he was familiar with Demosthenes, and his style has something of the classic moderation and true elegance. Some of his sermons could be preached in our churches with little alteration, and would be well received. If some one of you would make himself thoroughly acquainted with them, and publish them in a small volume with introductions and notes, I am persuaded that many persons would read them with interest, partly because the name is unknown, and the volume would awaken curiosity. And now how can I speak of the great Greek preachers?

Basil the Great (A. D. 329–379) possessed all possible advantages. His family was rich and of high social position in Pontus, and from his grand parents down had been remarkable for piety. Two of his brothers became bishops, one of them famous (Gregory of Nyssa); and his older sister, who powerfully influenced him, founded and presided over a monastery. His father, a distinguished rhetorician, gave him careful instruction from childhood. At school he surpassed all his fellow-pupils. Then he studied at Constantinople, taught by Libanius, the most famous teacher of rhetoric in that age, with whom he formed a lasting friendship. Afterwards he went to Athens, where his fellow-students included Julian (afterwards Emperor and Apostate), and Gregory Nazianzen, his early friend. Gregory tells us in a well-known funeral eulogium, * that when he heard Basil was coming to Athens, he gave the students so high an opinion of his abilities and eloquence, that they consented, as a special distinction, to exempt Basil from the species of hazing to which new students were always subjected.

Thus he had every advantage,—good-breeding, and all pious and inspiring home influences, careful early training, then life in the great capital city (giving knowledge of the world), and afterwards at the chief seat of learning in that age, Athens, with the ablest instructors and the most gifted fellow-students—his intellect disciplined, and his taste cultivated by the study of classic philosophy and oratory, and yet his Christian feeling ever warmed anew by the sympathy and example of his intelligent and devout kindred at home.

He died when less than fifty years old (like the English Dr. Barrow), but his life was crowded with religious and literary labors. As a preacher, Basil shows greater skill in the construction of

discourses than any Christian orator who had preceded him. He usually extemporized, but he knew how to put a sermon together, or to make it grow, in a natural manner. The chief excellency of his preaching is in the treatment of moral subjects. He had a rare knowledge of human nature, and you may notice that among all the changes of preaching in all the ages, two branches of knowledge possess a universal and indestructible interest, deep knowledge of human nature, and deep knowledge of Scripture. Basil shows wonderful power in depicting the various virtues, and still more remarkable skill in tracing the growth and consequences of leading vices. Amid all the admirable temperance literature of our own age, I have seen no more just and vivid exhibition of many of the evils of drunkenness, than is given by Basil in his sermon on that subject. Yet this and some others of his discourses seem to me to have a fault still common in sermons on moral subjects, viz., that they do not make sufficiently prominent the Gospel view of the evil, and the Gospel motives to avoid it. The Christian moralist should be a Christian moralist. It is not strange that Basil's old pagan instructor could enjoy this sermon on drunkenness. If the letters * between them on the occasion are genuine (and they possess great verisimilitude), we find that they praise each other in very extravagant terms. Libanius sends Basil an oration on the ill-humored man, of which Basil says in reply, "O Muses, and letters, and Athens, what gifts ye bestow upon your lovers." Then Libanius asks to see Basil's recent sermon on drunkenness, and having read it, says, "Surely, Basil, you live at Athens unawares, for the Cæsarea people (Basil was bishop of Cæsarea in Pontus) could not hear this discourse." Presently he adds, "I did not teach him. This man is Homer, yes Plato, yes Aristotle, yes Susarion, who knew everything." ... And in conclusion. "I would, O Basil, that you could give me such praises," etc. Compliments between a professor and his now famous and very grateful pupil are apt to be a trifle gushing, but in this case the thing does seem overdone.

Basil's style has the faults of his age, and I would not advise your reading him very rapidly or freely, lest your taste be offended; but taking just one discourse at a time, you feel that you are dealing with great mind, a noble character, a deeply devout and truly eloquent preacher.

Gregory of Nyssa, the brother of Basil, is among the Greek Fathers the profoundest thinker as to philosophy, as you may see brought out in Ueberweg's History of Philosophy. As a preacher, he was and is overshadowed by the fame of his brother and of his namesake, but so far as a slender acquaintance enables one to judge, I think him really a more satisfactory preacher than the other and more celebrated Gregory. This other, Gregory Nazianzen (A D. 329–389), the friend and fellow student of Basil, was doubtless at that time considered the most eloquent of all preachers until Chrysostom became known. Very ambitious, and enjoying the finest educational opportunities, Gregory was especially a student of eloquence, and was a man of imaginative and passionate nature. He was the first great hymn-writer; and his hymns became exceedingly popular in the Greek Church. Yet it has been justly said that his poetry is too oratorical, and his oratory too poetical. You may notice that few great preachers have written even a single good hymn, and no great hymn-writer has been very eminent as a preacher, unless Gregory be the exception, or Epbraem the Syrian. So more generally as to oratory and poetry. The oratorical and the poetic temperament seem closely related, yet are they remarkably distinct. An orator may derive very great benefit from studying poets, but many a preacher is damaged by failing to understand the difference between the poet's office and his own. Imagination is the poet's mistress, his queen; for the orator, she is a handmaid, highly useful, indeed absolutely needful, but only a handmaid. And

splendor of diction, which for the poet is one chief end, is for the orator only a subordinate means. But the very faults of Gregory's style, according to our taste, were high excellencies in the estimation of his contemporaries. His wildly extravagant hyperboles, perpetual effort to strike, and high-wrought splendor of imagery and diction, were accounted the most magnificent eloquence, and perhaps did really recommend the truth to some of his hearers. Thus while Patriarch of Constantinople, he preached five discourses (still extant), which are said to have done much in curing Arianism there, and which procured him the surname of Theologos, discourses on the Deity of Christ, but which you or I can scarcely read with any patience. The career of John, afterward surnamed Chrysostom (A. D. 347–407), is doubtless somewhat familiar to you all, and is exceedingly well depicted in the life by Stephens. He was younger, by fifteen or twenty years, than Basil and the Gregories. He was of a distinguished and wealthy family in Antioch, and under the devoted care of a widowed mother, received every possible educational advantage. The great teacher Libanius had now returned to his native Antioch, and found in John a favorite pupil, whom he would have wished to make his successor as professor of rhetoric and kindred subjects. In the great city John saw the world, and sharpened that penetrating knowledge of human nature for which, like Basil, he was remarkable. For a short time he practiced law, and Libanius warmly commended some of his speeches at the bar. But he turned away, weary and disgusted, from the thousand corruptions of society and government, and when his mother's death allowed he went into retirement with several friends, and spent several years in the close study of the Scriptures. Among other and greater results, it is said that Chrysostom knew almost the whole Bible by heart. In these studies they were directed by Diodorus, the head of a neighboring monastery, and afterwards a bishop, and author of long famous commentaries and other works. Here was a turning-point of Chrysostom's life. Diodorus, as we learn from various sources, founded what then appeared to be a new school of Biblical interpretation, a reaction from the well-known tendency of the older school of Alexandria. He shrank from allegorizing, and held closely to "the literal and historical meaning of the text." His copious writings, which had the honor to be specially attacked by the Emperor Julian, have perished, except a few fragments. But Diodorus lives forever in his theological pupil. It is among the greatest distinctions of Chrysostom, that his interpretation is almost entirely free from the wild allegorizing which had been nearly universal ever since Origen. It is a delightful contrast to turn from the other great preachers of the time (including Augustine), with their utterly loose interpretations, and fanciful spiritualizing, to the straight-forward, careful and usually sober interpretations of Chrysostom. His works are not only models of eloquence, but a treasury of exegesis. And for this the world is mainly indebted to Diodorus. Chrysostom had much native good sense, it is true, but so had Athanasius, Basil, Augustine. Nay, his early studies of Scripture were directed by a really wise and able instructor; and his good sense enabled him to seize the just principles of interpretation set before him, and to develop them still more ably, and recommend them far more widely than the instructor himself. Highly favored was such a student, and highly fortunate such a teacher. It is also believed (Förster) that Chrysostom was greatly influenced as to interpretation, by his fellow student, Theodore, known afterwards as Theodore of Mopsuestia, and a commentator of great ability. It is among the advantages of study in company with others, that a man of susceptible nature will be powerfully influenced by his associates, as well as by the instructors.

Chrysostom long shrank from the work of preaching, and the office of priest, the difficulties and responsibilities of which he has so impressively stated in his little work on the Priesthood. He wrote

this and other valuable works while holding inferior offices, but was ordained and began preaching, only at the age of thirty-nine. He died at sixty, after three years of exile. Thus his actual career as a preacher lasted only eighteen years, twelve years at Antioch, and six at Constantinople. In these years he preached almost daily, filling the civilized world with his fame, and leaving about one thousand sermons (many of them reported by others) that have descended to us. From no other preacher have one thousand sermons been published, except; Spurgeon, who has now gone considerably beyond that number. In our impatient age and country, when so many think time spent in preparation is time lost, it is well to remember that the two most celebrated preachers of the early Christian centuries began to preach, Chrysostom at thirty-nine, and Augustine at thirty-six.

I cannot fully discuss the characteristics of Chrysostom's preaching. It must be admitted that he is by no means always correct in his interpretations, particularly in the Old Testament, being ignorant of Hebrew, and often misled by the errors of the Septuagint; also that he shared many sad errors of his age, as to baptism and the Lord's Supper, asceticism and virginity, Saints and martyrs. It must also be conceded that his style of ten wearies us by excessive copiousness, minute and long-drawn descriptions, multiplied comparisons, and piled-up imagery. But we must always remember that this did not look to excited throngs as it does to us. Under such circumstances a certain rhetorical exaggeration and exuberance seems natural, as a statue placed high upon a pillar must be above life-size. But admit what you please, criticise as you please, and the fact remains that Chrysostom has never had a superior, and it may be gravely doubted whether he has had an equal, in the history of preaching. "He shared the faults of his age," you say. Yes, and a man who does not, will scarcely impress his age, or any other. "He does not show such consummate art as Demosthenes." That is true. But the finish and repose of high art is scarcely possible, and scarcely desirable, in addressing the preacher's heterogeneous audiences, comprising persons so different as to culture and interest in the subject. Demosthenes has everywhere a style as elegant and purely simple as the Venus dei Medici or the Parthenon; Chrysostom approaches in exuberance of fancy, in multiplication of images and illustrations, and in curiously varied repetitions, to a Gothic cathedral. Demosthenes is like the Greek Tragic Drama, strictly conformed to the three Unities; Chrysostom is more like the Romantic Drama. I cannot say like Shakspeare — the Shakspeare of preachers has not yet appeared. But why should he not some day appear? One who can touch every chord of human feeling, treat every interest of human life, draw illustration from every object and relation of the known universe, and use all to gain acceptance and obedience for the gospel of salvation. No preacher has ever come nearer this than Chrysostom, perhaps none, on the whole, so near. A Syrian Greek, and a Christian Greek, he does in no small measure combine the Asiatic and the European, the ancient and the modern. The rich fancy and blazing passion of an Asiatic is united with the power of intellect and energy of will which mark Europeans; while the finish and simplicity of Greek art are not so much wanting as lost in the manysidedness of Christian thought and Christian sentiment. As to style he certainly ranges the whole gamut of expression: for while his style is generally elevated, often magnificent, and sometimes extravagant, it occasionally becomes homely and rough as he lays bare the follies and vim of men. * Chrysostom is undoubtedly the prince of expository preachers. And he has very rarely been equalled in the treatment of moral subjects, while two of the most successful preachers on moral subjects in the modern centuries, viz., Bourdaloue and Barrow, were both devoted students of Chrysostom.

Among the Latin preachers of the period there are but two great names, Ambrose and Augustine (for their famous contemporary Jerome, though eloquent in his writings, never preached). Of Ambrose (A. D. 310–97,) I can say but a word. Of very distinguished family, carefully educated at Rome, he practised law at Milan with much *éclat* for eloquence, became civil governor there, and then in a curious and well-known fashion, was suddenly forced by the *vox populi* into the office of bishop. Aware of his ignorance of Christian truth, he diligently studied Origen, Hippolytus, and Basil the Great, and Philo the Jew. From these he learned the wildest allegorizing, and from them is said to have in fact derived the greater part of his thought. This borrowing from the Greeks by wholesale had been the general practice of Pagan Roman writers also, as everybody knows. Ambrose must have been a man of striking appearance, and his style is fine and flowing, which fact must have been the excuse for naming him the Christian Cicero, which seems to me extravagant praise. But the influence of his preaching was greatly increased by his administrative talent. A true Roman, a born ruler of men, he made himself felt by emperor and people, by his own and by subsequent ages. He was a man of noble character, and his hymns (the first Latin hymns of much importance) have a manly vigor and directness which are truly Roman. His character and administrative achievements, and his eloquent delivery, gave prestige to his writings, which would otherwise hardly have gained so great a reputation. But here is a lesson for preachers, who may so often add immensely to the influence of their preaching, whether it be good or not, by administrative tact and toil, and by personal dignity and worth. As to Augustine (A. D. 354–430), you know that he has mainly impressed himself on the world as a theologian. The great theological authority of the Middle Ages, and nominally though one can hardly think really the great authority of the Romish Church to the present day, he is also the father of the theology of the Protestant Reformation. Luther avowedly put Augustine next to the Bible, as his chief source of religious knowledge. Calvin reduced Augustine's doctrines to a religious form, aided by his own training in the scholastic works of the Middle Ages. What we call Calvinism is the doctrine of Paul, developed by Augustine and systematized by Calvin.

You know too that Augustine has written works of very high literary merit, apart from his theological and homiletical writings. His *Confessions* form one of the most unique and strangely impressive works in all literature—one of the books that every body ought by all means to read. His *City of God* has been called a “prose Epic,” and is a combination of history, philosophy and poetry that has a power and a charm all its own. Add that his work on *Christian Teaching* is the first treatise on Sacred Rhetoric and Homiletics, and after all that has followed, the last of its four books is still highly suggestive. But I think that if we had nothing else from Augustine than his *Sermons*, of which some three hundred and sixty remain that are reckoned genuine, we should recognize him as a great preacher, as a richly gifted man, and should feel ourselves powerfully attracted and impressed by his genius, his mighty will and passionate heart and deeply earnest piety. Our historian Paniel, in my opinion, wrongs Augustine by underestimating him as a preacher, because of bitter hostility to the doctrines of grace which Augustine taught. Brömel does him more justice, and Ebert. He is unsafe as an interpreter—a good many of the great theologians have been rather too independent in their exegesis—and wild with allegorizing, like every other great preacher of the age except Chrysos. But his sermons are full of power. He carefully, if not always correctly, explains his text, and repeats many times, in different ways, its substantial meaning. He deals much in dramatic question and answer, and in apostrophe; also in digression, the use of familiar phrases, direct address to particular classes of persons present—using in

general great and notable freedom. Away with our prim and starch formalities and uniformities! Yet freedom must be controlled, as in Augustine it commonly is controlled, by sound judgment, right feeling and good taste. The chief peculiarity of Augustine's style is his fondness for, and skill in producing, pithy phrases. In the terse and vigorous Latin, these often have great power. The capacity for throwing off such phrases is mainly natural, but may be indefinitely cultivated. And it is a great element of power, especially in addressing the masses of men, if one can, after stating some truth, condense it into a single keen phrase that will penetrate the hearer's mind and stick.

Hurried as this review has been, I have passed without mention a number of men who are more or less known to us as eminent preachers. An interesting topic for inquiry would be, Preaching among the early heretics. The enthusiastic Montanism which won over Tertullian in his prime, must have produced impassioned and stirring preachers. The Manichæism to which Augustine was so attached in his youth, was in some respects well suited to eloquence; and Augustine declares that Faustus the Manichæan was more eloquent than Ambrose, whom he greatly admired and loved. I do not know anything as to the Donatist preachers, but the mighty Arian party, it has been already in passing intimated, comprised preachers as well as scholars of great ability, from most of whom, however, nothing remains but a name.

I wish now to remark upon two or three of the many points of general instruction and suggestion which present themselves in connection with the preaching of the early Christian centuries.

1. As to entrance on the ministry. You have noticed that quite a number of the famous men who have passed rapidly before us, became presbyters or bishops against their will. E. g., Gregory Thaumaturgus (the pupil of Origen), and Gregory Nazianzen, who fled from ordination, and published an Apology for his flight, in which he set forth the responsible and difficult duties of the priesthood. So Chrysostom's beautiful treatise on the Priesthood was written to show why he was not willing to become a priest. Ambrose also, and Augustine entered the sacred office unwillingly, and many others that we know of. Partly this was due to sacerdotal notions, as implied in the very name they used, priesthood; partly it was a mere fashion; but in the main we must believe that these men honestly shrank from a calling so solemnly responsible, as many others have done in every age, including our own. Nay, we remember the saying of Paul, "Who is sufficient for these things?" and the consolation he has handed down to us, "Our sufficiency is of God."

You doubtless observed also how many of these foremost preachers were of families having a high social position, as Ephraem, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Ambrose and Augustine. This gives a preacher advantages of no slight importance, and we should not allow our more favored families to suppose that the ministry is to come only from the poor. Everybody notices too, the pious mothers of Gregory Nazianzen and Chrysostom, of Ambrose and Augustine, while in the case of Basil and his brother, the whole family were remarkable for piety, beginning with the grandparents.

2. As to Education, we have seen that after Constantine, in the blooming period of early Christian eloquence, these distinguished preachers had nearly all attended at the great centres of secular instruction, gaining the most thorough general education the age could afford. The pagan thought and taste had greatly degenerated, but the noble old Greek and Roman literature then existed in its entirety (not in fragments as we have it), and came to these students in their own tongues wherein they were born. Mr. Grote, in the preface to his Plato, very unfairly quotes Jerome to show

that it was the tendency of what he calls “Hebrew studies” to make a man despise and neglect the heathen classics. But Jerome had peculiar notions on this subject. Basil recommended the classic writers to a student, and Chrysostom and Augustine speak not so much as loving these writers less, but as loving the Scriptures more. Besides, their circumstances were very different from ours. We can admire the statues of deities, without thereby encouraging idolatry, but they could not; and so as to the pagan literature, almost all intimately associated with idolatry, which was then rapidly declining, but by no means dead. These considerations will account for the terms of disparagement in which the great Christian writers of the time sometimes speak of classical studies. But Julian, the apostate emperor, doubtless understood the situation, and he forbade Christian teachers to teach rhetoric and grammar, and to lecture on the old classic authors. If Christian youth wished to study these, let them go, he said, to the pagan teachers. And we are told of distinguished Christian professors of rhetoric who gave up their positions, in obedience to Julian’s edict.

We have also seen that a singularly large number of these great preachers had studied the grand systems of Greek and Roman law, which must have given most important general discipline. Tertullian, Cyprian and Ambrose, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Basil and Chrysostom, all studied law, and most of them for a while engaged in the practice. The same thing has been true of many eminent preachers in our own time. Let me remind you, too, of the great attention which nearly every one of these great preachers had paid to the study of Oratory, as a practical art. I will not discourse upon the importance to ourselves of this now so generally neglected study. I trust you all read the weighty words spoken last summer at Amherst College by an illustrious citizen, whose name recalls the whole history of American Liberty, and whose character and public services are worthy of the best days of the Republic, the Hon. Charles Francis Adams. He declared that in no country at the present day has public speaking such ample opportunities for exerting influence as in America, and in no civilized country is the art of public speaking so little studied. (I think that in this last respect he ought to have excepted England.) I would that his exhortations on that subject might sink into the hearts of our aspiring American youth. But besides general education, in all the really grand curriculum of the age, and at the great schools of Alexandria and Antioch, of Constantinople and Athens, of Rome and many lesser cities, these leading preachers nearly all pursued a long course of theological study, before entering upon the full work of the ministry. Going back to the times of Origen, we happen to have remaining a curious account of the studies in which he trained his pupils at Cæsarea. Gregory, afterwards surnamed Thaumaturgus (the miracle-worker), on his way from Cappadocia to a law-school at Beyrout, met Origen at Cæsarea, was converted by him to Christianity, and became his pupil there for eight years, though he had already studied at Alexandria and at Athens. When at last reluctantly leaving Cæsarea, Gregory delivered a valedictory, commonly known as his Panegyric upon Origen, which is very interesting on many accounts, among others because it is the earliest Christian oration we have.

He tells in this valedictory how Origen at the outset urged upon him in many conversations, the advantages and delights of knowledge, as compared with what men call practical pursuits, and soon fascinated him so that he could not leave. He says that he and his brother were like uncultivated land full of briars and thistles, or like wild horses, when Origen took hold of them. That he taught them both in the Socratic manner and by discourses—that he corrected their errors, and taught them to distinguish between truth and error, to be critical both as to language and

arguments. The subjects of their study, he says, were Physics (in the broad ancient sense of that term), especially Geometry, which he calls the solid basis of all knowledge, and Astronomy; afterwards Ethics, Philosophy in general, and Theology. Such was their eight years' course. And now in sadly turning away from this worshipped teacher and these cherished studies, Gregory compares himself to Adam driven out of Paradise, to the prodigal son leaving his father (only without any portion of goods), and to the Jews when carried into the Babylonian captivity. Do we mourn thus in leaving a long course of study? If not, is it because our teachers are not Origenes, or because we are not Gregories—or is it that our students do not commonly expect to be life-long celibates, and that thoughts of a domestic Paradise do often allure them away from the Paradise of College and Theological school? In respect to their style, the great Greek and Latin Fathers are, in general, by no means good models, as I have before intimated in passing. They have the overwrought style of their age. We see this already in Josephus, and Plutarch's *Miscellaneous Writings*, and the *Dialogue on Oratory* ascribed to Tacitus. We see it in Libanius and Julian. Even Chrysostom shows this tendency of his age, and often offends our taste. Here is a reason, from the point of view of Rhetoric, for objecting to the substitution of Christian Greek and Latin writers for the classics of the earlier time as text-books. Boys at school and college are always disappointed in Demosthenes at first, and they would think Gregory Nazianzen far more eloquent. These writers present precisely those faults of style which youthful and untrained minds are too ready to admire and imitate.

Passing over many other topics, I simply direct your attention, in conclusion, to the striking fact, that the Christian preaching of these early centuries culminated in Chrysostom and Augustine, and then suddenly and entirely ceased to show any remarkable power. East or West, after Chrysostom and Augustine, there is not another really great preacher whose sermons remain to us, for seven centuries. The reasons for this would appear upon a little reflection. In the East, the despotism and worldliness of the Imperial Court left no room for independence of thought, or for high hope of doing good by eloquence. Court intrigue had forced Gregory Nazianzen to resign at Constantinople, and driven Chrysostom into exile, and the Greek bishops afterwards became mere courtiers or mere slaves. In the West, amid the destruction of the Western Empire, and the conflicts of the barbarians, the Roman genius for government showed itself, and the high Christian officials went on gathering power and making Rome in a new sense the mistress of the world, but this was done by administrative talents like those of Leo the Great, and Gregory the Great, and there was no demand for supreme efforts in preaching. And in both East and West, men's minds were now turned towards impressive ritual, sacerdotal functions and sacramental efficacies, and these left little room, as they commonly do, for earnest and vigorous preaching.

End Notes * Gregory Nazianzen Or. 43, page 781–3 Bened.

* Basil, *Epistles* 351–6, p. 1093 ff. Migne.

* "The orator must command the whole scale of the language, from the most eloquent to the most low and vile. ... The street must be one of his schools. Ought not the scholar to be able to convey his meaning in terms as short and strong as the porter or truckman uses to convey his?"—Emerson's *Letters and Social Aims*.

01.03. Lecture III. Medieval And Reformation Preaching

Lecture III. Medieval And Reformation Preaching

It is a great mistake, in surveying the history of Preaching, to pass at once from Chrysostom and Augustine to the Reformation. Besides the fact, now so generally recognized, that there were “Reformers before the Reformation,” it is to be noticed that among the devoted Romanists of the Middle Ages there were some earnest, able and eloquent preachers. The common Protestant fashion of stigmatizing the “Dark Ages” is unphilosophical and unjust, and has proven, in some quarters, to be bad policy. Men who had been reared to think that everything Medieval was corrupt or silly, are sometimes so surprised by the first results of a little investigation that they go quite over to the opposite extreme. But not simply on grounds of general justice and fairness are we required to notice the Medieval preaching. The fact is that the history of preaching cannot be understood without taking account of that period. So far as the form of modern preaching differs from that of the early Christian centuries, the difference has had its origin in the Middle Ages.

It is true that in that period preaching was generally very much neglected. Over wide districts, and through long years at a time, there would be almost no preaching. When men assembled in churches it was only to witness ceremonies and hear chanting and intoning. If sermons were given, it was in many countries still the custom to preach only in Latin, which the people did not now understand, even in Southern Europe. Those who preached in the vernacular, would often give nothing but eulogies on the saints, accounts of current miracles, etc. Most of the lower clergy were grossly ignorant, and many of them grossly irreligious, while the bishops and other dignitaries were often engrossed with political administration or manœuvring, perhaps busy in war, if not occupied with pursuits still more unclerical and unchristian.

All this was true. And yet there were notable exceptions. Let us look for a moment at three or four leading examples.

Certainly Peter the Hermit was a great preacher. A man of very small stature and ungainly shape, his speaking was rendered powerful by fiery enthusiasm, and great flow of words. It is difficult to exaggerate the importance to an orator, of vigorous health; and yet several of the greatest preachers have been men in feeble health, as, besides Peter the Hermit, Chrysostom, St. Bernard, Calvin, Baxter—yea, apparently, the apostle Paul. But note that their diseases were not such as debilitate, not such as enfeeble the nervous system—that they were all capable of great mental application, and possessed great force of character, stimulated by burning zeal—and that most of them, though diligent students, were also much given to physical activity. In the time of Peter and Bernard, a feeble physique, especially if it appeared to be emaciated by fasting, rather helped a preacher’s oratory with the people; for first, it seemed to indicate great piety, and secondly, his powerful utterance when excited seemed in that superstitious age to be preternatural. The Hon. Alexander H. Stephens of Georgia, is in this respect an anachronism—if he had lived in the Middle Ages the fact that so frail a man can speak two hours and hold a great audience would have stamped him as a saint, preternaturally supported, and with more than

human claims to attention and belief.

Peter had a most inspiring theme; for with the great religious motive he united an appeal to the love of war, which was so strong in that age, and to the love of adventure, which is always so strong. But in addition to the inspiration of his theme, he himself must have been surpassingly eloquent. We are told (Michaud I, 43) that he made much use of “those vehement apostrophes which produce such an effect upon an uncultivated multitude. He described the profanation of the holy places, and the blood of the Christians shed in torrents in the streets of Jerusalem. He invoked, by turns, Heaven, the saints, the angels, to bear witness to the truth of what he told them. He apostrophized Mt. Zion, the rock of Calvary, and the Mount of Olives, which he made to resound with sobs and groans. When he had exhausted speech in painting the miseries of the faithful, he showed the spectators the crucifix which he carried with him; sometimes striking his breast and wounding his flesh, sometimes shedding torrents of tears.” Fanatical, no doubt he was, but our present concern is with his eloquence. Read, with this in view, the story of his preaching, and of the prodigious effects produced upon high and low, upon men, women and children, and you will probably believe that seldom, in all the history of man, has there been such overpowering popular eloquence as that of Peter. And while we are rejoicing to study the recorded and finished eloquence of Demosthenes and Daniel Webster, of Chrysostom and Robert Hall, we have also much to learn from the mere history of great popular orators like Patrick Henry and Peter the Hermit. But the case of the great Crusading Evangelist was very peculiar. We find a little later a notable example of preaching in the strict sense of the term.

Bernard of Clairvaux, commonly called St. Bernard, lived from A. D. 1091 to 1153 in France, a devoted monk and a fervently pious man. Pale, meagre, attenuated through much fasting, looking almost as unsubstantial as a spirit, he made a great impression the moment he was seen. He possessed extraordinary talents, and though he made light of human learning, he at least did so only after acquiring it. His sermons and other writings do not indicate a profound metaphysical thinker, like Augustine or Aquinas, but they present treasures of devout sentiment, pure, deep, delightful—mysticism at its best estate. His style has an elegant simplicity and sweetness that is charming, and while many of his expressions are as striking as those of Augustine, they seem perfectly easy and natural. His utterance and gesture are described as in the highest degree impressive. His power of persuasion was felt by high and low to be something irresistible. Even his letters swayed popes and sovereigns. This wonderful personal influence was shown in many cures, which he and others believed to be miraculous.

Bernard is often called “the last of the Fathers.” If we were asked who is the foremost preacher in the whole history of Latin Christianity, we should doubtless find the question narrowing itself to a choice between Augustine and Bernard. His sermons show more careful preparation than those of the early Latin Fathers. He has felt to some extent the systematizing tendencies of the scholastic thought and method—for Anselm’s principal works appeared before Bernard was born, and Abelard was his senior by a dozen years—and the effect of this systematizing tendency we see in the more orderly arrangement of his discourses, though they do not show formal divisions. He greatly loved to preach, and we are told that he preached oftener than the rules of his order appointed, both to the monks and to the people. He was accustomed to put down thoughts, and schemes of discourses, as they occurred to him, and work them up as he had occasion to preach—a plan which many other preachers have found useful. His methods of sermonizing have

considerable variety, and his manner of treatment t is free. I need not say that he was devoted to allegorizing, which was universal in that age. I count in his works eighty-six sermons on the Song of Solomon, and when the series was cut short by his death, he had just begun the third chapter. In his other sermons too he quotes the Song of Solomon as often as Chrysostom quotes Job. Before we speak lightly of this passionate love for Solomon's Song by medieval monks, as some Protestants do speak, it may be well to remember that Richard Baxter and Jonathan Edwards studied that book with peculiar delight.

Bernard was warmly praised by Luther, Melancthon and Calvin. I think that beyond any other medieval preacher, he will repay the student of the present day.

About fifty years after the death of Bernard, i. e. in the beginning of the thirteenth century, two new monastic orders were founded, the mendicant orders of Franciscans and Dominicans. The latter order was founded for the express purpose of preaching. And it is instructive to notice that the immediate occasion of its establishment was the observed popularity and power of preaching among the Waldenses. Besides settled preachers, Peter Waldo had recently begun to send out Evangelists, two by two, who were known as the "Poor Men of Lyons." Dominic began his order to meet these heretics just as Protestantism afterwards led to the Society of Jesus. But in a few years Dominic went to Rome, and preached there with irresistible eloquence, drawing the highest dignitaries to sympathize with his plans. All men could see that preaching was everywhere greatly needed, and the idea of a general order of preachers, to be controlled by the eloquent Dominic, was welcomed, so that Rome now became its centre. Within a few years this order embraced four hundred and seventy different monasteries, in every country of Europe, and spreading into Asia, making probably twenty thousand travelling preachers. In the course of time the Dominicans became worldly, and less zealous in this great work. But for two or three generations this mighty order of "Evangelists," as we should say, made the Christian world ring with their preaching. They formed also a singular and very influential outside order of laymen, called Tertiaries, who were bound by their vow to entertain the wandering preachers, to spread the fame of their eloquence, crowd to hear them, and "applaud, at least by rapt attention." You perceive that several things have been understood in the world before our day. The Franciscans addressed themselves especially to Foreign Mission work among the Mohammedans of Spain, Africa and the East, but also comprised many zealous preachers at home. To these two orders belonged the other two great medieval preachers of whom I shall speak, Antony of Padua being a Franciscan, and Thomas Aquinas a Dominican.

Antony, a Portuguese, and a Franciscan missionary to Africa, afterwards came to Italy, where he gained his extraordinary reputation as a preacher, and died in 1231, at the age of thirty-seven. He is reckoned by some as the most popular preacher that ever lived. We read of twenty thousand persons as crowding at night around the stand where he was to preach next morning, and after the sermon making bonfires of their playing cards, etc.; and sometimes as many as thirty thousand were present when he preached. In point of mere numbers, this surpasses Chrysostom, Whitefield, Spurgeon and Moody. Yet much of this popularity on the part of Antony of Padua was due to the superstitious belief that he had supernatural power, that he could work miracles. We are told, for instance, that once he preached to the fishes, "giving them in conclusion the apostolical benediction, and behold ! they showed their joy by lively movement of tail and fins, and raised their heads above the water, bowed reverently and went under. At this unbelievers were astonished,

and the most dreadful heretics were converted."*

Yet these superstitious follies must not prevent our observing that he was really a great preacher; and some things in his manner of preaching are particularly noteworthy.

(1) Antony of Padua was the first preacher, so far as I can learn; who made a careful division of his sermons into several heads—which his extant sermons show that he commonly did, though not universally. For example, on the text, “Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord,” Apocal. xiv., he begins thus: “Note that in these words death is described, about which the apostle John proposes three things, viz., the debt of nature, where he says, ‘The dead’; the merit of grace, where he says, ‘Who die in the Lord’; the reward of glory, where he says, ‘Blessed.’ ... “Likewise note that God gives us three things, viz. to live, to live well, to live forever. For in creation he gives us to live, in justification to live well, in glorification to live forever. But to live, little profits him to whom it is not given, or who does not strive, to live well; and to live well would not suffice if it were not given to live forever.” And so throughout, everything is formally divided.

These formal divisions, a new thing in the history of preaching, came from applying to practical discourse the methods then pursued in the Universities. Most of the great schoolmen were predecessors or contemporaries of Antony, and all the most vigorous thought of the time adopted their method. If it were asked how these methods themselves arose, the answer would seem to be this. The schoolmen sought to rationalize Christianity, to make it conformable and acceptable to human reason, as so many have done before and since their epoch. But these medieval thinkers could not rationalize as to the truth of Christianity, as to its sources, or its doctrinal contents, for all these were fixed for them by the unquestionable authority of the Church. So they fell to applying the processes of the Aristotelian logic to this fixed body of Christian truth, seeking by decomposition and reconstruction to bring it into forms acceptable to their reason. Each new philosopher would decompose more minutely and reorganize more elaborately. Thus logical division, formally stated, became the passion of the age. And while then and often afterwards carried to a great extreme, and though there have been many reactions, in preaching as in other departments of literature, yet this scholastic passion for analysis has powerfully affected the thought and the expression of all subsequent centuries. If any of you wish to examine the first known specimens of this method in preaching, and have not access to the rare old folio of Antony’s works in Latin, I have seen advertised a small volume of translations from Antony of Padua by Dr. Neale, who has also given some account of him in the volume on Medieval Preaching. You will notice that most of Antony’s sermons, as we have them, are really sketches of sermons, published, we are told, for the benefit of other brethren. Augustine dictated some short sermons, to be used by other preachers, but Antony has left the first collection of what modern pulpit literature knows only too well, as “Sketches and Skeletons.”

(2) But one would think it must have been something else than formal scholastic divisions that made Antony’s preaching so popular. And we find that he abounded in illustration, and that of a novel kind. Anecdotes of saints and martyrs had become somewhat stale, and Antony preferred to draw illustration from the trades and other occupations of those he was addressing, from the habits of animals, and other such matters of common observation.

(3) His allegorizing is utterly wild and baseless, beyond anything that I have seen even in the Fathers. But such stuff seems always to have a charm for the popular mind, as seen in many

ignorant Baptist preachers at the present day, white and colored—probably for two reasons, because it constantly presents novelties, and because it appeals to the imagination. Strict interpretation takes away from us for the most part this means of charming audiences, but we can to some extent make amends, since strict and careful interpretation will itself often give great freshness of view, even to the most familiar passages, while illustration both affords novelty and appeals to the imagination.

Thomas Aquinas, the Neapolitan Count, and Dominican friar, who died six centuries ago (1274) at the age of fifty, is by common consent regarded as the greatest theologian of the Middle Ages, and one of the greatest minds in the history of philosophy. It is surely an interesting fact that he was at the same time very popular as a preacher to the common people, being thus faithful to his Dominican vow. Amid the immense and amazing mass of his works are many brief discourses, and treatises which were originally discourses, marked by clearness, simplicity and practical point, and usually very short, many of them not requiring more than ten minutes, though these were doubtless expanded in preaching to the common people. He has also extended commentaries on perhaps half the books of Scripture, in which the method of exposition is strikingly like that with which we are all familiar in Matthew Henry, leading us to believe that in the former as well as in the latter case the exposition was, for the most part, first presented in the form of expository sermons. He is not highly imaginative, nor flowing in expression; the sentences are short, and everything runs into division and subdivision, usually by threes. But while there is no ornament, and no swelling passion, he uses many homely and lively comparisons, for explanation as well as for argument.

It is pleasant to think of the fact that this great philosopher and author loved to preach, and that plain people loved to hear him. And many of us ordinary men would do well like him to combine philosophical and other profound studies with simple and practical preaching. Thirty years ago, Jacob R. Scott, a Massachusetts man, and graduate of Brown and of Newton, became chaplain to the University of Virginia, and gave his valued friendship to a young student who was looking to the ministry. When the young man began to preach, unfortunately without regular theological education, he wrote to Mr. Scott for information about books and advice as to study, and received a long and instructive letter, in the course of which was given a bit of counsel which has several times since gone the rounds of the newspapers: "Read Butler, and preach to the negroes, and it will make a man of you." The prediction has certainly been but very partially fulfilled, and one of the conditions, it must be admitted, has not been fully complied with. While preaching much to the negroes, and other ignorant people, he has not sufficiently studied Butler, and other philosophers. I tell the simple story partly in order to pay a slight tribute of gratitude to a son of Newton who has passed away, and partly because it may bring a little nearer to you the important thought that we ought to combine profound studies with practical preaching.

You may notice that the great medieval preachers I have mentioned all fall within the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. To the same period belong the greatest of the Latin hymn-writers, Adam of St. Victor (who is now regarded as the foremost of them all), and the authors of the *Celestial City*, the *Stabat Mater*, and the *Dies Irae*. If you inquire for the cause of this accumulation of eminent preachers and sacred poets in that age, the explanation would doubtless be chiefly the Crusades. These had powerfully stirred the soul of Europe, awakening all minds and hearts. At the same time, by keeping up a distant warfare, they had given many generations of peace at home, and

thus afforded opportunity for the work of the great Universities and the rise of the great Schoolmen, and so likewise for the appearance of great preachers and hymn-writers. Moreover, the rise of the middle class greatly heightened the aggregate mental activity of society. And though what we call the "Revival of Learning" was much later than this, yet already there was a growing and inevitably inspiring acquaintance with the Classic Latin authors, as, for example, in the next generation after Thomas Aquinas, Dante shows himself familiar with Virgil. The study of the Roman Law had also been revived and there were now professors of Civil Law in all the great Universities. As regards preaching, we can see what causes ended this period of prosperity. For in the next two centuries (14th and 15th) there were again terrible wars in Europe itself. Scholasticism had run its course, the Papacy became frightfully corrupt, and the better spirits were either absorbed in Mysticism, or engaged in unsuccessful attempts to reform the 'Church. With the general corruption the great preaching orders rapidly degenerated. If Thomas Aquinas was a Dominican, and Tauler, so also was the infamous Tetzl, whose proclamation of indulgences called forth the theses of Luther. Of the great Mystics I can only mention Tauler, doubtless the foremost of his class in that age. Some of you are probably familiar with an admirable volume containing his Life and twenty-five sermons, published in New York in 1858. Tauler lived on the Rhine in the fourteenth century, having been educated at the University of Paris, then the greatest of all seats of learning. In a time of great political and social evils, of protracted civil war, followed by a terrible struggle between the Pope and the Emperor (for German Emperors and Popes have had many a fierce conflict before to-day), a time of frightful pestilence, a time of sadly dissolute morals even among priests and monks and nuns, Tauler labored as a faithful priest. After years thus spent, he was, at the age of fifty, lifted to what we call a Higher Life through the influence of a young layman, the head of a secret society which was trying to reform religion without leaving the Church. It was after this Higher Life period began with Tauler that he preached the sermons which were taken down by hearers and remain to us.

We ought to study these mystical writings. They represent one side of human nature, and minister, in an exaggerated way, to a want of men in every age. Our own age is intensely practical. Yet see how readily many persons accept the idea of a Higher Life, of the Rest of Faith, etc. Do not most of us so neglect this aspect of Christianity in our studies and our preaching, as to leave the natural thirst for it in some hearers ungratified, and thus prepare them to catch at, and delight in, such ideas and sentiments when presented in an extravagant and enthusiastic form? If we do not neglect the Scriptural mysticism—as found in the writings of John and also of Paul—we shall see less readiness among our people to accept a mysticism that is unscriptural. Let it be added that Tauler did not preach mere mystical raptures. He searchingly applies religious principle to the regulation of the inner and the outer life, and urges that ordinary homely duties shall be performed in a religious spirit.

I must pass with brief mention the preaching of the now celebrated "Reformers before the Reformation." Of Wyclif, who died in England twenty years later than Tauler, and of his "poor preachers," we may have time to think on another occasion. John Huss, who was a little later, and powerfully influenced by the writings of Wyclif, was an eloquent and scholarly man, University preacher and Queen's Confessor in Bohemia, and his "fervid sermons" in favor of moral and ecclesiastical reformation long made a great impression. And to pass over many others, we must believe that there has seldom been more impressive preaching than that of the Italian Dominican

Savonarola, who acted the part of prophet, preacher and virtual ruler in Florence during the last years of the fifteenth century, when Martin Luther was a child. A century before Luther, lived Thomas a-Kempis, in the Netherlands and Gerson in France. It is much disputed which of them wrote the tract on "The Imitation of Christ." The former is said by historians not to have been a very eloquent preacher; Gerson was a preacher of real power, and highly esteemed by Luther.

We come now to the preaching of the great Reformers. In devoting to them the mere fraction of a lecture, we have at least the advantage that here the leading persons and main facts are well known. Let us notice certain things which hold true of the Reformation preaching in general.

(1) It was a revival of preaching. We have seen that in the Middle Ages there was by no means such an utter dearth of preaching as many Protestant writers have represented. Yet the preachers we have referred to were, even when most numerous, rather exceptions to a rule. Even the great Missionary organizations, the Franciscans and Dominicans, poured forth their thousands of mendicant preachers to do a work which the local clergy mainly neglected, and which they were often all the more willing to neglect because the travelling friars would now and then undertake it. Peripatetic preachers, evangelists, however useful under some circumstances and worthy of honor, become a curse to any pastor who expects them to make amends for his own neglect of duty. In general, the clergy did not preach. And the Reformation was a great outburst of preaching, such as had not been seen since the early Christian centuries.

(2) It was a revival of Biblical preaching. Instead of long and often fabulous stories about saints and martyrs, and accounts of miracles, instead of passages from Aristotle and Seneca, and fine-spun subtleties of the Schoolmen, these men preached the Bible. The question was not what the Pope said; and even the Fathers, however highly esteemed, were not decisive authority—it was the Bible. The preacher's one great task was to set forth the doctrinal and moral teachings of the Word of God. And the greater part of their preaching was expository. Once more, after long centuries, people were reading the Scriptures in their own tongue, and preachers, studying the original Greek and Hebrew, were carefully explaining to the people the connected teachings of passage after passage and book after book. For example, Zwingli, when first beginning his ministry at Zürich, announced his intention to preach, not simply upon the church lessons, but upon the whole gospel of Matthew, chapter after chapter. Some friends objected that it would be an innovation, and injurious; but he justly said, "It is the old custom. Call to mind the homilies of Chrysostom on Matthew, and of Augustine on John." And these sermons of Zwingli's made a great impression. There was also at the basis of this expository preaching by the Reformers a much more strict and reasonable exegesis than had ever been common since the days of Chrysostom. Luther retained something of the love of allegorizing, as many Lutherans have done to the present day. But Calvin gave the ablest, soundest, clearest expositions of Scripture that had been seen for a thousand years, and most of the other great Reformers worked in the same direction. Such careful and continued exposition of the Bible, based in the main upon sound exegesis, and pursued with loving zeal, could not fail of great results, especially at a time when direct and exact knowledge of Scripture was a most attractive and refreshing novelty. The same sort of effect is to some extent seen in the case of certain useful laborers in our own day, who accomplish so much by Bible readings and highly Biblical preaching. The expository sermons of the Reformers, while in general free, are yet much more orderly than those of the Fathers. They have themselves studied the great scholastic works, and been trained in analysis and

arrangement, and the minds of all their cultivated hearers have received a similar bent. And so they easily, and almost spontaneously, give their discourses something of plan. Accordingly they are in many respects models of this species of preaching. In general, it may be said that the best specimens of expository preaching are to be found in Chrysostom, in the Reformers, especially Luther and Calvin, and in the Scottish pulpit of our own time.

(3) The Reformation involved a revival of controversial preaching. Religious controversy is unpopular in our day, being regarded as showing a lack of charity, of broad culture, and in the estimation of some, a lack even of social refinement and courtesy. It is possible that a few preachers, even some of our Baptist brethren, are too fond of controversy, and do perhaps exhibit some of the deficiencies mentioned. But it must not be forgotten that religious controversy is inevitable where living faith in definite truth is dwelling side by side with ruinous error and practical evils. And preachers may remember that controversial preaching, properly managed, is full of interest and full of power.

(4) We must add that there was in the Reformation a revival of preaching upon the doctrines of grace. The methods of preaching are, after all, not half so important as the materials. These great men preached justification by faith, salvation by grace. The doctrine of Divine sovereignty in human salvation was freely proclaimed by all the Reformers. However far some Protestants may have gone at a later period in opposition to these views, yet Protestantism was born of the doctrines of grace, and in the proclamation of these the Reformation preaching found its truest and highest power. There are many who say now-a-days, "But we have changed all that." Nay, till human nature changes and Jesus Christ changes, the power of the gospel will still reside in the great truth of salvation by sovereign grace. Let the humanitarian and the ritualist go their several ways, but let us boldly and warmly proclaim the truths which seem old and yet are so new to every needy heart, of sovereignty and atonement, of spiritual regeneration and justification by faith.

It would be difficult to find so marked a contrast between any two celebrated contemporaries in all the history of preaching as that between Luther and Calvin. Luther (1483–1546) was a broad-shouldered, broad-faced, burly German, overflowing with physical strength; Calvin (1509–64) a feeble-looking little Frenchman, with shrunken cheeks and slender frame, and bowed with study and weakness. Luther had a powerful intellect, but was also rich in sensibility, imagination and swelling passion—a man juicy with humor, delighting in music, in children, in the inferior animals, in poetic sympathy with nature. In the disputation at Leipzig he stood up to speak with a bouquet in his hand. Every constituent of his character was rich to overflowing, and yet it was always a manly vigor, without sentimental gush. With all this accords one of his marked faults, a prodigious and seemingly reckless extravagance, and even an occasional coarseness of language when excited, leading to expressions which ever since Bossuet have been the stock in trade of Anti-Protestant controversialists, and some of which it is impossible to defend. Calvin, on the other hand, was practically destitute of imagination and humor, seeming in his public life and works to have been all intellect and will, though his letters show that he was not only a good hater, but also a warm friend. And yet, while so widely different, both of these men were great preachers. What had they in common to make them great preachers? I answer, along with intellect they had force of character, an energetic nature, will. A great preacher is not a mere artist, and not a feeble suppliant, he is a conquering soul, a monarch, a born ruler of mankind. He wills, and men bow. Calvin was far less winning than Luther, but he was even more than Luther an autocrat. Each of

them had unbounded self-reliance too, and yet at the same time each was full of humble reliance on God. This combination, self-confidence, such as if it existed alone, would vitiate character, yet checked and upborne by simple, humble, child-like faith in God, this makes a Christian hero, for word or for work. The statement could be easily misunderstood, but as meant it is true and important, that a man must both believe in himself and believe in God, if he is to make a powerful impression on his fellow-men, and do great good in the world. This force of character in both Luther and Calvin gave great force to their utterance. Every body repeats the saying as to Luther that "his words were half battles." But of Calvin too it was said, and said by Beza who knew him so well, *Tot verba, tot pondera*, "every word weighed a pound,"—a phrase also used of Daniel Webster. It should be noticed too that both Luther and Calvin were drawn into much connection with practical affairs, and this tended to give them greater firmness and positiveness of character, and to render their preaching more vigorous, as well as better suited to the common mind. Here is another valuable combination of what are commonly reckoned incongruous qualities—to be a thinker and student, and at the same time a man of practical sense and practical experience. Such were the great Reformers, and such a man was the apostle Paul. The vast reputation of Calvin as theologian and church-builder has overshadowed his great merits as a commentator and a preacher. With the possible exception of Chrysostom, I think there is, as already intimated, no commentator before our own century whose exegesis is so generally satisfactory and so uniformly profitable as that of Calvin. And by all means use the original Latin, so clear and smooth and agreeable, Latin probably unsurpassed in literary excellence since the early centuries. All his extemporized sermons taken down in short hand, as well as his writings, show not so much great copiousness, as true command of language, his expression being, as a rule, singularly direct, simple, and forcible. The extent of his preaching looks to us wonderful. While lecturing at Geneva to many hundreds of students (sometimes eight hundred), while practically a ruler of Geneva, and constant adviser of the Reformed in all Switzerland, France and the Netherlands, England and Scotland, and while composing his so extensive and elaborate works, he would often preach every day. For example, I notice that the two hundred sermons on Deuteronomy, which are dated, were all delivered on week-days in the course of little more than a year, and sometimes on four or five days in succession. It was so with the other great Reformers. In fact, Luther accuses one preacher of leading an "idle life; for he preaches but twice a week, and has a salary of two hundred dollars a year." Luther himself, with all his lecturing, immense correspondence, and voluminous authorship, often preached every day for a week, and on fast days two or three times.

Luther had less than Calvin of sustained intensity, but he had at times an overwhelming force, and his preaching possessed the rhetorical advantage of being everywhere pervaded by one idea, that of justification by faith, round which he reorganized all existing Christian thought, and which gave a certain unity to all the overflowing variety of his illustration, sentiment and expression. In fact, did he not carry his one idea too far, and have not Protestants yet to recover from following him in this error? The apostles speak of loving Christ and knowing Christ, as securing salvation, but Luther would in every case by main force reduce it to believng. * But the undecomposed idea of loving Christ is certainly more intelligible and practically useful in the Sunday School, and so there may be persons who will be more benefited by the idea of knowing Christ than by that of believing on him.

Luther shows great realness, both in his personal grasp of Christian truth, and in his modes of presenting it. The conventional decorums he smashes, and with strong, rude, and sometimes even coarse expressions, with illustrations from almost every conceivable source, and with familiar address to the individual hearer, he brings the truth very close home. He gloried in being a preacher to the common people. Thus he says: "A true, pious and faithful preacher shall look to the children and servants, and to the poor, simple masses, who need instruction." "If one preaches to the coarse, hard populace, he must paint it for them, pound it, chew it, try all sorts of ways to soften them ever so little." He blamed Zwingli for interlarding his sermons with Greek, Hebrew and Latin, and praised those who preached so that the common people could understand. This subject of popular preaching has been much discussed in Germany down to the present day. There is a greater difference between cultivated people and the masses in Germany and England than in our own country. Yet even in America, even in New England, with its noble common schools and the omnipresent newspaper, the masses are comparatively ignorant, and need plain preaching, and we must not forget it.

Luther is a notable example of intense personality in preaching. His was indeed an imperial personality, of rich endowments, varied sympathies and manifold experiences. They who heard him were not only listening to truth, but they felt the man. Those who merely read his writings, in foreign lands and languages, felt the man, were drawn to him, and thus drawn to his gospel. There are conflicting opinions as to what is best in regard to the preacher's personality. Some offensively obtrude themselves, and push the gospel into the background. Others think the ideal is to put the gospel alone before the mind, and let the preacher be entirely forgotten. "Hide yourself behind the cross," is the phrase. What is here intended is well enough, but the statement is extreme, if not misleading. What is the use of a living preacher, if he is to be really hidden, even by the cross? The true ideal surely is, that the preacher shall come frankly forward, in full personality, modest through true humility and yet bold with personal conviction and fervid zeal and ardent love—presenting the gospel as a reality of his own experience, and attracting men to it by the power of a living and present human sympathy—and yet all the while preaching not himself, but Christ Jesus the Lord. In the Dresden gallery there is a small portrait by Titian, of a brother painter. He is in the foreground, a fine, rugged face, illuminated with the light of genius, while on one side, and a little in the background is the face of Titian himself, gazing upon his friend with loving, self-forgetting, and contagious admiration. Thus ought we to stand beside the cross. And observe that with all his boldness, Luther often trembled at the responsibility of preaching. He says in one of his sermons, "As soon as I learnt from the Holy Scriptures how terror-filled and perilous a matter it was to preach publicly in the church of God. ... there was nothing I so much desired as silence Nor am I now kept in the ministry of the Word, but by an overruled obedience to a will above my own, that is, the divine will; for as to my own will, it always shrank from it, nor is it fully reconciled unto it to this hour."

What I have time to say of Luther as to preaching must end with a paragraph from the Table Talk, which makes some good hits though very oddly arranged. "A good preacher should have these properties and virtues: first, to teach systematically; secondly, he should have a ready wit; thirdly, he should be elegant; fourthly, he should have a good voice; fifthly, a good memory; sixthly, he should know when to make an end; seventhly, he should be sure of his doctrine; eighthly, he should venture and engage body and blood, wealth and honor, in the Word; ninthly, he should

suffer himself to be mocked and jeered of every one.” The expression, “he should know when to make an end,” recalls a statement I have sometimes made to students, that public speaking may be summed up in three things: First, have something to say; secondly, say it; third and lastly, quit. As to the preaching of the other leading Reformers, I cannot speak at any length. Melancthon really preached very little. His lectures in Latin on Sundays were designed for his students. He did not enjoy preaching to miscellaneous congregations, and in the vulgar tongue. Zwingli (1484–1531) was a bold and energetic preacher, a thoroughly energetic man, and a most laborious student. Like Luther he was very fond of music, and would set his own Christian songs to music, and accompany them on the lyre. It is a German peculiarity that men have in every age so generally been practical musicians, and the neglect of this in our country is to be deplored. Singing will obviously be of very great profit, in many ways, to all young ministers, and instrumental music must not be considered unmanly or worthless in face of the fact that it has been so much practiced by those great peoples, the Hebrews, the Greeks and the Germans. Zwingli was not merely energetic and ardent, but tenderly emotional, as shown by his sorrowing tears during the great Conference with Luther at Marburg. Beyond even the other Reformers, he made much use of public debates, a practice which had been made common by the schoolmen. In the days of chivalry and tournaments, the professors and students began to hold intellectual tournaments also, two men being pitted against each other, or one man fixing his thesis, and undertaking to maintain it against all comers. You remember that the Reformation began with Luther’s theses as to Indulgences; and through all the period of the Reformation discussions were frequent. In Switzerland more than elsewhere these discussions appear to have produced important results. They seem in general to be most useful where men are unsettled in their opinions and indisposed to wide reading. Among us, they have now almost ceased in the older States, but are continued with keen relish in some parts of the West and South-west. Zwingli had one qualification for public discussions, which has sometimes been considered particularly effective, viz., great readiness in personal abuse—as shown, for example, in his writings against those whom he scornfully calls the Catabaptists.

Farel, the friend of Calvin, had a blazing French eloquence. But we cannot begin to enumerate. It was an age of great preachers, an age that called spirits from the vasty deep, and in troops they came. Of John Knox and the English Reformation preaching we may have another opportunity to think.

I must not stop without a word as to certain preachers of that day who have been too much neglected. The Anabaptists of the sixteenth century have so thoroughly a bad name in general literature that some persons would be surprised at the intimation that there were among them preachers of great power. By the help of my friend Dr. Howard Osgood, of Rochester Seminary, who has made the history of the Anabaptists a specialty, I am able to state a few facts of interest. The most distinguished preacher among the Swiss and Moravian Baptists was Balthasar Hübmaier, whose name is now beginning to be heard of again, and concerning whom you will find a very good article in Herzog’s Encyclopadie. He was educated at the University of Freiburg in Baden, and professor, A. D. 1512, in the University of Ingolstadt, with the celebrated Eck as his colleague, and afterwards was Cathedral pastor in Regensburg. At these places he gained the fame of the most eloquent man of his day. But reading Luther’s earlier works, and then studying the apostle Paul, he joined the reformed party, and in 1523, was a popular preacher in

Switzerland, already beginning to deny the propriety of Infant Baptism. In 1525 he was baptized. Then came fierce conflicts with Zwingli at Zürich, and banishment to Moravia, where in two years he brought many thousands into the rising Baptist churches, which then seemed likely to include the whole population. But Moravia fell into the hands of Austria, and Hübmaier was martyred at Vienna in 1528. A Reformed contemporary, not a Baptist, called him "truly a most eloquent and most highly cultivated man." Zwingli, in replying to Hübmaier's treatise on Infant Baptism, uses many hard words as usual, but shows great respect for his abilities. He calls Hübmaier 'that distinguished Doctor,' and admits (in a passage otherwise highly arrogant) that he has a greater faculty of speaking than himself. The writings of Hübmaier, which are difficult to obtain, are said to be marked by clearness, directness and force. They chiefly treat of the constitution and ordinances of the church. I find a really beautiful address (A. D. 1525) to the three churches of Regensburg, Ingolstadt and Freiburg, entitled "The Sum of a truly Christian Life," to be of the nature of a sermon. The arrangement is good, and the divisions distinctly stated. He is decidedly vigorous and acute in argument, making very sharp points. The style is clear and lively—when he has begun you feel drawn along, and want to follow him. Zwingli bears unintentional testimony to the excellence, in one important respect, of Hübmaier's method of argumentation. "You are wont to cry, 'I want no conjectures, bring forward Scripture, make what you say plain by Scripture,' etc." To all his later writings Hübmaier prefixed the motto, "Truth is immortal;" and certainly the hopes he expressed by this motto have been strikingly fulfilled as to the doctrine of religious liberty, which it is said he was among the first to announce and which in a new continent he had barely heard of has at last attained a glorious recognition.

I shall merely mention Conrad Grebel, educated at Vienna, and for two years the leader of the Swiss Baptists, who is said to have been learned, brilliant, with great power over an audience, an opponent whom Zwingli feared more than all others. And there were other Baptist preachers in Switzerland and South Germany, who were learned and eloquent men. In Holland, Menno Simon, well known in Church History, was for twenty-five years (1536–61) "the greatest of all Baptist missionaries in Northern Europe, establishing hundreds of churches. He was a spiritual-minded man, and deeply versed in the Bible." * A translation of his works has been published in Indiana, among the "Mennonites." His contemporary and successor, Dirck Phillips, is said by a Roman Catholic writer to have been "equal to Menno in eloquence and zeal, and superior in learning." We may add Bouwens, a very apostle in Holland and Belgium, whose diary records the baptism of near ten thousand persons baptized by himself, with the places; and this when a great price was set on his head by the merciless Duke of Alva. In conclusion, let us remember that with the Reformation began the free and wide use of printing to aid the work of preaching. In a few years after Luther took decided position, brief and pointed treatises of his were scattered through all Western and Southern Europe. Colporteurs were employed especially for this purpose, besides the much that was done by private exertion. This revived and purified Christianity seized upon the press as an auxiliary to the living preacher. The same course has been more or less pursued ever since, and notably in our own time. And perhaps few have even yet any just conception of the varied and powerful assistance we may derive from printing—and this without its being necessary for each church to set up its own newspaper. Every now and then some people discuss the question whether the press be not now more powerful than the pulpit. But really that is an unpractical inquiry. It is our true task and our high privilege, to make the pulpit, with the help of the press, more and more a power and a blessing.

End Notes * Lentz, i, p. 229.

* For example, 'That ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints,' etc. Luther: "This, however, is only to be attained unto by faith. Love has not anything to do in this matter, although it is an assistance as being an evidence whereby we are assured of our faith." So on John 17:3, 'That they may know thee,' etc. Luther: "For here you see the words are plain, and any one may comprehend and understand them. Christ giveth to all that believe eternal life."

* Osgood. See a good article in Herzog.

01.04. Lecture IV. The Great French Preachers

Lecture IV. The Great French Preachers A complete history of Preaching in France would of course go over ground to which we have heretofore made some reference. Thus in the medieval times, Peter the Hermit was a Frenchman, and so was St. Bernard. The good work done by the Waldensian preachers in the South of France in the twelfth century, led the Catholics (as we saw) to establish the Dominican order of preachers. And Calvin, though we think of him in connection with Geneva, was in all respects a Frenchman.

It may seem strange that we have almost no accounts of eminent preachers in France before the Middle Ages. And doubtless fuller information would show us that there were many men of power and influence. For the French are a nation highly capable of appreciating and producing eloquence. The dominant Franks did not materially modify the character of the old Keltic stock, and the Belts were from our earliest knowledge of them, and are still, an eloquent race. Cæsar describes to us popular orators among the Gauls who must have spoken with a fiery and passionate eloquence. The Gauls or Galatians) in Asia Minor received Paul's early preaching with unequalled enthusiasm. The Scotchman who converted the pagan Irish, and whom all Ireland reveres as St. Patrick, must have been, to judge from all accounts given, a preacher of great power over the hearts of men; and so was the Irishman Columba, who two centuries later preached from house to house throughout Scotland. The Irish to the present day are noted for a peculiarly imaginative oratory, not only in politics wherever there has been any political liberty, but also in preaching, notwithstanding the unfavorable influence of Romanism; and the most eloquent preacher in the Church of England at the present time is an Irishman bred and born, the Bishop of Peterborough. The Welsh also have been famous for eloquent preachers. And everywhere, in Galatians, Gauls, Irish, Welsh, and modern Frenchmen, there is the same blazing enthusiasm and mental activity, the same impulsiveness and prompt excitability, the same lively imagination, and (so far as we know) the same quick movements and passionate vehemence in delivery. But instead of searching French history for proofs that in every age they have had preachers not unworthy of the Keltic blood, we shall find it more instructive to come at once to the Golden Age of the French Pulpit Eloquence and French Literature in general, the seventeenth century, the latter half of which is dear to Frenchmen as the age of Louis XIV. Let us carefully note how thoroughly this period in France fulfilled the conditions of highly eloquent preaching. And perhaps this can be best managed for our purpose by planting ourselves in the year in which Bourdaloue first preached before the king, the year 1670 (a little over two centuries ago), when the glorious age of Louis the Great was just reaching its full splendor. * The king himself, the centre of everything, is now thirty-two years old, his reign having begun when he was a child of five years. While every great nation around has been losing strength, France has rapidly gained. Germany must require many generations to recover from the exhaustion produced by the terrible Thirty year's War, which ended only twenty-two years ago. Spain, which a century ago was the mistress of the world, has lost Holland and part of Flanders, and quite recently lost Portugal, has made a damaging peace with Louis, and under the rule of weak kings and the infamous Inquisition, has sunk into national

weakness and discontent and almost into ruin. England, after the dreadful Civil Wars and the brief rule of Cromwell, has now for ten years been persecuting the Nonconformists and endeavoring to imitate the wretched vices of Charles II, who is but a pitiful vassal of France. Italy, divided into a number of warring states, and busy in the Levant with the Turks, has herself been again and again a battle-ground for the French and the Spaniards. Amid this weakness on every hand, France, long so feeble, has seen her opportunity and improved it. Condé and Turenne have gained many a splendid victory over the Germans and over the once invincible Spanish infantry, covering themselves and their nation with the military glory in which Frenchmen so greatly delight, reviving the memory of that proud time when Charlemagne the Frenchman was Emperor of all Western Europe, and rendering themselves the objects of that enthusiastic popular admiration and love which will some years hence find expression in lofty funeral sermons. At home, the two great Cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin for forty years carried out with iron firmness the policy of Henry IV. and the Duke of Sully, steadily weakening the old feudal nobility and the once almost independent clergy, and concentrating all power in the crown, until fifteen years ago the young Louis, wise beyond his seventeen years, and conscious of despotic power, coolly gave his order to the Parliament, and uttered his memorable saying, "The State—I am the State." Many of the great nobles had in the previous century adopted the then powerful and rapidly growing Reformed religion as a means of making head against the crown, being ready enough, as unscrupulous politicians always are, to patronize any religion that could apparently strengthen their own political power. The Reformed (or as we say, Protestants) unwisely accepted the support and protection of these great nobles, and thus religious interests became subordinate to political interests. The successive religious wars, ending with the bloody wars of the Fronde in the early years of Louis, have gradually weakened the nobles and made them dependent on the Crown, and shortly before the year of which we are speaking, many nominally Reformed nobles went over to the dominant church—as for example Turenne himself, who in 1668 turned Catholic, at the request of the gracious sovereign who had made him a Marshal—and many from among the masses of the Reformed, long used to seeking protection and guidance from the nobility, began rapidly to follow them into the conquering Catholic communion, the church of the splendid court and the all-powerful king. The work of the great Cardinals has been well done, and nine years ago, in 1661, Mazarin was succeeded by Colbert, the gifted minister of Finance, whose financial genius is now rapidly enriching the nation and strengthening the throne. He has introduced from the Low Countries many new forms of manufacture, in which the skilful French fingers and the exquisite French taste are already beginning to surpass their teachers, and fast preparing for the days when Fashion, the mightiest of sovereigns, will sit enthroned in splendid Paris and rule over the civilized world. Along with manufactures Colbert has built up a spreading commerce and a powerful navy. Together with trade in the East and West Indies, he is attempting to rival the Spaniards and English in colonizing America. Some years ago, Canada was organized as a colony, and not many years hence the French will go for the first time down the Mississippi, and up and down its stream will claim a new and grand territory, which after the great king they will name Louisiana. In connection with and by means of all these financial enterprises, which are rapidly increasing the wealth of the country, the acute Minister confirms the triumphs of his predecessors over the feudal system, by building up a wealthy class of burghers, who look to the government for protection of business and property, and help by their financial strength to make the king utterly supreme over the old feudal nobility. Evil enough from this centralization and this wealth may come in the future,

but at present, France rejoices in her growing population and riches, is stimulated by the loftiest national pride, and looks with unutterable admiration to him who seems the embodiment of all her power and splendor and glory, the Great Monarch.

Besides this extraordinary national prosperity, and stimulating national spirit, it is an age of prodigious intellectual activity. In our year 1670, it has been forty-four years since the death of Bacon, whose ideas and methods are now widely known, and twenty-eight years since the death of Galileo, shortly after having (as it has been wittily stated) “at the age of seventy years, begged pardon for being right.” Just forty years ago died the great astronomer Kepler, and young Isaac Newton, at the age of twenty-eight, is already working over Kepler’s laws. Harvey, who discovered the circulation of the blood, died thirteen years ago, and ten years earlier died Torricelli, who learned the weight of the atmosphere, and invented the barometer. Just about this time were also invented the air-pump, the electrical machine, the pendulum. These grand discoveries and inventions at once indicate and produce great general activity of mind throughout the cultivated circles of Europe. And this activity is seen not merely in physical science, but also in metaphysics. It is twenty years since the death of Descartes, the greatest of French philosophers, who applied the Baconian method of observation and analysis to metaphysics, and has become for France the father of idealism and of rationalism. Spinoza has already written most of his great essays in Pantheistic philosophy, which a few years hence, at his early death, he will leave behind. Malebranche, the leading disciple of Descartes, has reached the age of thirty-two; and Leibnitz, a brilliant youth of twenty-four, living on the Rhine, has since the of seventeen been issuing a succession of remarkable treatises on philosophy, law and politics—working out, among other things, a curious project for inducing Louis XIV. to leave Germany and the Low Countries alone, and turn his ambitious projects towards an invasion of Egypt. Hobbes is still living, at an advanced age; and John Locke, now thirty-eight years old, dissatisfied with the ethical and political results of Hobbes’ development of sensational philosophy, and stimulated by the writings of Descartes, is profoundly meditating on the faculties of the human mind and the sources of human knowledge, and slowly preparing for his great “Essay on the Human Understanding,” which will not appear till twenty years hence. In this year, 1670, he writes an impracticable constitution for the American colony which in honour of Charles II, is called Carolina. The inquiring and erudite minds of the age are also drawing together and beginning to act in association. The English Royal Society was chartered ten years ago on the accession of Charles II, but had in fact existed in the time of Cromwell; and Colbert, “jealous of this new glory,” has in the last few years encouraged the formation of like societies in France, the Academy of Inscriptions, the Academy of Sciences, the Academy of Music, and also the Royal Library.

Besides, there are admirable Schools of the highest order. The University of Paris is perhaps no longer at the head of Europe, as it was in the later Middle Ages, but it has a great reputation, and in Theology there is no school of higher authority than the Sorbonne. Colleges have been established in numerous towns by the Jesuits, who make teaching a specialty and have reduced it to a science, and the volunteer teaching at Port Royal was a few years ago exerting a potent influence. The great preachers of the age are all men of regular and thoughtful education.

Along with all this activity in physical and metaphysical science, and in education, there has rapidly arisen a general literature of singular richness and vigor and consummate elegance—a literature that will be the pride of France for centuries to come. Corneille, who with all his literary faults has

more elevation and nobleness than any other French dramatist, is now an old man, and his works are all well known. Molière, probably the foremost writer of Comedy in all the modern world, has issued nearly all the plays that will be known as his chefs-d'œuvre. Racine is still young, but has published several great tragedies, especially the *Andromache* and the *Britannicus*. Numerous satires of Boileau have been published, and every body is reading some Fables of la Fontaine. The Duc de la Rochefoucauld five years ago sent forth into all hands the Collection of shrewd and witty and often mournfully profound Maxims in which he essays to show that the motive of all human action is self-love. Mme. de Sévigné, very highly educated and wonderfully attractive notwithstanding her lack of personal beauty, is admired and influential in court circles, and devoutly fond of pulpit eloquence, and will begin next year the correspondence with her daughter which is to make her the most famous letter writer in the world. Above all, Pascal, the prince of French prose-writers, the marvel of precocity, of mathematical knowledge and physical discovery and philosophical thought, and the deeply humble and devout Christian, who died eight years ago, had five years before his death published his "Provincials," a work of such literary excellence and charm, such keen and delicious satire, that all France is reading it; and even the Jesuits, though they hate, malign and affect to despise him, yet secretly read his wonderful book. In consequence of Pascal's unpopularity as a Jansenist, it will be some years before the publication of his "Thoughts," a collection of papers he has left behind him, consisting of mere fragments, yet rich in the profoundest Christian wisdom, and destined to be lovingly studied for long years to come. By these great writers the French language has been developed and disciplined into the very highest excellence of which it seems capable. In liquid clearness, vivacious movement and delicate grace it is unsurpassed among ancient or modern tongues, while not equal to Greek or to English in flexibility and in energy. Only a few years later than 1670 it will supersede the Latin as the language of European diplomacy. In Art as well as in Literature the age is marked by great activity and decided excellence. It is but forty years since the death of Rubens and Van Dyk, while Rembrandt is still living at the age of sixtyeight, and Murillo, in Spain, at about the same age. The great French painter, Poussin, died seven years ago, and Claude Lorraine, who will long continue to be regarded as the foremost of landscape painters, is seventy years old. The art of painting has just reached its height of power and popularity in France; of all the great French Academies the earliest was the Academy of Painting, established in 1648. In Architecture, Paris already boasts the Louvre, the Palais Royal, and many other noble structures; and there is a youth of twenty-three, named Mansard, who will add greatly to the architectural glories of Paris and of Versailles, and will hand down his name to a curious immortality in connection with a peculiar style of roof which he has invented.

We thus perceive that when Bourdaloue first preached before the king, in 1670, it was an age well suited to the attainment of excellence in anything that belongs to the realm of thought or of art. The nation was powerful, glorious, wealthy and vigorously governed. A strong sentiment of nationality fostered national literature in every department. Startling progress in physical science and novelties in metaphysics were stirring men's minds. A popular despotism left no room for political activity or aspiration, while a grand outburst of general literature had awakened an excited interest. It was an Augustan age. And certain peculiar circumstances stimulated French Catholics at that time to the pursuit of pulpit eloquence.

One of these was the fact that the Reformed, or Protestants in France had long possessed able and eloquent preachers. The indefatigable Jesuits, organized to contend against Protestantism in every way, perceived, now that the Civil Wars were over, that it was desirable to rival the Protestants in preaching, and began to use all their immense influence in the encouragement of pulpit eloquence.

Another stimulating circumstance was the rise of the Jansenists, proclaiming much the same truths that we call the “doctrines of grace,” distinguished for learning, and educational influence, for deep piety and literary power. In the famous schools at Port Royal were taught such men as Tillemont, the Church Historian, and the poet Racine. Among the teachers was De Saci, who made the French version of the Bible which has taken fast hold on the popular heart, and Arnauld, the fruitful and powerful polemic; and there was not a Jesuit in all France who did not smart and burn under the delicate and stinging sarcasms of the Port Royalist Pascal.

Now the Jansenists did not particularly cultivate eloquence. But the Jansenists of Port Royal had great power at Court. And the shrewd Jesuits, looking around for every means of gaining the superiority over these hated rivals, perceived that much might be done through the penchant of the king for eloquent preaching. This was the most singular of all the circumstances I have referred to as stimulating the French Catholic preaching of that age, the fact that Louis XIV. so greatly delighted in pulpit eloquence. It was a curious idiosyncrasy. He not merely took pleasure in orations marked by imagination, passion and elegance, as a good many monarchs have done, but he wanted earnest and kindling appeals to the conscience, real preaching. In fact, Louis was in his own way a Very religious man. He tried hard to serve God and Mammon, and Ashtoreth to boot. His preachers saw that he listened attentively, that his feelings could be touched, his conscience could sometimes be reached. They were constantly hoping to make him a better man, and through him to exert a powerful influence for good upon the Court and the nation. Thus they had the highest possible stimulus to zealous exertions. And although they never made Louis a good man, yet his love for preaching, and for preaching that powerfully stirred the soul, brought about this remarkable result, that it became the fashion of that brilliant Court to attend church with eager interest, and to admire preachers who were not simply agreeable speakers but passionately in earnest. Not a few in the court circle were striving like the king to be at once worldly and religious, some were truly devout, but everybody recognized that it was “quite the thing” to be an admirer of pulpit eloquence. I know of but one other example in the history of preaching in which this was the height of the fashion in a splendid and wicked court. That other instance is Constantinople, at the time when Gregory Nazianzen and afterwards Chrysostom preached there; and we remember how brief and unsatisfactory was their career in the great capital. Here at Paris the experiment lasted longer. And notice that as most of the hearers really went only because it was fashionable, and must have their taste gratified, and as the French taste for literature and art was now very highly cultivated, so the great court preachers, while intensely earnest, must also be literary artists of the highest order.

Such were the general and special conditions under which the Catholic pulpit attained—under the reign of Louis XIV. and under that reign alone—such extraordinary power and splendor.

Let us now briefly note the principal preachers, both Protestant and Catholic, of that epoch. We may divide into three periods: (1) The period before Bossuet, (2) Bossuet and Bourdaloue and

their contemporaries, (3) Massillon and Saurin. In the two generations preceding the career of Bossuet, we find the French Catholic pulpit at a very low stage. Recent writers have shown that the Catholic preachers of that time consisted of two classes. Some, rhetorical and full of ancient learning but destitute of devoutness, mingled paganism and Christianity, even illustrating the Passion of Christ by the sacrifice of Iphigenia, the bravery with which Mucius Scevola plunged his hand into the flames, and the mourning of the Romans over the death of Julius Cæsar. A later French writer said of them, "One needed prodigious knowledge in order to preach so badly." Others, rude and vulgar, appealed to the tastes and passions of the ignorant, very much after the fashion of what we call hardshell preachers. Thus, as it has been said, "The court preachers ruined religion by adapting it to the taste of the beau monde, while the vulgar haranguers ruined it also by adapting it to the taste of the multitude." There were of course some exceptions. Voltaire mentions one preacher, Lingendes, about 1630, and mentions him as he does so many things, with a malicious purpose. This Lingendes left among his manuscripts some good funeral sermons, and Voltaire says that Fléchier, in his funeral discourse for Marshal Turenne, borrowed from one of these his text, the entire exordium, and several considerable passages besides. It has been recently shown that Bourdaloue also borrows from the same preacher some ideas and an occasional short passage, and that some of Bourdaloue's plans in Panegyrics resemble those of P. Senault, a preacher then much in vogue for ornate erudition and rhetoric. But the Reformed or Protestant pulpit of that period was, as I have already stated, occupied by some really able men, whose sermons had such power and literary merit as to be published and widely read. These men, long overshadowed by the celebrated Catholic and Protestant preachers of the next generations, have received tardy justice from the noble work of Vinet, "History of Preaching among the Reformed of France in the seventeenth century," a work containing just such biographical notices, representative extracts and critical estimates as one desires to have, and a model which I trust some of those present may one day follow in depicting important periods in the history of the English and American pulpit. Drawing upon Vinet, let me briefly mention three or four of these men, who show conclusively that the Protestant preachers in this first half of the century were far in advance of the Catholic preachers.

Du Moulin (Miller), 1568–1658, was a famous preacher in Paris and afterwards at Sedan. He had been educated in England, and professor of philosophy in Scotland. While pastor in Paris, an attempt was made by James I. of England to use him in a plan for uniting the French and English Protestants into one church. Banished for these political complications, he took refuge at Sedan (which did not then belong to France), and lived there as professor of theology and pastor. Du Moulin published more than seventy-five works, including ten volumes of sermons. He seems not to have been a man of the highest genius, but full of vigor and good sense, powerful in controversy, practical and pointed. He was regarded by the Catholics as their most formidable antagonist, and his works long continued to be bulwarks of Protestantism. Fenelon undertook to refute one of them, near the close of the century. The style of Du Moulin is marked by the homeliness and brusque freedom he longed for what French critics call the Gallic period of their language, before the men of Louis XIV. had reduced it to an elegant bondage. And he was purposely simple in the arrangement of discourses, and direct and downright in utterance, because he regarded that as the duty of a preacher of the gospel—a view which certainly contains important elements of truth.

Faucheur (1585–1657) was a man of culture and taste, and “essentially a preacher.” He wrote a treatise on Oratorical Delivery, which is said to be elegant in expression and full of wisdom. And yet, while a careful student of the art of preaching, his own preaching was direct and simple. Surely this is as it should be. Faucheur published eight volumes of sermons. His style is remarkable for movement. From beginning to end of the discourses he “seems never to touch the ground.” There is never a moment of distraction or cessation, but he presses right on. Now this may be an excellence, but may be a fault; and it is a matter in regard to which Americans of today are in some danger of fault, being so restless and excitable. Good preaching must have movement, but not uniform in velocity or on the same level. If a discourse course is to be highly impassioned anywhere, it cannot be equally impassioned everywhere. Study the great musical compositions—what variety as to rapidity of movement, and as to passion. So oratory requires a basis of repose, with alternations of passion and quiet, of more rapid and less rapid movement. Yet some of our preachers and Anniversary speakers seem to think, and some hearers seem to agree with them, that one must go like the fast mail trains. We do not give a man a chance to be really eloquent, if we require him to be always rapid, if we are too restless to tolerate repose.

Faucheur was a master of language. Vinet maintains that he anticipated Pascal in using what was destined to become the modern French; in knowing how, “at that moment of crisis, to choose in the ancient tongue what the future was going to preserve, and amid the numerous new expressions those which the future was going to adopt.” Pascal has the glory of having fixed the language. “He did it, not by introducing new words or constructions, but by giving the seal of his genius to a language which existed already, and which we find in his earlier contemporary, Faucheur.” A professor of philosophy at the age of eighteen, and called when very young to a leading pulpit near Paris, was Mestrezat, 1592–1657, of whom it is said by Bayle, a sufficiently impartial critic: “There are no sermons that contain a sublimer theology than those which he preached on the Epistle to the Hebrews.”

Omitting several others, let us notice Daillé, 1594–1670, whose little work “On the right use of the Fathers” became very popular, and continues to be valued to the present day. He published twenty volumes of sermons, which show that while not a highly eloquent man, he was an able reasoner, full of good sense, and with a familiar, neat and flowing style. He was the first Frenchman whose controversial religious works ever became popular, and the first Protestant whose literary merits are known to have been recognized among the Catholics.

Balzac, a literary man of distinction (1592–1654), one of the original members of the French Academy, and who has left some excellent prose, appears to have greatly admired Daillé. He speaks in a letter of a visit received from him, in which Daillé “said such good things and said them so well that I assure you no conversation ever satisfied me more than that, nor left in my mind more agreeable images.” In another letter he speaks in the strongest terms of Daillé’s sixth sermon on the Resurrection, saying, “What an excellent production! how worthy of the primitive church! How powerful the preacher is in persuasion! and how convincing are his proofs ! I have never read anything more rational and more judicious!”

Now it may be observed that these able and popular Protestant preachers all flourished before Bossuet began his career, and that Daillé, the latest of those mentioned, died in the year 1670, in which Bourdaloue first preached before the king. Each of them preached for many years in Paris,

and their numerous and spirited controversial writings, together with the number of Protestant nobility who attended their ministrations, must have drawn to them the constant notice of the Catholic teachers and preachers.

I think it follows not only that there were eminent Protestant preachers before the outburst of Catholic eloquence, which is manifest, * but that their ability and popularity must have stimulated the Catholics to rivalry.

We now reach the great Catholic preachers, Bossuet and Bourdaloue. Of these, every one among us has some knowledge, and I shall attempt only to present points of special interest and instruction.

Bossuet (1627–1704) was of good family, and reared in a house full of books, of which he early became passionately fond, delighting in Latin and Greek literature. One day, in the library, the boy came across a copy of the Bible, which he had never read. It was open at Isaiah, and, fascinated with the sublime poetry, he went on eagerly reading, and at length burst forth and read aloud to his father and uncle, who had been talking politics, and who now “listened, half awe-struck, to the boyish reciter.” From this time the book he most loved was the Bible. Through life he always carried a Bible with him on his journeys, and almost every day, his secretary says, made fresh notes on the margin. He knew by heart almost the entire text (for he had a prodigious memory), and yet seemed always to read with as much attention and interest as if he had never read it before. His preaching abounds in felicitous Scripture quotation and remark. And who can tell how much this passion for Scripture, beginning with Isaiah, did to foster his eloquence—to develop that chastened splendor, that sublime but subdued magnificence of imagery and diction, which makes him the very perfection, the beau ideal of French eloquence? This story of his finding the Bible might remind one of Luther; and it is to be noticed that these greatest of Catholic preachers all showed loving familiarity with the Bible. But the difference also is great and characteristic. Luther found Romans, and finally learned from it justification by faith; Bossuet found the book of Isaiah, and was fascinated by its poetry. And through life this difference was maintained. Bossuet drew from the Bible sublime sentiments; Luther drew from it the central truths, the very life-blood, of the gospel of salvation. At fifteen Bossuet was profoundly studying at a college in Paris the philosophy of Descartes, whose writings were just becoming generally known, he being thirty years older than Bossuet. At sixteen he maintained a “thesis of philosophy” with such distinguished success, that he received the foolish invitation to come suddenly, at 11 P. M., to a house in Paris which was a centre of literary fashion, and there before a brilliant audience to preach upon a text assigned. The result made him at once a celebrity. All this was very unhealthy, but it shows the kind of artificial relish for pulpit eloquence which already (1641) pervaded the court circle, and what sort of atmosphere was breathed by these great preachers. Some other young men had become popular preachers in Paris before taking orders, and Bossuet was saved from this by the advice of a bishop, who urged him to turn away from such premature popularity and become mature in culture and character before he preached much in the capital. This was doubtless the turning-point of Bossuet’s career, which decided that he was not to be the meteor of a moment but an abiding luminary. How often are brilliant young men spoiled by the applause bestowed on a few early efforts—silly admirers persuading them that their gifts lift them above all ordinary dependence on training and experience. It is precisely such men who most imperatively need thorough discipline.

Bossuet finally graduated at twenty-one, making remarkable address in the presence of the great Prince of Condé, who from that time was his friend. He spent some years of faithful labor as archdeacon of Metz, (how strangely sound these names, Metz and Sedan, after recent occurrences,) and at the age of thirty-three began to preach before the king. For the next ten years he preached regularly in Paris, and often before the court. Then Bourdaloue came; Bossuet was made bishop of Meaux, and afterwards seldom preached in Paris, except his great Funeral Orations. I cannot speak of his subsequent work as instructor to the Dauphin, for whose use he wrote the Discourse on Universal History, the first attempt at a Philosophy of History. Nor of his great work on the Variations of Protestantism, probably the most effective polemic against Protestantism that has ever been written—acute, adroit, a trifle unscrupulous, and in style most attractive.

Bossuet was capable, as he had shown when a lad, of absolutely improvising with great power; but he was very unwilling to preach without some written preparation. Most of his sermons were preached from a brief sketch, often in pencil—jotting down the “points, and the prominent lessons he wished to teach.” Some of them were written and rewritten, with the greatest care, and then recited. Yet he very earnestly condemned those who in preparing a sermon think more of “its after effects in print” than of its effect in the act of preaching.

He possessed in the highest degree the physical requisites to eloquence—having a fine, in fact a strikingly handsome and majestic person, with a voice powerful and pleasing, and perfect grace of manner. His style is the perfection of French, the glory of French literature—clear, vivid, drawing you on from beginning to end, with skilful variety in topic, imagery, and passion of repose of expression, and throughout a grace, a felicity, a charming elegance, that in all the world has scarcely been rivalled. A gifted pupil of mine once said, “I read Bossuet with admiring despair.” This is not an unhealthy feeling at the first blush of acquaintance, for it may be presently followed by admiring study, not with the hope of rivalling, but with longing to enjoy more fully, and to learn sweet lessons of refined taste, and love of the truly beautiful in literary art.

Yet I cannot concur in the opinion now almost universal among French critics, that Bossuet is the greatest of their preachers. I think that honor belongs to Bourdaloue (1632–1704), whom the French now place even lower than Massillon. Bourdaloue appeals especially to the intellect and the conscience, and while also highly imaginative and impassioned he is not in these respects equal to the others. Bossuet appeals especially to the imagination and the taste, and so the most characteristic and the most popular of his discourses are the Funeral Orations, in which the requisites are graceful narration, high-wrought imagery and delicate sentiment. These, together with his charming style, are what the average French writer of to-day most highly appreciates. It is precisely in these things, as seen in his Funeral Orations and Panegyrics, that Bourdaloue is least successful. Bossuet is also honored by the modern litterateur because of the great and lasting distinction of his other works, while Bourdaloue has left almost nothing but sermons. Massillon, on the other hand, has marvellous power in touching the feelings, in awakening tender emotions, together with great clearness, ease and beauty of style. Secular critics relish that which excites emotion, which is sweetly pathetic or awe-inspiring, much more than that which, through convictions of the intellect, makes its stern demand on the conscience. These considerations may account for the fact that such a change has occurred in the judgment of critics. Their own contemporaries regarded Bourdaloue as decidedly superior to Bossuet.

Bourdaloue's father was a lawyer, of good family, and a gifted speaker. The son was educated at a Jesuit college, and naturally became a Jesuit notwithstanding his father's opposition. In his studies he showed a special talent for mathematics, which easily connects itself with the prominence of analysis and argument in his preaching. After graduating, he was directed, according to the wise Jesuit usage, to spend some years in teaching, which is often a particularly good preparation for the life-work of preaching. He first taught grammar, classic literature and rhetoric, afterwards philosophy, and finally theology. During this period, he wrote a brief treatise on Rhetoric. For ten years, including the later years of his teaching, he preached as a sort of home missionary. While thus preaching at Rouen, his sermons drew great crowds, and the Jesuit authorities began to understand his power and value. A Jesuit associate says: "All the mechanics left their shops, and the merchants their business, the lawyers left the palace and the doctors their patients." And he good-humoredly adds: "For my part, when I preached there the next year, I put everything straight again; nobody left his business any more." So at the age of thirty-seven, after this long course of study, teaching and provincial preaching, Bourdaloue is brought to Paris. In a few months we hear that the church overflows, and a caustic letter-writer adds that "these good Fathers of the Society proclaim him as an angel descended from heaven." They see that here is a man who will do them honor, and strengthen their position in the rivalry with the Jansenists. The next year, 1670, he preached before the king, and Madame de Sévigné, who was from first to last his ardent admirer, says he acquitted himself "divinely." For thirty-four years from that time Bourdaloue was the leading court-preacher, only in the last five years outshone by young Massillon. He preached the Advent and Lent series by turns before the king and in the principal parishes in Paris, in the former case "making the courtiers tremble," as we are told by Madame de Sévigné, and in the parish churches "attracting such crowds that the carriages were coming for hours in advance, and trade was interrupted in the neighboring streets." He also frequently preached in the humble village churches, and it is said that the people were astonished at the simplicity of his language, and would say, "Is this the famous Paris preacher? Why, we understood all he said." A like story is told of Tillotson, of Archibald Alexander, and of various others.

Bourdaloue, as already observed, is remarkable for profound thought and forcible argument. Voltaire says, "He appears to wish rather to convince than to touch the feelings; and he never dreams of pleasing." And yet he does please, in a high degree, and does sometimes deeply move. Is not this a preacher of the highest order—occupied with noble thoughts, aiming to move through instruction and conviction, and pleasing without an effort, and without diverting attention from truth and duty?

It is especially in treating moral subjects that Bourdaloue is a model. There had been no preaching of great merit in this respect since Basil and Chrysostom, and perhaps no one in later times has treated moral subjects in so instructive and admirable a manner as Bourdaloue. He analyzes the topic with conspicuous ability, and depicts with a master hand the beauty of virtuous living, and the terrible nature and consequences of vice. It is interesting to compare his pictures of life with those of his contemporary Molière, the latter presenting always the ludicrous side, which entertains but seldom greatly profits, while the preacher, with his mind all on sin and eternity and God, will not let you think of vice as amusing, but makes you shudder at its wickedness and its awful results. There is no more remarkable example of Bourdaloue's excellence in this respect than his sermon on Impurity. At any time it would have been difficult to treat this subject in that licentious capital and

court, with that shameful example in the king himself, but there were special difficulties at the moment. There had recently been discovered, in the case of a countess, a series of the most frightful poisonings and other crimes, in connection with the most shameless and incredible debauchery. All Paris shuddered. It was then that Bourdaloue spoke, with a boldness that amazes and almost alarms us, and yet without a touch of real indelicacy, without a word to awaken prurient curiosity. There are many other instructive examples among his numerous discourses on subjects of morality. It has appeared to me that few preachers treat this class of subjects with decided skill, or so frequently as is to be desired; and I think Bourdaloue is in this regard eminently worthy of early and careful study. If I might add a slight suggestion, it would be as follows: To eulogize virtues is often more useful than to assail vices. And in attempting to depict vices, have a care of two things: (1) That you do not seem to know more of these matters than a preacher ought to know; (2) that you do not excite curiosity and amusement rather than abhorrence. The famous story that Bourdaloue one day described in his sermon an adulterer, and then looking at the king, solemnly said, "Tu es ille vir," is pronounced by the most recent biographer an invention; but he does not present the evidence and we cannot judge. At any rate Bourdaloue was constantly saying very pointed things, which the king could not but feel were meant for him, and yet Louis had so much of good sense and conscience, and saw so clearly the preacher's sincerity and honesty, that he took no offence. In fact, strict morality is not really an unpopular theme. People feel that the preacher ought to say these things, and that they ought to hear them. So once when some courtiers suggested that Bourdaloue spoke too boldly and pointedly, the king replied: "The preacher has done his duty; it is for us to do ours."

Bourdaloue was a great student, but was also fond of society, and himself sprightly and even humorous in conversation. It was thus that he came to know so well the character and wants of his time. He often met Racine, Mme. de Sévigné, Boileau. Let a preacher seize every opportunity of free conversation with the most cultivated and the most ignorant, being more solicitous in both cases to hear than to speak, and then he may be able in preaching to bring home his message to the "business and bosoms" of all.

We can say but a word of Fénelon (1651–1715,) who was a younger contemporary of Bossuet and Bourdaloue. Both gifted and good in an extraordinary degree, educated with the greatest care, perhaps the foremost of all French preachers in that unction in which the French so greatly delight, with the highest charm of style, and great actual popularity as a preacher, he has left us to conjecture his pulpit power, with the help of four sermons which are believed to have been written in his early life, and which are not of remarkable excellence. This was certainly carrying to a great extreme the preference for unwritten preaching, which he has so eloquently exhibited in his beautiful Dialogues on Eloquence. Why did he not write at least some discourses after preaching them, like Chrysostom and like Robert Hall? He severely condemns Bourdaloue's method of strict recitation, and as a matter of general theory the condemnation is undoubtedly just, but why refuse to write at all? In all practical matters he who prefers one plan need not utterly abjure others. And as to methods of preparing and delivering sermons, the highest and noblest standard is that privately stated by a living preacher, "I wish to be master of all methods, and slave of none."

Two Protestant contemporaries of Bossuet and Bourdaloue were men of distinguished ability.

Du Bosc (1623–1692,) was of good family, and highly educated. You notice that, as already remarked, all the great preachers of this epoch, Protestant and Catholic, were thoroughly educated, and most of them reared in good society. Besides great clearness of thought, fertility of invention and richness of imagination, Du Bosc had singular physical advantages, being extremely well-made, with a voice at once agreeable and powerful, and vigorous health. In 1668 he appeared before the king, to entreat that he would not, as proposed, take away certain rights of the Protestants. After hearing him through, the king went into the queen's chamber and said, "Madame, I have just listened to the best speaker in my kingdom." And turning to the courtiers he repeated. "It is certain that I never heard any one speak so well." He had then often heard Bossuet, though never Bourdaloue. The address of Du Bosc is given in full by Vinet, together with copious extracts from sermons, and is a truly noble specimen of eloquence, worthy to be generally known. Du Bosc early became pastor at Caen, in Normandy, and three several invitations to churches in Paris could never draw him away from the flock he loved. The most famous Protestant preacher of the time was Claude (1619–1687). His father was a minister of great knowledge, who carefully educated him at home, and then sent him to study philosophy and theology at Montauban. For some years he was pastor of a small church, where he could devote a great part of his time to study. A young minister who wishes to make the most of himself must give at least one-third of his time to studies which look not to next Sunday but to coming years; and this can usually be best done in a small charge. Claude became pastor in Paris at the age of forty-seven, and from that time was the soul of the Reformed party, being especially vigorous in oral and written controversy with the Catholics. A book of his in reply to a work by the Jansenists Arnauld and Nicole, was eagerly circulated by the Jesuits, who were ready for anything to damage the Jansenists. Claude's oral controversy with Bossuet attracted great attention. The high-born Protestant lady who brought it about was already disposed to go over—as so many of the Reformed nobility were then doing—and she soon after became a Catholic. But Claude sustained himself with great ability against the most splendid polemic in France. Even Bossuet's report shows that his arguments were acute and powerful, and the great bishop says, "I feared for those who heard him." When the edict of Nantes was revoked, in 1685, Claude was especially named, and required to quit the kingdom in twenty-four hours. He knew it some days in advance, and his farewell to his flock is a noble and affecting monument of that time of trial. His ordinary discourses, of which but one volume was left, seldom show intense passion, and were very carefully wrought out and revised; yet with all their careful composition and purity of style, there is rapid movement—that spirited dash which belongs alike to French soldiers and to French orators, and which is so admirable in both.

Claude's Essay on the Composition of a Sermon was for a century and a half the favorite Protestant text-book. The editions of Robert Robinson and Charles Simeon are well known. Its great fault is that it teaches the construction of sermons on too stiff and uniform a plan. Both by example and in precept Claude protests against the extreme rhetorical brilliancy in which the national taste of the time delighted, which his great Catholic contemporaries cultivated as necessary in court-preachers, and to which some of the Protestant preachers had become a little inclined. The general feeling among the Reformed was that a preacher should eschew oratory. When this fact is taken into the account, I think it becomes clear that Claude and Du Bose, though inferior in splendid eloquence and in real power, are yet worthy to be named even with Bossuet and Bourdaloue. As to the remaining period of that great age, a briefer account must suffice. There

are two conspicuous names, Massillon and Saurin.

Massillon (1663–1742) had an early history quite similar to that of his great predecessors. Obscure origin, but college education, monastic retirement, then professor of Belles-lettres and of Theology, and at the age of thirty-six named court-preacher, in 1699, five years before the death of Bossuet and Bourdaloue. He greatly admired Bourdaloue, but avowedly determined to pursue a very different course. His theory, as given by the nephew who edited his works, was as follows: The preacher must not go into much detail upon points of character and life which concern only a part of his hearers, as particular callings, ages, etc., but must aim at universal interest, and this is found chiefly in the passions. Accordingly Massillon habitually assumes principles as granted, or establishes them very briefly, and then proceeds to analyze and depict the reasons why men do not conform to these principles, as found in their passions (in the broad sense), including appetites, sloth, ambition, avarice, etc., and to expose the numerous self-deceptions by which men quiet conscience. Now this certainly represents one very important department of preaching. But observe two things as to what he condemns. (1) What is addressed to one class of persons may be made very interesting and profitable to others, as for example, sermons to the young may interest the old, sermons to Christians may impress the irreligious, and vice versa. (2) It would not be well if all preachers took principles for granted. It is necessary for some minds, and interesting to many, to have principles established and confirmed by the preacher. In fact, Massillon seems to have been too much influenced by the desire to take a different tack from Bourdaloue, and thus to have made his own methods one-sided. But all the world knows what wonderful power he had in exciting emotion. Appealing to the passions is an important part of the preacher's work, though not the highest part; and no finer example of it can be found than in Massillon, together with a style of singular ease and sweetness. But when he is lauded as one of the very greatest of preachers, then I say, compare his most famous sermon, "On the small number of the Elect," with the somewhat similar sermon of Jonathan Edwards, "Sinners in the hands of an angry God," and you will feel that the one is super-ficial and artificial, compared with the tremendous power of the other.

Massillon's nephew says his sermons were not composed, as one might suppose, with slow toil, but "with a facility akin to the miraculous; not one of them cost more than ten or twelve days." His delivery was not declamatory, like that of Bourdaloue and most Frenchmen, but comparatively quiet; yet he seemed to be completely possessed and penetrated by his subject—which is often far more impressive than "tearing passion to tatters," while in the French Court it had the charm of novelty. In 1718 he preached before Louis XV., then nine years old, ten sermons in Lent, which are commonly known as his Petit Carême, "Little Lent." They are probably the earliest examples of sermons addressed to a child, and are admirable for their simplicity and sweetness. The great Protestant preacher Saurin (1677–1730) was a contemporary of Massillon, but connection between them was impossible, for Saurin was a child of but eight years when the revocation of the Edict drove him and his father to Geneva. His father was a lawyer, famous for his elegant style. At Geneva, then "the capital of the Protestant world," the youth had great advantages for education. At seventeen he enlisted in a volunteer corps of refugees to help William of England against Louis XVI., and proved a gallant young soldier, at the same time often conducting religious worship and even preaching to his comrades. After three years, when peace was made, he returned and studied three years longer at Geneva, gaining great distinction as a student. His exercises in oratory "drew a crowd, for which on one occasion it was necessary to open the doors of the

cathedral." His five years as a pastor were spent in London, with a small church of French refugees. Here, like a true Protestant, he married a wife. Yet, though a real love affair, this union did not turn out very well. Unexampled as the case may be, the minister's wife was of an unlucky disposition; and being blessed with the company of a mother-in-law, sister-in-law, and two brothers-in-law, she made the house too hot to hold them. A bad manager she was, too, while he, for his part, was negligent and wastefully generous.

Well, well, but he was a great preacher, and when London fogs proved unhealthy, they created him a new position at the Hague, where he spent his remaining twenty-five years in extraordinary popularity and usefulness. Places in his church were engaged a fortnight in advance by the most distinguished persons, and people climbed up on ladders to look in at the windows. The famous scholar Le Clerc (Clericus) long refused to hear him, on the ground that a Christian preacher should have nothing oratorical, and he "distrusted effects produced rather by a vain eloquence than by force of argument." One day he consented to go, on condition that he should sit behind the pulpit, so as not to see the oratorical action. At the end of the sermon he found himself in front of the pulpit, with tears in his eyes. For Saurin was a true orator. While not devoting himself, like the great Catholic preachers, to the art of eloquence, he possessed an energetic nature, a powerful imagination, a good person and voice, and his delivery, though commonly quiet, often swelled into passionate earnestness. And he was also a great thinker, beyond even Bourdaloue, probably beyond any other French preacher except Calvin. The doctrinal views we call Calvinism compel men to think deeply, if they are capable of thinking at all. It is then not strange that the published sermons of Saurin at once gained a great reputation throughout the Protestant world, and exerted a most wholesome influence. In Germany, where preaching was then at a low ebb, it is believed that Mosheim and his school derived much inspiration from Saurin, and at a later period Reinhard frankly acknowledged great indebtedness to this noble French model. There were numerous English translations, but that of Robert Robinson has, I believe, superseded all the others. Among all these great French preachers, I should say, read mainly in Bourdaloue and Saurin. His last years were saddened by the harsh assaults of some ministers who were envious and jealous. Alas ! that old and bitter, that too often repeated story of ministerial jealousy. But why did French pulpit eloquence so suddenly fail, after rising so high? Why is it that after Massillon and Saurin you do not know the name of any French preacher for almost a century? * We can easily see, as we saw before in the time of Chrysostom and Augustine, the cause of this decline. Protestantism was crushed in France, its best elements banished, and the few who remained and continued faithful, were destitute of the means of culture, for ministers and for people, while the refugees in foreign countries would generally continue to worship in French for only one or two generations. The Catholics, for their part, not only lost the stimulating rivalry of Protestant preaching, but also the artificial stimulus of Louis XVI.'s love for pulpit eloquence. Massillon, after preaching the aged king's funeral, and trying to make some impression on the child that succeeded him, retired to his diocese, and for many years preached faithfully there, out never revisited the court. And now that Jansenism and Protestantism were gone, infidelity and corruption struck deep and spread widely and rapidly through the nation. There can be no true eloquence where there is not hope of carrying your point, and preachers could have little hope of doing good in the days when Voltaire and his associates led the national thought, and when the king could say, "After me, the deluge." About 1775 a Jesuit preacher at Notre-Dame did give several sermons that manifestly had something in them. A biographical sketch at a later period mentioned that this preacher's discourses had a

rather peculiar character, and that “people thought they saw errors in them.” It has since come to light that the worthy Jesuit preached a whole volume of extracts from Saurin, word for word.

These things being considered, we have little occasion to concur in Voltaire’s explanation of the decay of pulpit eloquence, viz., that the subject had been exhausted, and nothing was now possible but commonplace. And how is it that of late we have eloquent French preaching again? Napoleon gave the Protestants toleration and support, which the subsequent governments have not disturbed. About the same time there was in Switzerland a reaction to evangelical sentiments, producing Vinet, D’Aubigné, and Cæsar Malan. As soon as there was time for educational opportunities to show their effect among the French Protestants, we hear of Adolphe Monod, a man of rare eloquence. James W. Alexander, hearing him on two different European journeys, each time declared him the most eloquent preacher living; and it seems to me doubtful whether, with the exception of Robert Hall, the century has produced his equal. About the same time came the elder Coquerel, a man of great power in the pulpit. It is difficult to gain information upon the question, but my impression is that in this century as in the seventeenth, effective preaching in France began with the Protestants. I know not whether this Protestant movement had produced any conscious effect on the erratic Lacordaire, who thirty years ago began to revive at Notre-Dame the traditions of the old Dominicans as a preaching order; or on the Jesuit Father Félix, who followed him in that celebrated pulpit, to be succeeded himself a few years ago by the well known Father Hyacinthe. Of Protestants the most famous at the present time are the younger Coquerel, and Bersier, whom I heard repeatedly in Paris some years ago, who has published several volumes of sermons, and whom not many living preachers equal in true eloquence. In conclusion, let us briefly notice certain faults in the French preachers, especially in the great Catholic preachers of the seventeenth century.

They never suggest much beyond what they say. This is a general defect of French style, arising from the passion for clearness. “Whatever is not clear is not French,” they repeat with a just pride. But by consequence, they avoid saying anything that cannot be said with entire clearness. And so we find little of that rich suggestiveness, which is common in the best English speaking and writing, and even more in the German.

There is a monotonous uniformity of elegance. They are never familiar, never for a moment homely. There is nothing of anecdote, scarcely anything of narrative illustration. Like the court of Louis XIV., they never appear save in full dress. And so many elegant discourses finally weary us with their glitter, like the pictures in the galleries of the Louvre. In fine, these sermons, with all their merit, are too plainly a work of art. The art is very perfect, such as in a drama or a romance we might regard with unalloyed satisfaction. But for preaching it is too prominent. We sigh for something unmistakably natural, real, genuine. As artists, then, the great French preachers may be to us most instructive and inspiring masters. But when it comes to actual preaching, then the highest art—nay, the old maxim is itself superficial and misleading, for our aim should be not simply to have art and conceal it, but to rise above art—or, if we must state it in Latin, *summa artem superare*.

Note. Since the lecture was delivered, a letter has been received from M. Bersier (see above, page 183), in reply to some inquiries, and I take the liberty of extracting as follows:

“The Catholic pulpit is singularly sterile at our epoch in France. We may say that since Lacordaire, Ravignan, and Father Hyacinthe no orator has appeared of real excellence. Father Félix, of the order of the Jesuits, has preached with a certain success for several Lent seasons at Notre Dame, and just now they are trying to bring into vogue the name of Father Monsabré. But neither of them rises to the height of his task. Their fundamental characteristic is the ultramontane logic, developing inflexibly the principles of the Syllabus, hurling them as a defiance against contemporary society, and saying to it: Submit to Rome, or thou art lost. No profound study of the Scriptures, no psychology, nothing truly interior, or persuasive. It is the method of outward authority brought into the pulpit, with the arid procedures of the scholastic demonstration—a thing at once empty and pretentious.

“In the Protestant Church of France, one may name M. Coulin, of Geneva, who has made at Paris remarkable sermons on the Son of Man; M. Dhombres of Paris, a highly practical orator and full of unction; and in the Liberal party Messrs. Fontanès and Viguier, who, since the death of Athanase Coquerel the younger, are its most distinguished preachers.”

M. Bersier has abstained from mentioning his own associate among the Independent Reformed Churches, M. de Pressensé.

End Notes

* I follow usually the dates of the Oxford Tables, from which some of the facts are derived, and some also from Voltaire.

* Compare the dates:

Du Moulin 1568–1658.

Faucheur 1585–1657.

Mestrezat 1592–1657.

Daillé 1594–1670.

Claude 1619—1687.

Bossuet 1627—1704.

Du Bosc 1623—1692.

Bourdaloue 1632—1704.

Fénelon 1651–1715.

Saurin 1677–1730.

Masaillon 1663–1742.

* Except Bridaine, who flourished 1750, and is eulogized by Maury (Principles of Eloq.)

01.05. Lecture V. The English Pulpit

Lecture V. The English Pulpit In this brief course of lectures you have seen that the periods embraced are far too vast for satisfactory treatment; and yet some important departments in the History of Preaching have to be left entirely out of view. Besides the Greek preachers of medieval and modern times, the Spanish and Portuguese and later Italian preachers and others, we have taken no account of the German pulpit since Luther. It seemed better, for various reasons, to treat of the French rather than the German preachers. And for this final lecture I choose the English pulpit, which, even if we should not glance at Scotland or America, presents a field of immense extent and sufficiently embarrassing in its richness. The History of Preaching in England comprises five specially noteworthy periods: (1) Wyclif, (2) The Reformation, (3) The Puritan and Anglican preachers of the seventeenth century, (4) The Age of Whitefield and Wesley, (5) The nineteenth Century, of which there is an earlier and a later division. *

Before Wyclif, we find little in English preaching that is particularly instructive. The missionaries Augustine and Paulinus, who converted the heathen English in the seventh century, must have spoken with power, but their eloquence is not preserved. Let us frequently remind ourselves that the history of recorded preaching is but a small part of the history of preaching. The venerable Bede has left us some very brief discourses, supposed to have been imperfectly written down by his hearers, which show life and spirit, but would have been forgotten but for his famous History.

Wyclif (1324–82), the first great Protestant, the first who not merely condemned some evils in the Catholic church, but struck at the very heart of the Papal system, was a preacher of great power. He does not exhibit much imagination, and so is not in the full sense eloquent. But he is singularly vigorous and acute in argument, and has the talent for “putting things” which belongs to a great teacher of men. His bold antagonisms, hard hits and unsparing sarcasms, his shrewd use of the dilemma and the *reductio ad absurdum*, show the master of popular argumentation. In his development from a scholastic divine, a student and teacher of dry philosophical theology, into a pungent, stirring preacher and popular leader, he is a representative man; for these two sides of character and life must in some measure be combined in every man who is to achieve great usefulness as a preacher of the gospel. Yet with all this popular power and skill, Wyclif did his chief work not by his own preaching, but through others. He gathered around him plain and devout men, filled with his ideas and his spirit, and sent them forth as home missionaries, and it was chiefly by their humble and zealous preaching, publicly and from house to house, together with the circulation of Wyclif’s tracts, written in the language of the people, that the new doctrines spread like wild-fire through all England, till a hostile contemporary complained that “a man could scarcely meet two people on the same road but one of them was a disciple of Wyclif.” These “simple priests,” as they were called, corresponded to the Dominican order of preaching friars—as it was when first constituted—also to Wesley’s circuit riders, and to the often illiterate but devoted men who have done so much in the establishment of Baptist churches throughout the United States. We see in this work of Wyclif and his friends an example of the fact that a professor may sometimes do more through his pupils than he could have done by personal labor as pastor and

preacher. In fact, every gospel worker should strive to infuse the spirit of work into others. The wisest and most useful pastor is not he who accomplishes most by his individual exertions, but rather he who can gather the largest number of true helpers, being himself the nucleus around which their labors may crystallize into a compact and effective whole.

Wyclif's reformation contained the germs of that which one hundred and fifty years later proved so grandly successful; and yet in a few years after his death it was crushed, leaving of manifest results only his translation of the Bible, and the marked influence of his writings upon John Huss, in distant Bohemia, which at that time was connected with England by a royal marriage. England's first great reformer, and her first great poet, Chaucer—who was Wyclif's younger contemporary and friend—had no successors for many weary generations, during which the nation was enfeebled and demoralized by the hundred years' struggle with France, and afterward by the Wars of the Roses at home. When all this had passed, and there was again peace and orderly government and returning prosperity, then again the English were ready to think of curing the dreadful evils which disgraced the clergy and the church, and just then came the spread of the New Learning, with Erasmus' Greek Testament and Tyndale's English Bible, the stirring ideas of Luther, and the political and connubial schemes of Henry VIII., all of which concurring forces produced the English Reformation.

There is no doubt that the Revival of Letters formed one leading occasion of the Reformation, both in Germany and in England. And already before the Reformation began, this revived study of Greek literature was producing some wholesome effect upon preaching. As early as 1510 we read of Colet, Dean of St. Paul's, as "the great preacher of his day, and the predecessor of Latimer in his simplicity, directness and force." He had gone to Italy to study Greek, and then for several years had taught Greek at Oxford, awakening the enthusiastic admiration of Erasmus, who said, "When I heard him speak, methought I heard Plato himself talk." Notice then that this earliest of the great Greek scholars of England was as a preacher remarkable for "simplicity, directness and force." It is another significant fact that Colet, who had lectured at Oxford on the Greek Testament, with all the other professors of the University taking notes, was perhaps the first preacher of the time that regularly expounded the Scriptures on Sundays. Good popular exposition always rests on loving study of the Scriptures, and usually upon study of the original.

Everybody knows that the most notable preacher of the English Reformation was Latimer (about 1490 to 1555). The superficial reader of his sermons would probably at first regard Latimer as a sort of oddity, with his homely humor, queer stories and quaint phrases, his frank egotism and general familiarity. But read on carefully, and you soon become convinced that you are dealing with a powerful mind and an elevated character. He was well educated at Oxford, but never forgot his experiences as the son of an humble yeoman, and while brought into relation to the great and learned, never lost sympathy with common life and the common mind. A student of books, you see that he has been still more a keen observer of men and things. He does not speak of life as one who has seen it dimly mirrored in literature, but as one who has eagerly looked upon the vivid original. His utterances are as fresh as morning air, or the morning song of the birds. He grasps truth with vigor, handles it with ease, holds it up before you in startling reality. It is pleasant to say that some of his best sermons have recently been made accessible to all, in one of the small volumes of "English Reprints," sold for a trifle. I think that persons who occupy themselves much with the study of pulpit eloquence, who are hunting in every age for "Masterpieces," and setting up

lofty standards of homiletical art, would find it most wholesome to read several sermons of Latimer, to feel the power of his careless vigor and intense vitality, and remind themselves that not quite all the great preachers of the world have been perpetually engaged in the production of masterpieces of eloquence.

How many of the most influential Reformers were men of much the same stamp. Luther, Zwingle, Wyclif, Latimer, Knox—all intellectual and educated, but all men of the people, in full mental sympathy with the people, and thus able to command popular sympathy, and to send great electric thrills through the community, the nation, the age. Some of our American Baptist ministers of a hundred years ago had all these qualities, except education. If John Leland had been thoroughly educated in his youth, he might have shaken the continent. Great is refined culture and literary taste, but greater far is shrewd mother-wit, and racy humor, and wide and varied sympathy, and close, personal observation of the strangely mingled life we men are living in this strange world.

Two years after Latimer preached the “Seven Sermons before Edward VI.” which remain to us, there was added to the number of the king’s chaplains (1551) the other most remarkable English preacher of the time, John Knox (1505–1572). Professor Lorimer, in his “John Knox and the Church of England,” published last year from newly discovered materials, has conclusively shown that the great Scotchman exerted a powerful influence in England, and did more than Bishop Hooper to develop and shape that Puritan sentiment which a century later became so powerful. In his preaching, as already intimated, he somewhat resembled Latimer, being an educated man but quite superior to pedantry and formality, and remarkable for force of thought and stirring earnestness. Like Latimer too, he usually preached without written preparation; and as he seldom wrote out his sermons afterwards, we have to judge of his powers as a preacher mainly from his other works. I think you will best get the impress of his character and catch his spirit by reading his “History of the Reformation in Scotland.” His was “the martial or do-battle style of pulpit oratory,” in fact he was particularly fond of martial figures. This was natural in those stormy times, and in a preacher whose life was often in sore peril, but at whose grave the Regent Murray pronounced the now well known eulogium, “There lies he, who never feared the face of man.” Fearlessness is a quality scarcely less needful for preachers in the “piping time of peace,” than in time of persecution, scarcely less needed by us, for example, than by our fathers of a century ago. How many now are afraid of social influence, or afraid of being stigmatized as wanting in “culture,” or ignorant of “science,” or—worst of all—as lacking in “charity.” While eschewing bitterness, let us covet boldness.

Knox is a notable example of entering upon the ministry late in life. Educated for the Catholic priesthood, but early deposed because of Protestant heresy, he meant to spend his time as professor and public lecturer, but was pressed into the ministry at the age of forty-two. There is a further lesson in the fact that about this time he learned Greek, and at the age of forty-nine we find him at Geneva, busily studying Hebrew. Let it not be forgotten amid our elaborate processes of ministerial education that a man of competent intelligence may begin to preach when he is growing old, and be very useful; but also that such a preacher, if he has the right spirit, will be eager to supply, as far as may be, his educational deficiencies. The martial style of thought and expression which characterized Knox, was fitly attended by a most impassioned delivery. One who often heard him in his old age, afterwards described him as lifted by two servants up to the pulpit, “whar he behovit to lean, at his first entrie; but er he haid done with his sermone, he was sae active and

vigorous, that he was lyk to ding the pulpit in blads, and flie out of it." One of the pulpits he pounded is still preserved in Stirling; I remember standing in it, and while not presuming to aspire after an imitation of his delivery, yet longing to catch something of his bold and zealous spirit. It is a fact which might be worth some reflection, that the Scotch preachers, though living farther North, have as a rule been more fiery and impassioned than the English. As to other preachers of the Reformation period, we can say but a word. Bishop Hooper, the martyr, and the first Englishman who distinctly represented the Puritan tendency, was very zealous in preaching, for we are told by Burnet that at one period he preached four, or at least three times every day. Cranmer's sermons show force of argument, and an agreeable style, but little of the imagination and passion which are necessary to eloquence. Bishop Jewell was a learned man, and sometimes eloquent, but with little that was characteristic or very highly impressive. Archbishop Sandys was hot enough in his numerous quarrels, but not warm in preaching.

Between the Reformation and the time of Cromwell, including about a century, there were many able ecclesiastics, many learned divines, and some striking preachers, but none of the highest eminence. Hooker is immortal for his philosophical work on Ecclesiastical Polity, but was not attractive as a preacher. Dr. Donne is said to have been a man of learning and remarkable for brilliant imagination and tender sentiment; but his sermons are spoiled by those conceits, which abound in his poetry also. Let all fanciful and brilliant men remember that perpetual efforts to strike and dazzle soon weary and fail of their end. Bishop Andrewes was a learned and able man, worthy of his position as one of King James' translators of the Bible, but his sermons are so laden with learned quotation and discussion that they lack movement, and I cannot read them with profit or patience. Bishop Hall is seen to best advantage in his justly celebrated "Contemplations on the Old and New Testaments," which every preacher will find exceedingly instructive and suggestive, and from which I have observed that some recent German preachers borrow striking remarks, sometimes giving them verbatim without acknowledgment. No preacher of the highest power or of lasting reputation for three-quarters of a century, and yet this was precisely the age of Shakspeare and Bacon. The fact certainly calls for explanation. It will not do to say that the national mind was too much occupied with the Armada and the new trade with the Indies. These did not prevent the grand literary outburst, represented by Raleigh and Sidney, Spenser, Shakspeare and the other great dramatists, and Bacon. The comparative inferiority of preaching must be referred mainly to two causes. (1) There was in all Europe a reaction, more or less marked, from the excitement which had accompanied the early stages of the Reformation; and as a natural consequence of this reaction, preaching would become less intensely earnest. (2) There was in England at this time a great lack of religious freedom, and without this we can hardly anywhere find examples of the highest pulpit eloquence. The more radical reformers, nicknamed "Puritans," who insisted that church government, ceremonies, and religious life must all be strictly conformed to the "pure Word of God," and not controlled by the crown or by old Catholic usage, were from the time of Edward VI. numerous and earnest, but by no means agreed among themselves as to the length to which they would carry their opposition to Episcopacy, Catholic ceremonies, and Royal supremacy over the church. These unorganized and varying radical tendencies were sternly repressed by Elizabeth, and with no small success, both because of her immense personal popularity and by reason of her comparative moderation and regal tact. Still, while the reaction from the early zeal of the Reformation was lessening the zeal of the dominant churchmen, these Puritan tendencies continually, though slowly, gathered strength. Under James I., who was unpopular and unwise, the

persecution grew much more harsh and irritating, and therefore the Puritans became stronger. It began to appear to them that both political and religious freedom depended on the maintenance and triumph of their Puritan principles. Under Charles the two parties became more and more antagonistic and embittered, each party hating whatever doctrines and customs the others maintained, and the Puritans gradually became willing to die for their tenets, fearless of persecution and because fearless, free in heart. Meantime the Royalists had taken up the new theory that Episcopacy was Scriptural, of Divine appointment, like the Divine right of kings, and so their civil and religious loyalty mingled and strengthened each other. Now again there was burning religious earnestness and zeal, and thus it became possible that there should be intensely earnest and truly eloquent preaching.

Meanwhile, the thoughts of men were aroused and widened, as the seventeenth century went on. Voltaire thinks the French Calvinistic refugees carried eloquence into foreign countries. But this is nonsense as regards England, for the first Huguenot refugees found the great age of English pulpit eloquence almost at an end. In fact, every one of the great English preachers, Puritan and Anglican, with the single exception of South, was older than Bourdaloue, and several of them were twelve or fourteen years older than Bossuet. ¹ Clearly they did not learn eloquence from the French. The truth is that both English and French were stirred and moved by the spirit of the age, as I tried to describe it in the last lecture. And in England this spirit of the age combined with the fierce conflict between Puritan and Churchman, to quicken religious thought and kindle religious zeal, and thus to create the noble English eloquence of the seventeenth century. The great preachers of that age are so well known that a brief reference to each of them may be at once intelligible and sufficient.

Jeremy Taylor (1613–77), a graduate of Cambridge and always a zealous loyalist, was silenced during the Protectorate of Cromwell, and twice imprisoned, just as Bunyan was afterwards imprisoned by the other side. Supported by a nobleman as private chaplain, he spent those stormy years in diligent study and writing, and Charles II. made him a bishop. The “poet preacher,” as he is often called, would be intolerable now were it not for his fervent piety. His style is almost unrivalled among orators for its affluence of elegant diction, and its wealth of charming imagery. It is the very perfection of that species of eloquence which so many Sophomores are disappointed at not finding in Demosthenes, which they so fondly admire in Society speeches that go forever curling like blue smoke towards the skies. With the modern love for directness and downrightness of expression, we are apt utterly to condemn this high-wrought splendor of ornamentation, even as we should consider one of Sir Walter Raleigh’s doublets of bright-hued velvet, slashed with lace, to be very pretty no doubt but a trifle ridiculous. Even Dr. South already ridiculed Taylor’s poetic imagery with merciless severity; and at the present day I think few persons of mature age can read long in his glittering pages without weariness. And yet if one’s style is naturally dry, he would find it a very profitable thing to interest himself in Jeremy Taylor, not only the Sermons (which may be had in a single volume), but still more the famous treatises on Holy Living and Holy Dying.

Similar to Taylor in fervor and sweetness, even surpassing him in unction, and at the same time remarkable for his clear and engaging style, is Archbishop Leighton (1613–84). Learned, deeply devout, and of kindly and loving nature, his pages reflect his character. If you ask why he is so much praised and so little read, the answer would be, I think, that his writings, like his character, are lacking in force. He was not a man of decided nature and positive convictions. He consented

to leave the Scotch Presbyterian ministry and become a bishop, with the sincere hope that he might mingle the fire and water of the two great religious parties, and sadly mourned over his failure to overcome stubborn convictions which he was constitutionally unfitted to comprehend. Now there is a corresponding want of decision, positiveness, power, in his works, and this is a want for which nothing can make amends.

Leighton was fifty years old when he changed his denomination, and the credit of his eloquence might be claimed by both sides. But exactly contemporary with him and Jeremy Taylor were two Puritan preachers of great eminence, Baxter and Owen.

Baxter (1615–91) was not regularly educated, as were nearly all the distinguished preachers of that age, but from youth was a great reader, and through life a voluminous writer. His controversial works are said to show great metaphysical subtlety, and a good deal of hot-headed unfairness. His schemes for ecclesiastical union or “comprehension” were spoken of last summer by Dean Stanley with enthusiastic admiration, as might have been expected, but to ordinary mortals they seem much more creditable to his heart than his head. But as preacher, and as pastor, Baxter’s powers have seldom been equalled. The general reader cannot be advised to study his sermons, for with all their power they are to our taste very wearisome by their great length and their immense and confused multiplication of divisions and particulars. The scholastic method of dividing and subdividing without end reappears in these great Puritan preachers as nowhere else. Besides the demand which high Calvinism always makes for close thinking and careful distinctions, these interpreters were influenced by the desire to find everything in Scripture, and to draw out from every passage the whole of its possible contents; and they were restrained in their analytical extravagances by no such sense of artistic propriety as marked the French Calvinistic preachers, and in a less degree the Anglican preachers of the same age. It may be added that none of the Puritan divines seem to have given the slightest attention to finish of style, caring only for copiousness and force—a torrent of speech. These facts may help to account for the immense extent of their writings. Every possible question, of religion and of politics, was then hotly discussed with fresh and present interest; each of these questions the writer would treat under every possible aspect and with a studious multiplication of particulars; and not a moment’s thought was bestowed on elegance of expression or artistic symmetry of arrangement. No wonder they wrote so much. But while the great mass of Baxter’s works have lost their interest, and his sermons are unattractive, every minister ought carefully to read his practical treatises which have gained so wide a fame, the *Call to the Unconverted*, *Saints’ Rest*, *Narrative of his own Life*, *Dying Thoughts*, and *Reformed Pastor*. These exhibit the great and singularly profitable characteristic of Baxter’s preaching and writing, viz., his burning, earth-shaking, tremendous earnestness. In this high quality of preaching he has hardly anywhere an equal. Read these volumes, again and again, and let them kindle anew in your soul the zeal of the gospel. John Angell James tells of an “Earnest Ministry” in such a way as to make one desire earnestness; but far more will Baxter do towards making us really earnest.

Owen (1616–83) was a scholar in both classical and Rabbinical learning, worthy to be the contemporary of Lightfoot and Walton, ambitious as a boy student at Oxford, prodigious in life-long study and authorship, and at the same time a simple, earnest, and highly impressive preacher. His great exegetical and theological works were the favorite study of Andrew Fuller, who regarded his character also with admiring reverence. Fuller was a very noble example of the “self-made”

theologian and preacher, but he made himself with the help of the great scholars who had preceded him—as selfmade men commonly must do. A conveniently accessible and good specimen of Owen’s sermons may be found in the volume on Forgiveness, which is a series of discourses on the 130th Psalm. A dozen years younger than Baxter and Owen was Flavel (1627–91). He also was educated at Oxford, and a good scholar. While not equal to Owen in vigor and depth of thought, or to Baxter in overwhelming earnestness, he is pre-eminent for tenderness, unction, and also excels in clearness, both of arrangement and of style. He constructs discourses after the fashion of the time, but in striking contrast to those of Baxter and Howe, his plans are lucid, and even to our altered taste are not unpleasing. It was by hearing a pious lady read Flavel that young Archibald Alexander, a schoolmaster in the Wilderness, near Fredericksburg, Va., was brought to Christian faith and hope.

Bunyan (1628–88) was not only without regular education, but was not even a great reader like Baxter. Yet his sermons are quite à la mode, full of divisions and subdivisions, and their tone of thought shows intellectual sympathy with the best minds of the age. Even in those few cases in which really great “self-made” men have not learned much from books, they are always educated by the thought of their time, the ideas and aspirations which fill the intellectual atmosphere. When Bunyan began to preach, at the age of twenty-eight, Owen and Baxter were forty years old, Milton forty-eight, and it was only two years before the death of Cromwell. How much there was to stimulate and educate the susceptible and vigorous mind of the young tinker. Bunyan’s sermons, though often wearisome in length and in minute analysis, yet show clearness of arrangement and great fulness of thought, with singular practical point and consuming earnestness. His language in preaching cannot be expected to exhibit that high poetic grace, that exalted and charming simplicity into which his fancy was lifted amid the inspiring dreams of Bedford jail, but it is language not unworthy of the immortal dreamer. He abounds in lively turns and racy phrases, in a vivid dramatism that no preacher has surpassed, and his homeliest expressions are redeemed from vulgarity by a native elegance, an instinctive good taste. The brief story of his early life and conversion given in the treatise called “Grace Abounding” is worthy to be placed beside Augustine’s Confessions, and his allegory of the Holy War has been unjustly obscured by the lustre of its great rival. But the “Solomon’s Temple Spiritualized” shows the same creative imagination gone crazy with wild allegorizing, because unrestrained by any just principles of interpretation. Only a great genius could produce such nonsense.

It remains to mention, among the foremost Puritan preachers, John Howe (1630–1705). The Life of Howe, by that admirable writer, Henry Rogers, is of late accessible in a cheap form. As there was very little of incident to relate, the biographer has made his work all the more valuable to us by discussing many related matters in the religious history of the time.

Howe was graduated both at Cambridge and at Oxford. It is to be noticed that in that age men who held to Calvinistic doctrine and non-episcopal church government could have the benefit of the English Universities; and that most of the great Puritan divines were graduates, as were Henry Dunster, and others of those who established the civilization and culture of New England. This fact is suggestive, and yet we are warned not to push too far our inferences from it by the cases of Baxter and Bunyan. At Cambridge, Howe was intimate with Cudworth, More, and other famous Platonists, and became a devoted and appreciative student of Plato. He was a great philosophic theologian, and at the same time a very earnest and eloquent preacher. With extraordinary power

of intellect he had also remarkable power of imagination. Robert Hall said to a friend: "I have learned far more from John Howe than from any other author I ever read." Henry Rogers states that in conversation with him Hall once went so far as to say, "as a minister, he had derived more benefit from Howe than from all other divines put together." This fervid admiration is in part accounted for from the fact that Howe ably wrought out and powerfully stated, as in his treatise on "The Divine Prescience," precisely that scheme of moderate Calvinism which alone suited Mr. Hall's mind. But notice that Hall added, to the friend first mentioned: "There is an astonishing magnificence in his conceptions." Of this "magnificence" no one could better judge than Robert Hall. For two reasons mere cursory readers are in danger of not appreciating Howe's eloquence. He is so addicted to metaphysical thinking that we often have difficulty in following him, and so are apt to be engrossed with his philosophical theology. The other reason is the ruggedness of his style. Mr. Hall says: "There was, I think, an innate inaptitude in Howe's mind for discerning minute graces and proprieties, and hence his sentences are often long and cumbersome. Still he was unquestionably the greatest of the Puritan divines." Both the obscurity and the awkwardness of style must have been partially relieved for his hearers by the delivery. But for us it is necessary in approaching the study of Howe to expect difficulty, and the consequent careful reading will bring us into acquaintance with many of the noblest thoughts the human mind can conceive. The changes since Howe's time have in no respect been greater than in regard to the length of religious services. His contemporary Calamy says, with reference to the public fast days which were common during the Protectorate: Mr. Howe "told me it was upon those occasions his common way, to begin about nine in the morning, with a prayer for about a quarter of an hour, in which he begged a blessing on the work of the day; and afterwards read and expounded a chapter or psalm, in which he spent about three-quarters of an hour; then prayed for about an hour, preached for another hour, and prayed for about half an hour. After this, he retired and took some little refreshment for about a quarter of an hour (the people singing all the while), and then came again into the pulpit and prayed for another hour, and gave them another sermon of about an hour's length; and so concluded the services of the day, at about four of the clock in the evening, with about half an hour or more in prayer." Seven hours of continuous services, with an intermission of fifteen minutes for the poor preacher, and none at all for the poor people! But in our restless age, have we not gone quite to the opposite extreme? In the same year with Howe were born Barrow and Tillotson. Barrow (1630–77) was not only a very great man, but in many respects peculiar. His extraordinary physical strength and his force of character led to a youthful fondness for fighting, and in general he was so wayward and violent as to extort from his despairing father the singular wish, that "if it pleased God to take away any of his children, it might be his son Isaac." This famous saying ought to be repeated on all occasions, as it is such a comfort to all young men who were bad boys. The physical strength deserves special notice, for great literary achievements require uncommon power of bodily endurance, and this is usually attended by corresponding bodily strength. Few men have produced numerous and able works who were not strong in body. But trusting in his bodily strength, Barrow indulged excessively in the use of tobacco—a species of indulgence which (I venture to suggest) is particularly injurious to persons of sedentary, studious and anxious life, unsafe even for healthy ministers, and inevitably hurtful to those who are at all feeble and nervous. Imprudent in various respects, he lived to the age of only forty-seven. His early attainments were wonderful. He was made Fellow of Trinity at nineteen, and would have been appointed Greek Professor at twenty-four, but for the unpopularity, at that time, of his

Arminianism. He then spent five years in continental travel, practicing rigorous economy, and engaged in diligent study and intercourse with learned men. Do our American youth of to-day possess quite enough of that spirit which for sweet learning's sake has so often faced the most serious difficulties and practiced the sternest self-denial? I think Barrow and his contemporary Bourdaloue were the first great preachers of modern times who had been careful students of mathematics, and Barrow of the physical sciences also. There is something inspiring in the bare mention of the fact that Isaac Barrow resigned a mathematical chair at Cambridge to his pupil, Isaac Newton. But with all his devotion to these subjects he also laboriously studied the Classics and the Fathers, reading, for instance, the entire works of Chrysostom during a year's sojourn at Constantinople. As your examinations are approaching, I will tell the story of Barrow's examination for orders. The aged bishop, wishing but little trouble, placed the candidates in a row, and asked three questions. First, *Quid est fides?* Barrow, near the end of the row, had time to think, and when it came to his turn answered, *Quod non vides.* *Excellenter,* said the bishop. To the second question, *Quid est spes?* he answered, *Nondum res,* and the old man cried *Excellentius.* The third was *Quid est caritas?* and Barrow answered, *Ah! magister, id est raritas.* *Excellentissime,* shouted the bishop, *aut Erasmus est, aut diabolus.* But while really a prodigy of attainments and intellectual achievements, Barrow was never a working pastor, and most of the sermons he left were in fact never preached. Hence he was lacking in practical point and directness, in the tact of the experienced preacher. His sermons are really disquisitions on some topic, written to satisfy his own mind, and designed to be read to others if he should find occasion. As disquisitions they are wonderfully comprehensive and complete, fully unfolding the subject proposed, and accumulating a wealth of interesting particulars. These particulars are sometimes wearisomely numerous, but, unlike the Puritan discourses we spoke of, they are in general naturally arranged, and each of them really adds something to the train of thought. His style is ill described by Doddridge as "laconic," for it is in the highest degree copious, but it is condensed, compact. Every paragraph seems a treatise, each long sentence is crowded with ideas. And yet the whole has movement, vigorous and majestic movement, with the energy of profuseness, like a broadly rolling torrent.

Barrow is decidedly Arminian. The church of England was at first Calvinistic in doctrine, as the Articles show, but royalist hostility to the Puritans had gradually extended to a rejection of the doctrinal views especially associated with them, and Churchmen were by this time generally foes to Calvinism. Barrow however shows little enthusiasm for doctrine. His best sermons are on moral subjects, embracing all the leading topics of Christian morality. I know not where else in our language there can be found sermons on this important class of subjects so complete, forcible, satisfactory as those of Barrow. We have heretofore noticed the fact that he and Bourdaloue, both excelling in this respect, were both loving students of the early master on moral topics, Chrysostom. Read Jeremy Taylor to enrich the fancy, but Barrow to enrich the intellect and to show how the greatest copiousness may unite with great compactness and great energy of movement. Of two other Anglican preachers in that age I shall speak but briefly.

Dr. South (1638–1716) cannot be recommended for doctrine, nor yet for spirit, as he is unloving, harsh in his polemics, and delights in a savage style of sarcasm. But he shows great vigor of thought, and skill in argument, particularly in refutation. The discussions are relieved by racy wit, the plan of discussion is simple and clear, for that age, and the style is condensed, direct and pungent. Mr. Beecher speaks of having found special pleasure and profit in an early study of

South.

Archbishop Tillotson (1630–94), on the other hand, was a kindly and loving man, kind even to Nonconformists—which is much to say for a Churchman of that period. Like Barrow and South, he does not preach the “doctrines of grace,” but his polemics against Popery, and against the growing infidelity, are models of manly vigor, unstained by bitterness. Tillotson was by many of his contemporaries considered the foremost preacher of the age, and yet at the present day is far less admired than Jeremy Taylor and Barrow. I think this can be accounted for. As to the fact itself, Saurin, the French Protestant, who came to London six years after the good Archbishop’s death, and was doubtless all the more attracted to his works by hearing of his kindness to the Huguenot Refugees, speaks with great enthusiasm of his writings, calling him ‘my master,’ as Cyprian used to call Tertullian. Bishop Burnet, who survived Tillotson only twenty years, says: “He was not only the best preacher of the age, but seemed to have brought preaching to perfection; his sermons were so well liked, that all the nation proposed him as a pattern, and studied to copy after him.” The explanation is, I think, that Tillotson satisfied the yearning of the age for greater clearness and simplicity, both in arrangement of discourse and in style, a yearning doubtless strengthened, though not caused, by the French taste that prevailed in the court of Charles II. From the quirks and conceits of the Elizabethan prose, the involved, elaborate, sometimes stupendous sentences found even in Milton and Barrow, and the wearisome divisions and subdivisions of the Puritan preachers, and their contemporary Anglicans, to the easy and careless grace of the Addisonian period, the transition is made by Tillotson. Macaulay relates that Dryden was frequently heard to “own with pleasure that, if he had any talent for English prose, it was owing to his having often read the writings of the great Archbishop Tillotson.” But of this simplicity in arrangement and style we have long had numerous examples, some of them comparatively free from the faults of negligence which are noted in Tillotson and in Addison. As to topics, Tillotson’s arguments against infidelity are of course superseded now, and his able polemics against the Papacy have no general interest. Thus it comes to pass that we find little profit, and little ground for special admiration, in works which were long considered the noblest models of composition.

Much depends on peculiarities of taste, and on felt personal need, but if I were required to recommend two of the great English preachers of the seventeenth century as likely most richly to reward thorough study at the present time, I should name Barrow among the Churchmen, and among the Puritans John Howe. When this splendid group of preachers, with their contemporaries whom we have not been able to notice, had passed away, there threatened to be as complete a collapse of the English pulpit as was at the same time occurring in France. The Puritans, who formed the vital element of the preceding century, had fallen into popular disfavor, and the Act of Toleration under William and Mary took away the stimulus of persecution. What was worse, they were cut off from the universities, an unjust deprivation to which all Nonconformists were condemned until within the last few years. Their opportunities of education during the eighteenth century were confined to inferior “Academies,” and the Scotch Universities. Many an aspiring youth, as for example, Joseph Butler, was tempted into conformity by the prospect, sometimes even the offer, of an education at Oxford or Cambridge. And it was only as the Dissenters’ Colleges in England, and the Scottish Universities began to do vigorous teaching at the close of the century, that there was again a Nonconformist ministry of great power. As to the Churchmen, they had lost the stimulus of Puritan rivalry in preaching, and were now engaged in a life and death

struggle for the truth of Christianity with that rising infidelity which had sprung on the one hand from the rationalizing philosophy of Descartes and Hobbes, and on the other from the reaction into immorality which ensued upon the fall of the Commonwealth. This struggle for the truth of Revelation was powerfully maintained by Bishop Butler and others, while Richard Bentley was carrying classical learning to a height never surpassed in English history. In this state of things, during the first half of the eighteenth century, English preaching did not rise above mediocrity. Bishop Atterbury, learned and elegant, but not strong, was the leading preacher of the day in the Establishment. Among the Dissenters, Watts had considerable ability and some eloquence, but would now be utterly forgotten were it not for his hymns. And Doddridge, worked to death with his Academy, his pastorate, his correspondence and authorship, has left good sermons and good books, but nothing of the highest excellence. In Scotland there was Maclaurin, whose sermon on "Glorifying in the Cross" is truly one of the "Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence." And in far New England lived the foremost preacher of the age, one of the very noblest in all history for intellect, imagination, and passion, for true and high eloquence, Jonathan Edwards.

Towards the middle of the century two men became known who have made illustrious the English preaching of their day. Whitefield and Wesley were both Oxford men, and used their cultivation in that preaching to the masses which had been the glory of the Puritan period. While Bolingbroke assailed Revelation, and Chesterfield politely sneered at everything unselfish and good, and Christian Apologists vainly strove to convince the intellect of the upper classes, Whitefield and Wesley began to preach to the consciences of men, and thus felt no need of confining their discourse to the cultivated and refined. In this preaching to the conscience must always begin, I think, the reaction from an age of skepticism. The biographies of Whitefield (1714–70) are full of instruction. The sermons we have were mere preparations, which in free delivery were so filled out with the thoughts suggested in the course of living speech, and so transfigured and glorified by enkindled imagination, as to be utterly different from the dull, cold, thing that here lies before us—more different than the blazing meteor from this dark, metallic stone that lies half buried in the earth. The sermons of Wesley (1703–91) require study, and will reward it. As printed, they were commonly written out after frequent delivery. They are too condensed to have been spoken, in this form, to the colliers and the servant girls at five o'clock in the morning. But they must be in substance the same that he habitually preached, and they present a problem. Wesley had nothing of Whitefield's impassioned oratory. He spoke with simple earnestness, and remained quiet while his hearers grew wild with excitement. What was the secret? Where the hidden power? We can only say that it was undoubting faith and extraordinary force of character, together with a peculiarity seen also in some generals on the field of battle, that their most intense excitement makes little outward noise or show and yet subtly communicates itself to others. No man can repeatedly make others feel deeply who does not feel deeply himself; it is only a difference in the way of showing it. Of course this subtle electricity resides in the soul of the speaker much more than in the recorded discourse. But read carefully these condensed and calm-looking sermons, and see if you do not feel the power of the man, and find yourself sometimes strangely moved.

Late in the century, and dying just before Wesley, was Robert Robinson (1735–90), who has left numerous sermons that are full of life, with flashes of genius. His erratic and uncertain course as to doctrine has caused him to be neglected. But a volume of his selected sermons, with a statement on the title-page that he was the author of the hymn, "Come, thou fount of every

blessing,” ought to find sale, and would be interesting and useful.

We come now to the nineteenth century, in which English pulpit literature is not only abundant but shows real power, and which must be divided, for our purpose, into an earlier and a later portion. It is obvious that we can only mention the principal names, and that very briefly. In the early part of the century the leading preachers were Hall, Chalmers, and Jay. The deeply interesting history of Robert Hall (1764–1831) is generally familiar, and remains as a choice morsel for those who have not read it. His precocity in childhood, his education, his inner life and character, and the origin of his works, are all topics full of interest. He was equally studious of thought and of style, and in both he reached the highest excellence. Take any one of his greatest sermons and you will see an exhibition of the noblest powers. There is a thorough acquaintance with his subject, and a vigorous grasp of it. There is great knowledge of human nature, and this not in the way of mere crude observation but of profound reflection. He who at nine years of age delighted in Edwards on the Will and Butler’s Analogy, has ever since been a profound student of metaphysics, ethics, and philosophical theology like that of Howe, and in this deep sense has studied human nature. He shows great analytical power, dissecting every part of the subject, and laying it open; and at the same time adequate power of construction, giving the discourse a clear, simple and complete plan. We also perceive singular power of argument. The whole sermon is often an argument, and upon a view of the subject well chosen for general effect; and the arguments, though usually profound, are made level to the capacity of all intelligent hearers. His imagination is exalted, imperial, but constantly subordinated to the purposes of the argument. Nowhere is there imagery that appears to be introduced for its own sake. The most splendid bursts, the loftiest flights, seem to come just where they are natural and needful. And the style—well, it is a model of perspicuity, energy, and elegance. The terms are chosen with singular felicity. The sentences are never very long, nor in the slightest degree involved, and longer and shorter sentences are agreeably mingled, while the rhythm is greatly varied, and always harmonious. Do we mean to say that Mr. Hall’s style is perfect? No, there are palpable, though slight defects, in his most finished productions, as there are in every work of every writer. And in one important respect Mr. Hall’s style is, if not faulty, yet quite opposed to the taste of our own time. It has a dignity that is too uniformly sustained. Though not at all pompous, it is never familiar, and thus its range is restricted. There is the same difference with regard to style, between that age and this, as with regard to dress and manners. And while we are sometimes too free and easy, in all these directions, yet upon the whole we have gained. If Robert Hall lived in our time, he would have greater flexibility, and thereby his noble sermons would be sensibly improved. Whether he would not, if reared in our age, have been lacking in more important respects, is another question.

Christmas Evans, the Welshman (1766–1838), is a notable example of untutored eloquence. His undisciplined imagination rioted in splendors, his descriptive powers captivated the enthusiastic Keltic mountaineers, and the whirlwinds of his passion bore them aloft to the skies. For such a man, thorough education might have hampered the wings of soaring fancy, and made him really less effective—a Pegasus harnessed to the plough.

William Jay (1769–1853) was not a man of shining gifts, but is an excellent model of sermonizing, in respect to his fresh, ingenious and yet natural plans, and in his copious, often strikingly felicitous quotations from the Bible. Read his sermons, and also his admirable Morning and Evening Exercises, which are sermons on a small scale.

Robert Hall's most gifted contemporary in the pulpit was Chalmers (1780–1847), whose rare genius and unique method in preaching one would find pleasure, if there were opportunity, in attempting to depict. No student of English preaching must fail to read the magnificent *Astronomical Sermons*, nor at least a part of the expository *Lectures on Romans*. He will find that the one thought of each discourse is not merely presented in ever varying beauty, like the kaleidoscope to which Hall compared Chalmers' preaching, but as in our stereoscope it is made to stand out in solid form and full proportions. His religious philosophy is elevated and satisfying. His style is beautiful, but any imitation of it would be unpleasing if not ridiculous.

I could wish to speak at some length of the English preachers who have attained distinction in the last thirty or forty years. I should want to commend Melvill for his numerous and suggestive examples of rich discourses drawn by legitimate process from the most unlikely texts; and to tell of John Henry Newman, with his deep, magnetic nature, whose plain and intensely vital discourses make the soul quiver with solemn awe. To recommend Frederick Robertson would be a work of supererogation, for everybody has been reading him, but there might be profit in attempting to discriminate, as he himself could not, between the true and false elements which had grown up together in his thought, and between the strength and the weakness of his so attractive discourses. I should direct special attention to Canon Liddon, now the leading preacher in the Church of England, whose elaborate sermons show us how the most difficult fundamental questions of religion, questions of Providence and prayer, of sin and atonement, of the soul and immortality, may be treated with reference to the ablest attacks of disbelief and doubt, and yet without making the sermon unintelligible, in general, to any hearers of fair capacity and cultivation. And there is a whole class of recent preachers in England and Scotland, who have given new power and interest to expository preaching, bringing to bear the methods and results of modern Biblical learning, and not disregarding, as did Chrysostom and in a less degree Luther, the absolute need, in order to the most effective discourse, of unity and plan. Alford's other sermons are not of great power; but his Sunday afternoon lectures in London, with many hearers holding their Greek Testaments, were, according to the testimony of Bishop Ellicott * and others, surpassingly instructive and engaging. Dr. Vaughan's expository sermons on the Book of Revelation are quite good. Johnstone on James and on Philippians meets exactly the wants of a highly educated but gospel-loving congregation. And Candlish, the foremost Scottish preacher of the century except Chalmers, has in his *Genesis*, *First Epistle of John*, and *fifteenth chapter of Corinthians*, taught a new and high lesson in pulpit exposition. The time would fail to speak of strong Dr. Binney and Newman Hall and Joseph Parker, all deservedly famous; of Bishop Wilberforce and Bishop Magee, whom one of his colleagues on the Episcopal bench described to me as the finest extemporaneous speaker in England; of Guthrie and Caird, Cumming and Ker; of Landells and Maclaren, whose little volumes of brief, fresh and spirited discourses are very suggestive to city pastors; and of Spurgeon, a model in several respects, but whose greatest distinction, to my mind, is the fact that he has so long gathered and held vast congregations, and kept the ear of the reading world, without ever forsaking the gospel in search of variety, or weakening his doctrine to suit the tastes of the age. But I have purposely spoken chiefly of both the English and the French preachers who lived before our own time. I think that young men should be specially exhorted to read old books. If you have a friend in the ministry who is growing old, urge him to read mainly new books, that he may freshen his mind, and keep in sympathy with his surroundings. "But must not young men keep abreast of the age?" Certainly, only the first thing

is to get abreast of the age, and in order to this they must go back to where the age came from, and join there the great procession of its moving thought. Can I suggest anything, in conclusion, with reference to the character and demands, as to preaching, of the time to which you will belong, the coming third or half of a century? I shall barely touch a few points, without any expansion.

(1) It becomes every day more important to draw a firm line of demarkation between Physical Science and Theology, and to insist that each party shall work on its own side the line in peace. Even where there appears to be ground of antagonism, it will commonly be best not to court conflict, but to work quietly on in the assurance that we have truth, and that as new scientific theories pass out of speculation into matured truth also, it will then become plain enough in what way the two departments of truth are to be reconciled.

(2) As the past generation has witnessed a painfully rapid growth of religious skepticism in England and America, so it is to be expected that your generation will see a great and blessed reaction. Unless I am mistaken, that reaction has already in some directions begun to show itself. You will promote the healthier tendencies by preaching the definite doctrines of the Bible, and by abundant exposition of the Bible text. Men grow weary of mere philosophical speculation and vague sentiment, and will listen again to the sweet and solemn voice of the Word of God.

(3) Our age has made remarkable progress as to one great doctrine of Christianity—progress, not in apprehending the doctrine, but in realizing its truth. As the fourth century made clear the Divinity of Christ, so the nineteenth century has brought out his Humanity. The most destructive criticism has unconsciously contributed to this result. It will henceforth be possible to present more complete and symmetrical views of the Lord Jesus Christ and his work of salvation than the pulpit has generally exhibited in any past age. Picture vividly before your hearers Jesus the man, while not allowing them to forget that he was Christ the Son of God, and you will mightily win them to love and serve him.

(4) It will be important to sympathize with and use the humanitarian tendencies which have become so strongly developed. Show in a thousand ways what Christianity has done and can do for all the noblest interests of humanity, and how all this is possible only because Christianity is itself divine. The one true gospel of humanity is the gospel of the Son of God.

(5) You must know how to unite breadth of view, and charity in feeling, with fidelity to truth. The age is in love with liberality, and allows that word to cover many a falsehood and many a folly. But the age will feel more and more its need of truth, and “speaking truth in love” will meet its double want.

(6) As to methods of preaching, you are entered upon a time of great freedom in composition, a time in which men are little restrained by classical models or current usage, whether as to the structure or the style of discourse. This is true in general literature, and also in preaching. You may freely adopt any of the methods which have been found useful in any age of the past, or by varied experiment may learn for yourselves how best to meet the wants of the present. Freedom is always a blessing and a power, when it is used with wise self-control.

(7) It is scarcely necessary to caution you against the love of sensation which marks our excitable age. We see this in many writers of history and romance, even in some writers in science, to say nothing of numerous politicians and periodicals. A few preachers, some of them weak but some

really strong men, have fallen in with this tendency of the time. Where they have done much real good, it has been rather in spite of this practice, than by means of it, and they should be instructive as a warning.

(8) In your time, as in all times, the thing needed will be not oratorical display but genuine eloquence, the eloquence which springs from vigorous thinking, strong convictions, fervid imagination and passionate earnestness; and true spiritual success will be attained only in proportion as you gain, in humble prayer, the blessing of the Holy Spirit.

I trust, brethren, that these observations on the History of Preaching—for the abounding imperfections of which I shall not stop to apologize—may by God’s blessing be of some use in preparing you for the difficult and responsible, yet sweet and blessed work to which your lives are devoted. I trust you will feel incited to study the instructive history and inspiring discourses of the great preachers who have gone before you, and will be stimulated by their example to develop every particle of your native power, and to fill your whole life with zealous usefulness. Themistocles said the trophies of Marathon would not let him sleep. May the thought of all the noble preachers and their blessed work kindle in you a noble emulation. And when weary and worn, stir yourselves to fresh zeal by remembering the rest that remaineth and the rewards that cannot fail. “ o to shine,” said Whitefield one night as he stood preaching in the open air and looked up to the brilliant heavens, “ o to shine as the brightness of the firmament, as yonder stars forever and ever.”

End Notes

* Although English pulpit literature is so rich, it is remarkable that we have no treatise whatever on its history. The well known aversion of the English to rhetorical art might in this case have been overcome by their love of history. Of late years America has greatly surpassed the mother-country in the production of numerous and valuable works on Homiletics, and in like manner it may be that Americans will take the lead in writing the history of the English Pulpit. Corresponding works exist already among the French, and are somewhat numerous in Germany. But even the German writers confine themselves almost entirely to their own country, being apparently quite unacquainted with the English preachers.

1 Examine the following table:

Baxter

1615–1691

Owen

1616–1683

Flavel

1627–1691

Bunyan

1628–1688

Howe

1630–1705

Leighton

1611–1684

Jer. Taylor

1613–1677

Barrow

1630–1677

Tillotson

1630–1694

South

1638–1716

Bossuet

1627–1704

Bourdaloue

1632–1704

Fénelon

1651–1715

Massillon

1663–1742

Saurin

1677–1730

* See the Bishop's excellent paper in the Life of Alford.

01.06. Appendix

Appendix

Without attempting anything like a complete account of the Literature belonging to those departments of the History of Preaching which are treated in these lectures, it may be useful to mention some of the principal works in each case, so far as known to the author. On Lecture II. (Preaching in the Early Christian Centuries) I. Works of the Fathers, with the Lives, Prefaces, Monita, etc., of the Benedictine and Migne editions.

Works on Church History.

Gibbon.

Bingham's Antiquities, and Smith's Dict. of Christian Antiquities.

II. Paniel, Geschichte der christlichen Beredsamkeit und der Homiletik, 1839. (Much the most thorough work on the General History of Preaching; but only a fragment, ending with Augustine. Most of the chapter on Chrysostom was translated in the Bibliotheca Sacra, 1847.)

Ebert, Gesch. der christlich-lateinischen Literatur, 1874. (Extends to Charlemagne, and designed as Introduction to General History of the Literature of the Middle Ages in the West. A work of great learning, vigor and freshness, in which, however, the history of preaching necessarily occupies a subordinate place.)

Villemain, Tableau de l'Éloquence Chrétienne au IVe Siècle. (New edition, 1870. A series of very entertaining essays.)

Moule, Christian Oratory during the first five centuries. London, 1859. (A prize essay of considerable interest and value.)

Brömel, Homiletische Charakterbilder, 1869–74. (Begins with sketches of Chrysostom and Augustine. Well written and fair.)

Fish, Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence. New York. (Contains sermons, with brief historical sketches of periods and of individual preachers. It would be easy to point out faults in this work, but it is convenient and useful.)

III. On the Life of Chrysostom, Neander is still valuable, Perthes not worth much; Stephens (London, 1872) is the fullest and best work; Förster (Gotha, 1869) treats ably of Chrysostom in relation to Doctrine-history; "The Mouth of Gold," by Edwin Johnson (New York, 1873), a sort of dramatic poem on the life and times of Chrysostom, is worth reading. —Martin, Saint Jean Chrysostome, ses œuvres et son siècle. Paris, 1875, three volumes, 8 vo., I have not seen.

Lecture III. (Medieval and Reformation Preaching) Works on Church History, and special works on the Reformation.

Works of St. Bernard, Antony of Padua, Thomas Aquinas, Tauler.

Lives and Works of Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli.

Lenz, *Geschichte der christlichen Homiletik*, 1839. (Useful, though meagre.) Neale, *Medieval Preaching*. London, 1856. (Not thorough, but serviceable.)

Baring-Gould, *Post-Medieval Preaching*. London, 1865. (A mere collection of curious odds and ends about second-rate preachers.) Brömel, *Charakterbilder* (as above).

Histories of German Preaching, especially those by Schenk and Schmidt, give accounts of Luther as a preacher.

Fish, *Masterpieces* (as before).

Lecture IV. (Great French Preachers) Works of the Preachers in question, especially of Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon, Saurin, A. Monod, Bersier.

Voltaire, *Age of Louis 14*.

Vinet, *Histoire de la Prédication parmi les Réformés de France au Dix-Septième Siècle*. Paris, 1860. (A remarkably good book, containing sketches, representative extracts, critical discussions, and practical hints.) Feugère, *Bourdaloue: Sa Prédication et son Temps*. 2me éd. Paris. 1874. (Thorough and able.) Bossuet and his Contemporaries. New York, 1875. (By an English lady. Readable, and, of some value.)

Berthault, *Saurin et la Prédication Protestante jusqu' à la fin du règne de Louis XIV*. Paris, 1875. (Pretty good, but not like Feugère or Vinet.)

Bungener, *The Preacher and the King, or Bourdaloue in the Court of Louis XIV*. (A new edition of the translation is just issued. Well known as an interesting and instructive story.) Alexander, *Thoughts on Preaching*. Art. "Eloquence of the French Pulpit." (Quite good.)

Turnbull, *Pulpit Orators of France and Switzerland*. New York, 1848. (Several sermons from the first half of this century, with brief sketches of the preachers.)

Fish, *Masterpieces* (as before), and also his *Pulpit Eloquence of the nineteenth century*. (The translation he gives of Bourdaloue is faulty, and that of Massillon is very bad.) Lecture V. (English Pulpit) *Lives and Works of the Preachers in question*.

Works on English History.

Works on Ecclesiastical History of England, especially Burnet, Fuller, Wordsworth's *Eccl. Biography*, Stoughton.

Fish's two works (as above).

Alexander, *Thoughts on Preaching*. Art. "The Pulpit in Ancient and Modern Times."

Great Modern Preachers. London. 1875. A small volume, containing a dozen pleasant sketches of English Preachers. *Our Bishops and Deans*. By Rev. F. Arnold. London, 1875. 2 volumes, 8vo. Hastily written, but entertaining.

02.00. On the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons

On the Preparation and

Delivery of Sermons

By Rev. John A. Broadus, D. D., LL.D.

Prof. in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville KY

A. C. ARMSTRONG & SON,

51 East Tenth St. , Hew York.

LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF PREACHING

BY JOHN A. BROADUS, D. D., LL. D., <https://archive.org/details/lecturesonthehis00broauoft> NEW EDITION.

NEW YORK:

A. C. ARMSTRONG & SON

1876.

---> Contents <--- DCox

LECTURE I. SPECIMENS OF PREACHING IN THE BIBLE.

Design of the lectures 5.

Judah before Joseph 6.

Moses and Joshua 7:1-26.

Jotham 8.

David 8.

Solomon 10.

The Prophets 10.

Elijah 12.

Amos 13.

Jonah 14.

Isaiah 14:1-32.

Jeremiah 16:1-21.

Ezekiel 17:1-24.

John the Baptist 19.

Our Lord as a Preacher . . . 22-36.

Authoritative 22.

Relation to the common mind 24.

Controversial 25.

Repetitions 27.

Variety 81.

Use of paradox and hyperbole 81.

Tone and spirit 33.

Mel

The Epistles 36.

Paul 38.

His style 39.

Adaptation 40.

Christian Rhetoric 43.

LECTURE II. PREACHING IN THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CENTURIES.

First period 44.

Second century 45.

Informal preaching 46.

Lay-preaching 47.

Forgotten laborers 49.

Not many wise 50.

Origen 51.

As scholar and teacher. 52.

As to allegorizing. . . 53.

As a preacher 56.

Second period 57.

Eusebius 63.

Athanasius 63.

Ephraem Syrus 64.

Macarius 65.

Asterius 66.

Basil the Great 67.

Gregory Nazianzen 71.

Chrysostom 73.

Ambrose 79.

Augustine 81.

General remarks, as to entrance on the ministry 84.

As to education 86.

A Theological Seminary 89.

As to Christian classics 91.

Blank after Chrysostom and Augustine , 91.

LECTURE III. MEDIEVAL AND REFORMATION PREACHING.

Reasons for attention to Medieval Preaching 93.

Peter the Hermit :... 95.

St. Bernard 97.

Dominicans and Franciscans 100.

Antony of Padua 101.

Thomas Aquinas 106.

Why all in twelfth and thirteenth centuries 109.

Tauler 110.

Huss and Savonarola 112.

Reformation Preaching 1 13.

A revival of preaching 113.

A revival of Biblical and expository preaching 114.

Of controversial preaching 116.

Of preaching upon the doctrines of grace 117.

Contrast between Luther and Calvin 118.

Yet both great preachers 119.

Calvin as a commentator and a preacher 121.

Luther as a preacher 122.

Personality in preaching 124.

Zwingle 127.

Public debates 128.

Anabaptist preachers, viz

Hlibmaier 129.

Grebel 132.

Menno 133.

Use of printing to aid preaching 188.

LECTURE IV. THE GREAT FRENCH PREACHERS.

Keltic eloquence 185.

Ageol Louis XIV 180.

Prosperity of France 137.

An age of great intellectual activity 141.

Of elegant general literature , 144.

Excellence of the French language 145.

Art 146.

Catholics stimulated by the Reformed and by the Jansenists 147.

The king s penchant for eloquent preaching . 148.

Fashionable to admire pulpit eloquence 149.

Low stage of the Catholic pulpit before Bossuet 151.

Able Reformed preachers before Bossuet, viz.

Du Moulin 153.

Faucheur 154.

Daille 156.

Bossuet 158.

Bourdalous 164.
Fenelon 170.
Du Bosc 171.
Claude 172.
Massillon 174.
Saurin 177.
Decline of the French pulpit in the eighteenth century . . . 180.
Eloquent French preachers in the nineteenth century 182.
Certain faults of the great French preachers 183.
Letter from M. Bersier . . . 185.
LECTURE V. THE ENGLISH PULPIT.
Five periods 186.
Wyclif 188.
Colet 191.
Latimer 192.
John Knox 194.
Decline after the Reformation 197.
Revival in the next century 20(1.
Jeremy Taylor 201.
Leighton , 203.
Baxter 204.
Owen... ... 206.
Flavel 207.
Bunyan 207.
John Howe 209.
Barrow 212.
South 217.
Tillotson 217.
Threatened decline in the eighteenth century 219.

Atterbury, Watts, Doddridge 221.
Whitefield 222.
Wesley 222.
Robert Robinson 223.
Robert Hall 224.
Christmas Evans 226.
William Jay 227.
Chalmers 227.
Recent English preachers 228.
Expository preachers 229.
Importance of reading old books 230.
Suggestions for the future, viz.
As to Physical Science and Theology 231.
Reaction from skepticism 231.
Humanity of Christ 232.
Humanitarian and liberal tendencies 233.
Freedom as to methods of preaching 233.
Love of sensation 234.
Genuine eloquence 234.
Conclusion . . . 235.

APPENDIX. ON THE LITERATURE OF THE SUBJECT.

PREFACE.

THESE lectures were delivered at the Newton Theological Institution, near Boston, in May last. I had been requested to discuss subjects connected with Homiletics, and the place of delivery was the lecture-room of the church. It was therefore necessary that the lectures should be popular in tone, and should abound in practical suggestions. Under such circumstances, I could not fail to perceive the difficulty of treating, in four or five lectures, so vast a subject as the History of Preaching. For this history is interwoven with the general history of Christianity, which itself belongs inseparably to the history of Civilization. Yet I greatly desired to develop, however imperfectly, the leading ideas involved in the history of preaching ; to show what causes brought about the prosperity of the pulpit at one time and its decline at another ; to indicate the great principles as to preaching which are thus taught us. I trust that my attempt may be of service to those who have never made any survey of this wide field, and may stimulate some persons to

study particular portions of it with thoroughness, and thus gradually to fill up the gap which here exists in English religious literature. The principal helps which are accessible, chiefly in other languages, are mentioned in the Appendix. While using them with diligence, I have scarcely ever simply borrowed their statements, and in such cases have always indicated the fact. Where not giving the results of my own study and teaching in the past, I have sought to test by personal examination the ideas and critical judgments of others, before adopting them. At some points my knowledge has of necessity been quite limited. If errors have arisen as to matter of fact, I shall esteem it a favor to have them pointed out. As regards the merits of particular preachers, there is of course much room for difference of opinion. The sketches of eminent preachers are usually very slight, but it could not be otherwise if space were to be saved for general ideas and for practical hints.

Some further explanations will be found at the beginning and end of the closing lecture. V The kind reception given to the lectures at New ton by a general audience of ladies and gentlemen, as well as by the Faculty and Students, has led me to hope that they may find readers who are not ministers, but who take interest in preaching, in Christianity, in history.

God grant that the little volume may be of some real use.

GREENVILLE, S. C. OCT. 1876.

02.01. LECTURE I. SPECIMENS OP PREACHING IN THE BIBLE.

LECTURE I. SPECIMENS OP PREACHING IN THE BIBLE.

IT is my purpose in these lectures to offer you some observations on the History of Preaching. The subject is obviously too vast to be treated in five lectures. You will please notice, therefore, that I shall by no means attempt a systematic discussion of the history of preaching, but shall only make observations upon some of its most characteristic and instructive periods. My general plan will be as follows : While giving a brief account of the leading preachers in one of these periods, I shall concern myself chiefly with two inquiries; first, what was the relation of these preachers to their own time, and secondly, what are the principal lessons they have left for us. These lessons will in part be formally stated, but will often come out only in the way of incidental remark as we go on. I hope that we shall thus draw from the wide field of our contemplation some immediate instruction and stimulus for our own work as preachers, and also that you may become so far interested in the subject as hereafter to occupy yourselves, more largely than might otherwise have been the case, with the truly magnificent literature of the Pulpit. This first lecture will be devoted to Preaching in the Bible. I can only mention some of the most important examples, including one or two secular speeches which are of some interest. On the Old Testament it is necessary to be particularly brief, in order to discuss somewhat more fully the preaching of our Lord. The speech of Judah before Joseph, is unsurpassed in all literature as an example of the simplest, tenderest, truest pathos. And if you want to see the contrast between pathos and bathos as you will rarely see it elsewhere, just read the production of this speech by Philo (Works, II 73, Mangey), elaborated in the starchy fashion of the Alexandrian school and do by all means read this as translated and expanded in worthy Dr. Hunter's Sacred Biography, ironed out and smoothed down into the miraculous elegance oi style which belongs to the school of Dr. Blair. That two men of cultivation, one of them a man of eminent ability, should regard this vapid stuf as in any sense an improvement upon Judah's speech, is a phenomenon in criticism, and a warning to rhetoricians.

We have a Farewell Address from Moses, viz. the Book of Deuteronomy. And like many English and German discourses, the sermon ends with a hymn, composed by the preacher. Some students of Homiletics would at once fasten on the fact that this first recorded example of an extended discourse was a written sermon. Others would reply that in this case the speaker was aware that he was not, by training or by nature, an orator, but a man "slow of speech and slow of tongue." The one remark would be about as good as the other, each of them amounting to very little as is the case with a great many other remarks that are made on botli sides of the question thus alluded to.

There are two brief Farewell Addresses from Joshua, which are really quite remarkable, as might appear if we had time to analyze them, in their finely rhetorical use of historical narrative, animated dialogue, and imaginative and passionate appeal. The brief speech of Jotham (Judges 9:1-57) is note worthy, for although a purely secular speech, it offers several points of suggestion to preachers. (1) He had a magnificent pulpit, standing high on the steep sides of Mt. Gerizim and

some people appear to think the pulpit a great matter in preaching.

(2) He had a powerful voice, for although beyond the reach of arrow or sling, he could make himself heard far below. This is not only an important gift for open-air preaching, but it will be indispensable for all preachers if we are to have many more of these dreadful Gothic churches, which are so admirable for everything except the proper object of a church, to be a place for speaking and hearing.

(3) He employed a striking illustration, a fable.

(4) He applied the illustration, in a very direct and outspoken manner, without fear or favor. (5) He ran away from the sensation he had made.

David possessed such unique and unrivalled gifts as a sacred poet, that we are apt not to think of him as a speaker. But in sooth, this extraordinary man seems to have been a universal genius, if ever there was one, as well as to have had that for which Margaret Fuller used to sigh, a universal experience. And his speeches to Saul (1 Samuel 24:1-22; 1 Samuel 26:1-25), with his reply to Abigail (1 Samuel 25:1-44), do seem to me, though so briefly recorded, to exhibit eloquence of a very high order, on which you would find it instructive and stimulating to meditate. We ought to notice, too, the singularly skilful and effective speech addressed to David by Abigail. Its tact and sagacity are truly feminine ; some of the most destructive German critics have admitted that this at least is a genuine bit. Persons in search of Scripture precedents might in this case also imagine themselves to find one, by noting that we have here a woman speaking in public. But again there is an obvious reply, that this was not really a public address, but a petition addressed to one man, and that in behalf of her husband, because he was a "fool" and could not speak for himself. The address of Nathan to David, the winning and touching parable with which he stirs the king's feelings and awakens his sense of right and wrong, and then the sudden and pointed application, and fierce outpouring of the story of his crimes, strikes even the most careless reader as a model of reproof, a gem of eloquence. Solomon, at the Dedication of the Temple, made an address to the people, and then a prayer, the first reported prayer of any considerable length a prayer strikingly appropriate, carefully arranged, and very impressive. The singular hook of Ecclesiastes is a religious discourse, a sermon. Its mournful text is often repeated, "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity." The discourse should be read as a whole, or listened to while another reads, its successive portions ever coming back, like a certain class of modern sermons, to the text as a melancholy refrain, sinking ever deeper into your heart with its painful but wholesome lesson, till at last the ringing conclusion is reached, "Fear God, and keep his commandments, for this is the whole of man" the whole of his duty and his destiny, the whole of his real pleasure, the whole of his true manliness, the all of man. I think we ought never to repeat "All is vanity" without adding "Fear God, and keep his commandments, for this is all." But the great preachers of Old Testament times were the Prophets. You ... are no doubt all aware that the New Testament minister corresponds not at all to the Old Testament priest, but in important respects to the Old Testament prophet. Alas that the great majority of the Christian world so early lost sight of this fact, and that many are still so slow, even among Protestants, to perceive it clearly. The New Testament minister is not a priest, a cleric except in so far as all Christians are a priesthood, a clergy, viz., the Lord's heritage he is a teacher in God's name, even as the Old Testament prophet was a teacher, with the peculiar advantage of being inspired. You also know that it was by no means the main business of the

prophets to predict the future as people are now apt to suppose from our modern use of the word prophet but that they spoke of the past and the present, often much more than of the future. The prophets reminded the people of their sins, exhorted them to repent, and instructed them in religious and moral, in social and personal duties ; and when they predict the future, it was almost in the way of warning or encouragement, give to forsake their sins and serve God. The redictive element naturally attracts the chief attention of Bible readers to-day and yet in reality, as things stood then, it was almost always subordinate, and often comparatively diminutive. The prophets were preachers. The earlier prophets have left us no full record of their inspired teachings. From Samuel we have a few, brief addresses, wise and weighty ; from the great Elijah, several single sentences, spoken on great occasions, and which are flashes of lightning in a dark night, revealing to us the whole man and his surroundings. Abrupt, terse, vehement, fiery, these utterances are volcanic explosions from a fire long burning within, and they make us feel the power, the tremendous power, of the inspired speaker. It is true of every born orator, that in his grandest utterances you yet feel the man himself to be greater than all he has said. And so we feel as to Elijah. You have doubtless observed that Elijah has given us a striking example of the use of ridicule in sacred discourse. He mocked the priests of Baal, before all the people. Idolatry is essentially absurd, and ridicule was therefore a fair way of exposing it. In like manner, all irreligion has aspects and elements that are absurd, and it is sometimes useful (if carefully done) to show this by irony and ridicule. In the book of Proverbs, irreligion is constantly stigmatized as folly, and frequently depicted with the keenest sarcasm. Slight touches of irony and scorn are also observed in the apostle Paul. We have then a certain amount of Scripture example for the use of ridicule in preaching. But it should be a sparing use, and very carefully managed.

Notice now the prophets from whom some connected teachings are preserved what we call books of the prophets.

Some of these were highly educated men, perhaps trained, as some writers think, in the Theological Schools begun by Samuel, "the schools of the prophets." Yet others were destitute of all such training. Amos says expressly (Amos 7:14) that he was " DO prophet nor a prophet's son," i. e., not trained in the schools as one of the so-called "sons of the prophets," but that he was a shepherd and gardener. Accordingly, many of his illustrations are rural, and they are fresh, as we sometimes find now in a gifted but uneducated country preacher. The prophets frequently quote each other, as is well known, and besides quotations, they often exhibit such similarity in leading thoughts and favorite expressions as seems to indicate that they had studied in the same schools. At any rate, they did carefully study the inspired discourses of their predecessors and contemporaries. Take now a few examples. From Jonah, we have apparently only the burden or refrain of his preaching in Nineveh, and can learn very little in the rhetorical sense, but we catch right impressive glimpses of his character and feeling. You see him (1) Shrinking from his task as has been since done by many a preacher, young and old. (2) Desponding when the excitement of long-continued and impassioned preaching had been followed by reaction ; ready to take unhealthy views of his preaching and its results, of God and man, of life and of death. (3) So much concerned for his own credit more, in that morbid hour, than for the welfare of man or the glory of God. The most eloquent of all the prophets, the one from whom most can be learned as to preaching, is obviously Isaiah. Isaiah was the very opposite of Amos, the shepherd and gardener. He lived at court during several reigns, and in that of Hezekiah was high in influence. He was a highly

educated man, a man of refined taste, and singular literary power and skill. He enjoyed in the best sense of that now often misused term, the advantage of Culture, with all its light and its sweetness. His writings, like all the other inspired books, take their literary character from the natural endowments, educational advantages, and social condition, of the man. They exhibit an imperial imagination, controlled by a disciplined intellect and by good taste. This imagination shows itself in vivid and rapid description, as well as in imagery. The careful and loving study of Isaiah has educated many a preacher's imagination to an extent of which he was by no means conscious, and few things are so important to an orator as the real cultivation of imagination. True, the book of Isaiah presents the poetic oftener than the strictly oratorical use of this faculty. But the two shade into each other ; and we also, when we become greatly excited, and our hearers with us, do naturally use in speaking such imaginative conceptions and expressions as generally belong only to poetry. In Part I of the book of Isaiah the oratorical element very distinctly predominates it is direct address, aiming at practical results in those who hear. Sometimes the style even sinks into quiet narrative, but oftener it rises into passionate appeal. And in Part II (from the 40th chapter on), the orator is lost in the poet. The prophet's soul is completely carried away by imagination and passion, till we have no longer an inspired orator directly addressing us, but a rapt seer, bursting into song, pouring forth in rhythmical strains his inspired and impassioned predictions. He is like the angel that appeared to the shepherds, whose message soon passed into song. Besides the yet higher blessings which have come to the world from the devotional and practical, the predictive and theological contents of this grand prophet's writings, who can estimate how much he has done in training servants of God for the highest and truest forms of religious eloquence!

Jeremiah, whom the Jews of our Lord's time regarded as perhaps the greatest of the prophets, has in modern times been much misunderstood, the popular term "Jeremiah" representing him as a doleful and weak lamenter, like some of the "weeping preachers" we occasionally see, whose chief capacity seems to lie in the lachrymal organs. But Jeremiah uttered his " Lamentations " upon such great and mournful occasion as might make the strongest man weep, if truly patriotic and deeply pious. And his discourses, like his personal history, recall no tearful weakling, but a statesman and preacher of strong character and intense earnestness, tender in pity but resolution of purpose. Such a man's bursts of passionate grief are a mighty power in eloquence. Jeremiah is also an example in the way of preaching unwritten discourses, and then, by divine direction, gathering them up into a book, with the hope of thus renewing and deepening their impression on the popular mind (Jeremiah 36:2-3).

Among the other prophets I can only say a word as to Ezekiel. His high-wrought imagery has little power to develop our imagination (compared with Isaiah), because mainly very far removed from our modes of thought and feeling. But as to the spirit of the preacher he offers us singularly valuable instruction, e. g., "And go, get thee unto the children of thy people, and speak unto them and tell them Thus saith the Lord Jehovah, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear." " When I say unto the wicked, wicked (man), thou shalt surely die ; if thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way, that wicked man shall die in his iniquity ; but his blood will I require at thine hand." Nor are there any sadder words in all the Bible for a preacher, any that more touchingly appeal to a common and mournful experience, than the following: "And they come unto thee all the people cometh, and they sit before thee as my people, and they hear thy words, but they will not do them : for with their mouth they show much love, but their heart goeth after their covetousness.

And lo, thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument : for they hear thy words, but they do them not." Alas I how often still, they come and hear, they are entertained and pleased, they go off with idle praises, and that is all!

We cannot stop to speak of Ezra, and his grand expository discourse "from the morning until midday;" nor of Malachi, with his sharp common sense, and his home-thrusts of question and answer; nor of that curious production of the Inter-biblical period called the 4th Book of Maccabees, really a sort of sermon by a Jew who had become a Stoic philosopher ; nor of much else that might have some interest for we must come at once to the New Testament.

John the Baptist the herald of Messiah's approach, presents several good lessons as to preaching. Consider (1) His fearlessness. The Pharisees and Sadducees represented the culture and wealth, the best social respectability and religious reputation of the time, and yet when their conduct demanded it, he boldly called them a brood of vipers. He was braver than Elijah, who faced Ahab but was so frightened by one threatening message from Jezebel that he ran the whole length of the land, and a day's journey into the desert, and wanted to die ; while the new Elijah declared Herodias an adulteress, though he knew her character and must have foreseen her relentless wrath. (2) His humility always turning attention away from himself to the Coming One, testifying of him on every occasion, willing to decrease that he might increase. (3) His practicalness.. He brought a grand and thrilling announcement, but brought also a practical injunction, for which it was to be the motive. "The reign of heaven has come near therefore repent." And you have noticed his remarkable directions in Luke iii, to the people at large, to the publicans, to the soldiers, indicating to each class its characteristic fault, hitting the nail on the head at every blow. (4) His striving after, immediate results He did not say, go off and think about it, and in the course of time you may come to repentance ; he said, repent now, profess it now, and show it henceforth, by fruit worthy of repentance. (5) His use of a ceremony to reinforce his preaching, and exhibit its results a ceremony so solemn to those receiving, as impressive to the spectators. Many a prophet had preached that men should repent, i. e., should turn from their sins, many had enforced the exhortation by predicting the coming of Messiah (though they could not declare it to be certainly near), but here was a striking novelty; this prophet bade them receive, and at his hands, a most thorough purification, in token that they did repent, and did wish to be subjects of the kingdom of God. This striking and novel ceremony gave name, among all the people, to the man and his ministry. John the Baptizer, he was universally called, as we see from the fact that he is so named in the Gospels and Acts, and in Gospels too. And when Jesus in the last week of his ministry asked the chief priests and scribes a question about John, he did not say, the preaching of John nor, the ministry of John nor, the work of John but, "the baptism of John, was it from heaven, or of men?" That represented to the people his whole mission. Now apart from all its significance in other respects, we can see that this ceremony had an important bearing on his preaching, as picturing what the preaching demanded, and as an appropriate action by which the people promptly set forth the effect which the preaching had produced on them. Many of the measures employed now, by which hearers may show that they are impressed, and profess their purposes, are but appeals, more or less wise, to these same principles of human nature to which John's baptism appealed. The central figure of Scripture, for our present purpose as in all other respects, is the Saviour himself. We can but touch a few of the many points that here present themselves. Our Lord as a Preacher, is a topic that has waited through all the ages for thorough

treatment, and is waiting still.

(1) Every one observes that as a preacher our Lord was authoritative. You know that the tone of the ordinary Jewish teachers at that time was quite different from this. If some question was under discussion in synagogue or theological school, an aged man with flowing white beard and tremulous voice would say "When I was a boy, my grand father who was a Rabbi often told me how R. Nathan Bar Tolmai used to say so and so." For them nothing was weighty till sanctified by antiquity, nothing could be settled save by the accumulation of many ancient opinions. But here came a teacher who spake,, as one having authority, who continually repeated, Ye have heard that it was said to the ancients, but say to you; in a way which no one could think of calling egotism, which all recognized as the tone of conscious and true authority. Of course our Lord was unique in this respect but in truth every preacher who is to accomplish much must, in his manner and degree, speak with authority. And do you ask how we may attain this? For one thing, by personal study of Scripture. What you have drawn right out of the Bible, by your own laborious examination, you will unconsciously state with a tone of authority. Again, by personally systematizing the teachings of Scripture, or at any rate carefully scrutinizing any proposed system in every part before accepting it, so that you feel confident, as a matter of personal conviction, that it is true. Further, by personal experience of the truth. And in general, by her. And the authority drawn from all these sources will be every year augmented by the usefulness already achieved, for the French proverb is here profoundly true, "There is nothing that succeeds like success."

(2) I shall not dwell upon the originality of our Lord's preaching. This has been sufficiently treated by various popular writers. In fact, I think they have insisted too much on this point, and I prefer to urge,

(3) That although so original, he brought his teachings into relation to the common mind. He did not startle his hearers with his originality, but employed current modes of thought and expression, e. g., The Golden Rule was not wholly new to the world. Confucius, Isocrates and others had taught the negative side of it ; our Lord states it as a positive precept, thus making the rule much more comprehensive, and more widely important. Moreover, the essential principle was really contained in Leviticus 21:18. So the Golden Rule was not presented as something absolutely new. Again, the thought of the Fatherhood of God was not alien to the heathen mind, and was sometimes taught in the Old Testament. Christ brought it out clearly, and made the thought familiar and sweet. Further more, he taught much that had to be more fully developed by the apostles ; since men could not understand any full account of certain doctrines till the facts upon which they were to rest had taken place for example, atonement and intercession. And he acted upon the same principle in his mode of stating things. He used proverbs and other current mode of expression. He drew illustrations entirely from things familiar with his hearers. And what they could not then understand he stated in parables, which might be remembered for future reflection.

I repeat, then, that our Lord tempered his originality, so as to keep his teachings within reach of the common mind. If you are teaching a child, you do not present thoughts entirely apart from and above the child's previous consciousness; you try to link the new thoughts to what the child has thought of before. Thus wisely did our Lord teach the human race. But unreflecting followers have felt bound to insist that his ethical as well as his theological teachings were absolutely original; and

superficial opposers have imagined they were detracting from his honor when they showed that for the most part he only carried farther and lifted higher and extended more widely the views of ethical truth which had been dimly caught by the universal human mind, or had at least been seen by the loftiest souls. What they make an objection is a part of the wisdom of our Lord's preaching.

(4) His teachings were to a great extent controversial, polemical. He was constantly aiming at some error or evil practice existing among his hearers. You remember at once how this principle pervades the entire Sermon on the Mount. His strong words as to wealth and poverty were addressed to the Jews, who believed that to be rich was a proof of God's favor, and to be poor was a sure sign of his displeasure. "No man can come to me except the Father which sent me draw him," was said to the fanatical crowd who imagined they were coming to him and following him because they were gaping at his miracles and delighted to get food without work. Like examples abound. In fact, there are very few of his utterances that have not a distinctly polemical character, aimed at his immediate hearers; and we must take account of this, as affecting not the principles but the mode of stating them, or we shall often fail to make exact and just interpretation of his teachings. The lesson here as to our own preaching is obvious, though very important. Truth, in this world oppressed with error, cannot hope, has no right, to keep the peace. Christ came not to cast peace upon the earth, but a sword. We must not shrink from antagonism and conflict in proclaiming the gospel, publicly or privately; though in fearlessly maintaining this conflict we must not sacrifice courtesy, of true Christian charity.

(5) Our Lord's frequent repetitions are remarkable and instructive. I shall mention some examples, of course not giving mere parallel accounts from the different Evangelists of the same occasion, but cases in which the same saying is recorded as repeated on different occasions. The Son of man is come to save that which was lost, was spoken twice. Matthew 18:11; Luke 19:10. If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, etc. (3), Matthew 17:20; Matthew 21:21; Luke 17:5. Whosoever shall confess me, etc. (3), Matthew 10:32; Luke 12:8; Luke 9:26. He that finds his life shall lose it, etc., (4), Matthew 10:38-39; Matthew 16:24-25; Luke 17:33; John 12:25. Take up his cross and follow me (4), Matthew 10:38; Matthew 16:24; Luke 14:27; Mark 10:21. Whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased, etc. (3), Matthew 23:12; Luke 14:11; Luke 18:14. Except ye become as little children, etc. (2), Matthew 18:3; Matthew 19:14; and other modes, besides these two, of inculcating the same lesson of humility (2), Matthew 20:26; John 13:13 ff. (comp. Luke 22:24; ff.) The servant is not greater than his lord (4) Matthew 10:24; Luke 6:40; John 13:6; and John 15:20; where he refers to the fact that he had told them this before. In two other cases, John 13:33 (comp. John 7:34; John 8:21), and John 10:26; he speaks of having before told them what he is now saying again. Where I am, there shall also my servant be (3), John 12:26; John 14:3; John 17:24. To these examples of short sayings (and there are others) add the fact that considerable portions of the Sermon on the Mount, as given by Matthew, are also given by Matthew and the other Synoptics as spoken on other occasions. E. g., The remarkable exhortation to take no thought, etc., ten verses of Matthew 6:1-34, is reproduced with slight alteration in Luke 12:1-59, the former in Galilee, the latter probably long afterwards, and in Judea or Perea. The Lord's Prayer, Matthew 6:9-13, was given on a later occasion, Luke 11:2-4; in a greatly shortened form (according to the correct text), but with all the leading thoughts retained. So likewise the instructions to the 70 disciples (Luke 10:1; ff.) closely resemble those previously given to the twelve apostles (Matthew 10:5; ff.) The lament over Jerusalem was made three times, and our

Lord foretold his death to his disciples five times. The parable of the pounds (Luke 19:1-48) was reproduced a few days afterwards in the parable of the talents (Matthew 25:1-46), with only some special features omitted.

There are numerous other examples. And that so many should occur in the four extremely brief memoirs we have, the fourth, too, being almost entirely different from the others, is very remarkable. These repetitions may for the most part be classified as follows : (1) Different audiences, being similar in condition and wants, needed some of the same lessons. (2) Some brief, pithy sayings would naturally be introduced in different connections. (3) Some lessons were particularly hard to be learned, as humility, cross-bearing, etc.; and so as to the great difficulty the twelve had in believing that the Messiah was really going to be rejected and put to death. And what instruction do we find for ourselves in this marked feature of our Lord's preaching? Here was the wisest of all teachers ; in him was no poverty of resources, no shrinking from mental exertion. He must have repeated because it was best to repeat. Freshness and variety are very desirable, no doubt ; but the fundamental truths of Christianity are not numerous, and men really need to have them often repeated. And many preachers, carried away by the tendencies of the present age, our furious 19th century, when the chief reading of most people is newspapers and books called emphatically novels, and the $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\tau\epsilon\rho\tau\iota$ of the lounging Athenians pales before the eagerness with which we rush to bulletin boards to catch the yet later news that has just girdled the world, many preachers go wild with the desire for novelty and the dread of repetition, and fall to preaching politics and news, science and speculation, anything, everything, to Refresh. Let the example of the Great Preacher be to us a rebuke, a caution, a comfort. A preacher should be a living man, and strive to get hold of his contemporaries ; yet nearly all of the good that preachers do is done not by new truths but by old truths, with fresh combination, illustration, application, experience, but old truths, yea, and often repeated in similar phrase, without apology and without fear. (6) There is no real conflict with all this when we add : Consider the wonderful variety of our Lord's methods of teaching. Variety as to place. He preached in synagogues, courts of the temple, private houses ; in deserts, on the mountain side, by the lake shore, from the boat ; to crowds, or to single persons ; anywhere, everywhere. Variety, too, as to occasion. Some of his discourses were deliberately undertaken, it would seem, with reference to certain conjunctures in his ministry, as the Sermon on the Mount, the instructions preceding the Mission of the Twelve (Matthew 10:1-42), the discourse on the Mount of Olives, the Farewell Address to his disciples, etc. But most of them appear to have been suggested at the moment, by particular events and circumstances, as the visit of Nicodemus, the woman coming to Jacob's well, the message of John the Baptist, the application of the rich young man, the story of the Galileans whom Pilate had slain, etc. And variety as to modes of stating truth. He employed authoritative assertion, arguments of many kinds, explanation, illustration, appeal and warning. He also used striking paradoxes and hyperbolic expressions to wake up his hearers, and make them listen and remember and think, e. g., "Who soever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Let us pause a moment, and consider. Many persons have been perplexed by this saying of our Lord, many have misunderstood it, but one thing is certain, no one ever forgot it, when once read or heard, and no one ever failed to reflect that it stands in the strongest antagonism to our natural feelings of resentment and revenge. Now remember. Our Lord was for the most part a street preacher and a field preacher. He had to gather his audiences and hold them, to awaken their minds, to lodge some leading and suggestive truths permanently in their memory. When we recall these conditions

of his teaching, together with the fact that many of his hearers were indifferent and not a few were hostile, we may perceive why he should have somewhat frequently used what we may fairly call extravagant hyperboles, sayings which will mislead if taken literally, but which understood as they were intended are in an unrivalled degree instructive and suggestive, sure to be remembered, weighty and mighty. In thus using pithy, and paradoxical or hyperbolic statements, our Lord was suiting himself to the customs as well as the wants of his hearers. There are scores of the Proverbs of Solomon, that are really of the same character, e. g., what does this mean? When thou sittest to eat with a ruler, mark well what is before thee ; and put a knife to thy throat if thou art given to appetite (Proverbs 23:2). Better cut your throat than eat greedily before his excellency. And so with many other sayings of the uninspired Jewish teachers, as recorded in some of the Rabbinical books.* * My attention was called to this last fact by my colleague Dr. TOT.

"But are not such expressions hard to interpret, and likely to be misunderstood? " Yes, they require care, breadth of view and sound judgment to interpret them. And I think it absolutely necessary, if we would interpret aright the teachings of our Lord, to remember that he spoke not as a scientific lecturer but as a preacher, a preacher for the most part to the common people, an open-air preacher, addressing restless and mainly unsympathizing crowds. In fact one will be all the better prepared to interpret these discourses if he has himself had experience of practical preaching under similar conditions. Some of our Lord's paradoxical and hyperbolic sayings have been often and grievously misunderstood. Interpreting them literally, some good people have tried, for example, to refrain from all self-defence, to give to all beggars, etc. ; and other good people, seeing that these things were impracticable, have sadly despaired of living in any respect up to the requirements of him who has so earnestly urged us to hear his sayings and do them ; while many opposers have unceasingly said that the morality taught by Jesus is impossible, and therefore really unwise. Misunderstood yes, I suppose our Lord has been worse misunderstood than any other teacher that ever spoke to the human race. But what of that? All powerful things are very dangerous if improperly handled. That which can do no harm though misused, can it do any good? Our attempts at usefulness in this world may always be represented as to their results by this simple algebraical formula: + So much good done So much harm done So much. It is our duty, as far as possible, to diminish the harm as well as increase the good; but can we ever reduce the harm down to zero, without reducing the good to zero too? If we are too painfully solicitous to avoid doing harm, we shall do nothing. The notions of our " sensation preachers " contain an element of truth. And to find that true and good and mighty something which they grope after in darkness and do not reach, we have but to study the preaching of Jesus Christ.

(7) I add but a word as to his tone and spirit. These cannot be fully analyzed, but we must seek to imitate them as far as we can apprehend, or can catch by sympathy. We must meditate on his perfect fidelity to truth, and yet perfect courtesy and kindness ; his severity in rebuking, without any tinge of bitterness ; his directness and simplicity, and yet his tact wise as the serpent, with the simplicity of the dove; his complete sympathy with man, and also complete sympathy with God bringing heaven down to earth, that he might lift up earth to heaven. And so in him we see, as we see in all his more worthy followers, that materials of preaching are important, and methods of preaching are important, but that most important of all is personal character and spirit.

I have time for but a few words as to the preaching of the Apostles. I regret this, because we may find in their discourses a greater number of practical lessons as to preaching, than in other parts of

Scripture. But it is also easier to find those lessons here than elsewhere, and one who is interested in the matter will have comparatively little need of help. The apostolical Epistles were not in general expected to be read by all or by many of those to whom they were sent, but were written addresses, designed to be read out in meeting, and listened to. Most of them are really written sermons, not written to be read by the author himself, but sent to some distant church to be read there by another person. Especially is this true of 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, Colossians, and the Circular letter or address which we call Ephesians ; also of the discourses sent out by James, Peter, Jude, John, Most of all is it true of the epistle or discourse to the Hebrews, which has every mark of being a sermon, and concerning the origin of which I decidedly prefer the theory of Clement and Origen, that it was a sermon preached by Paul, and reported by some other person, perhaps by Luke, who has reported so many other discourses of his in Acts. However that may be, it is clear that many of what we commonly describe as epistles are really sermons. Nearly all of those to whom they were originally addressed got their knowledge of them not by reading them but by hearing them read, as it is said in the Apocalypse, "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear," etc. It is important to recall this fact for several reasons. (1) In the enthusiasm which is now rightly and nobly felt for popular education, there is danger of our imagining that the ability to read is indispensable to one's being a Christian. Certainly it is eminently desirable that the freedmen of the South, for example, should learn to read, and we must all labor for this; and yet some of them are not only sincere but somewhat intelligent Christians, simply by hearing the Bible read, as among the early Christians. (2) If the apostolical discourses were originally designed to be read aloud to congregations, do they not err who suppose that there is little need now of publicly reading the Scriptures, because " everybody, " as they phrase it, can now read the Bible for himself? Still is the saying true, "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear." (3) "What we call the Epistles can often be better understood by studying them as discourses than as in the strict sense epistles. And useful lessons can be drawn from them as to the best methods of preaching.

Besides these great discourses, written verbatim after the dictation of the inspired authors, we have in Acts brief and usually condensed reports of other discourses, chiefly addresses by Peter and by Paul. From all these there is really much to be learned as to methods of preaching. Especially do the discourses, both in Acts and in the so-called Epistles, of the great apostle Paul, furnish a rich field for homiletical study.

How profitable it would be to examine narrowly his argumentation, as in Galatians, Romans, Colossians, Hebrews. Also to study his bursts of passionate feeling, and vehement exhortations, as in 2 Corinthians, Romans, Ephesians, Hebrews. How instructive would be the collection and classification of his illustrations, which are not often drawn from nature (as in James), but chiefly from the practical life of men, their business, their amusements, etc. And his style is singularly rich in rhetorical lessons a style consisting not in quietly earnest and straightforward talk, like practical Peter, and not poetic, pictorial, vivid like James, but logic set on fire a ceaseless stream of argument and earnest appeal, often swelling into a torrent which bears everything along, confusedly, perhaps, but with mighty force, resistlessly. You see in the various addresses and epistles of Paul the style of a many-sided man here a Boanerges in passionate vehemence, and there as tender as a woman's love hesitating not to break sentences in twain by sudden bursts or digressions piling strong words upon each other, like Ossa upon Pelion, in the struggling effort to

reach the height of his great argument, to give fit expression to his swelling emotion scorning the wisdom of words, the strained and artificial energy and elegance in which the degenerate Greeks of the day delighted, and yet producing without apparent effort a gem of literary beauty not surpassed in all the world's literature, that eulogium upon love, which blazes like a diamond on the bosom of Scripture. As I said of Isaiah, so it may be said of Paul, that thousands have unconsciously learned from him how to preach. And how much richer and more complete the lesson may be if we will apply ourselves to it consciously and thoughtfully.

One point as to the great apostle's preaching I must not omit to mention the striking adaptation of every discourse to the audience and the occasion. You have noticed that in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia he spoke as a Jew to the Jews, arguing from Scripture and from their national history. At Lystra, among ignorant and barbarous idolaters, he utters the simplest truths of natural religion, while at Athens those same truths were brought out with varied, profound and skilful argument, and with a courtly grace of expression which came spontaneously to the lips of a cultivated and refined man in addressing such an audience. Similar examples of adaptation are seen in the great series of Apologies, before the fanatical Jews who had been trying to kill him in the temple court, before the Sanhedrim, before Felix and Festus, before Agrippa, and to the Jews at Rome. No one of all the apostle's discourses recorded in Acts would have been suitable to take the place of any other. So likewise as to his Epistles. Think of sending Romans to Corinth, or Colossians to Rome and so of the rest.

There is here a surpassingly important lesson for preachers. Every discourse ought to be so carefully and precisely adapted to the particular audience and occasion, that it would not suit another occasion or audience without important alteration. Very rarely is it allowable, if ever, to make a sermon so general that it will suit all places equally well, for then it does not exactly suit any place. If you do not attempt to imitate Paul in anything else as to preaching, be sure to follow his example in this that you try to adapt every sermon to that time, that place, that people ; and if you repeat it elsewhere, search eagerly beforehand to find out at least some points of specific adaptation to the new occasion and congregation. Even though these points be sometimes very slight in themselves, yet they may act like the delicate tendrils which hold the vine to its supports, and are essential to its fruitfulness.

I close with one general inquiry. When we note how many specimens of eloquence the Scriptures present, and see how instructive they are, even upon a hurried glance, are we to conclude, as some virtually maintain, that the Art of Preaching should be learned exclusively from the Bible? I answer, No, by no means. Men think they put honor upon the Bible by maintaining this, and by insisting that Homiletics shall be regarded as essentially distinct from Rhetoric. In like manner some are very unwilling to admit that Christian sculpture is inferior to that of the ancient Greeks ; and I remember an American book in which it is earnestly contended that the model of the Parthenon must have been derived from Solomon's temple through the Phenicians, to be sure. Justin Martyr, who lived in Palestine less than a century after the crucifixion, told Trypho that Jesus, in his carpenter-life at Nazareth, made ploughs and ox-yokes, and there is nothing improbable in the statement. Would you suppose that he made ploughs of a new pattern, greatly better than those in use there before? Why should he not introduce all our modern improvements in ploughs, yea, and all those of the ages yet to come? You answer, our Lord came into the world to teach moral and spiritual truth, and not to introduce mechanical inventions. Precisely so as to

architecture, then, and sculpture, and all the arts, including the art of Rhetoric. In speaking, our Lord and the prophets and the apostles have left us noble and highly instructive examples, from which we ought lovingly to learn. But they employed the methods common in their time, and natural to the Shemitic races. And we are really following their example, in the spirit of it, if we employ the methods best suited to the Aryan races, and to modern thought and modern feeling.

02.02. LECTURE II ON PREACHING IN THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CENTURIES.

LECTURE II ON PREACHING IN THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CENTURIES. THE ascension of our Lord, according to the most probable Chronology, was in A. D. 30. Now in A. D. 430 was the death of Augustine, the last great preacher of the early centuries. We thus have a period of exactly four centuries. If we divide this, the year 230 will fairly represent the life and work of Origen (died 253), who forms the transition from the earlier to the later style of Christian preaching.

We have first to deal, then, with the two centuries from 30 to 230, from the Ascension to the time of Origen. For the greater part of this first period, we know very little of Christian preaching, after the close of the New Testament itself. The few works that remain to us from the so-called Apostolic Fathers, are related to preaching just as were the Epistles of the inspired Apostles. They are letters, but designed to be read in public, and some of them showing oratorical feeling, though they have not the oratorical form. Still more is this true of Justin Martyr, particularly in his Apologies ; you feel that here is a thoroughly oratorical nature. Ignatius, Justin, Polycarp, must have been vigorous, impassioned, powerful preachers ; and so with some of the other "Apologists" (besides Justin), whose writings in defence of Christianity remain to us. But from none of them does anything remain that could be called a sermon, nor from any one else before Origen, except two small fragments of homilies from the famous Gnostic Valentinus (preserved by Clement of Alexandria), which are of curious interest, but not homiletically instructive. Irenaeus was a man of great earnestness and force, but not even in the references to his lost writings is there any mention of sermons. The writings of Tertullian amply show that he was a born orator. His penetrating insight into subjects, his splendid imagination, his overpowering passion, the torrent-like movement of his style, heedless of elegance and of grammatical accuracy, his very exaggerations, and his fiery assaults upon his antagonists, all seem to show the man born to be a speaker. A lawyer in his youth, it is natural to suppose that he exercised himself much in oral Christian teaching, and his great familiarity with the Bible qualified him for the task. But none of his writings approach the form of a sermon. We should not even know from his own works, that he ever became a presbyter, though Jerome states that he did. For this almost entire want of sermons remaining from the first two centuries, there are several reasons, which we need not go far to seek. The preaching of the time was in general quite informal. The preacher did not make λόγοι, discourses, but only μιλῆς, homilies, that is conversations, talks. Even in the fourth century, there was still retained, by some out of the way congregation, the practice of asking the preacher many questions, and answering questions asked by him, so as to make the homily to some extent a conversation. And in this period it was always a mere familiar talk, which of course might rise into dignity, and swell into passion, but only in an informal way. The general feeling appears also to have been that dependence on the promised blessing of the Paraclete forbade elaborate preparation of discourses. And this feeling would prevent many from writing out their discourses after they were spoken, as the same feeling appears to have prevented the German Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, and many American Baptist ministers a century ago. But we

must by no means imagine there was but little preaching during the two first centuries, because no sermons remain. In fact preaching was then very general, almost universal, among the Christians. Lay-preaching was not an exception, it was the rule. Like the first disciples the Christians still went everywhere preaching the word. The notion that the Christian minister corresponded to the Old Testament priest had not yet gained the ascendancy. We find Irenaeus and Tertullian insisting that all Christians are priests. We learn from Eusebius (History VI. 19) that Origen, before he was ordained a presbyter, went to Palestine, and was invited by the bishops of Caesarea and Jerusalem to "expound the sacred Scriptures publicly in the church." The bishop of Alexandria, who was an enemy to Origen, condemned this, declaring it unheard of "that laymen should deliver discourses in the presence of the bishop." But the bishop of Jerusalem pronounced that notion a great mistake, appealing to various examples. It was still common in some regions, though now unknown in others, to invite laymen who could edify the brethren, to do so ; and this even when sacerdotal feeling was growing strong. In these first centuries, then, almost all the Christians preached. Thus, preaching was informal, and therefore unrecorded. Even of the presbyters at that time, few were educated or had much leisure for study. And when some able and scholarly man became a Christian, however he might occupy himself with profound studies, and the preparation of elaborate works, as Justin or Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus or Tertullian, yet when he stood up to preach, then like Faraday in the little Sandemanian chapel in London, he would lay his studies aside and speak impromptu, with the greatest simplicity. It is a favorite and just idea of recent writers on history, that the historian should not confine himself, as was so long common, to men in high places, and to single great events, but should try to reproduce the life of the many, and the numerous forces affecting that life, and gradually preparing for the great events. This, however, can never be fully done, and the shortcoming is of necessity particularly great in the history of preaching. Yet let us at least bear in mind that the early progress of Christianity, that great and wonderful progress to which we still appeal as one of the proofs of its Divine origin, was due mainly to the labors of obscure men, who have left no sermons, and not even a name to history, but whose work remains plain before the all-seeing eye, and whose reward is sure. Hail, ye unknown, forgotten brethren! we celebrate the names of your leaders, but we will not forget that you fought the battles, and gained the victories. The Christian world feels your impress, though it has lost your names. And we likewise, if we cannot live in men's memories, will rejoice at the thought that if we work for God, our work shall live, and we too shall live in our work. And not only are these early laborers now unknown, but most of them were in their own day little cared for by the great and the learned, most of them were uneducated. Throughout the first two or three centuries, it continued to be true that not many wise according to the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, were called to be Christian ministers or Christians at all. It was mainly the foolish things, weak things, base things, that God chose. And what power they had through the story of the cross, illuminated by earnest Christian living! There is a famous passage of Chrysostom (Homily xix. on the Statues), in which he bestows generous and exuberant eulogy on the country preachers around Antioch, many of whom were present that day in his church. He says, in his high-wrought fashion, that their presence beautified the city and adorned the church, and describes them as different in dialect (for they were Syrians), but speaking the same language in respect of faith, a people free from cares, leading a sober and truly dignified life. He says they learn lessons of virtue and self-control, from tilling the soil. "You might see each of them now yoking oxen to the plough, and cutting a deep furrow in the ground, at another time with their word

cleaning out sins from men's souls. They are not ashamed of work, but ashamed of idleness, knowing that idleness is a teacher of all wickedness. And while the philosophers walk about with conspicuous cloak and staff and beard, these plain men are far truer philosophers, for they teach immortality and judgment to come, and conform all their life to these hopes, being instructed by the divine writings." Not only in the first centuries, then, but in Chrysostom's day also, there were these uncultivated but good and useful men ; and such preachers have abounded from that day to this, in every period, country and persuasion in which Christianity was making any real and rapid progress. Our first period is divided from the second by the work of the celebrated Origen, probably A. D. 186 253. He was truly an epoch-making man, in Bible learning, in ministerial education, and in homiletics. Everybody knows what an impetus he gave to Biblical learning. All Christian scholars in the next two centuries, and many in every subsequent century, drew largely from the vast stores of learning gathered in his great works. The zealous studies of the present century in Text-criticism, present Origen as facile princeps among the Fathers in that respect, and give constantly new occasion to admire the scholarly accuracy and iron diligence of the Adamantine student. He was also the great educator among the early Christians. For nearly thirty years, beginning when a precocious youth of seventeen, he was chief Catechist in Alexandria, or as we should say, Theological professor, aided, after a time, by one of his distinguished pupils. And when banished from Alexandria, and living at Caesarea in Palestine, he there taught as a private instructor, but with students from distant lands, and with great éclat, for about twenty years more. During a great part of this time, from youth to age, he also preached every day, while at the same time laboring over his varied and immense works, so large a portion of which have long ago perished. Some glimpse of the subjects and methods of study in his theological school, we shall be able to get before we close. He was not only a teacher of preachers, but also a teacher of teachers. He had had predecessors in Alexandria, as Clement and his teacher Pantanus, but it was Origen that made the Alexandrian school the chief seat of Christian learning for many generations to come. And his private teaching at Caesarea gave occasion for the founding of a public school there by the famous Pamphilus, the friend of Eusebius. But in respect to methods of preaching also, Origen made an epoch. As to interpretation of Scripture, he dignified and appeared to justify the practice of allegorizing. It is an utter mistake to say, though a mistake often repeated, that he was the father of this practice. His teacher, Clement, gives us instances of it; Justin Martyr has specimens as wild as anything in Origen, and the Epistle ascribed to Barnabas contains much allegorizing that seems to us absurd and contemptible. In fact, Origen's great master in this respect was Philo, the Alexandrian Jew, who was a contemporary of our Lord. Origen did but apply to the New Testament, and to the Old Testament in a Christian sense, those methods of allegorizing by which Philo had made the Old Testament teach Platonic and Stoic Philosophy Celsus, the shrewd and vigorous unbeliever, made it an objection that the New Testament did not admit of allegorizing. Origen resented this as a slander, adducing several passages in which Paul himself had used allegory, and doubtless feeling all the more called on to show by his own allegorical interpretations that the Christian books did have those deep allegorical meanings which the Jews claimed for their books, and the Greeks for theirs. Allegorizing had long been the rage at Alexandria. Porphyry pretended that Origen had only learned it from the Greek mysteries. Philo himself did but carry out more fully and ably the method of Aristobulus, his predecessor by a century and a half. Indeed, recent Egyptologists tell us that fifteen centuries before Christ, the Egyptian priests were disputing as to the true text, and allegorizing the

statements, of their Book of the Dead, or Funeral Rites. But while Origen by no means originated allegorizing, he did do much to recommend it, by presenting the striking, though delusive, theory, that as man is composed of body, soul and spirit, so Scripture has a threefold sense, the grammatical, the moral, and the spiritual, and also by actually working out a spiritual sense for a great part of the Old and New Testaments, with perverse and absurd ingenuity. In this way he injured preaching. Men who held to a deep, esoteric sense, which only the few could understand, who, like the Gnostics, regarded themselves as a sort of spiritual aristocracy, would not only neglect to bring forth and apply the plain teachings of Scripture, but they habitually made light of these teachings, and cared mainly for such hearers as could soar with them into the "misty mid-regions" of allegorizing. Now it is very well as a general principle that we should preach with some reference to the wants of the highly cultivated, and should deal in profound thought, but after all it is the plain truths of Scripture that do the chief good, to cultivated as well as uncultivated. One who begins to regard himself as distinctively a preacher for the intellectual or the learned, will spoil his preaching as rapidly as possible. At a later period, all Christians became accustomed to the methods of allegorizing, and it ceased for the most part to be an esoteric affair, and became almost universal, with the exception of Chrysostom and his associates, in all the subsequent centuries till the Reformation. But Origen did good in teaching men to bring out the grammatical and the moral sense, though he understood these. In his early youth a teacher of grammar and rhetoric, he had a feeling for language, an exegetical sense, and his homilies and other works form the first examples of any pains-taking explanation of Scripture, or approach to accurate exegesis. As to the form of Christian discourses, he first, so far as we know, made them discourses indeed, and not a mere string of loosely connected observations, dependent for their connection on accidental suggestion or the promptings of passion, and he first made series of homilies on entire books. This was a great advance, and prepared the way for future improvements. Yet still the homily was without unity of structure. Origen does not take the fundamental thought of the passage, and treat every verse in relation to that, but he just takes clause after clause as they come, and remarks upon them in succession. Not till a century later was this fault corrected, and only partially then. In fact this lack of unity is still the commonest and gravest fault in ordinary attempts at expository preaching. But such feeling does not now prevail, and it is more hurtful now than formerly, for the modern mind demands unity in all discourse. If you would succeed in expository preaching, let every such sermon have a genuine and marked unity.

Origen's fame as a Biblical scholar, has overshadowed his merits as a preacher. And in general the exegetical element is more prominent in his homilies, than the oratorical. Yet he has occasional passages that are truly eloquent. Our second period of two centuries is from A. D. 230 to 430, or from Origen to Augustine. This again may be divided into two parts, for the year 330 will roughly represent to us the time of Constantine. Of the first half, from 230 to about 330, there is comparatively little to say, but the last of our four centuries is the time when Christian preaching springs into exuberant growth, and blossoms into glorious beauty. From the time of Origen, a much more considerable portion of Christian ministers must have been educated men, for there were now several theological schools, religious libraries began to be formed, sermons were taken down in short-hand and circulated, and (though the persecutions had not yet ended) there was an increasing number of intelligent people among the Christians, who would appreciate and desire an educated ministry. And yet almost no sermons of that period are now in existence. The celebrated controversial writer Hippolytus, a contemporary of Origen, is said to have been very eloquent. One

homily and some fragments now remaining, are represented as showing considerable oratorical skill. Gregory, afterwards called Thaumaturgus, to distinguish him from the famous Gregories of later times, was a pupil of Origen, and a most enthusiastic admirer. His panegyric on Origen, delivered when leaving the theological school, is a really eloquent production, possessing much curious interest. But the few extant homilies ascribed to him are not probably genuine. It is evident that many sermons must have been written down during this period. It may be that most of them perished during the great persecution under Diocletian, when so great an effort was made to destroy all Christian writings. In the "West, among the Latin" speaking Christians, we still find no sermons at all that have come down to modern times. Cyprian, in Carthage, while not an original thinker, but an avowed imitator of Tertullian, had yet very fine oratorical gifts, and spent his early life as a popular teacher of rhetoric. The style of his writings is very pleasing, but he left no sermons. Novatian, the heretic at Rome, (with whom some of our Baptist brethren are zealous to establish a denominational affinity,) is represented by Neander as "distinguished for clearness of Christian knowledge . . . and for a happy faculty of teaching," but the works now doubtfully ascribed to him, and even the list of his works given by Jerome, comprise no sermons. But now we approach a new period. The grand effort[^] of Diocletian had failed, and it became evident that Christianity could not be destroyed by persecution. Constantine adopted Christianity as the main plank in his political platform. Being successful, becoming sole ruler of the world, and favoring the Christians in every way, he wrought a most sudden and complete change in their position, a change having the most varied and important results for that age and for the ages to come. Yea, all Christendom is agitated to-day, by the consequences of Constantine's grand stroke of policy. In no respect were the immediate results more important than in regard to preaching. The young men who were looking to the ministry of the gospel could now without difficulty avail themselves of all the best educational facilities in the great University cities, before attending their Christian theological schools. They could now enjoy, not only undisturbed quiet in Christian life, study, and work, but the best social advantages. The power for good or evil, in every age and country, of social position, and social influences. Before this time Christians could scarcely anywhere be received into the best society, and if thus received they would be frequently met by heathen customs in which all were expected to take part. But now fashionable society smiled on Christians, and greatly courted those who were influential. It became the fashion to attend church. It was a passport to imperial favor, that one should be a very zealous Christian. And fashionable people in Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and hundreds of smaller towns, began to speak, (so Chrysostom intimates,) almost as enthusiastically about the favorite preacher of the hour, as they spoke of the favorite horse in the races, or the reigning actor of the theatre. The number of real Christians who were intelligent rapidly increased; and when to these was added the fashionable world, there arose a great demand for preachers who were literary, and eloquent. And if the preacher was a deeply pious man, his soul would be stirred by observing the crowds of professed Christians, many of whom had nothing of Christianity but the name, and he would be moved to the most earnest and passionate warnings and appeals.

Besides, all Christendom was rent by the great Arian controversy. Now that the outside pressure of persecution was removed, the Christians would not hesitate to throw their whole soul into controversy. While a skeptical modern historian may sneer at a world-shaking dispute over one letter, the difference between $\mu\omicron\iota\omicron\sigma\omicron\nu$ and $\mu\omicron\sigma\omicron\nu$, yet such a subtle distinction was well suited to the genius of the Orientalized Greeks, and Hellenized Orientals. And although the

controversy was largely carried on by political maneuvering, and courting favor with successive Emperors, favorites and governors, still much might be, much often was accomplished by able and eloquent sermons on the various aspects of this great question as to the Divinity of Christ, which touched the very heart of Christianity, and could be so presented as mightily to stir the souls of all susceptible hearers. Many of the Arian preachers too, were very able, highly educated, acute in argument, and passionately earnest in advocating their ingenious and plausible theory. Such rivalry must have powerfully stimulated the orthodox preachers.

Moreover, Christian discourses could now be freely published, and widely circulated. Thus the sermons of the more eloquent preachers speedily became a model and a stimulus to other preachers every where, and also helped to create a demand for attractive and impressive discourse, on the part of such private Christians as read the publications.

These glimpses of the situation may give us some conception of the conditions under which Christian Preaching blazed out into such splendor, and such real power, in the century which began with Constantine and Eusebius, and ended with Chrysostom and Augustine.

Eusebius himself, the justly famous historian, had in certain respects good gifts for preaching, and has left some homilies, besides his extravagant and over wrought panegyric on Constantine ; but he occupied himself chiefly with his extensive historical and chronological studies and treatises. From Athanasius, the great Trinitarian leader, we have no genuine homilies remaining. His style of writing has directness, simplicity, and native force, a vigorous and manly eloquence, such as one seldom meets with in that age of stilted rhetoric. Gregory Nazianzen, his eulogist, declares that Athanasius had no literary culture. But this is probably like Ben Jonson's saying that Shakspeare had small Latin and less Greek, because he had not been a life long student like himself. It is, however, worth notice that in his two remarkable treatises on the Incarnation, written in all probability when he was between twenty and twenty-five years old, Athanasius shows the same excellencies of style as in his later works, which seems to prove that these excellencies were mainly native. I think that the more Athanasius is read, the more it will be regretted that he has left us no sermons. As to Cyril of Jerusalem, it must suffice to remark, that his well-known sermons to those about to be baptized, and to those recently baptized, while not of remarkable ability, are suggestive examples of a practice which, with due modifications, might with great advantage be more largely pursued among us. The name of Ephraem the Syrian, who died in 378 (five years after Athanasius), has in a singular manner become familiar to all of us, though we may not have looked at his works. A MS. of the New Testament, written in the fifth century, was about the twelfth century written over with some works translated from Ephraem, and is now known to critics of the Text as the MS. C, or the Codex of Ephraem the Syrian. His is the great name among the Syrian Christians, and he is represented as one of the leading Christian orators of the century of which we are speaking. As a rare peculiarity among those great preachers, he was what we call a self-made man. Yet like all such men who really accomplish much, he was educated by the ideas and influences of the age, by books, and by personal contact with gifted contemporaries. He knew little Greek, yet enough to correspond freely with Basil the Great. I have never yet found opportunity to read much of his writings, but I notice that he is very highly eulogized by Villemain, and described, by him and others, as a highly emotional preacher, sometimes intensely solemn. The portions I have read also show a truly Oriental fondness for imagery. He was at the same time a poet, the earliest Syriac hymns being from his pen. Shall we give a moment to Macarius,

the Egyptian monk? His homilies are without text, desultory, familiar talks to the monks, and often to a considerable extent made up of answers to questions which they ask, thus being literally homilies. They are crazy with allegorizing, and wild with mysticism, but very sweet and engaging in tone, and urging to all the monastic virtues, prayer, silence, humility and self-mortification, in a very impressive manner. Certainly monasticism was a sadly one-sided thing, but its one side of Christianity has been beautifully exhibited by some of the earlier and medieval monks, both in precept and example. Are we not inclined to be one-sided too, caring only for thought and practical activity, and neglecting the cultivation religious sensibility, and of the passive virtues? It would do most of us good to read some of the best of the early monastic writers, as every body agrees is true of the (Imitation of Christ, and the medieval Latin Hymns.

I must mention one other of the less famous preachers of the time, one scarcely ever mentioned in works of Church History for we know almost nothing of his life, and his sermons take little part in the great controversies but who deserves a very warm commendation. It is Asterius, bishop of Amasea in Pontus. Of his copious writings, we have left about ten homilies believed to be genuine, and some fragments of others, but these are admirable, some of them really charming. The subjects are moral or historical; he has fine descriptive powers; the style is marked by exquisite richness of expression, and not overwrought. His allusions show that he was familiar with Demosthenes, and his style has something of the classic moderation and true elegance. Some of his sermons could be preached in our churches with little alteration, and would be well received. If some one of you would make himself thoroughly acquainted with them, and publish them in a small volume with introductions and notes, I am persuaded that many persons would read them with interest, partly because the name is unknown, and the volume would awaken curiosity. And now how can I speak of the great Greek preachers?

Basil the Great (A. D. 329-379) possessed all possible advantages. His family was rich and of high social position in Pontus, and from his grand parents down had been remarkable for piety. Two of his brothers became bishops, one of them famous (Gregory of Nyssa); and his older sister, who powerfully influenced him, founded and presided over a monastery. His father, a distinguished rhetorician, gave him careful instruction from childhood. At school he surpassed all his fellow-pupils. Then he studied at Constantinople, taught by Libanius, the most famous teacher of rhetoric in that age, with whom he formed a lasting friendship. Afterwards he went to Athens, where his fellow-students included Julian (afterwards Emperor and Apostate), and Gregory Nazianzen, his early friend. Gregory tells us in a well-known funeral eulogium,[1] that when he heard Basil was coming to Athens, he gave the students so high an opinion of his abilities and eloquence, that they consented, as a special distinction, to exempt Basil from the species of hazing to which new students were always subjected.

Thus he had every advantage, good-breeding, and all pious and inspiring home influences, careful early training, then life in the great capital city (giving knowledge of the world), and afterwards at the chief seat of learning in that age, Athens, with the ablest instructors and the most gifted fellow students his intellect disciplined, and his taste cultivated by the study of classic philosophy and oratory, and yet his Christian feeling ever warmed anew by the sympathy and example of his intelligent and devout kindred at home.

He died when less than fifty years old (like the English Dr. Barrow), but his life was crowded with religious and literary labors. As a preacher, Basil shows greater skill in the construction of discourses than any Christian orator who had preceded him. He usually extemporized, but he knew how to put a sermon together, or to make it grow, in a natural manner. The chief excellency of his preaching is in the treatment of moral subjects. He had a rare knowledge of human nature, and you may notice that among all the changes of preaching in all the ages, two branches of knowledge possess a universal and indestructible interest, deep knowledge of human nature, and deep knowledge of Scripture. Basil shows wonderful power in depicting the various virtues, and still more remarkable skill in tracing the growth and consequences of leading vices. Amid all the admirable temperance literature of our own age, I have seen no more just and vivid exhibition of many of the evils of drunkenness, than is given by Basil in his sermon on that subject. Yet this and some others of his discourses seem to me to have a fault still common in sermons on moral subjects, viz., that they do not make sufficiently prominent the Gospel view of the evil, and the Gospel motives to avoid it. The Christian moralist should be a Christian moralist. It is not strange that Basil's old pagan instructor could enjoy this sermon on drunkenness. If the letters [2] between them, on the occasion are genuine (and they possess great verisimilitude), we find that they praise each other in very extravagant terms. Libanius sends Basil an oration on the ill-humored man, of which Basil says in reply, to Muses, and letters, and Athens, what gifts ye bestow upon your lovers." Then Libanius asks to see Basil's recent sermon on drunkenness, and having read it, says, "Surely, Basil, you live at Athens unawares, for the Caesarea people (Basil was bishop of Caesarea in Pontus) could not hear this discourse." Presently he adds, "I did not teach him. This man is Homer, yes Plato, yes Aristotle, yes Susarion, who knew everything." . . . And in conclusion. "I would, Basil, that you could give me such praises," etc. Compliments between a professor and his now famous and very grateful pupil are apt to be a trifle gushing, but in this case the thing does seem overdone.

Basil's style has the faults of his age, and I would not advise your reading him very rapidly or freely, lest your taste be offended ; but taking just one discourse at a time, you feel that you are dealing with a great mind, a noble character, a deeply devout and truly eloquent preacher.

Gregory of Nyssa, the brother of Basil, is among the Greek Fathers the profoundest thinker as to philosophy, as you may see brought out in Ueberweg's History of Philosophy. As a preacher, he was and is overshadowed by the fame of his brother and of his namesake, but so far as a slender acquaintance enables one to judge, I think him really a more satisfactory preacher than the other and more celebrated Gregory. This other, Gregory Nazianzen (A D. 329-389), the friend and fellow student of Basil, was doubtless at that time considered the most eloquent of all preachers until Chrysostom became known. Very ambitious, and enjoying the finest educational opportunities, Gregory was especially a student of eloquence, and was a man of imaginative and passionate nature. He was the first great hymn-writer ; and his hymns became exceedingly popular in the Greek Church. Yet it has been justly said that his poetry is too oratorical, and his oratory too poetical. You may notice that few great preachers have written even a single good hymn, and no great hymn-writer has been very eminent as a preacher, unless Gregory be the exception, or Ephraem the Syrian. So more generally as to oratory and poetry. The oratorical and the poetic temperament seem closely related, yet are they remarkably distinct. An orator may derive very great benefit from studying poets, but many a preacher is damaged by failing to understand the

difference between the poet's office and his own. Imagination is the poet's mistress, his queen ; for the orator, she is a handmaid, highly useful, indeed absolutely needful, but only a handmaid. And splendor of diction, which for the poet is one chief end, is for the orator only a subordinate means. But the very faults of Gregory's style, according to our taste, were high excellencies in the estimation of his contemporaries. His wildly extravagant hyperboles, perpetual effort to strike, and high-wrought splendor of imagery and diction, were accounted the most magnificent eloquence, and perhaps did really recommend the truth to some of his hearers. Thus while Patriarch of Constantinople, he preached five discourses (still extant), which are said to have done much in curing Arianism there, and which procured him the surname of Theologos, discourses on the Deity of Christ, but which you or I can scarcely read with any patience. The career of John, afterward surnamed Chrysostom (A. D. 347-407), is doubtless somewhat familiar to you all, and is exceedingly well depicted in the life by Stephens. He was younger, by fifteen or twenty years, than Basil and the Gregories. He was of a distinguished and wealthy family in Antioch, and under the devoted care of a widowed mother, received every possible educational advantage. The great teacher Libanius had now returned to his native Antioch, and found in John a favorite pupil, whom he would have wished to make his successor as professor of rhetoric and kindred subjects. In the great city John saw the world, and sharpened that (penetrating knowledge of human nature for which, like Basil, he was remarkable. For a short time he practiced law, and Libanius warmly commended some of his speeches at the bar. But he turned away, weary and disgusted, from the thousand corruptions of society and government, and when his mother's death allowed he went into retirement with several friends, and spent several years in the close study of the Scriptures. Among other and greater results, it is said that Chrysostom knew almost the whole Bible by heart. In these studies they were directed by Diodorus, the head of a neighboring monastery, and afterwards a bishop, and author of long famous commentaries and other works. Here was a turning-point of Chrysostom's life. Diodorus, as we learn from various sources, founded what then appeared to be a new school of Biblical interpretation, a reaction from the well-known tendency of the older school of Alexandria. He shrank from allegorizing, and held closely to "the literal and historical meaning of the text." His copious writings, which had the honor to be specially attacked by the Emperor Julian, have perished, except a few fragments. But Diodorus lives forever in his theological pupil. It is among the greatest distinctions of Chrysostom, that his interpretation is almost entirely free from the wild allegorizing which had been nearly universal ever since Origen. It is a delightful contrast to turn from the other great preachers of the time (including Augustine), with their utterly loose interpretations, and fanciful spiritualizing, to the straight-forward, careful and usually sober interpretations of Chrysostom. His works are not only models of eloquence, but a treasury of exegesis. And for this the world is mainly indebted to Diodorus. Chrysostom had much native good sense, it is true, but so had Athanasius, Basil, Augustine. Nay, his early studies of Scripture were directed by a really wise and able instructor ; and his good sense enabled him to seize the just principles of interpretation set before him, and to develop them still more ably, and recommend them far more widely than the instructor himself. Highly favored was such a student, and highly fortunate such a teacher. It is also believed (Forster) that Chrysostom was greatly influenced as to interpretation, by his fellow student, Theodore, known afterwards as Theodore of Mopsuestia, and a commentator of great ability. It is among the advantages of study in company with others, that a man of susceptible nature will be powerfully influenced by his associates, as well as by the instructors.

Chrysostom long shrank from the work of preaching, and the office of priest, the difficulties and responsibilities of which he has so impressively state in his little work on the Priesthood. He wrote this and other valuable works while holding inferior offices, but was ordained and began preaching, only at the age of thirty-nine. He died at sixty, after three years of exile. Thus his actual career as a preacher lasted only eighteen years, twelve years at Antioch, and six at Constantinople. In these years he preached almost daily, filling the civilized world with his fame, and leaving about one thousand sermons (many of them reported by others) that have descended to us. From no other preacher have one thousand sermons been published, except Spurgeon, who has now gone considerably beyond that number. In our impatient age and country, when so many think time spent in preparation is time lost, it is well to remember that the two most celebrated preachers of the early Christian centuries began to preach, Chrysostom at thirty-nine, and Augustine at thirty-six.

I cannot fully discuss the characteristics of Chrysostom's preaching. It must be admitted that he is by no means always correct in his interpretations, particularly in the Old Testament, being ignorant of Hebrew, and often misled by the errors of the Septuagint; also that he shared many sad errors of his age, as to baptism and the Lord's Supper, asceticism and virginity, saints and martyrs. It must also be conceded that his style often wearies us by excessive copiousness, minute and long-drawn descriptions, multiplied comparisons, and piled-up imagery. But we must always remember that this did not look to excited throngs as it does to us. Under such circumstances a certain rhetorical exaggeration and exuberance seems natural, as a statue placed high upon a pillar must be above life-size. But admit what you please, criticise as you please, and the fact remains that Chrysostom has never had a superior, and it may be gravely doubted whether he has had an equal, in the history of preaching. "He shared the faults of his age," you say. Yes, and a man who does not, will scarcely impress his age, or any other. "He does not show such consummate art as Demosthenes." That is true. But the finish and repose of high art is scarcely possible, and scarcely desirable, in addressing the preacher's heterogeneous audiences, comprising persons so different as to culture and interest in the subject. Demosthenes has everywhere a style as elegant and purely simple as the Venus del Medici or the Parthenon; Chrysostom approaches in exuberance of fancy, in multiplication of images and illustrations, and in curiously varied repetitions, to a Gothic cathedral. Demosthenes is like the Greek Tragic Drama, strictly conformed to the three Unities; Chrysostom is more like the Romantic Drama. I cannot say like Shakespeare the Shakespeare of preachers has not yet appeared. But why should he not some day appear? One who can touch every chord of human feeling, treat every interest of human life, draw illustration from every object and relation of the known universe, and use all to gain acceptance and obedience for the gospel of salvation. No preacher has ever come nearer this than Chrysostom, perhaps none, on the whole, so near. A Syrian Greek, and a Christian Greek, he does in no small measure combine the Asiatic and the European, the ancient and the modern. The rich fancy and blazing passion of an Asiatic is united with the power of intellect and energy of will which mark Europeans; while the finish and simplicity of Greek art are not so much wanting as lost in the manysidedness of Christian thought and Christian leniency. As to style he certainly ranges the whole gamut of expression; for while his style is generally elevated, often magnificent, and sometimes extravagant, it occasionally becomes homely and rough as he lays bare the follies and vices of men.[3] Chrysostom is undoubtedly the prince of expository preachers. And he has very rarely been equalled in the treatment of moral subjects, while two of the most successful

preachers on moral subjects in the modern centuries, viz., Bourdaloue and Barrow, were both devoted students of Chrysostom.

Among the Latin preachers of the period there are but two great names, Ambrose and Augustine (for their famous contemporary Jerome, though eloquent in his writings, never preached). Of Ambrose (A. D. 340-97,) I can say but a word. Of very distinguished family, carefully educated at Rome, he practised law at Milan with much *éclat* for eloquence, became civil governor there, and then in a curious and well-known fashion, was suddenly forced by the *vox populi* into the office of bishop. Aware of his ignorance of Christian truth, he diligently studied Origen, Hippolytus, and Basil the Great, and Philo the Jew. From these he learned the wildest allegorizing, and from them is said to have in fact derived the greater part of his thought. This borrowing from the Greeks by wholesale had been the general practice of Pagan Roman writers also, as everybody knows. Ambrose must have been a man of striking appearance, and his style is fine and flowing, which fact must have been the excuse for naming him the Christian Cicero, which seems to me extravagant praise. But the influence of his preaching was greatly increased by his administrative talent. A true Roman, a born ruler of men, he made himself felt by emperor and people, by his own and by subsequent ages. He was a man of noble character, and his hymns (the first Latin hymns of much importance) have a manly vigor and directness which are truly Roman. His character and administrative achievements, and his eloquent delivery, gave prestige to his writings, which would otherwise hardly have gained so great a reputation. But here is a lesson for preachers, who may so often add immensely to the influence of their preaching, whether it be good or not, by administrative tact and toil, and by personal dignity and worth. As to Augustine (A. D. 354-430,) you know that he has mainly impressed himself on the world as a theologian. The great theological authority of the Middle Ages, and nominally though one can hardly think really the great authority of the Romish Church to the present day, he is also the father of the theology of the Protestant Reformation. Luther avowedly put Augustine next to the Bible, as his chief source of religious knowledge. Calvin reduced Augustine's doctrines to a religious form, aided by his own training in the scholastic works of the Middle Ages. What we call Calvinism is the doctrine of Paul, developed by Augustine and systematized by Calvin.

You know too that Augustine has written works of very high literary merit, apart from his theological and homiletical writings. His *Confessions* form one of the most unique and strangely impressive works in all literature one of the books that every body ought by all means to read. His *City of God* has been called a "prose Epic," and is a combination of history, philosophy and poetry that has a power and a charm all its own. Add that his work on *Christian Teaching* is the first treatise on Sacred Rhetoric and Homiletics, and after all that has followed, the last of its four books is still highly suggestive. But I think that if we had nothing else from Augustine than his *Sermons*, of which some three hundred and sixty remain that are reckoned genuine, we should recognize him as a great preacher, as a richly gifted man, and should feel, ourselves powerfully attracted and impressed by his genius, his mighty will and passionate heart and, deeply earnest piety. Our historian Paniel, in my opinion, wrongs Augustine by underestimating him as a preacher, because of bitter hostility to the doctrines of grace which Augustine taught. Bromel does him more justice, and Ebert. He is unsafe as an interpreter a good many of the great theologians have been rather too independent in their exegesis and wild with allegorizing, like every other great preacher of the age except Chrysostom. But his sermons are full of power. Read carefully, if not always correctly,

explains his text, and repeats many times, in different ways, its substantial meaning. He deals much in dramatic question and answer, and in apostrophe ; also in digression, the use of familiar phrases, direct address to particular classes of persons present using in general great and notable freedom. Away with our prim and starch formalities and uniformities! Yet freedom must be controlled, as in Augustine it commonly is controlled, by sound judgment, right feeling and good taste. The chief peculiarity of Augustine's style is his fondness for, and skill in producing, pithy phrases. In the terse and vigorous Latin, these often have great power. The capacity for throwing off such phrases is mainly natural, but may be indefinitely cultivated. And it is a great element of power, especially in addressing the masses of men, if one can, after stating some truth, condense it into a single keen phrase that will penetrate the hearer's mind and stick.

Hurried as this review has been, I have passed without mention a number of men who are more or less known to us as eminent preachers. An interesting topic for inquiry would be, Preaching among the early "heretics. The enthusiastic Montanism which won over Tertullian in his prime, must have produced impassioned and stirring preachers. The Manichaeism to which Augustine was so attached in his youth, was in some respects well suited to eloquence; and Augustine declares that Faustus the Manichean was more eloquent than Ambrose, whom he greatly admired and loved. I do not know anything as to the Donatist preachers, but the mighty Arian party, it has been already in passing intimated, comprised preachers as well as scholars of great ability, from most of whom, however, nothing remains but a name.

I wish now to remark upon two or three of the many points of general instruction and suggestion which present themselves in connection with the preaching of the early Christian centuries.

1. As to entrance on the ministry. You have noticed that quite a number of the famous men who have passed rapidly before us, became presbyters or bishops against their will, e. g., Gregory Thaumaturgus (the pupil of Origen), and Gregory Nazianzen, who fled from ordination, and published as Apology for his flight, in which he set forth the responsible and difficult duties of the priesthood. So Chrysostom's beautiful treatise on the Priesthood was written to show why he was not willing to become a priest. Ambrose also, and Augustine entered the sacred office unwillingly, and many others that we know of. Partly this was due to sacerdotal notions, as implied in the very name they used, priesthood ; partly it was a mere fashion ; but in the main we must believe that these men honestly shrank from a calling so solemnly responsible, as many others have done in every age, including our own. Nay, we remember the saying of Paul, "Who is sufficient for these things?" and the consolation he has handed down to us, "Our sufficiency is of God."

You doubtless observed also how many of these foremost preachers were of families having a high social position, as Ephraem, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Ambrose and Augustine. This gives a preacher advantages of no slight importance, and we should not allow our more favored families to suppose that the ministry is to come only from the poor. Everybody notices too, the pious mothers of Gregory Nazianzen and Chrysostom, of Ambrose and Augustine, while in the case of Basil and his brother, the whole family were remarkable for piety, beginning with the grandparents.

2. As to Education, we have seen that after Constantine, in the blooming period of early Christian eloquence, these distinguished preachers had nearly all attended at the great centres of secular instruction, gaining the most thorough general education the age could afford. The pagan thought

and taste had greatly degenerated, but the noble old Greek and Roman literature then existed in its entirety (not in fragments as we have it), and came to these students in their own tongues wherein they were born. Mr. Grote, in the preface to his Plato, very unfairly quotes Jerome to show that it was the tendency of what he calls "Hebrew studies" to make a man despise and neglect the heathen classics. But Jerome had peculiar notions on this subject. Basil recommended the classic writers to a student, and Chrysostom and Augustine speak not so much as loving these writers less, but as loving the Scriptures more. Besides, their circumstances were very different from ours. We can admire the statues of deities, without thereby encouraging idolatry, but they could not ; and so as to the pagan literature, almost all intimately associated with idolatry, which was then rapidly declining, but by no means dead. These considerations will account for the terms of disparagement in which the great Christian writers of the time sometimes speak of classical studies. But Julian, the apostate emperor, doubtless understood the situation, and he forbade Christian teachers to teach rhetoric and grammar, and to lecture on the old classic authors. If Christian youth wished to study these, let them go, he said, to the pagan teachers. And we are told of distinguished Christian professors of rhetoric who gave up their positions, in obedience to Julian's edict.

We have also seen that a singularly large number of these great preachers had studied the grand systems of Greek and Roman law, which must have given most important general discipline. Tertullian, Cyprian and Ambrose, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Basil and Chrysostom, all studied law, and most of them for a while engaged in the practice. The same thing has been true of many eminent preachers in our own time. Let me remind you, too, of the great attention which nearly every one of these great preachers had paid to the study of Oratory, as a practical art. I will not discourse upon the importance to ourselves of this now so generally neglected study. I trust you all read the weighty words spoken last summer at Amherst College by an illustrious citizen, whose name recalls the whole history of American Liberty, and whose character and public services are worthy of the best days of the Republic, the Hon. Charles Francis Adams. He declared that in no country at the present day has public speaking such ample opportunities for exerting influence as in America, and in no civilized country is the art of public speaking so little studied. (I think that in this last respect he ought to have excepted England.) I would that his exhortations on that subject might sink into the hearts of our aspiring American youth. But besides general education, in all the really grand curriculum of the age, and at the great schools of Alexandria and Antioch, of Constantinople and Athens, of Rome and many lesser cities, these leading preachers nearly all pursued a long course of theological study, before entering upon the full work of the ministry. Going back to the times of Origen, we happen to have remaining a curious account of the studies in which he trained his pupils at Caesarea. Gregory, afterwards surnamed Thaumaturgus (the miracle-worker), on his way from Cappadocia to a law-school at Beyrout, met Origen at Caesarea, was converted by him to Christianity, and became his pupil there for eight years, though he had already studied at Alexandria and at Athens. When at last reluctantly leaving Caesarea, Gregory delivered a valedictory, commonly known as his Panegyric upon Origen, which is very interesting on many accounts, among others because it is the earliest Christian oration we have.

He tells in this valedictory how Origen at the outset urged upon him in many conversations, the advantages and delights of knowledge, as compared with what men call practical pursuits, and soon fascinated him so that he could not leave. He says that he and his brother were like

uncultivated land full of briars and thistles, or like wild horses, when Origen took hold of them. That he taught them both in the Socratic manner and by discourses that he corrected their errors, and taught them to distinguish between truth and error, to be critical both as to language and arguments. The subjects of their study, he says, were Physics (in the broad ancient sense of that term), especially Geometry, which he calls the solid basis of all knowledge, and Astronomy ; afterwards Ethics, Philosophy, in general, and Theology. Such was their eight years course. And now in sadly turning away from this worshipped teacher and these cherished studies, Gregory compares himself to Adam driven out of Paradise, to the prodigal son leaving his father (only without any portion of goods), and to the Jews when carried into the Babylonian captivity. Do we mourn thus in leaving a long course of study? If not, is it because our teachers are not Origenes, or because we are not Gregories or is it that our students do not commonly expect to be life-long celibates, and that thoughts of a domestic Paradise do often allure them away from the Paradise of College and Theological school? In respect to their style, the great Greek and Latin Fathers are, in general, by no means good models, as I have before intimated in passing. They have the overwrought style of their age. We see this already in Josephus, and Plutarch's Miscellaneous Writings, and the Dialogue on Oratory ascribed to Tacitus. We see it in Libanius and Julian. Even Chrysostom shows this tendency of his age, and often offends our taste. Here is a reason, from the point of view of Rhetoric, for objecting to the substitution of Christian Greek and Latin writers for the classics of the earlier time as text-books. Boys at school and college are always disappointed in Demosthenes at first, and they would think Gregory Nazianzen far more eloquent. These writers present precisely those faults of style which youth full and untrained minds are too ready to admire and imitate.

Passing over many other topics, I simply direct your attention, in conclusion, to the striking fact, that the Christian preaching of these early centuries culminated in Chrysostom and Augustine, and then suddenly and entirely ceased to show any remarkable power. East or West, after Chrysostom and Augustine, there is not another really great preacher whose sermons remain to us, for seven centuries. The reasons for this would appear upon a little reflection. In the East, the despotism and worldliness of the Imperial Court left no room for independence of thought, or for high hope of doing good by eloquence. Court intrigue had forced Gregory Nazianzen to resign at Constantinople, and driven Chrysostom into exile, and the Greek bishops afterwards became mere courtiers or mere slaves. In the West, amid the destruction of the Western Empire, and the conflicts of the barbarians, the Roman genius for government showed itself, and the high Christian officials went on gathering power and making Rome in a new sense the mistress of the world, but this was done by administrative talents like those of Leo the Great, and Gregory the Great, and there was no demand for supreme efforts in preaching. And in both East and West, men's minds were now turned towards impressive ritual, sacerdotal functions and sacramental efficacities, and these left little room, as they commonly do, for earnest and vigorous preaching.

FOOTNOTES [3] Gregory Nazianzen Or. 43, page 781-3 Bened.

[2] Basil, Epistles 3516, p. 1093 ff. M gne.

[3] "The orator must command the whole scale of the language, from the most eloquent to the most low and vile. . . . The street must be one of his schools. Ought not the scholar to be able to convey his meaning in terms as short and strong as the porter or truckman uses to convey his?"

--Emerson's Letters and Social Aims.

02.03. LECTURE III. MEDIEVAL AND REFORMATION PREACHING.

LECTURE III. MEDIEVAL AND REFORMATION PREACHING.

IT is a great mistake, in surveying the history of Preaching, to pass at once from Chrysostom and Augustine to the Reformation. Besides the fact, now so generally recognized, that there were "Reform ers before the Reformation," it is to be noticed that among the devoted Romanists of the Middle Ages there were some earnest, able and eloquent preachers. The common Protestant fashion of stigmatizing the "Dark Ages" is unphilosophical and unjust, and has proven, in some quarters, to be bad policy. Men who had been reared to think that everything Medieval was corrupt or silly, are sometimes so surprised by the first results of a little investigation that they go quite over to the opposite extreme. But not simply on grounds of general justice and fairness are we required to notice the Medieval preaching. The fact is that the history of preaching cannot be understood without taking account of that period. So far as the form of modern preaching differs from that of the early Christian centuries, the difference has had its origin in the Middle Ages.

It is true that in that period preaching was generally very much neglected. Over wide districts, and through long years at a time, there would be almost no preaching. When men assembled in churches it was only to witness ceremonies and hear chanting and intoning. If sermons were given, it was in many countries still the custom to preach only in Latin, which the people did not now understand, even in Southern Europe. Those who preached in the vernacular, would often give nothing but eulogies on the saints, accounts of current miracles, etc. Most of the lower clergy were grossly ignorant, and many of them grossly irreligious, while the bishops and other dignitaries were often engrossed with political administration or manoeuvrings, perhaps busy in war, if not occupied with pursuits still more unclerical and unchristian.

All this was true. And yet there were notable exceptions. Let us look for a moment at three or four leading examples.

Certainly Peter the Hermit was a great preacher, A man of very small stature and ungainly shape, his speaking was rendered powerful by fiery enthusiasm, and great flow of words. It is difficult to exaggerate the importance to an orator, of vigorous health; and yet several of the greatest preachers have been men in feeble health, as, besides Peter the Hermit, Chrysostom, St. Bernard, Calvin, Baxter yea, apparently, the apostle Paul. But note that their diseases were not such as debilitate, not such as enfeeble the nervous system that they were all capable of great mental application, and possessed great force of character, stimulated by burning zeal and that most of them, though diligent students, were also much given to physical activity. In the time of Peter and Bernard, a feeble physique, especially if it appeared to be emaciated by fasting, rather helped a preacher's oratory with the people; for first, it seemed to indicate great piety, and secondly, his powerful utterance when excited seemed in that superstitious age to be preternatural. The Hon. Alexander H. Stephens of Georgia, is in this respect an anachronism if he had lived in the Middle Ages the fact that so frail a man can speak two hours and hold a great audience would have stamped him as a saint, preternaturally supported, and with 1 more than

human claims to attention and belief.

Peter had a most inspiring theme ; for with the great religious motive he united an appeal to the love of war, which was so strong in that age, and to the love of adventure, which is always so strong. But in addition to the inspiration of his theme, he him self must have been surpassingly eloquent. We are told (Michaud I 43) that he made much use of "those vehement apostrophes which produce such an effect upon an uncultivated multitude. He described the profanation of the holy places, and the blood of the Christians shed in torrents in the streets of Jerusalem. He invoked, by turns, Heaven, the saints, the angels, to bear witness to the truth of what he told them. He apostrophized Mt. Zion, the rock of Calvary, and the Mount of Olives, which he made to resound with sobs and groans. When he had exhausted speech in painting the miseries of the faithful, he showed the spectators the crucifix which he carried with him ; sometimes striking his breast and wounding his flesh, sometimes shedding torrents of tears." Fanatical, no doubt he was, but our present concern is with his eloquence. Read, with this in view, the story of his preaching, and of the prodigious effects produced upon high and low, upon men, women and children, and you will probably believe that seldom, in all the history of man, has there been such overpowering popular eloquence as that of Peter. And while we are rejoicing to study the recorded and finished eloquence of Demosthenes and Daniel Webster, of Chrysostom and Robert Hall, we have also much to learn from the mere history of great popular orators like Patrick Henry and Peter the Hermit. But the case of the great Crusading Evangelist was very peculiar. We find a little later a notable example of preaching in the strict sense of the term.

Bernard of Clairvaux, commonly called St. Bernard, lived from A. D. 1091 to 1153 in France, a devoted monk and a fervently pious man. Pale, meagre, attenuated through much fasting, looking almost as unsubstantial as a spirit, he made a great impression the moment he was seen. He possessed extraordinary talents, and though he made light of human learning, he at least did so only after acquiring it. His sermons and other writings do not indicate a profound metaphysical thinker, like Augustine or Aquinas, but they present treasures of devout sentiment, pure, deep, delightful mysticism at its best estate. His style has an elegant simplicity and sweetness that is charming, and while many of his expressions are as striking as those of Augustine, they seem perfectly easy and natural. His utterance and gesture are described as in the highest degree impressive. His power of persuasion was felt by high and low to be something irresistible. * Even his letters swayed popes and sovereigns. This wonderful personal influence was shown in many cures, which he and others believed to be miraculous. Bernard is often called "the last of the Fathers." If we were asked who is the foremost preacher in the whole history of Latin Christianity, we should doubtless find the question narrowing itself to a choice between Augustine and Bernard. His sermons show more careful preparation than those of the early Latin Fathers. He has felt to some extent the systematizing tendencies of the scholastic thought and method for Anselm's principal works appeared before Bernard was born, and Abelard was his Benioi by a dozen years and the effect of this tematizing tendency we see in the more orderly arrangement of his discourses, though they do not show formal divisions. He greatly loved to preach, and we are told that he preached of teneer than the rules of his order appointed, both to the monks and to the people. He was accustomed to put down thoughts, and schemes of discourses, as they occurred to him, and work them up as he had occasion to preach a plan which many other preachers have found useful. His methods of sermonizing have considerable variety, and his manner of treatment

is free. I need not say that he was devoted to allegorizing, which was universal in that ago. I count in his works eighty-six sermons on the Song of Solomon, and when the series was cut short by his death, he had just begun the third chapter. In his other sermons too he quotes the Song of Solomon as often as Chrysostom quotes Job. Before we speak lightly of this passionate love for Solomon's Song by medieval monks, as some Protestants do speak, it may be well to remember that Richard Baxter and Jonathan Edwards studied that book with peculiar delight. Bernard was warmly praised by Luther, Melancthon and Calvin. I think that beyond any other medieval preacher, he will repay the student of the present day.

About fifty years after the death of Bernard, t. e. in the beginning of the thirteenth century, two new monastic orders were founded, the mendicant orders of Franciscans and Dominicans. The latter order was founded for the express purpose of preaching. And it is instructive to notice that the immediate occasion of its establishment was the observed popularity and power of preaching among the Waldenses. Besides settled preachers, Peter Waldo had recently begun to send out Evangelists, two by two, who were known as the "Poor Men of Lyons." Dominic began his order to meet these heretics just as Protestantism afterwards led to the Society of Jesus. But in a few years Dominic went to Home, and preached there with irresistible eloquence, drawing the highest dignitaries to sympathize with his plans. All men could see that preaching was everywhere greatly needed, and the idea of a general order of preachers, to be controlled by the eloquent Dominic, was welcomed, so that Borne now became its centre. Within a few years this order embraced four hundred and seventy different monasteries, in every country of Europe., and spreading into Asia, making probably twenty thousand travelling preachers. In the course of time the Dominicans became worldly, and less zealous in this great work. But for two or three generations this mighty order of "Evangelists," as we should say, made the Christian world ring with their preaching. They formed also a singular and very influential outside order of laymen, called Tertiaries, who were bound by their vow to entertain the wandering preachers, to spread the fame of their eloquence, crowd to hear them, and "applaud, at least by rapt attention." You perceive that several things have been understood in the world before our day. The Franciscans addressed themselves especially to Foreign Mission work among the Mohammedans of Spain, Africa and the East, but also comprised many zealous preachers at home. To these two orders belonged the other two great medieval preachers of whom I shall speak, Antony of Padua being a Franciscan, and Thomas Aquinas a Dominican.

Antony, a Portuguese, and a Franciscan missionary to Africa, afterwards came to Italy, where he gained his extraordinary reputation as a preacher, and died in 1231, at the age of thirty-seven. He is reckoned by some as the most popular preacher that ever lived. We read of twenty thousand persons as crowding at night around the stand where he was to preach next morning, and after the sermon making bonfires of their playing cards, etc.; and sometimes as many as thirty thousand were present when he preached. In point of mere numbers, this surpasses Chrysostom, "Whitefield, Spurgeon and Moody. Yet much of this popularity on the part of Antony of Padua was due to the superstitious belief that he had supernatural power, that he could work miracles. We are told, for instance, that once he preached to the fishes, "giving them in conclusion the apostolical benediction, and behold! they showed their joy by lively movement of tail and fins, and raised their heads above the water, bowed reverently and went under. At this unbelievers were astonished, and the most dreadful heretics were converted." [1]

Yet these superstitious follies must not prevent our observing that he was really a great preacher and some things in his manner of preaching are particularly noteworthy.

(1) Antony of Padua was the first preacher, so far as I can learn, who made a careful division of his sermons into several heads which his extant sermons show that he commonly did, though not universally. For example, on the text, "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord," Apocal. xiv., he begins thus : " Note that in these words death is described, about which the apostle John proposes three things, viz., the debt of nature, where he says, The dead ; the merit of grace, where he says, "Who die in the Lord ; the reward of glory, where he says, * Blessed. . . . "Likewise note that God gives us three things, viz. to live, to live well, to live forever. For in creation he gives us to live, in justification to live well, in glorification to live forever. But to live, little profits him to whom it is not given, or who does not strive, to live well ; and to live well would not suffice if it were not given to live forever." And BO throughout, everything is formally divided.

These formal divisions, a new thing in the history of preaching, came from applying to practical discourse the methods then pursued in the Universities, Most of the great schoolmen were predecessors or contemporaries of Antony, and all the most vigorous thought of the time adopted their method. If it were asked how these methods themselves arose, the answer would seem to be this. The schoolmen sought to rationalize Christianity, to make it conformable and acceptable to human reason, as so many have done before and since their epoch. But these medieval thinkers could not rationalize as to the truth of Christianity, as to its sources, or its doctrinal contents, for all these were fixed for them by the unquestionable authority of the Church. So they fell to applying the processes of the Aristotelian logic to this fixed body of Christian truth, seeking by decomposition and reconstruction to bring it into forms acceptable to their reason. Each new philosopher would decompose more minutely and reorganize more elaborately. Thus logical division, formally stated, became the passion of the age. And while then and often afterwards carried to a great extreme, and though there have been many reactions, in preaching as in other departments of literature, yet this scholastic passion for analysis has powerfully affected the thought and the expression of all subsequent centuries. If any of you wish to examine the first known specimens of this method in preaching, and have not access to the rare old folio of Antony's works in Latin, I have seen advertised a small volume of translations from Antony of Padua by Dr. Neale, who has also given some account of him in the volume on Medieval Preaching. You will notice that most of Antony's sermons, as we have them, are really sketches of sermons, published, we are told, for the benefit of other brethren. Augustine dictated some short sermons, to be used by other preachers, but Antony has left the first collection of what modern pulpit literature knows only too well, as "Sketches and Skeletons."

(2) But one would think it must have been some thing else than formal scholastic divisions that made Antony's preaching so popular. And we find that he abounded in illustration, and that of a novel kind. Anecdotes of saints and martyrs had become somewhat stale, and Antony preferred to draw illustration from the trades and other occupations of those he was addressing, from the habits of animals, and other such matters of common observation.

(3) His allegorizing is utterly wild and baseless, beyond anything that I have seen even in the Fathers, But such stuff seems always to have a charm for the popular mind, as seen in many ignorant Baptist preachers at the present day, white and colored probably for two reasons,

because it constantly presents novelties, and because it appeals to the imagination. Strict interpretation takes away from us for the most part this means of charming audiences, but we can to some extent make amends, since strict and careful interpretation will itself often give great freshness of view, even to the most familiar passages, while illustration both affords novelty and appeals to the imagination.

Thomas Aquinas, the Neapolitan Count, and Dominican friar, who died six centuries ago (1274) at the age of fifty, is by common consent regarded as the greatest theologian of the Middle Ages, and one of the greatest minds in the history of philosophy. It is surely an interesting fact that he was at the same time very popular as a preacher to the common people, being thus faithful to his Dominican vow. Amid the immense and amazing mass of his works are many brief discourses, and treatises which were originally discourses, marked by clearness, simplicity and practical point, and usually very short, many of them not requiring more than ten minutes, though these were doubtless expanded in preaching to the common people. He has also extended commentaries on perhaps half the books of Scripture, in which the method of exposition is strikingly like that with which we are all familiar in Matthew Henry, leading us to believe that in the former as well as in the latter case the exposition was, for the most part, first presented in the form of expository sermons. He is not highly imaginative, nor flowing in expression ; the sentences are short, and everything runs into division and subdivision, usually by threes. But while there is no ornament, and no swelling passion, he uses many homely and lively comparisons, for explanation as well as for argument.

It is pleasant to think of the fact that this great philosopher and author loved to preach, and that plain people loved to hear him. And many of us ordinary men would do well like him to combine philosophical and other profound studies with simple and practical preaching. Thirty years ago, Jacob R. Scott, a Massachusetts man, and graduate of Brown and of Newton, became chaplain to the University of Virginia, and gave his valued friendship to a young student who was looking to the ministry. "When the young man began to preach, unfortunately without regular theological education, he wrote to Mr. Scott for information about books and advice as to study, and received a long and instructive letter, in the course of which was given a bit of counsel which has several times since gone the rounds of the newspapers : "Bead Butler, and preach to the negroes, and it will make a man of you." The prediction has certainly been but very partially fulfilled, and one of the conditions, it must be admitted, has not been fully complied with. While preaching much to the negroes, and other ignorant people, he has not sufficiently studied Butler, and other philosophers. I tell the simple story partly in order to pay a slight tribute of gratitude to a son of Newton who has passed away, and partly because it may bring a little nearer to you the important thought that we ought to combine profound studies with practical preaching.

You may notice that the great medieval preachers I have mentioned all fall within the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. To the same period belong the greatest of the Latin hymn-writers, Adam of St. Victor (who is now regarded as the foremost of them all), and the authors of the Celestial City, the Stabat Mater, and the Dies Irae. If you inquire for the cause of this accumulation of eminent preachers and sacred poets in that age, the explanation would doubtless be chiefly the Crusades. These had powerfully stirred the soul of Europe, awakening all minds and hearts. At the same time, by keeping up a distant warfare, they had given many generations of peace at home, and thus afforded opportunity for the work of the great Universities and the rise of the great

Schoolmen, and so likewise for the appearance of great preachers and hymn-writers. Moreover, the rise of the middle class greatly heightened the aggregate mental activity of society. And though what we call the "Revival of Learning" was much later than this, yet already there was a growing and inevitably inspiring acquaintance with the Classic Latin authors, as, for example, in the next generation after Thomas Aquinas, Dante shows himself familiar with Virgil. The study of the Roman Law had also been revived, and there were now professors of Civil Law in all the great Universities. As regards preaching, we can see what causes ended this period of prosperity. For in the next two centuries (14th and 15th) there were again terrible wars in Europe itself. Scholasticism had run its course, the Papacy became frightfully corrupt, and the better spirits were either absorbed in Mysticism, or engaged in unsuccessful attempts to reform the Church. With the general corruption the great preaching orders rapidly degenerated. If Thomas Aquinas was a Dominican, and Tauler, so also was the infamous Tetzels, whose proclamation of indulgences called forth the theses of Luther. Of the great Mystics I can only mention Tauler, doubtless the foremost of his class in that age. Some of you are probably familiar with an admirable volume containing his Life and twenty-five sermons, published in New York in 1858. Tauler lived on the Rhine in the fourteenth century, having been educated at the University of Paris, then the greatest of all seats of learning. In a time of great political and social evils, of protracted civil war, followed by a terrible struggle between the Pope and the Emperor (for German Emperors and Popes have had many a fierce conflict before to-day), a time of frightful pestilence, a time of sadly dissolute morals even among priests and monks and nuns, Tauler labored as a faithful priest. After years thus spent, he was, at the age of fifty, lifted to what we call a Higher Life through the influence of a young lay man, the head of a secret society which was trying to reform religion without leaving the Church. It was after this Higher Life period began with Tauler that he preached the sermons which were taken down by hearers and remain to us.

"We ought to study these mystical writings. They represent one side of human nature, and minister, in an exaggerated way, to a want of men in every age. Our own age is intensely practical. Yet see how readily many persons accept the idea of a Higher Life, of the Rest of Faith, etc. Do not most of us so neglect this aspect of Christianity in our studies and our preaching, as to leave the natural thirst for it in some hearers ungratified, and thus prepare them to catch at, and delight in, such ideas and sentiments when presented in an extravagant and enthusiastic form? If we do not neglect the Scriptural mysticism as found in the writings of John and also of Paul we shall see less readiness among our people to accept a mysticism that is unscriptural

Let it be added that Tauler did not preach mere mystical raptures. He searchingly applies religious principle to the regulation of the inner and the outer life, and urges that ordinary homely duties shall be performed in a religious spirit.

I must pass with brief mention the preaching of the now celebrated "Reformers before the Reformation." Of Wyclif, who died in England twenty years later than Tauler, and of his "poor preachers/ we may have time to think on another occasion. John Huss, who was a little later, and powerfully influenced by the writings of Wyclif, was an eloquent and scholarly man, University preacher and Queen's Confessor in Bohemia, and his "fervid sermons " in favor of moral and ecclesiastical reformation long made a great impression. And to pass over many others, we must believe that there has seldom been more impressive preaching than that of the Italian Dominican Savonarola, who acted the part of prophet, preacher and virtual ruler in Florence during the last

years of the fifteenth century, when Martin Luther was a child. A century before Luther, lived Thomas a-Kempis, in the Netherlands and Gerson in France. It is much disputed which of them wrote the tract on "The Imitation of Christ." The former is said by historians not to have been a very eloquent preacher; Gerson was a preacher of real power, and highly esteemed by Luther.

We come now to the preaching of the great REFORMERS. In devoting to them the mere fraction of a lecture, we have at least the advantage that here the leading persons and main facts are well known. Let us notice certain things which hold true of the Reformation preaching in general.

(1) It was a revival of preaching. We have seen that in the Middle Ages there was by no means such an utter dearth of preaching as many Protestant writers have represented. Yet the preachers we have referred to were, even when most numerous, rather exceptions to a rule. Even the great Missionary organizations, the Franciscans and Dominicans, poured forth their thousands of mendicant preachers to do a work which the local clergy mainly neglected, and which they were often all the more willing to neglect because the travelling friars would now and then undertake it. Peripatetic preachers, evangelists, however useful under some circumstances and worthy of honor, become a curse to any pastor who expects them to make amends for his own neglect of duty. In general, the clergy did not preach. And the Reformation was a great outburst of preaching, such as had not been seen since the early Christian centuries.

(2) It was a revival of Biblical preaching. In stead of long and often fabulous stories about saints and martyrs, and accounts of miracles, instead of passages from Aristotle and Seneca, and fine-spun subtleties of the Schoolmen, these men preached the Bible. The question was not what the Pope said; and even the Fathers, however highly esteemed, were not decisive authority it was the Bible. The preacher's one great task was to set forth the doctrinal and moral teachings of the Word of God. And the greater part of their preaching was expository. Once more, after long centuries, people were reading the Scriptures in their own tongue, and preachers, studying the original Greek and Hebrew, were carefully explaining to the people the connected teachings of passage after passage and book after book. For example, Zwingli, when first beginning his ministry at Zurich, announced his intention to preach, not simply upon the church lessons, but upon the whole gospel of Matthew, chapter after chapter. Some friends objected that it would be an innovation, and injurious; but he justly said, "It is the old custom. Call to mind the homilies of Chrysostom on Matthew, and of Augustine on John." And these sermons of Zwingli's made a great impression. There was also at the basis of this expository preaching by the Reformers a much more strict and reasonable exegesis than had ever been common since the days of Chrysostom. Luther retained something of the love of allegorizing, as many Lutherans have done to the present day. But Calvin gave the ablest, soundest, clearest expositions of Scripture that had been seen for a thousand years, and most of the other great Reformers worked in the same direction. Such careful and continued exposition of the Bible, based in the main upon sound exegesis, and pursued with loving zeal, could not fail of great results, especially at a time when direct and exact knowledge of Scripture was a most attractive and refreshing novelty. The same sort of effect is to some extent seen in the case of certain useful laborers in our own day, who accomplish so much by Bible readings and highly Biblical preaching. The expository sermons of the Reformers, while in general free, are yet much more orderly than those of the Fathers. They have themselves studied the great scholastic works, and been trained in analysis and arrangement, and the minds of all their cultivated hearers have received a similar bent. And so

they easily, and almost spontaneously, give their discourses something of plan. Accordingly they are in many respects models of this species of preaching. In general, it may be said that the best specimens of expository preaching are to be found in Chrysostom, in the Reformers, especially Luther and Calvin, and in the sottish pulpit of our own time.

(3) The Reformation involved a revival of controversial preaching. Religious controversy is unpopular in our day, being regarded as showing a lack of charity, of broad culture, and in the estimation of some, a lack even of social refinement and courtesy. It is possible that a few preachers, even some of our Baptist brethren, are too fond of controversy, and do perhaps exhibit some of the deficiencies mentioned. But it must not be forgotten that religious controversy is inevitable where living faith in definite truth is dwelling side by side with ruinous error and practical evils. And preachers may remember that controversial preaching, properly managed, is full of interest and full of power.

(4) We must add that there was in the Reformation a revival of preaching upon the doctrines of grace. The methods of preaching are, after all, not half so important as the materials. These great men preached justification by faith, salvation by grace. The doctrine of Divine sovereignty in human salvation was freely proclaimed by all the Reformers. However far some Protestants may have gone at a later period in opposition to these views, yet Protestantism was born of the doctrines of grace, and in the proclamation of these the Reformation preaching found its truest and highest power. There are many who say now-a-days, "But we have changed all that." Nay, till human nature changes and Jesus Christ changes, the power of the gospel will still reside in the great truth of salvation by sovereign grace. Let the humanitarian and the ritualist go their several ways, but let us boldly and warmly proclaim the truths which seem old and yet are so new to every needy heart, of sovereignty and atonement, of spiritual regeneration and justification by faith.

It would be difficult to find so marked a contrast between any two celebrated contemporaries in all the history of preaching as that between LUTHER and CALVIN. Luther (1483-1546) was a broad-shouldered, broad-faced, burly German, overflowing with physical strength; Calvin (1509-64) a feeble-looking little Frenchman, with shrunken cheeks and slender frame, and bowed with study and weakness. Luther had a powerful intellect, but was also rich in sensibility, imagination and swelling passion a man juicy with humor, delighting in music, in children, in the inferior animals, in poetic sympathy with nature. In the disputation at Leipzig he stood up to speak with a bouquet in his hand. Every constituent of his character was rich to overflowing, and yet it was always a manly vigor, without sentimental gush. With, all this accords one of his marked faults, a prodigious and seemingly reckless extravagance, and even an occasional coarseness of language when excited, leading to expressions which ever since Bossuet have been the stock in trade of Anti-Protestant controversialists, and some of which it is impossible to defend. Calvin, on the other hand, was practically destitute of imagination and humor, seeming in his public life and works to have been all intellect and will, though his letters show that he was not only a good hater, but also a warm friend. And yet, while so widely different, both of these men were great preachers. What had they in common to make them great preachers? I answer, along with intellect they had (force of character,) an energetic nature,) (will) A great preacher is not a mere artist, and not a feeble suppliant, he is a conquering soul, a monarch, a born ruler of mankind. He wills, and men bow. Calvin was far less winning than Luther, but he was even more than Luther an autocrat. Each of them had (unbounded self-reliance) too, and yet at the same time each was full of (humble

reliance on God). This combination, self-confidence, such as if it existed alone, would vitiate character, yet checked and upborne by simple, humble, child-like faith in God this makes a Christian hero, for word or for wo/k. The statement could be easily misunderstood, but as meant it is true and important, that a man must both believe in himself and believe in God, if he is to make a powerful impression on his fellow-men, and do great good in the world. This force of character in both Luther and Calvin gave great force to their utterance. Every body repeats the saying as to Luther that "his words were half battles." But of Calvin too it was said, and said by Beza who knew him so well, Tot verba, tot pondera, " every word weighed a pound," a phrase also used of Daniel Webster. It should be noticed too that both Luther and Calvin were drawn into much connection with practical affairs, and this tended to give them greater firmness and positiveness of character, and to render their preaching more vigorous, as well as better suited to the common mind. Here is another valuable combination of what are commonly reckoned incongruous qualities to be a thinker and student, and at the same time a man of practical sense and practical experience. Such were the great Reformers, and such a man was the apostle Paul The vast reputation of Calvin as theologian and church-builder has overshadowed his great merits as a commentator and a preacher. With the possible exception of Chrysostom, I think there is, as already intimated, no commentator before our own century whose exegesis is so generally satisfactory and so uniformly profitable as that of Calvin. And by all means use the original Latin, so clear and smooth and agreeable, Latin probably unsurpassed in literary excellence since the early centuries. All his extemporized sermons taken down in short hand, as well as his writings, show not so much great copiousness, as true command of language, his expression being, as a rule, singularly direct, simple, and forcible. The extent of his preaching looks to us wonderful. While lecturing at Geneva to many hundreds of students (some times eight hundred), while practically a ruler of Geneva, and constant adviser of the Reformed in all Switzerland, France and the Netherlands, Eng land and Scotland, and while composing his so extensive and elaborate works, he would often preach every day. For example, I notice that the two hundred sermons on Deuteronomy, which are dated, were all delivered on week-days in the course of little more than a year, and sometimes on four or five days in succession. It was so with the other great Reformers. In fact, Luther accuses one preacher of leading an "idle life; for he preaches but twice a week, and has a salary of two hundred dollars a year." Luther himself, with all his lecturing, immense correspondence, and voluminous authorship, often preached every day for a week, and on fast days two or three times.

Luther had (less than Calvin of (sustained in tensivity,) but he had at times an (overwhelming force, and his preaching possessed the (rhetorical advantage of being everywhere pervaded by one idea) that of justification by faith, round which he reorganized all existing Christian thought, and which gave a certain unity to all the overflowing variety of his illustration, sentiment and expression. In fact, did he not carry his one idea too far, and have not Protestants yet to recover from following him in this error? The apostles speak of loving Christ and knowing Christ, as securing salvation, but Luther would in every case by main force reduce it to believing. [2] But the undecomposed idea of loving Christ is certainly more intelligible and practically useful in the Sunday School, and so there may be persons who will be more benefited by the idea of knowing Christ than by that of believing on him.

Luther shows great realness, both in his personal grasp of Christian truth, and in his modes of presenting it. The conventional decorums he smashes, and with strong, rude, and sometimes

even coarse expressions, with illustrations from almost every conceivable source, and with familiar address to the individual hearer, he brings the truth very close home. He gloried in being a preacher to the common people. Thus he says : "A true, pious and faithful preacher shall look to the children and servants, and to the poor, simple masses, who need instruction." "If one preaches to the coarse, hard populace, he must paint it for them, pound it, chew it, try all sorts of ways to soften them ever so little." Ho blamed Zwingli for interlarding his sermons with Greek, Hebrew and Latin, and praised those who preached so that the common people could understand. This subject of popular preaching has been much discussed in Germany down to the present day. There is a greater difference between cultivated people and the masses in Germany and Eng land than in our own country. Yet even in Amer ica, even in New England, with its noble common schools and the omnipresent newspaper, the masses are comparatively ignorant, and need plain preach ing, and we must not forget it.

Luther is a notable example of intense personality in preaching. His was indeed an imperial personality, of rich endowments, varied sympathies and manifold experiences. They who heard him were not only listening to truth, but they felt the man. Those who merely read his writings, in foreign lands and languages, felt the man, were drawn to him, and thus drawn to his gospel. There are conflicting opinions as to what is best in regard to the preacher's personality. Some offensively obtrude themselves, and push the gospel into the background. Others think the ideal is to put the gospel alone before the mind, and let the preacher be entirely forgotten. "Hide yourself behind the cross," is the phrase. What is here intended is well enough, but the statement is extreme, if not misleading. "What is the use of a living preacher, if he is to be really hidden, even by the cross? The true ideal surely is, that the preacher shall come frankly forward, in full personality, modest through true humility and yet bold with personal conviction and fervid zeal and ardent love presenting the gospel as a reality of his own experience, and attracting men to it by the power of a living and present human sympathy and yet all the while preaching not himself, but Christ Jesus the Lord. In the Dresden gallery there is a small por trait by Titian, of a brother painter. He is in the foreground, a fine, rugged face, illuminated with the light of genius, while on one side, and a little in the background is the face of Titian himself, gazing upon his friend with loving, self-forgetting, and contagious admiration. Thus ought we to stand beside the cross. And observe that with all his boldness Luther often trembled at the responsibility of preaching. He says in one of his sermons, "As soon as I learnt from the Holy Scriptures how terror-filled and perilous a matter it was to preach publicly in the church of God there was nothing I so much desired as silence Nor am I now kept in the ministry of the Word, but by an overruled obedience to a will above my own, that is, the divine will ; for as to my own will, it always shrank from it, nor is it fully reconciled unto it to this hour."

What I have time to say of Luther as to preaching must end with a paragraph from the Table Talk, which makes some good hits though very oddly arranged. "A good preacher should have these properties and virtues : first, to teach systematically ; secondly, he should have a ready wit ; thirdly, he should be elegant ; fourthly, he should have a good voice ; fifthly, a good memory ; sixthly, he should know when to make an end ; seventhly, he should be sure of his doctrine ; eighthly, he should venture and engage body and blood, wealth and honor, in the Word; ninthly, he should suffer himself to be mocked and jeered of every one." The expression, "he should know when to make an end," recalls a statement I have sometimes made to students, that public

speaking may be summed up in three things : First, have something to say ; secondly, say it ; third and lastly, quit. As to the preaching of the other leading Reformers, I cannot speak at any length. Melancthon really preached very little. His lectures in Latin on Sundays were designed for his students. He did not enjoy preaching to miscellaneous congregations, and in the vulgar tongue. Zwingli (1484-1531) was a bold and energetic preacher, a thoroughly energetic man, and a most laborious student. Like Luther he was very fond of music, and would set his own Christian songs to music, and accompany them on the lyre. It is a German peculiarity that men have in every age so generally been practical musicians, and the neglect of this in our country is to be deplored. Singing will obviously be of very great profit, in many ways, to all young ministers, and instrumental music must not be considered unmanly or worthless in face of the fact that it has been so much practiced by those great peoples, the Hebrews, the Greeks and the Germans. Zwingli was not merely energetic and ardent, but tenderly emotional, as shown by his sorrowing tears during the great Conference with Luther at Marburg. Beyond even the other Reformers, he made much use of public debates, a practice which had been made common by the schoolmen. In the days of chivalry and tournaments, the professors and students began to hold intellectual tournaments also, two men being pitted against each other, or one man fixing his thesis, and undertaking to maintain it against all comers. You remember that the Reformation began with Luther's theses as to Indulgences ; and through all the period of the Reformation discussions were frequent. In Switzerland more than elsewhere these discussions appear to have produced important results. They seem in general to be most useful where men are unsettled in their opinions and indisposed to wide reading. Among us, they have now almost ceased in the older States, but are continued with keen relish in some parts of the West and South-west. Zwingli had one qualification for public discussions, which has sometimes been considered particularly effective, viz., great readiness in personal abuse as shown, for example, in his writings against those whom he scornfully calls the Catabaptists. Farel, the friend of Calvin, had a blazing French eloquence. But we cannot begin to enumerate. It was an age of great preachers, an age that called spirits from the vasty deep, and in troops they came. Of John Knox and the English Reformation preaching we may have another opportunity to think.

I must not stop without a word as to certain preachers" of that day who have been too much neglected. The Anabaptists of the sixteenth century have so thoroughly a bad name in general literature that some persons would be surprised at the intimation that there were among them preachers of great power. By the help of my friend Dr. Howard Osgood, of Rochester Seminary, who has made the history of the Anabaptists a specialty, I am able to state a few facts of interest. The most distinguished preacher among the Swiss and Moravian Baptists was Balthasar Hiibmaier, whose name is now beginning to be heard of again, and concerning whom you will find a very good article in Herzog's Encyclopadie. He was educated at the University of Freiburg in Baden, and professor, A. D. 1512, in the University of Ingolstadt with the celebrated Eck as his colleague, and afterwards was Cathedral pastor in Regensburg. At these places he gained the fame of the most eloquent man of his day. But reading Luther's earlier works, and then studying the apostle Paul, he joined the reformed party, and in 1523, was a popular preacher in Switzerland, already beginning to deny the propriety of Infant Baptism. In 1525 he was baptized. Then came fierce conflicts with Zwingli at Zurich, and banishment to Moravia, where in two years he brought many thousands into the rising Baptist churches, which then seemed likely to include the whole population. But Moravia fell into the hands of Austria, and Hiibmaier was martyred at

Vienna in 1528. A Reformed contemporary, not a Baptist, called him "truly a most eloquent and most highly cultivated man." Zwingli, in replying to Hiibmaier's treatise on Infant Baptism, uses many hard words as usual, but shows great respect for his abilities. He calls Hiibmaier that distinguished Doctor, and admits (in a passage otherwise highly arrogant) that he has a greater faculty of speaking than himself. The writings of Hiibmaier, which are difficult to obtain, are said to be marked by clearness, directness and force. They chiefly treat of the constitution and ordinances of the church. I find a really beautiful address (A. D. 1525) to the three churches of Kegensburg, Ingolstadt and Freiburg, entitled "The Sum of a truly Christian Life," to be of the nature of a sermon. The arrangement is good, and the divisions distinctly stated. He is decidedly vigorous and acute in argument, making very sharp points. The style is clear and lively when he has begun you feel drawn along, and want to follow him. Zwingli bears unintentional testimony to the excellence, in one important respect, of Hubmaier's method of argumentation. "You are wont to cry, I want no conjectures, bring forward Scripture, make what you say plain by Scripture, etc." To all his later writings Hiibmaier prefixed the motto, "Truth is immortal;" and certainly the hopes he expressed by this motto have been strikingly fulfilled as to the doctrine of religious liberty, which it is said he was among the first to announce and which in a new continent he had barely heard of has at last attained a glorious recognition.

I shall merely mention Conrad Grebel, educator* at Vienna, and for two years the leader of the Swiss Baptists, who is said to have been learned, brilliant, with great power over an audience, an opponent whom Zwingli feared more than all others. And there were other Baptist preachers in Switzerland and South Germany, who were learned and eloquent men. In Holland, Menno Simon, well known in Church History, was for twenty-five years (1536-61) "the greatest of all Baptist missionaries in Northern Europe, establishing hundreds of churches. He was a spiritual-minded man, and deeply versed in the Bible." [3] A translation of his works has been published in Indiana, among the "Mennonites." His contemporary and successor, Dirck Phillips, is said by a Roman Catholic writer to have been "equal to Menno in eloquence and zeal, and superior in learning." We may add Bouwens, a very apostle in Holland and Belgium, whose diary records the baptism of near ten thousand persons baptized by himself, with the places; and this when a great price was set on his head by the merciless Duke of Alva. In conclusion, let us remember that with the Reformation began the free and wide use of printing to aid the work of preaching. In a few years after Luther took decided position, brief and pointed treatises of his were scattered through all Western and Southern Europe. Colporteurs were employed especially for this purpose, besides the much that was done by private exertion. This revived and purified Christianity seized upon the press as an auxiliary to the living preacher. The same course has been more or less pursued ever since, and notably in our own time. And perhaps few have even yet any just conception of the varied and powerful assistance we may derive from printing and this without its being necessary for each church to set up its own newspaper. Every now and then some people discuss the question whether the press be not now more powerful than the pulpit. But really that is an unpractical inquiry. It is our true task and our high privilege, to make the pulpit, with the help of the press, more and more a power and a blessing.

FOOTNOTES [1] Lent, i, p. 229.

[2] For example, That ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints, etc. Luther : " This, however, is only to be attained unto by faith. Love has not anything to

do in this matter, although it is an assistance as being an evidence whereby we are assured of our faith." So on John 17:3; That they may know thee, etc. Luther ; " For here you see the words are plain, and any one may comprehend and understand them. Christ giveth to all that believe eternal life."

[3] Oggood. See a good article in Herzog.

02.04. LECTURE IV. THE GREAT FRENCH PREACHERS.

LECTURE IV. THE GREAT FRENCH PREACHERS. A COMPLETE history of Preaching in France would of course go over ground to which we have hereto fore made some reference. Thus in the medieval times, Peter the Hermit was a Frenchman, and so was St. Bernard. The good work done by the Waldensian preachers in the South of France in the twelfth century, led the Catholics (as we saw) to establish the Dominican order of preachers. And Calvin, though we think of him in connection with Geneva, was in all respects a Frenchman.

It may seem strange that we have almost no accounts of eminent preachers in France before the Middle Ages. And doubtless fuller information would show us that there were many men of power and influence, For the French are a nation highly capable of appreciating and producing eloquence. The dominant Franks did not materially modify the character of the old Keltic stock, and the Kelts were from our earliest knowledge of them, and are still, an eloquent race. Caesar describes to us popular orators among the Gauls who must have spoken with a fiery and passionate eloquence. The Gauls (or Galatians) in Asia Minor received Paul's early preaching with unequalled enthusiasm. The Scotch man who converted the pagan Irish, and whom all Ireland reveres as St. Patrick, must have been, to judge from all accounts given, a preacher of great power over the hearts of men; and so was the Irishman Columba, who two centuries later preached from house to house throughout Scotland. The Irish to the present day are noted for a peculiarly imaginative oratory, not only in politics wherever there has been any political liberty, but also in preaching, notwithstanding the unfavorable influence of Romanism; and the most eloquent preacher in the Church of England at the present time is an Irishman bred and born, the Bishop of Peterborough. The Welsh also have been famous for eloquent preachers. And everywhere, in Galatians, Gauls, Irish, Welsh, and modern Frenchmen, there is the same blazing enthusiasm and mental activity, the same impulsiveness and prompt excitability; the same lively imagination, and (so far as we know) the same quick movements and passionate vehemence in del. very. But instead of searching French history for proofs that in every age they have had preachers not unworthy of the Keltic blood, we shall find it more instructive to come at once to the Golden Age of the French Pulpit Eloquence and French Literature in general, the seventeenth century, the latter half of which is dear to Frenchmen as the age of Louis XIV. Let us carefully note how thoroughly this period in France fulfilled the conditions of highly eloquent preaching. And perhaps this can be best managed for our purpose by planting ourselves in the year in which Bourdaloue first preached before the king, the year 1670 (a little over two centuries ago), when the glorious age of Louis the Great was just reaching its full splendor. [1] The king himself, the centre of everything, is now thirty-two years old, his reign having begun when he was a child of five years. While every great nation around has been losing strength, France has rapidly gained. Germany must require many generations to recover from the exhaustion produced by the terrible Thirty years War, which ended only twenty-two years ago. Spain, which a century ago was the mistress of the world, has lost Holland and part of Flanders, and quite recently lost Portugal, has made a damaging peace with Louis, and under the rule of weak kings and the infamous Inquisition, has sunk into national

weakness and discontent and almost into ruin. England, after the dreadful Civil Wars and the brief rule of Cromwell, has now for ten years been persecuting the Nonconformists and endeavoring to imitate the wretched vices of Charles II, who is but a pitiful vassal of France. Italy, divided into a number of warring states, and busy in the Levant with the Turks, has herself been again and again a battle-ground for the French and the Spaniards. Amid this weakness on every hand, France, long so feeble, has seen her opportunity and improved it. Conde and Turenne have gained many a splendid victory over the Germans and over the once invincible Spanish infantry, covering themselves and their nation with the military glory in which Frenchmen so greatly delight, reviving the memory of that proud time when Charlemagne the Frenchman was Emperor of all Western Europe, and rendering themselves the objects of that enthusiastic popular admiration and love which will some years hence find expression in lofty funeral sermons. At home, the two great Cardinals Kichelieu and Mazarin for forty years carried out with iron firmness the policy of Henry IV. and the Duke of Sully, steadily weakening the old feudal nobility and the once almost independent clergy, and concentrating all power in the crown, until fifteen years ago the young Louis, wise beyond his seventeen years, and conscious of despotic power, coolly gave his order to the Parliament, and uttered his memorable saying, "The State I am the State." Many of the great nobles had in the previous century adopted the then powerful and rapidly growing Reformed religion as a means of making head against the crown, being ready enough, as unscrupulous politicians always are, to patronize any religion that apparently strengthen their own political power. The Reformed (or as we say, Protestants) unwisely accepted the support and protection of these great nobles, and thus religious interests became subordinate to political interests. The successive religious wars, ending with the bloody wars of the Fronde in the early years of Louis, have gradually weakened the nobles and made them dependent on the Crown, and shortly before the year of which we are speaking, many nominally Reformed nobles went over to the dominant church as for example Turenne himself, who in 1668 turned Catholic, at the request of the gracious sovereign who had made him a Marshal and many from among the masses of the Reformed, long used to seeking protection and guidance from the nobility, began rapidly to follow them into the conquering Catholic communion, the church of the splendid court and the all-powerful king. The work of the great Cardinals has been well done, and nine years ago, in 1661, Mazarin was succeeded by Colbert, the gifted minister of Finance, whose financial genius is now rapidly enriching the nation and strengthening the throne. He has introduced from the Low Countries many new forms of manufacture, in which the skilful French fingers and the exquisite French taste are already beginning to surpass their teachers, and fast preparing for the days when Fashion, the mightiest of sovereigns, will sit enthroned in splendid Paris and rule over the civilized world. Along with manufactures Colbert has built up a spreading commerce and a powerful navy. Together with trade in the East and West Indies, he is attempting to rival the Spaniards and English in colonizing America. Some years ago, Canada was organized as a colony, and not many years hence the French will go for the first time down the Mississippi, and up and down its stream will claim a new and grand territory, which after the great king they will name Louisiana. In connection with and by means of all these financial enterprises, which are rapidly increasing the wealth of the country, the acute Minister confirms the triumphs of his predecessors over the feudal system, by building up a wealthy class of burghers, who look to the government for protection of business and property, and help by their financial strength to make the king utterly supreme over the old feudal nobility. Evil enough from this centralization and this wealth may

come in the future, but at present, France rejoices in her growing population and riches, is stimulated by the loftiest national pride, and looks with unutterable admiration to him who seems the embodiment of all her power and splendor and glory, the Great Monarch.

Besides this extraordinary national prosperity, and stimulating national spirit, it is an age of prodigious intellectual activity. In our year 1670, it has been forty-four years since the death of Bacon, whose ideas and methods are now widely known, and twenty-eight years since the death of Galileo, shortly after having (as it has been wittily stated) "at the age of seventy years, begged pardon for being right." Just forty years ago died the great astronomer Kepler, and young Isaac Newton, at the age of twenty-eight, is already working over Kepler's laws. Harvey, who discovered the circulation of the blood, died thirteen years ago, and ten years earlier died Torricelli, who learned the weight of the atmosphere, and invented the barometer. Just about this time were also invented the air-pump, the electrical machine, the pendulum. These grand discoveries and inventions at once indicate and produce great general activity of mind throughout the cultivated circles of Europe. And this activity is seen not merely in physical science, but also in metaphysics. It is twenty years since the death of Descartes, the greatest of French philosophers, who applied the Baconian method of observation and analysis to metaphysics, and has become for France the father of idealism and of rationalism. Spinoza has already written most of his great essays in Pantheistic philosophy, which a few years hence, at his early death, he will leave behind. Malebranche, the leading disciple of Descartes, has reached the age of thirty-two; and Leibnitz, a brilliant youth of twenty-four, living on the Rhine, has since the age of seventeen been issuing a succession of remarkable treatises on philosophy, law and politics working out, among other things, a curious project for inducing Louis XIV. to leave Germany and the Low Countries alone, and turn his ambitious projects towards an invasion of Egypt. Hobbes is still living, at an advanced age; and John Locke, now thirty-eight years old, dissatisfied with the ethical and political results of Hobbes development of sensational philosophy, and stimulated by the writings of Descartes, is profoundly meditating on the faculties of the human mind and the sources of human knowledge, and slowly preparing for his great "Essay on the Human Understanding," which will not appear till twenty years hence. In this year 1670, he writes an impracticable constitution for the American colony which in honor of Charles II. is called Carolina. The inquiring and erudite minds of the age are also drawing together and beginning to act in association. The English Royal Society was chartered ten years ago on the accession of Charles II, but had in fact existed in the time of Cromwell; and Colbert, "jealous of this new glory," has in the last few years encouraged the formation of like societies in France, the Academy of Inscriptions, the Academy of Sciences, the Academy of Music, and also the Royal Library.

Besides, there are admirable Schools of the highest order. The University of Paris is perhaps no longer at the head of Europe, as it was in the later Middle Ages, but it has a great reputation, and in Theology there is no school of higher authority than the Sorbonne. Colleges have been established in numerous towns by the Jesuits, who make teaching a specialty and have reduced it to a science, and the volunteer teaching at Port Royal was a few years ago exerting a potent influence. The great preachers of the age are all men of regular and thorough education.

Along with all this activity in physical and meta physical science, and in education, there has rapidly arisen a general literature of singular richness and vigor and consummate elegance a literature that will be the pride of France for centuries to come. Corneille, who with all his literary

faults has more elevation and nobleness than any other French dramatist, is now an old man, and his works are all well known. Molière, probably the foremost writer of Comedy in all the modern world, has issued nearly all the plays that will be known as his chefs-d oeuvre. Racine is still young, but has published several great tragedies, especially the *Andromache* and the *Britannicus*. Numerous satires of Boileau have been published, and every body is reading some *Fables* of La Fontaine. The *Du de la Rochefoucauld* five years ago sent forth into all hands the *Collection* of shrewd and witty and often mournfully profound *Maxims* in which he essays to show that the motive of all human action is self-love. M^{me}. de Sevigne, very highly educated and wonderfully attractive notwithstanding her lack of personal beauty, is admired and influential in court circles, and devoutly fond of pulpit eloquence, and will begin next year the correspondence with her daughter which is to make her the most famous letter writer in the world. Above all, Pascal, the prince of French prose-writers, the marvel of precocity, of mathematical knowledge and physical discovery and philosophical thought, and the deeply humble and devout Christian, who died eight years ago, had five years before his death published his "*Provincials*," a work of such literary excellence and charm, such keen and delicious satire, that all France is reading it; and even the Jesuits, though they hate, malign and affect to despise him, yet secretly read his wonderful book. In consequence of Pascal's unpopularity as a Jansenist, it will be some years before the publication of his "*Thoughts*," a collection of papers he has left behind him, consisting of mere fragments, yet rich in the profoundest Christian wisdom, and destined to be lovingly studied for long years to come. By these great writers the French language has been developed and disciplined into the very highest excellence of which it seems capable. In liquid clearness, vivacious movement and delicate grace it is unsurpassed among ancient or modern tongues, while not equal to Greek or to English in flexibility and in energy. Only a few years later than 1670 it will supersede the Latin as the language of European diplomacy. In Art as well as in Literature the age is marked by great activity and decided excellence. It is but forty years since the death of Rubens and Van Dyk, while Rembrandt is still living at the age of sixty-eight, and Murillo, in Spain, at about the same age. The great French painter, Poussin, died seven years ago, and Claude Lorraine, who will long continue to be regarded as the foremost of landscape painters, is seventy years old. The art of painting has just reached its height of power and popularity in France; of all the great French Academies the earliest was the Academy of Painting, established in 1648. In Architecture, Paris already boasts the Louvre, the Palais Royal, and many other noble structures; and there is a youth of twenty-three, named Mansard, who will add greatly to the architectural glories of Paris and of Versailles, and will hand down his name to a curious immortality in connection with a peculiar style of roof which he has invented.

We thus perceive that when Bourdaloue first preached before the king, in 1670, it was an age well suited to the attainment of excellence in anything that belongs to the realm of thought or of art. The nation was powerful, glorious, wealthy and vigorously governed. A strong sentiment of nationality fostered national literature in every department. Startling progress in physical science and novelties in metaphysics were stirring men's minds. A popular despotism left no room for political activity or aspiration, while a grand outburst of general literature had awakened an excited interest. It was an Augustan age. And certain peculiar circumstances stimulated French Catholics at that time to the pursuit of pulpit eloquence.

One of these was the fact that the Reformed, or Protestants in France had long possessed able and eloquent preachers. The indefatigable Jesuits, organized to contend against Protestantism in every way, perceived, now that the Civil Wars were over, that it was desirable to rival the Protestants in preaching, and began to use all their immense influence in the encouragement of pulpit eloquence.

Another stimulating circumstance was the rise of the Jansenists, proclaiming much the same truths that we call the "doctrines of grace," distinguished for learning, and educational influence, for deep piety and literary power. In the famous schools at Port Royal were taught such men as Tillemon, the Church Historian, and the poet Racine. Among the teachers was De Saci, who made the French version of the Bible which has taken fast hold on the popular heart, and Arnauld, the fruitful and powerful polemic; and there was not a Jesuit in all France who did not smart and burn under the delicate and stinging sarcasms of the Port Royalist Pascal.

Now the Jansenists did not particularly cultivate eloquence. But the Jansenists of Port Royal had great power at Court. And the shrewd Jesuits, looking around for every means of gaining the superiority over these hated rivals, perceived that much might be done through the penchant of the king for eloquent preaching. This was the most singular of all the circumstances I have referred to as stimulating the French Catholic preaching of that age, the fact that Louis XIV. so greatly delighted in pulpit eloquence. It was a curious idiosyncrasy. He not merely took pleasure in orations marked by imagination, passion and elegance, as a good many monarchs have done, but he wanted earnest and kindling appeals to the conscience, real preaching. In fact, Louis was in his own way a very religious man. He tried hard to serve God and Mammon, and Ashtoreth to boot. His preachers saw that he listened attentively, that his feelings could be touched, his conscience could sometimes be reached. They were constantly hoping to make him a better man, and through him to exert a powerful influence for good upon the Court and the nation. Thus they had the highest possible stimulus to zealous exertions. And although they never made Louis a good man, yet his love for preaching, and for preaching that powerfully stirred the soul, brought about this remarkable result, that it became the fashion of that brilliant Court to attend church with eager interest, and to admire preachers who were not simply agreeable speakers but passionately in earnest. Not a few in the court circle were striving like the king to be at once worldly and religious, some were truly devout, but everybody recognized that it was "quite the thing" to be an admirer of pulpit eloquence. I know of but one other example in the history of preaching in which this was the height of the fashion in a splendid and wicked court. That other instance is Constantinople, at the time when Gregory Nazianzen and afterwards Chrysostom preached there; and we remember how brief and unsatisfactory was their career in the great capital. Here at Paris the experiment lasted longer. And notice that as most of the hearers really went only because it was fashionable, and must have their taste gratified, and as the French taste for literature and art was now very highly cultivated, so the great court preachers, while intensely earnest, must also be literary artists of the highest order.

Such were the general and special conditions under which the Catholic pulpit attained under the reign of Louis XIV and under that reign alone such extraordinary power and splendor.

Let us now briefly note the principal preachers, both Protestant and Catholic, of that epoch. We can divide into three periods : (1) The period before Bossuet, (2) Bossuet and Bourdaloue and

their contemporaries, (3) Massillon and Saurin. In the two generations preceding the career of Bossuet, we find the French Catholic pulpit at a very low stage. Recent writers have shown that the Catholic preachers of that time consisted of two classes. Some, rhetorical and full of ancient learning but destitute of devoutness, mingled paganism and Christianity, even illustrating the Passion of Christ by the sacrifice of Iphigenia, the bravery with which Mucius Scaevola plunged his hand into the flames, and the mourning of the Romans over the death of Julius Caesar. A later French writer said of them, "One needed prodigious knowledge in order to preach so badly." Others, rude and vulgar, appealed to the tastes and passions of the ignorant, very much after the fashion of what we call hardshell preachers. Thus, as it has been said, "The court preachers ruined religion by adapting it to the taste of the beau monde, while the vulgar haranguers ruined it also by adapting it to the taste of the multitude." There were of course some exceptions. Voltaire mentions one preacher, Lingendes, about 1630, and mentions him as he does so many things, with a malicious purpose* This Lingendes left among his manuscripts some good funeral sermons, and Voltaire says that Flechier, in his funeral discourse for Marshal Turenne, borrowed from one of these his text, the entire exordium, and several considerable passages besides. It has been recently shown that Bourdaloue also borrows from the same preacher some ideas and an occasional short passage, and that some of Bourdaloue's plans in Panegyrics resemble those of P. Senault, a preacher then much in vogue for ornate erudition and rhetoric. But the Reformed or Protestant pulpit of that period was, as I have already stated, occupied by some really able men, whose sermons had such power and literary merit as to be published and widely read. These men, long overshadowed by the celebrated Catholic and, Protestant preachers of the next generations, have received tardy justice from the noble work of Vinet, "History of Preaching among the Reformed of France in the seventeenth century," a work containing just such biographical notices, representative extracts and critical estimates as one desires to have, and a model which I trust some of those present may one day follow in depicting important periods in the history of the English and American pulpit. Drawing upon Vinet, let me briefly mention three or four of these men, who show conclusively that the Protestant preachers in this first half of the century were far in advance of the Catholic preachers.

Du Moulin (Miller), 1568-1658, was a famous preacher in Paris and afterwards at Sedan. He had been educated in England, and professor of philosophy in Scotland. While pastor in Paris, an attempt was made by James I. of England to use him in a plan for uniting the French and English Protestants into one church. Banished for these political complications, he took refuge at Sedan (which did not then belong to France), and lived there as professor of theology and pastor. Du Moulin published more than seventy-five works, including ten volumes of sermons. He seems not to have been a man of the highest genius, but full of vigor and good sense, powerful in controversy, practical and pointed. He was regarded by the Catholics as their most formidable antagonist, and his works long continued to be bulwarks of Protestantism. Fenelon undertook to refute one of them, near the close of the century. The style of Du Moulin is marked by the homeliness and brusque freedom belonging to what French critics call the Gallic period of their language, before the men of Louis XIV. had reduced it to an elegant bondage. And he was purposely simple in the arrangement of discourses, and direct and downright in utterance, because he regarded that as the duty of a preacher of the gospel a view which certainly contains important elements of truth.

Faucheur (1585-1657) was a man of culture and taste, and "essentially a preacher." He wrote a treatise on Oratorical Delivery, which is said to be elegant in expression and full of wisdom. And yet, while a careful student of the art of preaching, his own preaching was direct and simple. Surely this is as it should be. Faucheur published eight volumes of sermons. His style is remarkable for movement. From beginning to end of the discourses he seems never to touch the ground." There is never a moment of distraction or cessation, but he presses right on. Now this may be an excellence, but may be a fault; and it is a matter in regard to which Americans of to day are in some danger of fault, being so restless and excitable. Good preaching must have movement, but not uniform in velocity or on the same level. If a discourse is to be highly impassioned anywhere, it cannot be equally impassioned everywhere. Study the great musical compositions what variety as to rapidity of movement, and as to passion. So oratory requires a basis of repose, with alternations of passion and quiet, of more rapid and less rapid movement. Yet some of our preachers and Anniversary speakers seem to think, and some hearers seem to agree with them, that one must go like the fast mail trains. We do not give a man a chance to be really eloquent, if we require him to be always rapid, if we are too restless to tolerate repose.

Faucheur was a master of language. Vinet maintains that he anticipated Pascal in using what was destined to become the modern French; in knowing how, "at that moment of crisis, to choose in the ancient tongue what the future was going to preserve, and amid the numerous new expressions those which the future was going to adopt." Pascal has the glory of having fixed the language. "He did it, not by introducing new words or constructions, but by giving the seal of his genius to a language which existed already, and which we find in his earlier contemporary, Faucheur." A professor of philosophy at the age of eight teen, and called when Tery young to a leading pulpit near Paris, was Mestrezat 1592-1657, of whom it is said by Bayle, a sufficiently impartial critic* " There are no sermons that contain a sublimer theology than those which he preached on the Epistle to the Hebrews."

Omitting several others, let us notice Daille 1594-1670, whose little work "On the right use of the Fathers" became very popular, and continues to be valued to the present day. He published twenty volumes of sermons, which show that while not a highly eloquent man, he was an able reasoner, full of good sense, and with a familiar, neat and flowing style. He was the first Frenchman whose controversial religious works ever became popular, and the first Protestant whose literary merits are known to have been recognized among the Catho lics.

Balzac, a literary man of distinction (1592- 1654), one of the original members of the French Academy, and who has left some excellent prose, appears to have greatly admired Daille. He speaks in a letter of a visit received from him, in which Daille " said such good things and said them so well that I assure you no conversation ever satisfied me more than that, nor left in my mind more agreeable images." In another letter he speaks in the strongest terms of Daille's sixth sermon on the Resurrection, saying, "What an excellent production! how worthy of the primitive church! How powerful the preacher is in persuasion! and how convincing are his proofs!....! have never read anything more rational and more judicious! "

Now it may he observed that these able and popular Protestant preachers all flourished before Bossuet began his career, and that Daille, the latest of those mentioned, died in the year 1670, in which Bourdaloue first preached before the king. Each of them preached for many years in Paris,

and their numerous and spirited controversial writings, together with the number of Protestant nobility who attended their ministrations, must have drawn to them the constant notice of the Catholic teachers and preachers.

I think it follows not only that there were eminent Protestant preachers before the outburst of Catholic eloquence, which is manifest^[3] but that their ability and popularity must have stimulated the Catholics to rivalry.

We now reach the great Catholic preachers, Bossuet and Bourdaloue. Of these, every one among us has some knowledge, and I shall attempt only to present points of special interest and instruction.

Bossuet (1627-1704) was of good family, and reared in a house full of books, of which he early became passionately fond, delighting in Latin and Greek literature. One day, in the library, the boy came across a copy of the Bible, which he had never read. It was open at Isaiah, and, fascinated with the sublime poetry, he went on eagerly reading, and at length burst forth and read aloud to his father and uncle, who had been talking politics, and who now "listened, half awe-struck, to the boyish reciter." From this time the book he most loved was the Bible. Through life he always carried a Bible with him on his journeys, and almost every day, his secretary says, made fresh notes on the margin. He knew by heart almost the entire text (for he had a prodigious memory), and yet seemed always to read with as much attention and interest as if he had never read it before. His preaching abounds in felicitous Scripture quotation and remark. And who can tell how much this passion for Scripture, beginning with Isaiah, did to foster his eloquence to develop that chastened splendor, that sublime but subdued magnificence of imagery and diction, which makes him the very perfection, the beau ideal of French eloquence? This story of his finding the Bible might remind one of Luther; and it is to be noticed that these greatest of Catholic preachers all showed loving familiarity with the Bible. But the difference also is great and characteristic. Luther found Romans, and finally learned from it justification by faith; Bossuet found the book of Isaiah, and was fascinated by its poetry. And through life this difference was maintained. Bossuet drew from the Bible sublime sentiments; Luther drew from it the central truths, the very life-blood, of the gospel of salvation. At fifteen Bossuet was profoundly studying at a college in Paris the philosophy of Descartes, whose writings were just becoming generally known, he being thirty years older than Bossuet. At sixteen he maintained a thesis of philosophy with such distinguished success, that he received the foolish invitation to come suddenly, at 11 p. M., to a house in Paris which was a centre of literary fashion, and there before a brilliant audience to preach upon a text assigned. The result made him at once a celebrity. All this was very unhealthy, but it shows the kind of artificial relish for pulpit eloquence which already (1641) pervaded the court circle, and what sort of atmosphere was breathed by these great preachers. Some other young men had become popular preachers in Paris before taking orders, and Bossuet was saved from this by the advice of a bishop, who urged him to turn away from such premature popularity and become mature in culture and character before he preached much in the capital. This was doubtless the turning-point of Bossuet's career, which decided that he was not to be the meteor of a moment but an abiding luminary. How often are brilliant young men spoiled by the applause bestowed on a few early efforts silly admirers persuading them that their gifts lift them above all ordinary dependence on training and experience. It is precisely such men who most imperatively need thorough discipline.

Bossuet finally graduated at twenty-one, making a remarkable address in the presence of the great Prince of Conde, who from that time was his friend. He spent some years of faithful labor as archdeacon of Metz, (how strangely sound these names, Metz and Sedan, after recent occurrences,) and at the age of thirty-three began to preach before the king. For the next ten years he preached regularly in Paris, and often before the court. Then Bourdaloue came; Bossuet was made bishop of Meaux, and afterwards seldom preached in Paris, except his great Funeral Orations. I cannot speak of his subsequent work as instructor to the Dauphin, for whose use he wrote the Discourse on Universal History, the first attempt at a Philosophy of History. Nor of his great work on the Variations of Protestantism, probably the most effective polemic against Protestantism that has ever been written acute, adroit, a trifle unscrupulous, and in style most attractive Bossuet was capable, as he had shown when a lad, of absolutely improvising with great power, but he was very unwilling to preach without some written preparation. Most of his sermons were preached from a brief sketch, often in pencil jotting down the "points, and the prominent lessons he wished to teach." Some of them were written and rewritten, with the greatest care, and then recited. Yet he very earnestly condemned those who in preparing a sermon think more of "its effect in print" than of its effect in the act of preaching.

He possessed in the highest degree the physical requisites to eloquence having a fine, in fact a strikingly handsome and majestic person, with a voice powerful and pleasing, and perfect grace of manner. His style is the perfection of French, the glory of French literature clear, vivid, drawing you on from beginning to end, with skilful variety in topic, imagery, and passion or repose of expression, and throughout a grace, a felicity, a charming elegance, that in all the world has scarcely been rivalled. A gifted pupil of mine once said, "I read Bossuet with admiring despair." This is not an unhealthy feeling at the first blush of acquaintance, for it may be presently followed by admiring study, not with the hope of rivalling, but with longing to enjoy more fully, and to learn sweet lessons of refined taste, and love of the truly beautiful in literary art.

Yet I cannot concur in the opinion now almost universal among French critics, that Bossuet is the greatest of their preachers. I think that honor belongs to Bourdaloue (1632-1704), whom the French now place even lower than Massillon. Bourdaloue appeals especially to the intellect and the conscience, and while also highly imaginative and impassioned he is not in these respects equal to the others. Bossuet appeals especially to the imagination and the taste, and so the most characteristic and the most popular of his discourses are the Funeral Orations, in which the requisites are graceful narration, high-wrought imagery and delicate sentiment. These, together with his charming style, are what the average French writer of to-day most highly appreciates. It is precisely in these things, as seen in his Funeral Orations and Panegyrics, that Bourdaloue is least successful. Bossuet is also honored by the modern litterateur because of the great and lasting distinction of his other works, while Bourdaloue has left almost nothing but sermons. Massillon, on the other hand, has marvellous power in touching the feelings, in awakening tender emotions, together with great clearness, ease and beauty of style. Secular critics relish that which excites emotion, which is sweetly pathetic or awe-inspiring, much more than that which, through convictions of the intellect, makes its stern demand on the conscience. These considerations may account for the fact that such a change has occurred in the judgment of critics. Their own contemporaries regarded Bourdaloue as decidedly superior to Bossuet.

Bourdaloue's father was a lawyer, of good family, and a gifted speaker. The son was educated at a Jesuit college, and naturally became a Jesuit notwithstanding his father's opposition. In his studies he showed a special talent for mathematics, which easily connects itself with the prominence of analysis and argument in his preaching. After graduating, he was directed, according to the wise Jesuit usage, to spend some years in teaching, which is often a particularly good preparation for the life-work of preaching. He first taught grammar, classic literature and rhetoric, afterwards philosophy, and finally theology. During this period, he wrote a brief treatise on Rhetoric. For ten years, including the later years of his teaching, he preached as a sort of home missionary. While thus preaching at Rouen, his sermons drew great crowds, and the Jesuit authorities began to understand his power and value. A Jesuit associate says: "All the mechanics left their shops, and the merchants their business, the lawyers left the palace and the doctors, their patients." And he good-humoredly adds:

"For my part, when I preached there the next year, I put everything straight again; nobody left his business any more." So at the age of thirty-seven, after this long course of study, teaching and provincial preaching, Bourdaloue is brought to Paris. In a few months we hear that the church overflows, and a caustic letter-writer adds that "these good Fathers of the Society proclaim him as an angel descended from heaven." They see that here is a man who will do them honor, and strengthen their position in the rivalry with the Jansenists. The next year 1670, he preached before the king, and Madame de Sevign, who was from first to last his ardent admirer, says he acquitted himself "divinely." For thirty-four years from that time Bourdaloue was the leading court-preacher, only in the last five years outshone by young Massillon. He preached the Advent and Lent series by turns before the king and in the principal parishes in Paris, in the former case "making the courtiers tremble," as we are told by Madame de Sevigne, and in the parish churches "attracting such crowds that the carriages were coming for hours in advance, and trade was interrupted in the neighboring streets." He also frequently preached in the humble village churches, and it is said that the people were astonished at the simplicity of his language, and would say, "Is this the famous Paris preacher? Why, we understood all he said." A like story is told of Tillotson, of Archibald Alexander, and of various others.

Bourdaloue, as already observed, is remarkable for profound thought and forcible argument. Voltaire says, "He appears to wish rather to convince than to touch the feelings; and he never dreams of pleasing." And yet he does please, in a high degree, and does sometimes deeply move. Is not this a preacher of the highest order occupied with noble thoughts, aiming to move through instruction and conviction, and pleasing without an effort, and without diverting attention from truth and duty?

It is especially in treating moral subjects that Bourdaloue is a model. There had been no preaching of great merit in this respect since Basil and Chrysostom, and perhaps no one in later times has treated moral subjects in so instructive and admirable a manner as Bourdaloue. He analyzes the topic with conspicuous ability, and depicts with a master hand the beauty of virtuous living, and the terrible nature and consequences of vice. It is interesting to compare his pictures of life with those of his contemporary Moliere, the latter presenting always the ludicrous side, which entertains but seldom greatly profits, while the preacher, with his mind all on sin and eternity and God, will not let you think of vice as amusing, but makes you shudder at its wickedness and its awful results. There is no more remarkable example of Bourdaloue's excellence in this respect than his sermon on

Impurity. At any time it would have been difficult to treat this subject in that licentious capital and court, with that shameful example in the king himself, but there were special difficulties at the moment. There had recently been discovered, in the case of a countess, a series of the most frightful poisonings and other crimes, in connection with the most shameless and incredible debauchery. All Paris shuddered. It was then that Bourdaloue spoke, with a boldness that amazes and almost alarms us, and yet without a touch of real indelicacy, without a word to awaken prurient curiosity. There are many other instructive examples among his numerous discourses on subjects of morality. It has appeared to me that few preachers treat this class of subjects with decided skill, or so frequently as is to be desired; and I think Bourdaloue is in this regard eminently worthy of early and careful study. If I might add a slight suggestion, it would be as follows : To eulogize virtues is often more useful than to assail vices. And in attempting to depict vices, have a care of two things : (1) That you do not seem to know more of these matters than a preacher ought to know; (2) that you do not excite curiosity and amusement rather than abhorrence. The famous story that Bourdaloue one day described in his sermon an adulterer, and then looking at the king, solemnly said, " Tu es ille vir," is pronounced by the most recent biographer an invention; but he does not present the evidence and we cannot judge. At any rate Bourdaloue was constantly saying very pointed things, which the king could not but feel were meant for him, and yet Louis had so much of good sense and conscience, and saw so clearly the preacher's sincerity and honesty, that he took no offence. In fact, strict morality is not really an unpopular theme. People feel that the preacher ought to say these things, and that they ought to hear them. So once when some courtiers suggested that Bourdaloue spoke too boldly and pointedly, the king replied: "The preacher has done his duty; it is for us to do ours."

Bourdaloue was a great student, but was also fond of society, and himself sprightly and even humorous in conversation. It was thus that he came to know so well the character and wants of his time. He often met Racine, Mme. de Sevigne", Boileau. Let a preacher seize every opportunity of free conversation with the most cultivated and the most ignorant, being more solicitous in both cases to hear than to speak, and then he may be able in preaching to bring home his message to the " business and bosoms" of all.

"We can say but a word of Fenelon (1651-1715,) who was a younger contemporary of Bossuet and Bourdaloue, Both gifted and good in an extraordinary degree, educated with the greatest care, perhaps the foremost of all French preachers in that unctious in which the French so greatly delight, with the highest charm of style, and great actual popularity as a preacher, he has left us to conjecture his pulpit power, with the help of four sermons which are believed to have been written in his early life, and which are not of remarkable excellence. This was certainly carrying to a great extreme the preference for unwritten preaching, which he has so eloquently exhibited in his beautiful Dialogues on Eloquence. Why did he not write at least some discourses after preaching them, like Chrysostom and like Robert Hall? He severely condemns Bourdaloue's method of strict recitation, and as a matter of general theory the condemnation is undoubtedly just, but why refuse to write at all? In all practical matters he who prefers one plan road not utterly abjure others. And as to methods of preparing and delivering sermons, the highest and noblest standard is that privately stated by a living preacher, "I wish to be master of all methods, and slave of none."

Two Protestant contemporaries of Bossuet and Bourdaloue were men of distinguished ability.

Du Bosc (1623-1692,) was of good family, and highly educated. You notice that, as already remarked, all the great preachers of this epoch, Protestant and Catholic, were thoroughly educated, and most of them reared in good society. Besides great clearness of thought, fertility of invention and richness of imagination, Du Bosc had singular physical advantages, being extremely well-made, with a voice at once agreeable and powerful, and vigorous health. In 1668 he appeared before the king, to entreat that he would not, as proposed, take away certain rights of the Protestants. After hearing him through, the king went into the queen's chamber and said, "Madame, I have just listened to the best speaker in my kingdom." And turning to the courtiers he repeated. "It is certain that I never heard any one speak so well." He had then often heard Bossuet, though never Bourdaloue. The address of Du Bosc is given in full by Vinet, together with copious extracts from sermons, and is a truly noble specimen of eloquence, worthy to be generally known. Du Bosc early became pastor at Caen, in Normandy, and three several invitations to churches in Paris could never draw him away from the flock he loved. The most famous Protestant preacher of the time was Olaude (1619-1687). His father was a minister of great knowledge, who carefully educated him at home, and then sent him to study philosophy and theology at Montauban. For some years he was pastor of a small church, where he could devote a great part of his time to study. A young minister who wishes to make the most of himself must give at least one-third of his time to studies which look not to next Sunday but to coming years; and this can usually be best done in a small charge. Claude became pastor in Paris at the age of forty-seven, and from that time was the soul of the Reformed party, being especially vigorous in oral and written controversy with the Catholics. A book of his in reply to a work by the Jansenists Arnault! and Nicole, was eagerly circulated by the Jesuits, who were ready for anything to damage the Jansenists. Claude's oral controversy with Bossuet attracted great attention. The high-born Protestant lady who brought it about was already disposed to go over as so many of the Keformed nobility were then doing and she soon after became a Catholic. But Claude sustained himself with great ability against the most splendid polemic in France. Even Bossuet's report shows that his arguments were acute and powerful, and the great bishop says, "I feared for those who heard him." When the edict of Nantes was revoked, in 1685, Claude was especially named, and required to quit the kingdom in twenty-four hours. He knew it some days in advance, and his farewell to his flock is a noble and affecting monument of that time of trial. His ordinary discourses, of which but one volume was left, seldom show intense passion, and were very carefully wrought out and revised; yet with all their careful composition and purity of style, there is rapid movement that spirited dash which belongs alike to French soldiers and to French orators, and which is so admirable in both. Claude's Essay on the Composition of a Sermon was for a century and a half the favorite Protestant text-book. The editions of Robert Robinson and Charles Simeon are well known. Its great fault is that it teaches the construction of sermons on too stiff and uniform a plan. Both by example and in precept Claude protests against the extreme rhetorical brilliancy in which the national taste of the time delighted, which his great Catholic contemporaries cultivated as necessary in court-preachers, and to which some of the Protestant preachers had become a little inclined. The general feeling among the Reformed was that a preacher should eschew oratory. When this fact is taken into the account, I think it becomes clear that Claude and Du Bosc, though inferior in splendid eloquence and in real power, are yet worthy to be named even with Bossuet and Bourdaloue. As to the remaining period of that great age, a briefer account must suffice. There are two conspicuous names, Massillon and Saurin.

Massillon (1663-1742) had an early history quite similar to that of his great predecessors. Obscure origin, but college education, monastic retirement, then professor of Belles-lettres and of Theology, and at the age of thirty-six named court-preacher, in 1699, five years before the death of Bossuet and Bourdaloue. He greatly admired Bourdaloue, but avowedly determined to pursue a very different course. His theory, as given by the nephew who edited his works, was as follows : The preacher must not go into much detail upon points of character and life which concern only a part of his hearers, as particular callings, ages, etc., but must aim at universal interest, and this is found chiefly in the passions. Accordingly Massillon habitually assumes principles as granted, or establishes them very briefly, and then proceeds to analyze and depict the reasons why men do not conform to these principles, as found in their passions (in the broad sense), including appetites, sloth, ambition, avarice, etc., and to expose the numerous self-deceptions by which men quiet conscience. Now this certainly represents one very important department of preaching. But observe two things as to what he condemns. (1) What is addressed to one class of persons may be made very interesting and profitable to others. as for example, sermons to the young may interest the old, sermons to Christians may impress the irreligious, and vice versa. (2) It would not be well if all preachers took principles for granted. It is necessary for some minds, and interesting to many, to have principles established and confirmed by the preacher. In fact, Massillon seems to have been too much influenced by the desire to take a different tack from Bourdaloue, and thus to have made his own methods one-sided. But all the world knows what wonderful power he had in exciting emotion. Appealing to the passions is an important part of the preacher's work, though not the highest part; and no finer example of it can be found than in Massillon, together with a style of singular ease and sweetness. But when he is lauded as one of the very greatest of preachers, then I say, compare his most famous sermon, " On the small number of the Elect," with the somewhat similar sermon of Jonathan Edwards, "Sinners in the hands of an angry God," and you will feel that the one is superficial and artificial, compared with the tremendous power of the other. Massillon's nephew says his sermon* were not composed, as one might suppose, with slow toil, but "with a facility akin to the miraculous; not one of them cost more than ten or twelve days." His delivery was not declamatory, like that of Bourdaloue and most Frenchmen, but comparatively quiet; yet he seemed to be completely possessed and penetrated by his subject which is often far more impressive than "tearing passion to tatters/ while in the French Court it had the charm of novelty. In 1718 he preached before Louis XV., then nine years old, ten sermons in Lent, which are commonly known as his Petit Careme, "Little Lent." They are probably the earliest examples of sermons addressed to a child, and are admirable for their simplicity and sweetness. The great Protestant preacher Saurin (1677-1730) was a contemporary of Massillon, but connection between them was impossible, for Saurin was a child of but eight years when the revocation of the Edict drove him and his father to Geneva. His father was a lawyer, famous for his elegant style. At Geneva, then "the capital of the Protestant world," the youth had great advantages for education. At seventeen he enlisted in a volunteer corps of refugees to help William of England against Louis XIV., and proved a gallant young soldier, at the same time often conducting religious worship and even preaching to his comrades. After three years, when peace was made, he returned and studied three years longer at Geneva, gaining great distinction as a student. His exercises in oratory "drew a crowd, for which on one occasion it was necessary to open the doors of the cathedral." His five years as a pastor were spent in London, with a small church of French refugees. Here, like a true Protestant, he married a wife. Yet, though a real love affair, this union

did not turn out very well. Unexampled as the case may be, the minister's wife was of an unlucky disposition; and being blessed with the company of a mother-in-law, sister-in-law, and two brothers-in-law, she made the house too hot to hold them. A bad manager she was, too, while he, for his part, was negligent and wastefully generous.

Well, well, but he was a great preacher, and when London fogs proved unhealthy, they created him a new position at the Hague, where he spent his remaining twenty-five years in extraordinary popularity and usefulness. Places in his church were engaged a fortnight in advance by the most distinguished persons, and people climbed up on ladders to look in at the windows. The famous scholar Le Clerc (Clericus) long refused to hear him, on the ground that a Christian preacher should have nothing oratorical, and he "distrusted effects produced rather by a vain eloquence than by force of argument." One day he consented to go, on condition that he should sit behind the pulpit, so as not to see the oratorical action. At the end of the sermon he found himself in front of the pulpit, with tears in his eyes. For Saurin was a true orator. While not devoting himself, like the great Catholic preachers, to the art of eloquence, he possessed an energetic nature, a powerful imagination, a good person and voice, and his delivery, though commonly quiet, often swelled into passionate earnestness. And he was also a great thinker, beyond even Bourdaloue, probably beyond any other French preacher except Calvin. The doctrinal views we call Calvinism compel men to think deeply, if they are capable of thinking at all. It is then not strange that the published sermons of Saurin at once gained a great reputation throughout the Protestant world, and exerted a most wholesome influence. In Germany, where preaching was then at a low ebb, it is believed that Mosheim and his School derived much inspiration from Saurin, and at a later period Reinhard frankly acknowledged great indebtedness to this noble French model. There were numerous English translations, but that of Robert Robinson has, I believe, superseded all the others. Among all these great French preachers, I should say, read mainly in Bourdaloue and Saurin. His last years were saddened by the harsh assaults of some ministers who were envious and jealous. Alas! that old and bitter, that too often repeated story of ministerial jealousy. But why did French pulpit eloquence so suddenly fail, after rising so high? Why is it that after Massillon and Saurin you do not know the name of any French preacher for almost a century? [2] We can easily see, as we saw before in the time of Chrysostom and Augustine, the cause of this decline. Protestantism was crushed in France, its best elements banished, and the few who remained and continued faithful, were destitute of the means of culture, for ministers and for people, while the refugees in foreign countries would generally continue to worship in French for only one or two generations. The Catholics, for their part, not only lost the stimulating rivalry of Protestant preaching, but also the artificial stimulus of Louis XIV.'s love for pulpit eloquence. Massillon, after preaching the aged king's funeral, and trying to make some impression on the child that succeeded him, retired to his diocese, and for many years preached faithfully there, but never revisited the court. And now that Jainism and Protestantism were gone, infidelity and corruption struck deep and spread widely and rapidly through the nation. There can be no true eloquence where there is not hope of carrying your point, and preachers could have little hope of doing good in the days when Voltaire and his associates led the national thought, and when the king could say, "After me, the deluge." About 1775 a Jesuit preacher at Notre-Dame did give several sermons that manifestly had something in them. A biographical sketch at a later period mentioned that this preacher's discourses had a rather peculiar character, and that "people thought they saw errors in them." It has since come to light that the worthy Jesuit preached a whole volume of extracts from Saurin, word for word.

These things being considered, we have little occasion to concur in Voltaire's explanation of the decay of pulpit eloquence, viz., that the subject had been exhausted, and nothing was now possible but commonplace. And how is it that of late we have eloquent French preaching again? Napoleon gave the Protestants toleration and support, which the subsequent governments have not disturbed. About the same time there was in Switzerland a reaction to evangelical sentiments, producing Vinet, D Aubigne, and Caesar Malan. As soon as there was time for educational opportunities to show their effect among the French Protestants, we hear of Adolphe Monod, a man of rare eloquence. James W. Alexander, hearing him on two different European journeys, each time declared him the most eloquent preacher living; and it seems to me doubtful whether, with the exception of Robert Hall, the century has produced his equal. About the same time came the elder Coquerel, a man of great power in the pulpit. It is difficult to gain information upon the question, but my impression is that in this century as in the seventeenth, effective preaching in France began with the Protestants. I know not whether this Protestant movement had produced any conscious effect on the erratic Lacordaire, who thirty years ago began to revive at Notre-Dame the traditions of the old Dominicans as a preaching order; or on the Jesuit Father Felix, who followed him in that celebrated pulpit, to be succeeded himself a few years ago by the well known Father Hyacinthe. Of Protestants the most famous at the present time are the younger Coquerel, and Bersier, whom I heard repeatedly in Paris some years ago, who has published several volumes of sermons, and whom not many living preachers equal in true eloquence. In conclusion, let us briefly notice certain faults in the French preachers, especially in the great Catholic preachers of the seventeenth century.

They never suggest much beyond what they say This is a general defect of French style, arising from the passion for clearness. "Whatever is not clear is not French," they repeat with a just pride. But by consequence, they avoid saying anything that can not be said with entire clearness. And so we find little of that rich suggestiveness, which is common in the best English speaking and writing, and even more in the German.

There is a monotonous uniformity of elegance. They are never familiar, never for a moment homely. There is nothing of anecdote, scarcely anything of narrative illustration. Like the court of Louis XIV., they never appear save in full dress. And so many elegant discourses finally weary us with their glitter, like the pictures in the galleries of the Louvre. In fine, these sermons, with all their merit, are too plainly a work of art. The art is very perfect, such as in a drama or a romance we might regard with unalloyed satisfaction. But for preaching it is too prominent. We sigh for something unmistakably natural, real, genuine. As artists, then, the great French preachers may be to us most instructive and inspiring masters. But when it comes to actual preaching, then the highest art nay, the old maxim is itself superficial and misleading, for our aim should be not simply to have art and conceal it, but to rise above art or, if we must state it in Latin, *summa ars artem superare*.

NOTE. Since the lecture was delivered, a letter has been received from M. Bersier (see above, page 183), in reply to some inquiries, and I take the liberty of extracting as follows :

"The Catholic pulpit is singularly sterile at our epoch in France. We may say that since Lacordaire, Ravignan, and Father Hyacinthe no orator has appeared of real excellence. Father Felix, of the order of the Jesuits, has preached with a certain success for several Lent seasons at Notre Dame,

and just now they are trying to bring into vogue the name of Father Monsabre. But neither of them rises to the height of his task. Their fundamental characteristic is the ultramontane logic, developing inflexibly the principles of the Syllabus, hurling them as a defiance against contemporary society, and saying to it: Submit to Rome, or thou art lost. No profound study of the Scriptures, no psychology, nothing truly interior, or persuasive. It is the method of outward authority brought into the pulpit, with the arid procedures of the scholastic demonstration a thing at once empty and pretentious.

"In the Protestant Church of France, one may name M. Coulin, of Geneva, who has made at Paris remarkable sermons on the Son of Man; M. Dhombres of Paris, a highly practical orator and full of unction; and in the Liberal party Messrs. Fontanes and Viguier, who, since the death of Athanase Coquerel the younger, are its most distinguished preachers."

M. Bersier has abstained from mentioning his own associate among the Independent Reformed Churches, M. de Presseuse.

FOOTNOTES

[1] I follow usually the dates of the Oxford Tables, from which some of the facts are derived, and some also from Voltaire.

[2] Except Bridaine, who flourished 1750, and is eulogized by Maury (Principles of Eloq.) [3] Compare the dates :

Du Moulin 1568-1658.

Faucheur 1585-1657.

Mestrezat 1592-1657.

Daille 1594-1670.

Claude 1619-1687. Bossuet 1637-1704.

Da Bosc 1623-1692. Bourdaloue 1632-1704.

Fenelon 1651-1715.

Saurin 1677-1730. Massillon 1663-1742. {159.}

02.05. LECTURE V. THE ENGLISH PULPIT.

LECTURE V. THE ENGLISH PULPIT. IN this brief course of lectures you have seen that the periods embraced are far too vast for satisfactory treatment; and yet some important departments in the History of Preaching have to be left entirely out of view. Besides the Greek preachers of medieval and modern times, the Spanish and Portuguese and later Italian preachers and others, we have taken no account of the German pulpit since Luther. It seemed better, for various reasons, to treat of the French rather than the German preachers. And for this final lecture I choose the English pulpit, which, even if we should not glance at Scotland or America, presents a field of immense extent and sufficiently embarrassing in its richness. The History of Preaching in England comprises five specially noteworthy periods : (1) Wyclif, (2) The [Reformation, (3) The Puritan and Anglican preachers of the seventeenth century, (4) The Age of Whitefield and Wesley, (5) The Nineteenth Century, of which there is an earlier and a later division.[1]

Before Wyclif, we find little in English preaching that is particularly instructive. The missionaries Augustine and Paulinus, who converted the heathen English in the seventh century, must have spoken with power, but their eloquence is not preserved. Let us frequently remind ourselves that the history of recorded preaching is but a small part of the history of preaching. The venerable Bede has left us some very brief discourses, supposed to have been imperfectly written down by his hearers, which show life and spirit, but would have been forgotten but for his famous History. Wyclif (1324-82), the first great Protestant, the first who not merely condemned some evils in the Catholic church, but struck at the very heart of the Papal system, was a preacher of great power. He does not exhibit much imagination, and so is not in the full sense eloquent. But he is singularly vigorous and acute in argument, and has the talent for "putting things" which belongs to a great teacher of men. His bold antagonisms, hard hits and unsparing sarcasms, his shrewd use of the dilemma and the *reductio ad absurdum*, show the master of popular argumentation. In his development from a scholastic divine, a student and teacher of dry philosophical theology, into a pungent, stirring preacher and popular leader, he is a representative man ; for these two sides of character and life must in some measure be combined in every man who is to achieve great usefulness as a preacher of the gospel. Yet with all this popular power and skill, Wyclif did his chief work not by his own preaching, but through others. He gathered around him plain and devout men, filled with his ideas and his spirit, and sent them forth as home missionaries, and it was chiefly by their humble and zealous preaching, publicly and from house to house, together with the circulation of Wyclif's tracts, written in the language of the people, that the new doctrines spread like wild fire through all England, till a hostile contemporary complained that " a man could scarcely meet two people on the same road but one of them was a disciple of Wyclif." These "simple priests," as they were called, corresponded to the Dominican order of preaching friars as it was when first constituted also to Wesley's circuit riders, and to the often illiterate but devoted men who have done so much in the establishment of Baptist churches throughout the United States. We see in this work of Wyclif and his friends an example of the fact that a professor may sometimes do more through his pupils than he could have done by personal labor as pastor and preacher. In

fact, every gospel worker should strive to infuse the spirit of work into others. The wisest and most useful pastor is not he who accomplishes most by his individual exertions, but rather he who can gather the largest number of true helpers, being himself the nucleus around which their labors may crystallize into a compact and effective whole.

Wyclif's reformation contained the germs of that which one hundred and fifty years later proved so grandly successful ; and yet in a few years after his death it was crushed, leaving of manifest results only his translation of the Bible, and the marked influence of his writings upon John Huss, in distant Bohemia, which at that time was connected with England by a royal marriage. England's first great reformer, and her first great poet, Chaucer who was Wyclif's younger contemporary and friend had no successors for many weary generations, during which the nation was enfeebled and demoralized by the hundred years struggle with France, and after ward by the Wars of the Roses at home. When all this had passed, and there was again peace and orderly government and returning prosperity, then again the English were ready to think of curing the dreadful evils which disgraced the clergy and the church, and just then came the spread of the New Learning, with Erasmus Greek Testament and Tyndale's English Bible, the stirring ideas of Luther, and the political and connubial schemes of Henry VIII. , all of which concurring forces produced the English Reformation.

There is no doubt that the Revival of Letters formed one leading occasion of the Reformation, both in Germany and in England. And already before the Reformation began, this revived study of Greek literature was producing some wholesome effect upon preaching. As early as 1510 we read of Colet, Dean of St. Paul s, as " the great preacher of his day, and the predecessor of Latimer in his simplicity, directness and force." He had gone to Italy to study Greek, and then for several years had taught Greek at Oxford, awakening the enthusiastic admiration of Erasmus, who said, " When I heard him speak, methought I heard Plato himself talk." Notice then that this earliest of the great Greek scholars of England was as a preacher remarkable for "simplicity, directness and force." It is another significant fact that Colet, who had lectured at Oxford on the Greek Testament, with all the other professors of the University taking notes, was perhaps the first preacher of the time that regularly expounded the Scriptures on Sundays. Good popular exposition always rests on loving study of the Scriptures, and usually upon study of the original.

Everybody knows that the most notable preacher of the English Reformation was Latimer (about 1490 to 1555). The superficial reader of his sermons would probably at first regard Latimer as a sort of oddity, with his homely humor, queer stories and quaint phrases, his frank egotism and general familiarity. But read on carefully, and you soon become convinced that you are dealing with a powerful mind and an elevated character. He was well educated at Oxford, but never forgot his experiences as the son of an humble yeoman, and while brought into relation to the great and learned, never lost sympathy with common life and the common mind. A student of books, you see that he has been still more a keen observer of men and things. He does not speak of life as one who has seen it dimly mirrored in literature, but as one who has eagerly looked upon the vivid original. His utterances are as fresh as morning air, or the morning song of the birds. He grasps truth with vigor, handles it with ease, holds it up before you in startling reality. It is pleasant to say that some of his best sermons have recently been made accessible to all, in one of the small volumes of " English Keprints," sold for a trifle. I think that persons who occupy themselves much with the study of pulpit eloquence, who are hunting in every age for "Masterpieces," and setting up

lofty standards of homiletical art, would find it most wholesome to read several sermons of Latimer, to feel the power of his careless vigor and in tense vitality, and remind themselves that not quite all the great preachers of the world have been perpetually engaged in the production of masterpieces of eloquence. How many of the most influential Reformers were men of much the same stamp. Luther, Zwingli, Wyclif, Latimer, Knox all intellectual and educated, but all men of the people, in full mental sympathy with the people, and thus able to command popular sympathy, and to send great electric thrills through the community, the nation, the age. Some of our American Baptist ministers of a hundred years ago had all these qualities, except education. If John Leland had been thoroughly educated in his youth, he might have shaken the continent. Great is refined culture and literary taste, but greater far is shrewd mother-wit, and racy humor, and wide and varied sympathy, and close, personal observation of the strangely mingled life we men are living in this strange world.

Two years after Latimer preached the "Seven Sermons before Edward VI." which remain to us, there was added to the number of the king's chaplains (1551) the other most remarkable English preacher of the time, John Knox (1505-1572). Professor Lorimer, in his "John Knox and the Church of England," published last year from newly discovered materials, has conclusively shown that the great Scotchman exerted a powerful influence in England, and did more than Bishop Hooper to develop and shape that Puritan sentiment which a century later became so powerful. In his preaching, as already intimated, he somewhat resembled Latimer, being an educated man but quite superior to pedantry and formality, and remarkable for force of thought and stirring earnestness. Like Latimer too, he usually preached without written preparation; and as he seldom wrote out his sermons afterwards, we have to judge of his powers as a preacher mainly from his other works. I think you will best get the impress of his character and catch his spirit by reading his "History of the Reformation in Scotland." His was "the martial or lo-battle style of pulpit oratory," in fact he was particularly fond of martial figures. This was natural in those stormy times, and in a preacher whose life was often in sore peril, but at whose grave the Regent Murray pronounced the now well known eulogium, "There lies he, who never feared the face of man." Fearlessness is a quality scarcely less needful for preachers in the "piping time of peace," than in time of persecution, scarcely less needed by us, for example, than by our fathers of a century ago. How many now are afraid of social influence, or afraid of being stigmatized as wanting in "culture," or ignorant of "science," or worst of all as lacking in "charity." While eschewing bitterness, let us covet boldness.

Knox is a notable example of entering upon the ministry late in life. Educated for the Catholic priesthood, but early deposed because of Protestant heresy, he meant to spend his time as professor and public lecturer, but was pressed into the ministry at the age of forty-two. There is a further lesson in the fact that about this time he learned Greek, and at the age of forty-nine we find him at Geneva, busily studying Hebrew. Let it not be forgotten amid our elaborate processes of ministerial education that a man of competent intelligence may begin to preach when he is growing old, and be very useful; but also that such a preacher, if he has the right spirit, will be eager to supply, as far as may be, his educational deficiencies. The martial style of thought and expression which characterized Knox, was fitly attended by a most impassioned delivery. One who often heard him in his old age, afterwards described him as lifted by two servants up to the pulpit, "where he behoved to lean, at his first entry; but ere he had done with his sermon, he was so active and

vigorous, that he was lyk to ding the pulpit in Mads, and flie out of it." One of the pulpits he pounded is still preserved in Stirling ; I remember standing in it, and while not presuming to aspire after an imitation of his delivery, yet longing to catch something of his bold and zealous spirit. It is a fact which might be worth some reflection, that the Scotch preachers, though living farther North, have as a rule been more fiery and impassioned than the English. As to other preachers of the [Reformation period, we can say but a word. Bishop Hooper, the martyr, and the first Englishman who distinctly represented the Puritan tendency, was very zealous in preach ing, for we are told by Burnet that at one period he preached four, or at least three times every day. Cranmer's sermons show force of argument, and an agreeable style, but little of the imagination anc passion which are necessary to eloquence. Bishop Jewell was a learned man, and sometimes eloquent, but with little that was characteristic or very highly impressive. Archbishop Sandys was hot enough in his numerous quarrels, but not warm in preach ing.

Between the Reformation and the time of Crom well, including about a century, there were many able ecclesiastics, many learned divines, and some striking preachers, but none of the highest eminence. Hooker is immortal for his philosophical work on Ecclesiastical Polity, but was not attractive as a preacher. Dr. Donne is said to have been a man of learning and remarkable for brilliant imagination and tender sentiment ; but his sermons are spoiled by those conceits, which abound in his poetry also. Let all fanciful and brilliant men remember that perpetual efforts to strike and dazzle soon weary and fail of their end. Bishop Andrewes was a learned and able man, worthy of his position as one of King James translators of the Bible, but his sermons are so laden with learned quotation and discussion that they lack movement, and I cannot read them with profit or patience. Bishop Hall is seen to best advantage in his justly celebrated "Contemplations on the Old and New Testaments," which every preacher will find exceedingly instructive and sug gestive, and from which I have observed that some recent German preachers borrow striking remarks, sometimes giving them verbatim without acknowl edgment. No preacher of the highest power or of lasting reputation for three-quarters of a century, and yet this was precisely the age of Shakspeare and Bacon. The fact certainly calls for explanation. It will not do to say that the national mind was too much occu pied with the Armada and the new trade with the Indies. These did not prevent the grand literary outburst, represented by Raleigh and Sidney, Spenser, Shakspeare and the other great dramatists, and Ba con. The comparative inferiority of preaching must be referred mainly to two causes. (1) There was in all Europe a reaction, more or less marked, from the excitement which had accompanied the early stages of the Reformation ; and as a natural consequence of this reaction, preaching would become less intensely earnest. (2) There was in England at this time a great lack of religious freedom, and with out this we can hardly anywhere find examples of the highest pulpit eloquence. The more radical reformers, nicknamed " Puritans," who insisted that church government, ceremonies, and religious life must all be strictly conformed to the "pure Word of God," and not controlled by the crown or by old Catholic usage, were from the time of Edward VI. numerous and earnest, but by no means agreed among themselves as to the length to which they would carry their opposition to Episcopacy, Catholic ceremonies, and Royal supremacy over the church. These unorganized and varying radical tendencies were sternly repressed by Elizabeth, and with no small success, both because of her immense personal popu larity and by reason of her comparative moderation and regal tact. Still, while the reaction from the early zeal of the Reformation was lessening the zeal of the dominant churchmen, these Puritan tendencies continually, though slowly, gathered strength Under James I., who was unpopular and unwise, the

persecution grew much more harsh and irritating, and therefore the Puritans became stronger. It began to appear to them that both political and religious freedom depended on the maintenance and triumph of their Puritan principles. Under Charles the two parties became more and more antagonistic and embittered, each party hating whatever doctrines and customs the others maintained, and the Puritans gradually became willing to die for their tenets, fearless of persecution and because fearless, free in heart. Meantime the Royalists had taken up the new theory that Episcopacy was Scriptural, of Divine appointment, like the Divine right of kings, and so their civil and religious loyalty mingled and strengthened each other. Now again there was burning religious earnestness and zeal, and thus it became possible that there should be intensely earnest and truly eloquent preaching.

Meanwhile, the thoughts of men were aroused and widened, as the seventeenth century went on. Voltaire thinks the French Calvinistic refugees carried eloquence into foreign countries. But this is nonsense as regards England, for the first Huguenot refugees found the great age of English pulpit eloquence almost at an end. In fact, every one of the great English preachers, Puritan and Anglican, with the single exception of South, was older than Bourdaloue, and several of them were twelve or fourteen years older than Bossuet. ¹ Clearly they did not learn eloquence from the French. The truth is that both English and French were fired and moved by the spirit of the age, as I tried to describe it in the last lecture. And in England this spirit of the age combined with the fierce conflict between Puritan and Churchman, to quicken religious thought and kindle religious zeal, and thus to create the noble English eloquence of the seventeenth century. The great preachers of that age are so well known that a brief reference to each of them may be at once intelligible and sufficient.

Jeremy Taylor (1613-77), a graduate of Cambridge and always a zealous loyalist, was silenced
¹ Examine the following table:

Baxter 1615-1691 Leighton. . . . 1611-1684 Bossuet 1627-1704.

Owen 1616-1683 Jer. Taylor. . 1613-1677 Bourdaloue . 1632-1704.

Flavel 1627-1691 Barrow 1630-1677 Fenelon 1651-1715.

Bunyan 1628-1688 Tillotson.... 1630-1694 Massillon.... 1663-1742.

Howe 1630-1705 South 1638-1716 Saurin 1677-1730. during the Protectorate of Cromwell, and twice imprisoned, just as Bunyan was afterwards imprisoned by the other side. Supported by a nobleman as private chaplain, he spent those stormy years in diligent study and writing, and Charles II. made him a bishop. The "poet preacher," as he is often called, would be intolerable now were it not for his fervent piety. His style is almost unrivalled among orators for its affluence of elegant diction, and its wealth of charming imagery. It is the very perfection of that species of eloquence which so many Sophomores are disappointed at not finding in Demosthenes, which they so fondly admire in Society speeches that go forever curling like blue smoke towards the skies. With the modern love for directness and downright-ness of expression, we are apt utterly to condemn this high-wrought splendor of ornamentation, even as we should consider one of Sir Walter Raleigh's doublets of bright-hued velvet, slashed with lace, to be very pretty no doubt but a trifle ridiculous. Even Dr. South already ridiculed Taylor's poetic imagery with merciless severity ; and at the present day I think few persons of mature age can read long in his glittering pages

without weariness. And yet if one's style is naturally dry, he would find it a very profitable thing to interest himself in Jeremy Taylor, not only the Sermons (which may be had in a single volume), but still more the famous treatises on Holy Living and Holy Dying.

Similar to Taylor in fervor and sweetness, even surpassing him in unction, and at the same time remarkable for his clear and engaging style, is Arch bishop Leighton (1613-84). Learned, deeply devout, and of kindly and loving nature, his pages reflect his character. If you ask why he is so much praised and so little read, the answer would be, I think, that his writings, like his character, are lacking in force. He was not a man of decided nature and positive convictions. He consented to leave the Scotch Presbyterian ministry and become a bishop, with the sincere hope that he might mingle the fire and water of the two great religious parties, and sadly mourned over his failure to overcome stubborn convictions which he was constitutionally unfitted to comprehend. Now there is a corresponding want of decision, positiveness, power, in his works, and this is a want for which nothing can make amends.

Leighton was fifty years old when he changed his denomination, and the credit of his eloquence might be claimed by both sides. But exactly contemporary with him and Jeremy Taylor were two Puritan preachers of great eminence, Baxter and Owen.

Baxter (1615-91) was not regularly educated, as were nearly all the distinguished preachers of that age, but from youth was a great reader, and through life a voluminous writer. His controversial works are said to show great metaphysical subtlety, and a good deal of hot-headed unfairness. His schemes for ecclesiastical union or "comprehension" were spoken of last summer by Dean Stanley with enthusiastic admiration, as might have been expected, but to ordinary mortals they seem much more creditable to his heart than his head. But as preacher, and as pastor, Baxter's powers have seldom been equalled. The general reader cannot be advised to study his sermons, for with all their power they are to our taste very wearisome by their great length and their immense and confused multiplication of divisions and particulars. The scholastic method of dividing and subdividing without end reappears in these great Puritan preachers as nowhere else. Besides the demand which high Calvinism always makes for close thinking and careful distinctions, these interpreters were influenced by the desire to find every thing in Scripture, and to draw out from every passage the whole of its possible contents; and they were restrained in their analytical extravagances by no such sense of artistic propriety as marked the French Calvinistic preachers, and in a less degree the Anglican preachers of the same age. It may be added that none of the Puritan divines seem to have given the slightest attention to finish of style, caring only for copiousness and force a torrent of speech. These facts may help to account for the immense extent of their writings. Every possible question, of religion and of politics, was then hotly discussed with fresh and present interest; each of these questions the writer would treat under every possible aspect and with a studious multiplication of particulars; and not a moment's thought was bestowed on elegance of expression or artistic symmetry of arrangement. No wonder they wrote so much. But while the great mass of Baxter's works have lost their interest, and his sermons are unattractive, every minister ought carefully to read his practical treatises which have gained so wide a fame, the Call to the Unconverted, Saints Eest, Narrative of his own Life, Dying Thoughts, and Reformed Pastor. These exhibit the great and singularly profitable characteristic of Baxter's preaching and writing, viz., his burning, earth-shaking, tremendous earnestness. In this high quality of preaching he has hardly anywhere an equal. Read these volumes, again and

again, and let them kindle anew in your soul the zeal of the gospel. John Angell James tells of an "Earnest Ministry" in such a way as to make one desire earnestness ; but far more will Baxter do towards making us really earnest. Owen (1616-83) was a scholar in both classical and Rabbinical learning, worthy to be the contemporary of Lightfoot and Walton, ambitious as a boy student at Oxford, prodigious in life-long study and authorship, and at the same time a simple, earnest, and highly impressive preacher. His great exegetical and theological works were the favorite study of Andrew Fuller, who regarded his character also with admiring reverence. Fuller was a very noble example of the "self-made" theologian and preacher, but he made himself with the help of the great scholars who had preceded him as self made men commonly must do. A conveniently accessible and good specimen of Owen's sermons may be found in the volume on Forgiveness, which is a series of discourses on the 130th Psalm. A dozen years younger than Baxter and Owen was Flavel (1627-91). He also was educated at Oxford, and a good scholar. While not equal to Owen in vigor and depth of thought, or to Baxter in overwhelming earnestness, he is pre-eminent for tenderness, unction, and also excels in clearness, both of arrangement and of style. He constructs discourses after the fashion of the time, but in striking contrast to those of Baxter and Howe, his plans are lucid, and even to our altered taste are not unpleasing. It was by hearing a pious lady read Flavel that young Archibald Alexander, a schoolmaster in the "Wilderness, near Fredericksburg, Va., was brought to Christian faith and hope.

Bunyan (1628-88) was not only without regular education, but was not even a great reader like Baxter. Yet his sermons are quite *à la mode*, full of divisions and subdivisions, and their tone of thought shows intellectual sympathy with the best minds of the age. Even in those few cases in which really great "self-made" men have not learned much from books, they are always educated by the thought of their time, the ideas and aspirations which fill the intellectual atmosphere. When Bunyan began to preach, at the age of twenty-eight, Owen and Baxter were forty years old, Milton forty-eight, and it was only two years before the death of Cromwell. How much there was to stimulate and educate the susceptible and vigorous mind of the young tinker. Bunyan's sermons, though often wearisome in length and in minute analysis, yet show clearness of arrangement and great fulness of thought, with singular practical point and consuming earnestness. His language in preaching cannot be expected to exhibit that high poetic grace, that exalted and charming simplicity into which his fancy was lifted amid the inspiring dreams of Bedford jail, but it is language not unworthy of the immortal dreamer. He abounds in lively turns and racy phrases, in a vivid dramatism that no preacher has surpassed, and his homeliest expressions are redeemed from vulgarity by a native elegance, an instinctive good taste. The brief story of his early life and conversion given in the treatise jailed " Grace Abounding" is worthy to be placed beside Augustine's Confessions, and his allegory of the Holy War has been unjustly obscured by the lastre of its great rival. But the "Solomon's Temple Spiritualized" shows the same creative imagination gone crazy with wild allegorizing, because unrestrained by any just principles of interpretation. Only a great genius could produce such nonsense.

It remains to mention, among the foremost Puritan preachers, John Howe (1630-1705). The Life of Howe, by that admirable writer, Henry Rogers, is of late accessible in a cheap form. As there was very little of incident to relate, the biographer has made his work all the more valuable to us by discussing many related matters in the religious history of the time.

Howe was graduated both at Cambridge and at Oxford. It is to be noticed that in that age men who held to Calvinistic doctrine and non-episcopal church government could have the benefit of the English Universities; and that most of the great Puritan divines were graduates, as were Henry Dunster, and others of those who established the civilization and culture of New England. This fact is suggestive, and yet we are warned not to push too far our inferences from it by the cases of Baxter and Bunyan. At Cambridge, Howe was intimate with Cudworth, More, and other famous Platonists, and became a devoted and appreciative student of Plato. He was a great philosophic theologian, and at the same time a very earnest and eloquent preacher. With extraordinary power of intellect he had also remarkable power of imagination. Robert Hall said to a friend: "I have learned far more from John Howe than from any other author I ever read." Henry Rogers states that in conversation with him Hall once went so far as to say, "as a minister, he had derived more benefit from Howe than from all other divines put together." This fervid admiration is in part accounted for from the fact that Howe ably wrought out and powerfully stated, as in his treatise on "The Divine Prescience," precisely that scheme of moderate Calvinism which alone suited Mr. Hall's mind. But notice that Hall added, to the friend first mentioned: "There is an astonishing magnificence in his conceptions." Of this "magnificence" no one could better judge than Robert Hall. For two reasons mere cursory readers are in danger of not appreciating Howe's eloquence. He is so addicted to metaphysical thinking that we often have difficulty in following him, and so are apt to be engrossed with his philosophical theology. The other reason is the ruggedness of his style. Mr. Hall says: "There was, I think, an innate inability in Howe's mind for discerning minute graces and proprieties, and hence his sentences are often long and cumbersome. Still he was unquestionably the greatest of the Puritan divines." Both the obscurity and the awkwardness of style must have been partially relieved for his hearers by the delivery. But for us it is necessary in approaching the study of Howe to expect difficulty, and the consequent careful reading will bring us into acquaintance with many of the noblest thoughts the human mind can conceive. The changes since Howe's time have in no respect been greater than in regard to the length of religious services. His contemporary Calamy says, with reference to the public fast days which were common during the Protectorate: Mr. Howe "told me it was upon those occasions his common way, to begin about nine in the morning, with a prayer for about a quarter of an hour, in which he begged a blessing on the work of the day; and afterwards read and expounded a chapter or psalm, in which he spent about three-quarters of an hour; then prayed for about an hour, preached for another hour, and prayed for about half an hour. After this, he retired and took some little refreshment for about a quarter of an hour (the people singing all the while), and then came again into the pulpit and prayed for another hour, and gave them another sermon of about an hour's length; and so concluded the services of the day, at about four of the clock in the evening, with about half an hour or more in prayer." Seven hours of continuous services, with an intermission of fifteen minutes for the poor preacher, and none at all for the poor people! But in our restless age, have we not gone quite to the opposite extreme? In the same year with Howe were born Barrow and Tillotson. Barrow (1630-77) was not only a very great man, but in many respects peculiar. His extraordinary physical strength and his force of character led to a youthful fondness for fighting, and in general he was so wayward and violent as to extort from his despairing father the singular wish, that "if it pleased God to take away any of his children, it might be his son Isaac." This famous saying ought to be repeated on all occasions, as it is such a comfort to all young men who were bad boys. The physical strength deserves special notice, for great literary

achievements require uncommon power of bodily endurance, and this is usually attended by corresponding bodily strength. Few men have produced numerous and able works who were not strong in body. But trusting in his bodily strength, Barrow indulged excessively in the use of tobacco a species of indulgence which (I venture to suggest) is particularly injurious to persons of sedentary, studious and anxious life, unsafe even for healthy ministers, and inevitably hurtful to those who are at all feeble and nervous. Imprudent in various respects, he lived to the age of only forty-seven. His early attainments were wonderful. He was made Fellow of Trinity at nineteen, and would have been appointed Greek Professor at twenty-four, but for the unpopularity, at that time, of his Arminianism. He then spent five years in continental travel, practicing rigorous economy, and engaged in diligent study and intercourse with learned men. Do our American youth of to-day possess quite enough of that spirit which for sweet learning's sake has so often faced the most serious difficulties and practiced the sternest self-denial? I think Barrow and his contemporary Bourdaloue were the first great preachers of modern times who had been careful students of mathematics, and Barrow of the physical sciences also. There is something inspiring in the bare mention of the fact that Isaac Barrow resigned a mathematical chair at Cambridge to his pupil, Isaac Newton. But with all his devotion to these subjects he also laboriously studied the Classics and the Fathers, reading, for instance, the entire works of Chrysostom during a year's sojourn at Constantinople. As your examinations are approaching, I will tell the story of Barrow's examination for orders. The aged bishop, wishing but little trouble, placed the candidates in a row, and asked three questions. First, *Quid est fides?* Barrow, near the end of the row, had time to think, and when it came to his turn answered, *Quod non vides.* *Excellenter,* said the bishop. To the second question, *Quid est spes?* he answered, *Nondum res,* and the old man cried *Excellentius.* The third was *Quid est caritas?* and Barrow answered, *Ah I magister, id est raritas.* *Excellentissime,* shouted the bishop, *aut Erasmus est, aut diabolus.* But while really a prodigy of attainments and intellectual achievements, Barrow was never a working pastor, and most of the sermons he left were in fact never preached. Hence he was lacking in practical point and directness, in the tact of the experienced preacher. His sermons are really disquisitions on some topic, written to satisfy his own mind, and designed to be read to others if he should find occasion. As disquisitions they are wonderfully comprehensive and complete, fully unfolding the subject proposed, and accumulating a wealth of interesting particulars. These particulars are sometimes wearisomely numerous, but, unlike the Puritan discourses we spoke of, they are in general naturally arranged, and each of them really adds something to the train of thought. His style is ill described by Doddridge as "laconic," for it is in the highest degree copious, but it is condensed, compact. Every paragraph seems a treatise, each long sentence is crowded with ideas. And yet the whole has movement, vigorous and majestic movement, with the energy of profuseness, like a broadly rolling torrent.

Barrow is decidedly Arminian. The church of England was at first Calvinistic in doctrine, as the Articles show, but royalist hostility to the Puritans had gradually extended to a rejection of the doctrinal views especially associated with them, and Churchmen were by this time generally foes to Calvinism. Barrow however shows little enthusiasm for doctrine. His best sermons are on moral subjects, embracing all the leading topics of Christian morality. I know not where else in our language there can be found sermons on this important class of subjects so complete, forcible, satisfactory as those of Barrow. We have heretofore noticed the fact that he and Bourdaloue, both excelling in this respect, were both loving students of the early master on moral topics,

Chrysostom. Bead Jeremy Taylor to enrich the fancy, but Barrow to enrich the intellect and to show how the greatest copiousness may unite with great compactness and great energy of movement. Of two other Anglican preachers in that age I shall speak but briefly. Dr. South (1638-1716) cannot be recommended for doctrine, nor yet for spirit, as he is unloving., harsh in his polemics, and delights in a savage style of sarcasm. But he shows great vigor of thought, and skill in argument, particularly in refutation. The discussions are relieved by racy wit, the plan of discussion is simple and clear, for that age, and the style is condensed, direct and pungent. Mr. Beecher speaks of having found special pleasure and profit in an early study of South.

Archbishop Tillotson (1630-94), on the other hand, was a kindly and loving man, kind even to Nonconformists which is much to say for a Churchman of that period. Like Barrow and South, he does not preach the "doctrines of grace," but his polemics against Popery, and against the growing infidelity, are models of manly vigor, unstained by bitterness. Tillotson was by many of his contemporaries considered the foremost preacher of the age, and yet at the present day is far less admired than Jeremy Taylor and Barrow. I think this can be accounted for. As to the fact itself, Saurin, the French Protestant, who came to London six years after the good Archbishop's death, and was doubtless all the more attracted to his works by hearing of his kindness to the Huguenot refugees, speaks with great enthusiasm of his writings, calling him my master/ as Cyprian used to call Tertullian. Bishop Burnet, who survived Tillotson only twenty years, says : "He was not only the best preacher of the age, but seemed to have brought preaching to perfection ; his sermons were so well liked, that all the nation proposed him as a pattern, and studied to copy after him." The explanation is, I think, that Tillotson satisfied the yearning of the age for greater clearness and simplicity, both in arrangement of discourse and in style, a yearning doubtless strengthened, though not caused, by the French taste that prevailed in the court of Charles II. From the quirks and conceits of the Elizabethan prose, the involved, elaborate, sometimes stupendous sentences found even in Milton and Barrow, and the wearisome divisions and subdivisions of the Puritan preachers, and their contemporary Anglicans, to the easy and careless grace of the Addisonian period, the transition is made by Tillotson. Macaulay relates that Dryden was frequently heard to "own with pleasure that, if he had any talent for English prose, it was owing to his having often read the writings of the great Archbishop Tillotson." But of this simplicity in arrangement and style we have long had numerous examples, some of them comparatively free from the faults of negligence which are noted in Tillotson and in Addison. As to topics, Tillotson's arguments against infidelity are of course superseded now, and his able polemics against the Papacy have no general interest. Thus it comes to pass that we find little profit, and little ground for special admiration, in works which were long considered the noblest models of composition.

Much depends on peculiarities of taste, and on felt personal need, but if I were required to recommend two of the great English preachers of the seventeenth century as likely most richly to reward thorough study at the present time, I should name Barrow among the Churchmen, and among the Puritans John Howe. When this splendid group of preachers, with their contemporaries whom we have not been able to notice, had passed away, there threatened to be as complete a collapse of the English pulpit as was at the same time occurring in France. The Puritans, who formed the vital element of the preceding century had fallen into popular disfavor, and the Act of Toleration under William and Mary took away the stimulus of persecution. What was worse, they were cut off from the universities, an unjust deprivation to which all Nonconformists were condemned until within the

last few years. Their opportunities of education during the eighteenth century were confined to inferior " Academies/ and the Scotch Universities. Many an aspiring youth, as for example, Joseph Butler, was tempted into conformity by the prospect, sometimes even the offer, of an education at Oxford or Cambridge. And it was only as the Dissenters Colleges in England, and the Scottish Universities began to do vigorous teaching at the close of the century, that there was again a Nonconformist ministry of great power. As to the Churchmen, they had lost the stimulus of Puritan rivalry in preaching, and were now engaged in a life and death struggle for the truth of Christianity with that rising infidelity which had sprung on the one hand from the rationalizing philosophy of Descartes and Hobbes, and on the other from, the reaction into immorality which ensued upon the fall of the Commonwealth This struggle for the truth of Revelation was powerfully maintained by Bishop Butler and others, while Richard Bentley was carrying classical learning to a height never surpassed in English history. In this state of things, during the first half of the eighteenth century, English preaching did not rise above mediocrity. Bishop Atterbury, learned and elegant, but not strong, was the leading preacher of the day in the Establishment. Among the Dissenters, Watts had considerable ability and some eloquence, but would now be utterly forgotten were it not for his hymns. And Doddridge, worked to death with his Academy, his pastorate, his correspondence and authorship, has left good sermons and good books, but nothing of the highest excellence. In Scotland there was Maclaurin, whose sermon on " Glorifying in the Cross " is truly one of the " Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence." And in far New England lived the foremost preacher of the age, one of the very noblest in all history for intellect, imagination, and passion, for true and high eloquence, Jonathan Edwards.

Towards the middle of the century two men became known who have made illustrious the English preaching of their day. Whitefield and Wesley were both Oxford men, and used their cultivation in that preaching to the masses which had been the glory of the Puritan period. While Bolingbroke assailed Revelation, and Chesterfield politely sneered at every thing unselfish and good, and Christian Apologists vainly strove to convince the intellect of the upper classes, Whitefield and Wesley began to preach to the consciences of men, and thus felt no need of confining their discourse to the cultivated and refined. In this preaching to the conscience must always begin, I think, the reaction from an age of skepticism. The biographies of Whitefield (1714-70) are full of instruction. The sermons we have were mere preparations, which in free delivery were so filled out with the thoughts suggested in the course of living speech, and so transfigured and glorified by enkindled imagination, as to be utterly different from the dull, cold thing that here lies before us more different than the blazing meteor from this dark, metallic stone that lies half buried in the earth. The sermons of Wesley (1703-91) require study, and will reward it. As printed, they were commonly written out after frequent delivery. They are too condensed to have been spoken, in this form, to the colliers and the servant girls at five o'clock in the morning. But they must be in substance the same that he habitually preached, and they present a problem. Wesley had nothing of Whitefield's impassioned oratory. He spoke with simple earnestness, and remained quiet while his hearers grew wild with excitement. What was the secret? Where the hidden power? We can only say that it was undoubting faith and extraordinary force of character, together with a peculiarity seen also in some generals on the field of battle, that their most intense excitement makes little outward noise or show and yet subtly communicates itself to others. "No man can repeatedly make others feel deeply who does not feel deeply himself ; it is only a difference in the way of showing it. Of course this subtle electricity resides in the soul of the speaker much more

than in the recorded discourse. But read carefully these condensed and calm-looking sermons, and see if you do not feel the power of the man, and find yourself sometimes strangely moved.

Late in the century, and dying just before Wesley, was Robert Robinson (1735-90), who has left numerous sermons that are full of life, with flashes of genius. His erratic and uncertain course as to doctrine has caused him to be neglected. But a volume of his selected sermons, with a statement on the title-page that he was the author of the hymn, "Come, thou fount of every blessing," ought to find sale, and would be interesting and useful.

We come now to the nineteenth century, in which English pulpit literature is not only abundant but shows real power, and which must be divided, for our purpose, into an earlier and a later portion. It is obvious that we can only mention the principal names, and that very briefly. In the early part of the century the leading preachers were Hall, Chalmers, and Jay. The deeply interesting history of Robert Hall (1764-1831) is generally familiar, and remains as a choice morsel for those who have not read it. His precocity in childhood, his education, his inner life and character, and the origin of his works, are all topics full of interest. He was equally studious of thought and of style, and in both he reached the high est excellence. Take any one of his greatest sermons and you will see an exhibition of the noblest power: There is a thorough acquaintance with his subject; and a vigorous grasp of it. There is great knowledge of human nature, and this not in the way of mere crude observation but of profound reflection. He who at nine years of age delighted in Edwards on the Will and Butler's Analogy, has ever since been a profound student of metaphysics, ethics, and philosophical theology like that of Howe, and in this deep sense has studied human nature. He shows great analytical power, dissecting every part of the subject, and laying it open; and at the same time adequate power of construction, giving the discourse a clear, simple and complete plan. We also perceive singular power of argument. The whole sermon is often an argument, and upon a view of the subject well chosen for general effect; and the arguments, though usually profound, are made level to the capacity of all intelligent hearers. His imagination is exalted, imperial, but constantly subordinated to the purposes of the argument. Nowhere is there imagery that appears to be introduced for its own sake. The most splendid bursts, the loftiest flights, seem to come just where they are natural and needful. And the style well, it is a model of perspicuity, energy, and elegance. The terms are chosen with singular felicity. The sentences are never very long, nor in the slightest degree involved, and longer and shorter sentences are agreeably mingled, while the rhythm is greatly varied, and always harmonious. Do we mean to say that Mr. Hall's style is perfect? No, there are palpable, though slight defects, in his most finished productions, as there are in every work of every writer. And in one important respect Mr. Hall's style is, if not faulty, yet quite opposed to the taste of our own time. It has a dignity that is too uniformly sustained. Though not at all pompous, it is never familiar, and thus its range is restricted. There is the same difference with regard to style, between that age and this, as with regard to dress and manners. And while we are sometimes too free and easy, in all these directions, yet upon the whole we have gained. If Robert Hall lived in our time, he would have greater flexibility, and thereby his noble sermons would be sensibly improved. Whether he would not, if reared in our age, have been lacking in more important respects, is another question.

Christmas Evans, the Welshman (1766-1838), is fit notable example of untutored eloquence. His undisciplined imagination rioted in splendors, his descriptive powers captivated the enthusiastic Celtic mountaineers, and the whirlwinds of his passion bore them aloft to the skies. For such a

man, thorough education might have hampered the wings of soaring fancy, and made him really less effective a Pegasus harnessed to the plough.

William Jay (1769-1853) was not a man of shining gifts, but is an excellent model of sermonizing, in respect to his fresh, ingenious and yet natural plans, and in his copious, often strikingly felicitous quotations from the Bible. Read his sermons, and also his admirable Morning and Evening Exercises, which are sermons on a small scale.

Robert Hall's most gifted contemporary in the pulpit was Chalmers (1780-1847), whose rare genius and unique method in preaching one would find pleasure, if there were opportunity, in attempting to depict. No student of English preaching must fail to read the magnificent Astronomical Sermons, nor at least a part of the expository Lectures on Romans. He will find that the one thought of each discourse is not merely presented in ever varying beauty, like the kaleidoscope to which Hall compared Chalmers preaching, but as in our stereoscope it is made to stand out in solid form and full proportions. His religious philosophy is elevated and satisfying. His style is beautiful, but any imitation of it would be displeasing if not ridiculous.

I could wish to speak at some length of the English preachers who have attained distinction in the last thirty or forty years. I should want to commend Melvill for his numerous and suggestive examples of rich discourses drawn by legitimate process from the most unlikely texts ; and to tell of John Henry Newman, with his deep, magnetic nature, whose plain and intensely vital discourses make the soul quiver with solemn awe. To recommend Frederick Robertson would be a work of supererogation, for everybody has been reading him, but there might be profit in attempting to discriminate, as he himself could not, between the true and false elements which had grown up together in his thought, and between the strength and the weakness of his so attractive discourses. I should direct special attention to Canon Liddon, now the leading preacher in the Church of England, whose elaborate sermons show us how the most difficult fundamental questions of religion, questions of Providence and prayer, of sin and atonement, of the soul and immortality, may be treated with reference to the ablest attacks of disbelief and doubt, and yet without making the sermon unintelligible, in general, to any hearers of fair capacity and cultivation. And there is a whole class of recent preachers in England and Scotland, who have given new power and interest to expository preaching, bringing to bear the methods and results of modern Biblical learning, and not disregarding, as did Chrysostom and in a less degree Luther, the absolute need, in order to the most effective discourse, of unity and plan. Alford's other sermons are not of great power ; but his Sunday after noon lectures in London, with many hearers holding their Greek Testaments, were, according to the testimony of Bishop Ellicott* and others, surpassingly instructive and engaging. Dr. Vaughan's expository sermons on the Book of Revelation are quite good. Johnstone on James and on Philippians meets exactly the wants of a highly educated but gospel-loving congregation. And Candlish, the foremost Scottish preacher of the century except Chalmers, has in his * See the Bishop's excellent paper in the Life of Alford. Genesis, First Epistle of John, and fifteenth chapter of Corinthians, taught a new and high lesson in pulpit exposition. The time would fail to speak of strong Dr. Binney and Newman Hall and Joseph Parker, all deservedly famous; of Bishop Wilberforce and Bishop Magee, whom one of his colleagues on the Episcopal bench described to me as the finest extemporaneous speaker in England ; of Guthrie and Caird, Gumming and Ker ; of Landells and Maclaren, whose little volumes of brief, fresh and spirited discourses are very suggestive to city pastors ; and of

Spurgeon, a model in several respects, but whose greatest distinction, to my mind, is the fact that he has so long gathered and held vast congregations, and kept the ear of the reading world, without ever forsaking the gospel in search of variety, or weakening his doctrine to suit the tastes of the age. But I have purposely spoken chiefly of both the English and the French preachers who lived before our own time. I think that young men should be specially exhorted to read old books. If you have a friend in the ministry who is growing old, urge him to read mainly new books, that he may freshen his mind, and keep in sympathy with his surroundings. "But must not young men keep abreast of the age?" Certainly, only the first thing is to get abreast of the age, and in order to this they must go back to where the age came from, and join there the great procession of its moving thought. Can I suggest anything, in conclusion, with reference to the character and demands, as to preaching, of the time to which you will belong, the coming third or half of a century? I shall barely touch a few points, without any expansion.

(1) It becomes every day more important to draw a firm line of demarcation between Physical Science and Theology, and to insist that each party shall work on its own side the line in peace. Even where there appears to be ground of antagonism, it will commonly be best not to court conflict, but to work quietly on in the assurance that we have truth, and that as new scientific theories pass out of speculation into matured truth also, it will then become plain enough in what way the two departments of truth are to be reconciled.

(2) As the past generation has witnessed a painfully rapid growth of religious skepticism in England and America, so it is to be expected that your generation will see a great and blessed reaction. Unless I am mistaken, that reaction has already in some directions begun to show itself. You will promote the healthier tendencies by preaching the definite doctrines of the Bible, and by abundant exposition of the Bible text. Men grow weary of mere philosophical speculation and vague sentiment, and will listen again to the sweet and solemn voice of the Word of God. (3) Our age has made remarkable progress as to one great doctrine of Christianity progress, not in apprehending the doctrine, but in realizing its truth. As the fourth century made clear the Divinity of Christ, so the nineteenth century has brought out his Humanity. The most destructive criticism has unconsciously contributed to this result. It will henceforth be possible to present more complete and symmetrical views of the Lord Jesus Christ and his work of salvation than the pulpit has generally exhibited in any past age. Picture vividly before your hearers Jesus the man, while not allowing them to forget that he was Christ the Son of God, and you will mightily win them to love and serve him.

(4) It will be important to sympathize with and use the humanitarian tendencies which have become so strongly developed. Show in a thousand ways what Christianity has done and can do for all the noblest interests of humanity, and how all this is possible only because Christianity is itself divine. The one true gospel of humanity is the gospel of the Son of God.

(5) You must know how to unite breadth of view, and charity in feeling, with fidelity to truth. The age is in love with liberality, and allows that word to cover many a falsehood and many a folly. But the age will feel more and more its need of truth, and "speaking truth in love" will meet its double want.

(6) As to methods of preaching, you are entered upon a time of great freedom in composition, a time in which men are little restrained by classical models or current usage, whether as to the

structure or the style of discourse. This is true in general literature, and also in preaching. You may freely adopt any of the methods which have been found useful in any age of the past, or by varied experiment may learn for yourselves how best to meet the wants of the present. Freedom is always a blessing and a power, when it is used with wise self-control.

(7) It is scarcely necessary to caution you against the love of sensation which marks our excitable age. We see this in many writers of history and romance, even in some writers on science, to say nothing of numerous politicians and periodicals. A few preachers, some of them weak but some really strong men, have fallen in with this tendency of the time. Where they have done much real good, it has been rather in spite of this practice, than by means of it, and they should be instructive as a warning.

(8) In your time, as in all times, the thing needed will be not oratorical display but genuine eloquence, the eloquence which springs from vigorous thinking, strong convictions, fervid imagination and passionate earnestness ; and true spiritual success will be attained only in proportion as you gain, in humble prayer, the blessing of the Holy Spirit.

I trust, brethren, that these observations on the History of Preaching for the abounding imperfections of which I shall not stop to apologize may by God's blessing be of some use in preparing you for the difficult and responsible, yet sweet and blessed work to which your lives are devoted. I trust you will feel incited to study the instructive history and inspiring discourses of the great preachers who have gone before you, and will be stimulated by their example to develop every particle of your native power, and to fill your whole life with zealous usefulness. Themistocles said the trophies of Marathon would not let him sleep. May the thought of all the noble preachers and their blessed work kindle in you a noble emulation. And when weary and worn, stir yourselves to fresh zeal by remembering the rest that remaineth and the rewards that cannot fail. " to shine," said Whifcefield one night as he stood preaching in the open air and looked up to the brilliant heavens, " to shine as the brightness of the firmament, as yonder stars forever and ever."

FOOTNOTES

[1] Although English pulpit literature is so rich, it is remarkable that we have no treatise whatever on its history. The well known aversion of the English to rhetorical art might in this case have been overcome by their love of history. Of late years America has greatly surpassed the mother-country in the production of numerous and valuable works on Homiletics, and in like manner it may be that Americans will take the lead in writing the history of the English Pulpit. Corresponding works exist already among the French, and are somewhat numerous in Germany. But even the German writers confine themselves almost entirely to their own country, being apparently quite unacquainted with the English preachers.

02.06 APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

WITHOUT attempting anything like a complete account of the Literature belonging to those departments of the History of Preaching which are treated in these lectures, it may be useful to mention some of the principal works in each case, so far as known to the author.

LECTURE II. (Preaching in the Early Christian centuries).

L Works of the Fathers, with the Lives, Prefaces. Monita, etc., of the Benedictine and Migne editions.

Works on Church History.

Gibbon.

Bingham s Antiquities, and Smith s Diet, of Chris tian Antiquities.

IL Paniel, Geschichte der christlichen Beredsamkeit und der Eomiletik 1839. (Much the most thorough work on the General History of Preaching ; but only a fragment, ending with Augustine. Most of the chapter on Chrysostom was translated in the Bibliotheca Sacra 1847.)

JEJbert, Gesch. der christlich-lateinischen Literatur 1874. (Extends to Charlemagne, and designed as Introduction to General History of the Literature of the Middle Ages in the West. A work of great learning, vigor and freshness, in which, however, the history of preaching necessarily occupies a sub ordinate place.)

Villemain, Tableau de 1 Eloquence Chre tienne au IV e Si 6cle. (New edition 1870. A series of very entertaining essays.)

Moule, Christian Oratory during the first five cen turies. London 1859. (A prize essay of consider able interest and value.) Bromel, Homiletische Charakterbilder 1869-74. (Begins with sketches of Chrysostom and Augustine Well written and fair.)

Fish, Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence. New York. (Contains sermons, with brief historical sketches of periods and of individual preachers. It would be easy to point out faults in this work, but it is convenient and useful.)

III. On the Life of Chrysostom, Neander is still valuable, Perthes not worth much ; Stephens (London, 1872) is the fullest and best work ; Forster (Gotha, 1869) treats ably of Chrysosfcom in relation to Doc trine-history ; " The Mouth of Gold, " by Edwin Johnson (New York 1873), a sort of dramatic poem on the life and times of Chrysostom, is worth reading. Martin, Saint Jean Chrysostome, ses oauvres et son siecle. Paris 1875, three volumes 8 vo., I have not seen.

LECTURE III. (Medieval and Reformation Preach-Works on Church History, and special works on the Reformation.) Works of St. Bernard, Antony of Padua, Thomas Aquinas, Tauler.

Lives and Works of Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli.

Lenz, Geschichte der christlichen Homiletik, 1839. (Useful, though meagre.) Necde, Medieval Preaching. London 1856. (Not thorough, but serviceable.)

Baring- Gould, Post-Medieval Preaching. London, 1865. (A mere collection of curious odds and ends about second-rate preachers.) Bromel, Charakterbilder (as above).

Histories of German Preaching, especially those by Schenk and Schmidt, give accounts of Luther as a preacher.

Msh, Masterpieces (as before).

LECTURE IV. (Great French Preachers.) Works of the Preachers in question, especially of Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon, Saurin, A. Monod, Bersier.

Voltaire, Age of Louis XIV.

Vinet, Histoire de la Predication parmi les Reformes de France au Dix-Septieme Siècle. Paris, 1860. (A remarkably good book, containing sketches, representative extracts, critical discussions, and practical hints.) Feugere, Bourdaloue : Sa Predication et son Temps. 2^{me} ed. Paris. 1874. (Thorough and able.) Bossuet and his Contemporaries. New York* 1875. (By an English lady. Readable, and of some value.)

Berthault, Saurin et la Predication Protestante jusqu'a la fin du règne de Louis XIV. Paris 1875. (Pretty good, but not like Feugere or Vinet.)

Bungener, The Preacher and the King, or Bourdaloue in the Court of Louis XIV. (A new edition of the translation is just issued. Well known as an interesting and instructive story.) Alexander } Thoughts on Preaching. Art. " Eloquence of the French Pulpit." (Quite good.)

Turribull, Pulpit Orators of France and Switzerland. New York 1848. (Several sermons from the first half of this century, with brief sketches of the preachers.)

Fish 9 Masterpieces (as before), and also his Pulpit Eloquence of the nineteenth century. (The translation he gives of Bourdaloue is faulty, and that of Massillon is very bad.) LECTURE V. (English Pulpit.) Lives and Works of the Preachers in question. Works on English History.

Works on Ecclesiastical History of England, especially Burnet, Fuller, Wordsworth's Eccl. Biography, Stoughton.

Fish's two works (as above).

Alexander, Thoughts on Preaching. Art. "The Pulpit in Ancient and Modern Times."

Great Modern Preachers. London. 1875. A small volume, containing a dozen pleasant sketches of English Preachers. Our Bishops and Deans. By Rev. F. Arnold. London 1875. 2 volumes 8vo. Hastily written, but entertaining.

S. A Letter by John A. Broadus on Divorce

A Letter by John A. Broadus on Divorce A letter on the subject of divorce had been received from Dr. John A. Broadus, of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. This letter is as follows:

LOUISVILLE, KY., July 24, 1885.

"MR. W. Z. LEA:

"DEAR BRO. I did not intend to delay so long in answering your letter.

"The case you describe belongs to a class sometimes causing great pain in the action necessary to be taken. To me it seems perfectly plain that our Lord expressly prohibits divorce, except for the cause of unchastity. When, therefore, two persons have been by law divorced on other grounds, and one of them, during the lifetime of the other, marries again, I do not see how a church can recognize this second marriage, or fail to treat it as adulterous. It may sometimes be a very painful action to take.

"Well-meaning people often confuse in their minds the civil and the religious element of marriage, and so may honestly think their action allowable in the second marriage, as it is according to the law of the State; but it seems to me clearly the duty of the church to exclude a member who has entered into such a marriage.

"But some prominent brethren among us incline to the opinion that Paul, in 1 Corinthians 7:1-40, authorizes divorce on the ground of desertion — a view from which has been developed, by degrees, all the loose divorce legislation of many Protestant countries. It seems to me a great mistake to suppose that Paul has changed the Savior's law on the subject, when his language means nothing more than that the Christian partners may live apart (separation, not divorce), if the heathen will not consent to their living together. But it ought to be borne in mind that some Baptists hold desertion to be a scriptural ground of divorce. The view I have taken is also that of [Alvah] Hovey on 'The Scriptural Law of Divorce,' where the subject is fully and ably discussed.

Yours truly, "JOHN A. BROADUS."

=====

[Taken from T. C. Schilling, Abstract History of the Mississippi Baptist Association, From Its Preliminary Organization in 1806 To The Centennial Session in 1906, 1908.]

S. Ask and it shall be given you

Ask and it shall be given you.

Ask and it shall be given you. Matthew 7:7.

ONE thing is certain, the Lord Jesus Christ believed in prayer. It is no new thing to find some persons who question the reality of prayer. There have always been such persons; but the Lord Jesus Christ believed in it. He showed his belief by often teaching us that we ought to pray, by assuring us that prayer will be heard, and by praying much himself. When a person, profoundly sincere and highly intelligent, frequently urges others to do a certain thing, and frequently does it himself, we are sure that he believes in it; so, whenever a man undertakes to say that prayer is not a reality, it ought to be distinctly borne in mind that he flings away the authority of Jesus Christ; that he arrays himself openly and hopelessly against the whole genius of the Christian religion, against the plainest teachings and constant practice of its founder.

We ought always to see where we are and to see what is the meaning of this or that position.

I do not know whether it is worth while, in passing, even for a moment, to recall the sensation of a few years ago on this subject, and remark upon it. I suppose that the idea of what they used to call a prayer test in the newspapers is plainly enough a thing improper and impossible. It is improper, because to ask Christians to confine their prayers to one side of a hospital, and pray not at all for the unhappy sufferers on the other side, is to ask a thing out of the question a refined species of cruelty to be practiced by those who believe in prayer. It is, improper, too, because it proposes that we should try experiments upon God. They did sometimes try that sort of thing upon Jesus Christ, and he invariably refused to submit to it. He wrought wonders and signs beyond number when he thought proper; but when they demanded a sign according to what they thought proper, he never granted it. For us to do this that is proposed would be just that which they did. And besides being improper, it is also impossible. We do not believe that prayer now works miracles. It is not the idea at all that prayer operates with respect to physical fixed forces otherwise than in accordance with physical laws. And so if you suppose prayer to be answered in such a case, it could only be in concurrence with proper physical conditions. Then the unbeliever would say at once that this is not a result of prayer. Such a test is impossible unless prayer works miracles, and no one who understands the matter would suppose that to be the idea. Is it not true, then plain enough now as we look back upon it that the great newspaper sensation of a few years since was a thing improper and a thing impossible? But for us who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, it comes back to this, that our yearning after God and that disposition to cry out to him for mercy and help, which is no invention of theological thinkers, which is the natural product of the human heart and the natural expression of human need and dependence, has the high sanction of the Founder of Christianity. He believed in prayer; he taught us to pray; he said: "Ask, and it shall be given." And notice how often he has repeated it. One might say that that one word was enough; one might say that all human hearts ought to fasten on that one utterance, and feed themselves on it, and rejoice in its assurances. But he said it three times: " Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find;

knock, and it shall be opened unto you.” As if not content with that, he repeats it three times again, in the form of an assurance that so it always is. “ For every one that asketh receiveth, and he that seeketh findeth, and to him that knocketh it is opened.” And even after that he goes on to argue it by a most cogent argument and affecting appeal. Why this multiplied repetition and assurance?

Ah! my friends and brethren, he knew very well how imperfectly we believe in prayer; how difficult it is for us to treat prayer as a reality, and he wanted to help us. He condescends to our infirmity, and again and again, in multiplied forms of expression, he would assure us that if we ask, we shall receive. You know how prone we are to make prayer degenerate into an outward thing. A little child needs to be constantly reminded by its mother that it must not just say prayers, but must mean what it is saying. And we, with all our intelligence and culture, are apt to make our public and private prayer a mere outward thing.

How hard it is for us also, when we try to pray, to realize what we are doing! I remember being once deeply impressed with this thought when present at an institution for the deaf and dumb. After some teaching had been done, one of the principal instructors proceeded to give them a little address on religion, we were told, and then he called upon them to pray. The whole room was still. He stood with reverent face and slowly moved his hands and arms in the signs which they understood, and they sat before him with distended, gazing eyes, and the room grew still as with the stillness of death. I said to myself I could hear my heart beat I said “ This is praying.” Not a word spoken, but this was praying, praying without any of the forms to which we are accustomed. The eyes were wide open, not a sound was heard, and yet human souls were entering into communion with the Father of all spirits. I went away with a profounder sense than ever before of the distinction between the mere outward form and means of prayer, and the inner spirit which is prayer. Now, our Saviour knows that it is hard for us to realize what we do when we are trying to pray.

He also knows how prone we are to be discouraged in our attempts to pray; when we try experiments upon prayer, and get out of heart, and quit. As a man who is endeavoring to effect some invention, and has given all his labor and used all his materials, hoping that he will get the result, when he fails, gives over the experiment, so, how often do we make a mere half-hearted experiment of praying for a certain blessing upon ourselves and others, and when it does not come, we are tempted to give it up as a failure! The Saviour knows how impatient we are that the blessing shall come quickly, and therefore cautions us not to faint when we do not receive it on the instant. We may not receive it in the form we looked for. It may come in a form so different that we shall scarcely recognize it as what we asked for; and so he gives us his assurance and seeks to build up confidence in our hearts that praying is a reality, that prayer is a power. And now notice the affecting appeal our Lord proceeds to make an appeal which those of us who are parents will feel in all its fullness, but which all of us can feel more or less because all of us know something of the affection of our own parents. “ What man is there of you a mere man who, if his son ask for bread, will he give him a stone?” Will he give him something that looks like bread, but which is worthless? “ Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent?” something that looks like a fish but which is poisonous and deadly? Will he mock his child’s petition by giving him something like what he asked for, but that would be useless and harmful? And if ye who are evil, with all the imperfections of your sinful humanity, if ye know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Heavenly Father give good things to them that ask him. It is not an argument

merely, as I used to think it was it is not an argument merely as to willingness to give. It is an argument as to wisdom in giving. If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children. The parent might make a mistake himself and give a stone for bread, or a serpent for a fish; as a rule, parents do not do, this; and if even ye, in your ignorance, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Heavenly Father give good gifts to those who ask him! It does at times happen that when our children ask for bread we do give them a stone; sometimes, alas! when they ask for a fish we give them a serpent. We do this because we make sad mistakes. How many parents think they are giving their children something good when they are giving them that which is useless or hurtful, as if they should give them a poisonous serpent that would sting them to death, though they do not know it! Often, too, we are ignorant, slothful or even selfish, and when the child asks, we won't take the pains to judge carefully, and when the child entreats again and again, we weakly yield. But if even we who are ignorant, heedless, selfish, know how to give good gifts, how much more will our Heavenly Father give good gifts to them that ask him, for he never makes mistakes and never neglects! How beautiful that old saying, "He is too wise to err, and too good to be unkind!" He never makes mistakes in listening to our requests. He is never too busy to attend to our wishes. And the very thought of his being unkind is intolerable.

So, then, our Father is not only willing to give, he is wise in giving. That is the point, and just there lies one of the greatest privileges the Scriptures open up to us, in the assurance that God will give wisely, and this involves withholding where he shall see that withholding is better. That is the sweetest privilege of prayer. For if God should give to you and me an unlimited promise of earthly good for the asking, the more we know ourselves and the more we understand human nature and human life, the more afraid we should be that we might ask for things which would be harmful. Have you not often asked God for something which you have lived to find out would have been a curse to you? Have you not often entreated God to spare you something which it turned out to be a blessing to you that he did not spare? Have you not learned more and more how little you could rely upon your judgment as to what was really best? So I say in that case the wisest and best people would be the slowest to ask, and people would pray less in proportion as they are better fitted to receive. But, as God is wise in giving, we may ask without fear. If we ask for something that we think is good and he sees it is evil, we may be sure that he will not grant it. If we ask for what is really good, he will do for us either what we ask or something which he sees to be better than what we asked. And so I repeat that this is a part of the privilege of prayer.

One Sunday afternoon, now many years ago, I remember to have been sitting in a darkened room with the body of a little child; and in the room was a little boy ten or twelve years of age, one of those strange, thoughtful children that startle us so by asking questions that sink down deep into the mysteries of human life.

After a long silence the boy spoke, and said, "Uncle, I should like to ask you something." "Well." "Does not the Bible say that whatever we ask God, he will do for us?" "Yes." "Well, I did ask him to spare my little cousin's life I did ask him and he did not do it.

I asked him and I don't know what to think about it."

Ah! I thought, as we sat in the darkened room, how far down the child is going already into the sorrowful depths of the human heart! The answer I made was something like this: "You know that

if your father should send you off to boarding-school, and were to tell you in parting that whatever you wanted you must write to him” and you should have it; and if you were to write to your father, on the strength of that promise, for something that was not right for him to give, or was not really best for you, your father would be very sure not to give it to you, and if he did not give it to you, would you think he had broken his promise?” The child heaved a sigh and said, “ Yes; I think I see how it is.’ 1 And my friends, the more you reflect upon it, the more comfort there is in that thought, that, in answering our prayer for temporal good, our Heavenly Father will give wisely, and so will even refuse our prayer when He sees that something else is better. This remarkable encouragement to prayer occurs towards the close of the Sermon on the Mount. Some of the commentators think there is no connection between it and the discourse that precedes; but it seems to me that the connection is plain. “Ask, and ye shall receive,” explains what he had been saying a little before. He said: “Judge not, that you be not judged;” and what good man ever heard that read, or read it himself, without smittings of heart? It is one of the commonest things, this business of harsh judgment of others, and it is very difficult for us to avoid it. We are so ready, the most thoughtful and purest of us, so ready to be hard upon others and easy upon ourselves, when we ought to reverse that proceeding. “Judge not, that ye be not judged.” Then, as you read along, behold you find something that seems to present a new and opposite difficulty. “ Give not that which is holy to the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you.” The purport of this is somewhat obscure; but one thing is clearly involved. We must know the character of those with whom we have intercourse, and deal with them accordingly; and yet we must not judge harshly. We must refrain from judgment, and at the same time must keep our own eyes open and know men. Now, when you put those things together, you say, Ah! who is sufficient for these things? Who can go through life, knowing the folly of men, understanding their wiles and their weaknesses, and yet not judging his fellow-men in an unkindly spirit? But he who enjoins these two difficult and seemingly antagonistic precepts immediately afterwards says: “ Ask, and it shall be given you.” Hard it is for us to do such things as these; but “ask, and it shall be given you.”

Again, if you go a little further back in the discourse, you will find he urges upon us not to be anxious about temporal good, not to be anxious about food and raiment, not to be anxious about to-morrow; and those who most earnestly try to follow that know best how hard it is to obey the command. Ah, as the responsibilities of life thicken around us, and there come to be others concerned in our action, it grows all the harder to restrain ourselves from anxiety about human affairs. In fact, we are obliged to look sharply to the future and plan for it, even for the far distant future. And yet here is Jesus Christ telling us not to be anxious about temporal good, not to be anxious about the future, but to put our trust in God’s providence and to seek God’s righteousness, and then there shall come a blessing upon our planning and exertion, and we need not be anxious. It is so hard, you say, for a man to go on amid grave responsibilities, and yet to restrain himself from this anxiety, so hard; but he who urged this upon us did not cease speaking before he said: “ Ask, and it shall be given you.”

Yet again, going further back in the discourse, you find that we must seek ever, and not be content without, a higher spiritual morality than that of the Scribes and Pharisees. Now, the Scribes and Pharisees, so far as outward proprieties of life are concerned, were eminently good men; and yet he tells us we must be better than they were. We must not only be outwardly good, but within we

must be pure from sin. We must not only have the outward appearance of chastity, but he tells us that there may be in a lustful look the essential element, and therefore the guilt, of unchastity. We are not only to restrain ourselves from external wrongdoing, but govern our thoughts and desires, and control our whole inner being, and make the world within us conform to the spirit of the teachings of Christ. And you say: "O, how difficult, how difficult!" Yes, difficult; but he who enjoined this upon us did not cease to speak on that same occasion till he had said, "Ask, and it shall be given you."

So, then, my hearers, let us learn to put the precepts of Christ along with Christ's invitation to seek help from on high. He who gave these stringent commands gave us encouragement to come and ask for help, the help of his grace, the help of his Holy Spirit. "How much more," as our Lord expressed it on another occasion, "will your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him." My friends, why do you not pray? Are you ashamed to pray? There are people not ashamed to be practicing vice, not ashamed to be heard speaking blasphemy, but ashamed to have it known that they pray. There are people that are too proud to bow their knees before the Lord God. There are people that think somehow it is beneath their dignity to pray. Are you ashamed to pray? The poet Coleridge wrote something in his youth which made light of prayer; but, in his later years, he called a friend to him one day and referred to what he had written and published, and said, "It was all folly," and then he said in earnest tones, "The very noblest possible exercise of the human mind is prayer." Is it not so? When men in all the loftiness of intellect look deepest into the spaces of the universe and widest into its wonders; when men, in the might of administrative talent, make it their ruling thought to control whole nations and the age they live in; when men govern great assemblies and sway them as the wind sways the harvest grain, even then it is all a little thing compared to the nobleness of the exercise of the human mind in prayer, wherein a human being, high or low, rich or poor, elevates his thought into communion with the thought of God, lifts up his spirit into fellowship with the Father of Spirits.

There was a man that trod the earth once who was superior to all men in holiness and wisdom, who lived all his life on earth without sin. He so wise and good, loved to pray, and are you ashamed to pray? My hearers, why do you not all pray? God knows whether you do or not, and you know. Are you afraid to pray? Well a man might be, when he thinks of all his sinfulness, when he remembers all the wicked things that he has done that men know of, and all the wicked things he has thought that men know not of, but God must know; when he sees he has not half confidence in the God he thinks of praying to. But there is a name we may plead; there is an intercessor we may lean on; there is a Holy Spirit to help our infirmities in praying.

O! sinful and troubled soul of man, you need not be afraid to pray! If you come in the name of Jesus Christ, you may come boldly to the throne of grace. If you come leaning on the Spirit's help, you may come assured that your request will be granted. My hearers, why do you not pray? Have you no need to pray? Is there no good thing that God can give, and that you need? No earthly good for yourself or others, about which you had better be asking the Giver of every good and perfect gift? No spiritual good? Have you no sins to be forgiven? Have you no weakness to be helped, no temptations to struggle against? Have you no troubles? O child of man, child of sin and sorrow, living in the strange world we are called to inhabit, have you no need to pray to your Father and your God? Why do you not pray? My friends, let us make it a practical lesson for us all.

Christian people, begin to pray more. Fathers of families, if you have neglected to pray with your families, begin now at once. If you have been negligent in public or private prayer, renew your petitions with earnestness. O, troubled one, shrinking away from the Saviour, remember that he said, " Ask and it shall be given you." And, if there is somebody here this evening that has not prayed for months, that has not prayed for years; if there is some man that has not prayed since the time long ago when he prayed by his mother's knee, and who all these years has been slighting God's word and rejecting God's invitation; O soul, O fellow-sinner, will you not to-night take Jesus' word home to your heart, and begin to find in your experience what some like you have found, that you have but to ask and it shall be given?

S. Baptism And The Lord's Supper

BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER 1. Who ought to be baptized? Every believer in Christ ought to be baptized.

2. Why ought every believer in Christ to be baptized? Because Christ has commanded us to declare our faith in him by being baptized. Matthew 28:19; Acts 8:12; Acts 10:48.

3. What is the action performed in Christian baptism? The action performed in Christian baptism is immersion in water. Mark 1:9; Mark 1:10; Acts 8:39.

4. What does this signify? The water signifies purification from sin, and the immersion signifies that we are dead to sin, and like Christ have been buried and risen again. Acts 22:16; Romans 6:4.

5. Does baptism procure forgiveness or the new birth? No, baptism only represents regeneration and forgiveness like a picture. John 3:5; Acts 2:38.

6. What is meant by our being baptized "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit"? It means that we take God the Father, the Son, and the Spirit as our Sovereign and Saviour. Matthew 28:19.

7. What is the solemn duty of all who have been baptized? It is the duty of all who have been baptized to live that new life of purity and obedience which their baptism signifies. Romans 6:4.

8. What is the Lord's Supper? A church observes the Lord's Supper by eating bread and drinking wine to represent the body and blood of our Saviour. 1 Corinthians 11:20; 1 Corinthians 11:26.

9. Why ought the bread and wine to be thus taken? Because Christ has commanded us to eat bread and drink wine in remembrance of him. Luke 22:19.

10. Who ought to partake of the Lord's Supper? Those ought to partake of the Lord's Supper who have believed in Christ, and have been baptized, and are trying to live in obedience to Christ's commands.

S. Character Building

Character Building Comprehensive Report of a Sermon By John A. Broadus, D.D., LL.D. In the Madison Avenue Baptist Church

New York City Text: 2 Peter 1:3-8; more especially commencing at 2 Peter 1:5.

I SUPPOSE we will all agree that the important work we have to do in this life, as regards ourselves, is the building of our characters. The business man knows how important it is for him to understand the character of his subordinates. A large part of the capital in trade of some men is this power to look into the hearts of others. How important is this gift to the politician. Have you never got a letter from a stranger proposing some great thing, and wished to look that man in the face for five minutes that you might be able to know him? How you looked the letter over and over again, in hopes that it might reveal something about the character of the sender. Have you never observed a skilled physician at the bedside of a very sick patient, endeavoring to draw the sick man into a conversation, talking on things unimportant, until you have wondered what it all meant? That physician, so quiet, seemingly indifferent in his talk, knew what he was about. He wished to understand the character of his patient. You, parents, all know how necessary it is that you find out the nature of your children. And pastors know how essential it is for them to look into the hearts of their parishioners. But important as it is to know the character of others, it is still more important that you understand your own. What a man is is more essential than his possessions or standing in the world. We have almost a morbid desire to know about our fellow-men. The press seeks to gratify this curiosity by its publication of what others are doing. We should look to ourselves — at the revelations our actions make of our own natures. Then, character is the only thing which we shall carry away from this fast, fleeting life. Our body, touched by death, shall soon drop from us, then what we are will remain, will pass on. The apostle, in the passage, is speaking of the building of character — He treats :

1. Of some reasons for this work.
2. Of lessons as to the way it is to be done.
3. The motives for doing the work.

First. — THE REASONS OR ENCOURAGEMENTS.

1. The Apostle says that God's divine power has given us all things which are necessary for the development of life and piety. He does not say that we will, unaided, be able to build up ourselves. We all know, who have tried it, how hard this work is. All things we need God gives us. Can we think of anything God has failed to give — donate — to us when we were earnestly desiring to perfect ourselves?

2. Then the Apostle adds, as another reason, that God has given us exceeding great promises for the future. "As the day is, so shall thy strength be." This cheers us in our greatest trouble. We do not know, when in the severest trial, but what God is just then, in this, fulfilling some promise? A

wise father does not give to his son at once a large capital. It might be ruinous to him. He gives him capital and responsibility and power as he is able to bear it. "Exceeding great and precious promises." How these words give us courage in our battle of life! Have you not walked out with a child in the darkness, where, if alone, it would be terror-stricken? It tightly grasps your hand. It wishes to assure itself that it has a hold of your hand. Thus assured, it is not afraid. Why? It has confidence. So we walk in dark places with God. We have a confidence that relieves us from fear. We need to be assured that God is with us. His promises, great, exceeding, and precious, give us this assurance.

3. Then we have an inspiring ideal. He has given us a nature that partakes of the Divine nature. It is true, we are animal. How the animal in us does assert itself! It is no wonder that many scientific men come to the conclusion that man is nothing but animal; that there is only a difference of degree. When you stop and think, shake yourselves, and listen to the voices in you, you will know there is a difference. Beasts reason a little, but exhibit no sign of a moral nature. They have no conscience. They know nothing whatever of right and wrong — of the word ought — a word a little child may utter, but which can shape the universe. Now, with this moral nature, which brings into kinship with the Divine nature, we have an inspiring reason for building up a right nature in us.

Second. — NEXT, THE APOSTLE SHOWS HOW WE ARE TO PROCEED IN THE WORK.

1. To your faith add virtue. He starts with faith, the foundation of all. He assumes that you believe. Without believing, you would not be a Christian. But you are not to stop with believing. He who stops there is no Christian. He must exercise his faith. And in the exercise of it virtue will be furnished. That is the meaning of the passage, "To your faith " supply "virtue;" that is, try to be good. The mother says to the child, "Try to be good." The learned philosopher, the poet with his mighty word-power, angels, God Himself, cannot say anything better than "try to be good."

2. To virtue supply knowledge. It is not enough that you simply desire to do what is right. You are to know what is right. You must get light. How often we say, had we known what we do now, we would not have done this or that. Even those who try the hardest to be good stumble in the darkness. Then there are very many who don't more than half try. How these do go astray! Very important is it that the Apostle has said, supply knowledge to thy faith. In the whirl of our daily life, when everything is so confusing, we need light as well as a desire to be good.

3. To your knowledge supply a good degree of self-control. That is the meaning of temperance. Passion and prejudice blind knowledge. We must control ourselves, or the light will be put out. Men often cheat themselves much more than they do others. You say we are speaking about simple things, as if to children. True, these things are simple, but they are the very essence of right living. The greatest things, the things that lie right near the foundations of life, are simple. Do some of you think that to gain self-control is easy? If you think so, you have never made a real effort at it. Do some of you think it hard? Remember, God works with and in him who tries to be right and to do right.

4. Then, in your exercise of self-control, have a good supply of patience. You have seen how sometimes those who have succeeded in gaining control of themselves are impatient with others who lack in this respect. Persons may obtain this mastery of themselves by heroic effort; or, it may be, they lack temptation. One has no patience with a drunkard — and it is hard enough to have

patience with such an one. The impatient man is cold and narrow, and could hardly be a drunkard if he tried. Did you never hear a drunkard, ashamed of himself, say "Well, I ain't stingy and mean, as that fellow." Says, the Apostle, let your self-control supply patience. In this mad, rushing age of ours how needful is this injunction! There are some who think patience to be a weak thing. It is no sign of strength that through lack of self-control we give vent to temper and passion. A horse that runs away does not prove that it is strong, but that the driver is weak.

5. Then, lest that we should think that this life is all, the Apostle continues, To patience supply piety. Piety controls all the other graces. Then, says he, see that in this piety is brotherly kindness ; and in this brotherly kindness is Charity — Love. Where there is so much to bear, so much roughness, so much that is selfish and hard, that worries and irritates, as in this world, how essential that the Christian should have patience and brotherly kindness and love.

Third. — OBSERVE SOME ADDITIONAL MOTIVES TO THIS WORK.

1. Through these things we will make progress in the life of a Christian, "For if these things be in you and abound, they make you that you shall neither be barren nor unfruitful," etc. If you are teaching a clerk his duties, you tell him to do this and that, and then he will understand how to do these other things. So with children; so with scholars at school. We learn duty through the discharge of duty. Christianity is a practical thing. If these truths be in you and abound, then will you know more of Christ and of His sustaining sympathy, and of the whole round of Christian truths. All this will be wrought through the atonement and intercession of Christ. So there will be no place for boasting. He who has developed the most, done the most, will be the most humble.

2. Another reason is given in 2 Peter 1:10 : You will make " your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things, you will never fall." I remember when a boy how those words, "calling and election," often sent a shiver through my soul. How many stumble over them. What does the Apostle say? — If you do these things, if you will supply to you faith, virtue, etc., you will never fall, and so you will make your calling and election sure. There is a divine side to this doctrine of election; but with that we have nothing to do. If a man wishes to know whether he is a Christian, one of the elect, let him try to do these things. How we are constantly brought back to the practical!

3. But a crowning motive is given in 2 Peter 1:11 : "For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ." The word ministered may be rendered supplied. Is not this motive enough that we give all diligence to perfect our characters? Brethren, I have tried to preach you a practical sermon, one that would help me in my troubles, and I pray God it may help you.

=====

[From I. K. Funk, editor, The Complete Preacher: Sermons Preached by Some of the Most Prominent Clergymen in this and Other Countries, 1895, pp. 38-40. Document from Google Books. — jrd]

S. Christian Joy

Christian Joy

John A. Broadus Rejoice in the Lord alway! and again I say rejoice. Php 4:4 A person who reads this letter of Paul to the Philippian Christians will hardly fail to observe, how often the apostle speaks of joy; how often he alludes to his own sources of joy; how often he bids his brethren to rejoice. There must be significance in this. The apostle Paul was not a man to use many words without meaning; and that divine Spirit, that guided him in what he wrote, never speaks for naught. When we read again and again injunctions like this, "Finally my brethren rejoice in the Lord," or "in all things by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, make your requests known," etc.; or when he says, "for your furtherance and joy of faith," "that your rejoicing may be more abundant," "I joy and rejoice with you all; for this cause also do ye joy and rejoice with me"; or, in the text, bids them "rejoice in the Lord alway," repeating the injunction with unusual and very marked emphasis, "and again I say, rejoice"-when we read all these passages and more than these, in one very brief letter, we may be assured that the writer was very earnest in his own rejoicing, and was quite anxious that his brethren should rejoice too, and was certain that they had ample cause of rejoicing.

It is well too to observe what was the condition of him who thus constantly tells of joyfulness, and what the condition of those upon whom he urged the duty of rejoicing and thankfulness. When Paul wrote to the Christians at Philippi, he was a prisoner at Rome; liable not merely to be tried upon the accusations made against him by the Jews (which were not likely to condemn him), but liable also to punishment for preaching a new religion which was not tolerated by the laws of the state, and more especially since it had a direct tendency to break down the religion of the state. He knew all this-he knew that his life was in danger; and yet still he rejoices, for he is confident that whether by his life or his death, Christ will be glorified, and he feels that to him (as he says) "to live is Christ, and to die, gain." He can rejoice too that his imprisonment has been the means of drawing attention to the religion he preaches, and that many have waxed bolder in preaching the gospel by reason of his bonds. And thus he, who was a prisoner, and could not know his fate, yet found abundant matter of thankfulness and rejoicing. The Philippian Christians, to whom he wrote, had to bear more than ordinary trials. The apostle himself, when first preaching there, had been grievously mistreated; and the zeal and hatred of the Jews had made them continue to wage an unremitting warfare against the few disciples there of the true faith. They had adversaries, they had opposition, they had persecutions. Yet Paul says, "rejoice." Surely, then, when we see an apostle rejoicing in bonds, and again and again saying "rejoice" to a feeble body of injured and persecuted men, we may know that thanksgiving and rejoicing is a great Christian duty, and an exalted Christian privilege. Therefore, I desire to speak now of Christian thankfulness and Christian joy. An unthankful and complaining spirit is an abiding sin against God, and a cause of almost continual unhappiness; and yet how common such a spirit is. How prone we seem to be to forget the good that life knows, and remember and brood over. its evil-to forget its joys, and think only of its sorrows-to forget thankfulness, and remember only to complain. The ox will graze all

day in green pastures, and know of nothing but the moment's enjoyment; and many a man will enjoy the blessings that are so spread out before him, the pleasures that are so thickly strewn along his path, and never have one moment's thought of the bountiful Being that gave them, that good and gracious One who is "kind to the unthankful and the evil." But then let trouble come-want or suffering, disappointment or anxiety, remorse or dread, and how soon he grows dissatisfied with life, how soon he complains of his hard lot, and murmurs against the God that made him. Is it not lamentable that men will never thank God for the countless blessings he confers upon them, and then remember him only to complain of the evils which they have brought upon themselves, and which are never half so great as their misconduct deserves? And if in those who care nothing for him that made them and preserves and blesses them, those who neglect or hate him, this conduct is so strange, how is it with those who have yet more to thank God for, who are his children by the new and spiritual birth, who are made heirs of God, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ? And yet, my brethren, how many an earnest Christian is grievously wanting in thankfulness for his Heavenly Father's goodness, and suffers himself often to complain and be peevish and fretful at the little trials of life; forgetting how much more there is even in the midst of trials, how much more joy than sorrow in his lot, and forgetting too the command of him who has said, "In every thing give thanks." We need to watch and pray concerning this disposition. We need to strive to change our ways of thinking and feeling about it. Let a man be reminded of the many blessings God had given him, and he will say at once, "Ah, but this one trouble destroys all my happiness, mars all my enjoyment"-and he will turn away his eyes from everything pleasant around him, and gaze moodily or fretfully at this source of trouble. If he does not carry it so far as this, he will be sure to let this discomfort prevent all thankfulness. Now I say we need to change here. Our feeling ought to be, that though we have troubles, yet these shall not prevent our being glad and thankful at the many blessings, the more numerous and rich and undeserved blessings we enjoy. "In every thing give thanks." Thank God for your enjoyments-they are the gift of his goodness. Do you really, my Christian hearer, look upon the blessings, I mean the temporal blessings, you enjoy as the gift of God? Do you really thank him with the heart, even when your lips are uttering words of thankfulness? My brethren, I have sometimes feared that with many of us there is three times a day a solemn mockery practiced. How often it happens that a family gather time after time around their table, spread with that abundant and pleasing food which, in the good providence of God they have been enabled to provide, and seem to thank their Heavenly Father for these blessings, and yet they do not thank him-and yet no heart of all those gathered there feels one emotion of gratitude to God. The grace before meals is necessary and proper, they believe, but neither he that speaks again nor they that hear again the oft-repeated words have any real feeling of thankfulness at all. I do not say this is so with all-I do not say it is always so with any; but is it not too often so? And if here, when you are professing to give thanks, you feel no thankfulness, alas how must it be in those unnumbered hours when you neither think nor speak of gratitude.

I say then that with reference to temporal blessings, to earthly good, to the ordinary course of affairs in life I fear you are sadly lacking, my Christian brethren, in the gratitude to God which you ought to cultivate and cherish. It is a poor return to make for that goodness which crowns your life with so many blessings, to be complaining constantly because something goes wrong. You say to a child who complains of what is given him, that he ought to be glad it is so good; it is far better than he deserves. And so might it be said to every professed child of God-however few comparatively may be your advantages and however many comparatively your troubles, you ought

to be thankful it is no worse, you ought to remember that it is far better than you deserve. But the rejoicing contemplated by the text amounts to very much more than gratitude for temporal mercies. Indeed, ample as I have tried to show is the ground for gratitude on the score of earthly blessings, and sadly remiss as we are in that we do not cultivate more of the spirit of thankfulness for present good, yet all these are at last but our Father's meaner gifts, and all such sources of pleasure are as nothing when compared with that higher rejoicing to which the Christian is here invited. It is to rejoice on account of spiritual blessings.

I know that in calling upon Christians to rejoice over their religious privileges and blessings, one is met by the danger of spiritual pride. I remember the Pharisee, who thanked God (at least he said he did-I doubt if he did really feel any thankfulness at all) that he was better than other men. I have not forgotten how sinful a feeling like this must be-how unworthy of creatures such as we are, who have no good in us, whose righteousness must be altogether the gift of another. This very consideration is sufficient to counteract every tendency to spiritual pride. If a man really is a Christian, he knows that all the good in him is of God; he knows that he has to thank God for every privilege he enjoys, and he cannot deserve credit for that which is the gift of another-and his gratitude to the giver would better make him humble than proud. No, the true Christian may rejoice over what the Lord has made him, without forgetting that he owes it to the Lord-"by the grace of God I am what I am." In the world, the proudest men are commonly those who have least to be proud of, and so in religion the man who has much of it is in very little danger of being proud thereof, for that religion whose essence is humility will always teach him to "rejoice with trembling."

I repeat then that the text looks properly to a spiritual rejoicing, and on the score of spiritual blessings. There are many reasons why Christians should rejoice, should rejoice in the Lord. Here are some of them.

I bid you rejoice, my dear hearer, because you have at least been awakened to a sense of your sins-that you are not a careless, nor a hardened sinner. It is a good thing for a man to be aware of his condition, because he is then more likely to seek relief. if a man finds he is in danger, there is hope that he will strive to escape. If one knows that he is diseased, and feels it, there is hope that he will seek the physician. And the fact that a man feels that he is a sinner shows that he is beginning to have more correct ideas of what sin is, and what holiness is, of what is his own character, and what that character ought to be. An awakened sinner is no more free from sin than he was before. But then he is more likely to seek the Saviour and thus be forgiven and purified. An old writer has said that a bucket which is being drawn out of the well is not felt to be heavy, till it begins to rise out of the water; that a man who is under water does not feel the weight of the tons that may be above him, so much as he would feel the weight of one little tubful of water on his head when he is out. So when a man feels the weight of his sin it seems as if he is not so wholly immersed in sin as he was before; he is coming out of it.

It is a lamentable thing that so many men and women are living without seeming ever to think of their being sinners. They not only enjoy God's bounty without ever thanking him, but they incur his displeasure without fearing him, they heap up for themselves wrath against the day of wrath without taking time to think what they are doing. Do you want to find the most lamentable, the most pitiable and deplorable spectacle on earth? Do not tell me of one who thinks he will soon recover and live many years, when consumption has fastened its grasp upon him and tomorrow he must

die. Do not tell me of him who sails gaily down the quickening current and forgets the cataract that is before him. But come and look upon the careless and reckless sinner, who is going on without one moment's thought to eternal death; who is standing upon the slippery places of earthly life, while the fiery billows of death and perdition roll beneath his feet, and yet does not seem to know where he is; who has in truth nothing before him but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries, and yet moves on as if the present were all bright and he had nothing to fear. But there is the hardened sinner-who has eyes that seeing see not, and ears that hearing hear not-who hardened the heart till now nothing can move, till God's wrath cannot alarm, nor his love attract, till his threatenings and his invitations fall alike unheeded on the ear, till the story of the bleeding, dying love of Jesus can never move. Oh, may God in his mercy deliver you, my dear hearer, from being a hardened sinner! Whatever else befall you, God forbid that you should be a hardened sinner! And my brethren I say I rejoice, and I bid you rejoice, that you are at least awakened-that you are not careless, not hardened. But there is greater cause still for rejoicing. My Christian brother, can you not rejoice that you have faith in Christ and enjoyment of religion, communion with God and hope of glory? You have faith in Christ. You have found him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write. You have found him who was exalted a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance unto Israel and remission of sins. You have found him who was lifted up to draw all men unto him. You know him who is the chief among ten thousand and altogether lovely. You have traced out something of the unsearchable riches of Christ. You have found the hidden treasure, the pearl of great price. You have learned that there is balm in Gilead, that there is a great Physician there; he has checked your fearful, mortal malady, and you shall live. You have looked to the brazen serpent, you are healed. You have sprinkled your door post with the blood of God's atoning Lamb, and the angel of destruction will pass you by. You have fled to the city of refuge, and the destroyer cannot come near you. You have laid your sins by faith on your substitute and he has borne them away into the wilderness. You have bathed in the fountain that was opened in the house of King David for sin and for uncleanness, and the defilement of guilt has been washed away. You have brought to Jesus the writing that bound you as a servant of sin, and he has annulled it by nailing it to his cross. In a word, you believe on the Saviour, and to you that believe he is precious. And my brother, if all these things be true of you, if Jesus is yours and you are his, have you not cause for rejoicing and praise and thanksgiving and love? We are told that on one occasion the disciples whom Jesus had sent out, returned with rejoicing, saying, "Lord, even the devils are subject to us through thy name." And the Master replied, "Rejoice not in this, that the devils are subject unto you, but rather rejoice that your names are written in heaven." And, my brethren, if you be true believers in Jesus, you may well rejoice that your names are written in heaven. It may amount to but little that your names are written on an earthly record as Christians, for that does not prove it true; a man may have a name to live and be dead. But if they are written in that blessed book, the Lamb's book of life, then may you rejoice indeed.

Again, you have the enjoyment of religious privileges. You have within your reach continually those delights which religion alone can afford. You can feed on the bread of life which came down from heaven, and drink sweet draughts from the wellspring of salvation. You can read the blessed teachings of God's holy word, you can walk to the house of God in company with those you love, and hear the sound of the glorious gospel, and rejoice that being mixed with faith in you that hear it, the word preached profits you. You can gather together for united prayer and feel that you sit

together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. You can lift your voices together in hymning the praises of your glorious Redeemer. And is there not in privileges like these matter for great and continual rejoicing?

Then you can enjoy communion with God. My hearer, have you ever felt what is meant by communion with God? Or is it only a something you have read of in the Bible and heard of from the pulpit, without understanding it? If you be a real, earnest Christian, you have felt what it is. You are able to call God Father. Although by sin men are separated from him and can look to him only as an offended Lord and a righteously angry Judge, yet you may rejoice at knowing that you have been adopted into the household of faith, and have received that spirit of adoption whereby you cry, "Abba, Father," and can in humble faith and earnest confidence lift your prayer unto him who is our Father in heaven. You can pray without ceasing unto him. As you hunger and thirst after righteousness, you can go to him and know that you shall be filled. As you feel yourself weak, you can hope for strength from him.

It is especially a privilege to pray to him alone, to commune with him in secret-to enter into your closet and shut the door and pray to your Father which is in secret, as knowing that your Father which seeth in secret himself shall reward you openly. You can pour out there before him your heart's inmost sorrows, your spirit's own peculiar wants. You can wrestle there alone with your God, for the blessings you need, and know that asking you shall receive. You can confess every sin, of word or deed, of thought or desire, and ask for forgiveness through the Saviour in whom you trust. You can pour out your soul there in earnest supplication for those you love who love not Jesus; you can spread out all their sad case before your God, and implore him to stop them and turn them and rescue and save them. Oh, the privilege of private prayer, the joy and peace that flow to the true believer from personal, spiritual communion with the Father of his spirit! But there is not only faith in the Saviour, and the enjoyment of religious privileges, and communion with God, but as if these were not enough to make the heart overflow with joy, we have more-there is the hope of glory. It is a bright and beautiful change when the water of some little muddy pool is drunk up by the sun, leaving be-hind all its earthly defilements, and when it appears again in rain-drops is clothed, as the sunbeams shine through it, in all the bright hues of the rainbow. But this is nothing, compared with the change from a sin-defiled dweller on the earth, to a glorified inmate of the Paradise of God. How blessed will be that change! when they who have entered the strait gate and walked the narrow way through the troubles and trials of earth, shall pass through the pearly gates and tread the golden streets of the New Jerusalem, the glorious city of our God; when they who have groaned in sickness and sighed in sorrow, they who have languished in pain and borne the agony of death, shall pass into that blest abode where "sickness and sorrow, pain and death, are felt and feared no more." Christian brother, I bid you read humbly, and yet rejoicingly, the soul-inspiring descriptions which are given us in the book of Revelation-the descriptions of the glorious city, the river and the tree of life, the robes of white, the harps of gold, the chorus of redeemed spirits, the song of Moses and the Lamb-I cannot tell what all these mean, but I know they mean and are intended to mean, all that is glorious and gladdening and bright and beautiful. Read it, humbly and thankfully, and let your heart swell with devout rejoicing, and your bosom heave with humble gratitude to him who has "given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace," the hope of immortality and eternal life, the hope of heaven, the hope of glory.

Happy art thou, O Christian, if such joys, such privileges, such cheering, gladdening hopes, are indeed experienced. How much our Heavenly Father has given you of temporal good, how much more of spiritual enjoyment and soul-sustaining hope. How much the Lord of life and glory has done on your behalf. Go tell one that is able to understand you, of his parents' tenderness and care; of his father's yearning fondness, his mother's unutterable love; of all their anxiety and uneasiness and privation and suffering on his account, and if he is not moved to love and gratitude, you call him a thankless wretch. Has not God loved you with more than a father's, more than a mother's love? Has not Jesus suffered for you unspeakable anguish and agony, has he not died for you? Will you be thankful for all goodness and mercy? When he, who has done so much for you, who has given you all those exalted privileges and blessed joys and glorious hopes on which we have been dwelling, when he bids you rejoice in him, rejoice always in him. Cultivate a spirit of thanksgiving, a spirit of rejoicing, and devote your life to his service, that all your life should be one ceaseless song of joy, one constant hymn of praise, "to him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father!" "Finally, brethren, rejoice in the Lord."

S. College Education for Men of Business

College Education for Men of Business.

THOSE sprightly, growing boys of yours, what are you going to do about their education? Let us think a little upon that question. Even if your mind is partly made up, there is no harm in listening to the notions of a man who has spent his life as an educator; of course you will decide for yourself all the same.

You have been looking about for now a good many years, and have pretty much concluded that it is desirable for those who are to be professional men to go to college. But your son will not enter a profession; he is going to spend his life in business. I ask, HOW DO YOU KNOW? You may have a very definite purpose on the subject, and so may he; but how can you be sure? Inquire concerning the men who have succeeded well in the several professions, and it will be very curious to see how small, a proportion of them, at the age of sixteen or eighteen, had any notion of spending their lives in the professions they finally adopted. Parents and teachers often err egregiously in their judgment as to what a youth was born for. It is said, that when Mr. Moody first spoke in a prayer-meeting, his pastor advised him not to attempt that again, as he had evidently no talent for public speaking; and now, let the crowds that hear his preaching tell, and the thousands of converts. And the lad himself will often err likewise. At one period of my own boyhood I read Cooper's novels, of which my father was very fond, until I became enamored of Indian life, and fully resolved that so soon as I became "a man," I would go to the Missouri Territory (as they used to call it), among the Blackfoot Indians, get to be a great hunter and fighter, marry a squaw, the daughter of an old chief, and succeed him as chief of the tribe, and live and die in paint and feathers. Would any sensible father and mother have said, The boy has got his head on that; it shows the native bent of his genius, and so there is no use in sending him to boarding-school? How do you know, then, and how does your son know, though he may have no such silly fancies as the boy just mentioned, what is his destined calling for life? And especially is this true as to the ministry of the gospel. If a man must be divinely called to this work, that will often happen much later in life than the proper time for entering college.

I am very glad you hold that the professional men of the future ought, in general, to be thoroughly educated.

Even in the past, the most eminent men have much more frequently had this advantage than most persons imagine. Of the leading Baptist ministers in America a hundred years ago, quite a number had been to college, and nearly all the rest were laborious students. Or take our statesmen. America has been the Paradise of what we call self-made men. In every calling such men came to the front, and in politics there was long a decided advantage in being a self-made man. The fraction of Americans who have been to college is extremely small; how large, in comparison, is the fraction of leading statesmen who were college bred, even in this "new country," with a prejudice in favor of the other class. Look at Congress, or the Legislature of this State, at any time during the last hundred years, or at the present day, and the comparison of these two fractions will

be very suggestive. And then we must stop calling ours a new country. Things are rapidly changing. In medicine and law it will, in less than fifty years, be required by public opinion here, as it is now in Europe, that the acceptable practitioner shall have a good general education and a thorough training in his profession. The editorial profession, which is looming up into such importance, greatly needs thorough education, in order to breadth of view and sympathy with all truth, in order to correct handling of the ten thousand subjects which journalists have to treat, and in order that they may cease butchering the English language and shocking literary taste in the frightful fashion to which, with few exceptions, they are now accustomed. And teachers, what profession is more important than this?

What greater need is there among us except the need of Christian morality than of really well-qualified teachers? Everybody believes in schools for children. But education has to work from above downwards. Where shall we get educated teachers, unless people more generally send their sons to our higher schools? As to our ministers, I think the Baptists have been quite right in encouraging some uneducated men to preach. It was a necessity, else the masses would never have been reached; for well-educated men were too few, and the illiterate could often command a fuller sympathy. A like necessity will still exist, but it will be constantly diminishing. An increasingly large proportion of our ministers must be thoroughly educated men, or Baptists will not keep pace with the times.

But, coming back to your son, SUPPOSE HE DOES spend his life as a man of business, an agriculturist, merchant, manufacture^e or the like. I earnestly urge that in such a business life, higher education, or what we commonly call college education, will be of great advantage to him. So many doubt this, deny, even ridicule the idea, that I beg your special attention.

Good and generous men, all over the land, are even giving their money to endow colleges to educate other people's sons, and then entirely failing to send their own sons to them. Now, I think, there is no little popular error about this something we call education, partly due to the wrong methods pursued and wrong ideas put forth by some professed educators. Pray consider, then, WHAT DO WE MEAN BY EDUCATION? This term is generally used among us in quite too narrow a sense. Thus, we hear a great deal about "educated men" and "self-educated men." But, in one sense, every man is self-educated who is ever really educated at all. It is only in the voluntary exertion of his mental powers that he gains development and discipline of these powers. John Randolph said: "Put a blockhead through college, and the more books you pile on his head the bigger blockhead he will be." A man has to educate himself, no matter how numerous and advantageous his helps. And then, in another sense, no man is self-educated. Even those who never have a teacher, if they really become educated men, have been educated by books (teachers who, being dead, yet speak), by the men with whom they converse, by the events which lead them to think, which draw out their powers into active exercise, by the ideas which are abroad in the atmosphere of their time. There is, then, no such broad difference between- the educated and the self-educated as many suppose.

Now, when can we say that one is an educated man? My answer would make something like the following points: 1. An educated man is one whose mind is widened out, so that he can take broad views, instead of being narrow-minded; so that he can see the different sides of a question, or at least can know that all questions have different sides. 2. An educated man is one who has the

power of patient thinking; who can fasten his mind on a subject, and hold it there while he pleases; who can keep looking at a subject till he sees into it and sees through it. If anybody imagines it easy to think, in this steady way, he has not tried it much. f 3. Again, an educated man is one who has sound judgment, who knows how to reason to right conclusions, and so to argue -as to convince others that he is right. 4. And finally not to speak now of imagination and taste, important as they are an educated man is one who can express his thoughts clearly and forcibly. Now, if this be a roughly correct description of an educated man, there are many among us who deserve that name, though they never went to college, and some of them went little to school. Look at our really successful business men. You will find that in most cases their minds are widened, so that they can take broad views. How grandly comprehensive are often the views of a great planter, merchant, manufacturer or railroad man! Also, that they can keep thinking of a subject till they see into it; that they can judge soundly, and reason and argue, reaching just conclusions themselves, and convincing others that they are right; and that they have command of clear and forcible expression. These, then, are really educated men. But notice. They gain this education, in the school of life, very slowly in most cases, and usually cannot be called educated in this sense, until they have reached or passed middle age. Now is it possible to select certain branches of knowledge, and combine them into such an apparatus of mental training, that, by putting our young men through this, we can, to a great extent, anticipate the discipline which would be slowly gained in the school of life, can give to the young man of twenty-one or twenty-five much of that accuracy of thought, soundness of judgment and command of expression, which otherwise he would not have till he reaches fifty or more? Of course this cannot be wholly done, for some kinds of mental training can be gained only by experience and by slow degrees; but can it be done to a considerable extent? Wide and varied experiment has shown that it can be. And precisely this is the main object of all wise educational processes. The knowledge gained may or may not be directly useful in subsequent life: the main thing is to educate, to give the young man, in a few years, much of that development and strengthening and discipline of his principal faculties, that use of himself, which, otherwise, he would have only when almost an old man. And remember that if, in certain respects, we cannot anticipate the lessons of the school of life, in other respects we can prepare the young man to learn those lessons to better purpose than would otherwise, for him, have been possible.

See, then, how unwise people are when they keep asking: "What good will Latin and Astronomy and Metaphysics do a business man?" and keep saying that our youth must study only those branches of knowledge that will be "useful." What can be so useful to a young man as to improve his sense, to give him greater power of thinking closely and soundly, and of making other people think as he thinks, and do what he wants them to do? You wish your son to be a practical man; but you do not want him to spend his life as simply a day-laborer. Well, if he is to rise above this, is to acquire property and control the labor of others for his advantage, it must be done by sense. Not even industry and saving ways will suffice, unless he can see into things, judge wisely about complicated questions and talk sensibly to those with whom he deals. No doubt these powers depend partly on natural endowment; but, then, they can be greatly improved by education, and I insist that to improve them is the main object of all wise educational processes. In fact, the method of education is even more important than the material. A superior teacher could, to a great extent, educate a superior pupil with almost any branch of knowledge. But certain subjects, suitably combined, are found to have much greater educating power than others, and on this principle we

select and recommend. If some of them are also of practical utility, that is, of course, very desirable. But, in very important respects, the mind may be better enlarged, invigorated, disciplined by subjects of study which have little to do with practical life; and I repeat that the effect on the mind itself is the principal matter.

RESULTS OF SUCCESS IN BUSINESS.

Besides, you do not simply wish your son to prosper in business, to accumulate property. Think of the good he is to get from his business success. He will wish to have a home, a bright and sweet home. Wealth alone cannot make this. I am not speaking now of the one thing that is needful, but consider how much culture contributes to the happiness and highest well-being of a growing family. Almost every man who has financial prosperity aspires to this. Some succeed, notwithstanding the lack of early advantages, but very few under such circumstances attain true and high culture. Many a worthy gentleman of middle age, fondly watching his growing children, and longing to inspire them with a relish for the delights of history, poetry, and popular science, to see them bathe their young minds in the sweet waters of literature, resolves winter after winter that he will read upon certain subjects buys a number of books, begins, and next summer remembers that he has done almost nothing, and mourns, again and again, that he did not acquire reading habits, and a basis of literary knowledge, in his youth. And sooth to say, many of our girls are now receiving a fairly good education, and women are so quick in picking up and turning to account a knowledge of general literature, that our young men must get a better education than has been common, or they will in many cases find themselves unpleasantly inferior to their wives.

Still further, as to your son, think of the good he is to do in life. Success in business will give him influence in some respects, but how much more influential he will be, and how much more useful as a member of society, if he had in youth a good education. You have known here and there a man prosperous, intelligent and of high character, who in a country neighborhood or a village was worth as much as a school he seemed to lift up the whole community. In our current politics one of the great wants is that of intelligent leading citizens.

There is much humbug now-a-days about reading and writing. Some of our new-light philosophers seem to think that if we can only teach everybody to read and write, then the masses will always vote wisely and do right. But what do they read? The fact is, the masses need, and always have, leaders, to tell them what to do; and the only question is whether they shall be led by low demagogues, or persons not much wiser than themselves, or on the other hand by men worthy to lead, qualified to lead wisely. So, too, in our churches, the most crying need at present is for an educated membership.

We have heard a great deal about educating our ministers, but educated private members, of both sexes, are just as necessary. These, where they do exist, give interest to Sunday-schools and prayer-meetings, diffuse correct ideas of Christian benevolence, and give sympathetic appreciation and moral support to an intelligent and active pastor. These can meet in conversation the subtle infidelity which is spreading its poison through all our society, which the pastor often declines to preach against lest he merely advertise instead of curing, and which is seldom mentioned to him in private because its advocates in general do not really wish to have their errors corrected. O how much we need a larger number of thoroughly educated and truly devoted men and women in all the churches!

DIFFICULTIES IN THE WAY OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

You say you are willing to send the boys to school, and want the teacher to do the best he can for them; but, when they are pretty nearly grown, you find they generally want to go into business, and you think they are about right go to school while they are boys, and get to work as soon as they are men. But consider.

We have agreed, have we not, that the mental conditions most important for business success are breadth of view, power of patient thinking, sound judgment. And I have insisted that the great object of wise schemes of education is to train the mind in these respects. Now, these powers cannot be trained till a person is nearly grown, for the excellent reason that not until then have they any considerable natural development. In a little child, the leading faculty is imagination, and the chief means of teaching it is story-telling. Everything must be put into that form, or, at least, must be sweetened with a story. If we do not tell the children stories, they will make some for themselves and tell them to each other. At the age of ten or twelve, the leading faculty is memory. That is the time to store the mind with knowledge of facts, explaining where it is not too difficult, but aiming chiefly to lodge the facts themselves permanently in the memory. But judgment, in any high and broad sense, analysis, generalization, abstract thinking, reasoning, these are, as a rule, not much developed until the age of eighteen or twenty. Of course, then, it is not until that age, as a rule, that we can begin to give those high mental powers any effective training. A great many efforts have been made of late years to have boys anticipate the studies proper only to comparative maturity. Children of a dozen years are found toiling over Evidences of Christianity, Rhetoric, English Syntax subjects which they cannot possibly understand. All this is a grievous mistake, though it is a well-meant effort to supply a felt want. These things ought to be learned, and others of the same sort; but they can be learned, not at the beginning, but only towards the end of "the teens." Now see what happens. Our boys and girls go to school, and perhaps learn well, during the period when memory predominates, get a useful knowledge of facts (though this might be much better managed than it commonly is), but just when they reach the age at which we could begin to give them education in the highest, broadest sense education that would really prepare them for the duties of life they break away; the boys plunge head foremost into business, and the girls well, they quit school!

Here is an evil most lamentable and wide-spread. Who trains horses that way, or builds houses, or railroads, or raises crops laboring a long time with the mere preparations, and stopping short just at the time when the consummation of the undertaking comes within reach?

What we call "higher education" is really the most practical part of the whole process; and yet our restless youths and our thoughtless parents neglect it, just because, forsooth, they are so anxious to be practical.

But, you ask, do we expect all the young men of the country to go to school until they are twenty-five years old? No, and we do not expect all the young men of the country to be highly successful in business, or highly influential and useful, as citizens or as Christians. Higher education is, of course, not possible for all. Besides, if college studies now keep many till the age of twenty-five, this is usually because our preparatory schools and our general methods of training children have been, for the most part, so poor and unsatisfactory. When better ideas are diffused throughout society, when a larger number of good teachers are trained, and more good schools

are established, then most of our competent young men will be able to complete a fair course of higher education by the time they are twenty-one or twenty-two.

You remind me of another difficulty, that there is need of some early training for business itself. Certainly, one who is to be a farmer ought to work on a farm in his early teens, watching every detail with a boy's sharp observation, and learning how to do all kinds of work himself; and he who is to be a merchant ought, while still a boy, to hop counters and tie bundles, to keep accounts, and observe the quality of goods and the tastes of customers. But this can be managed by putting such boys to work on Saturdays and in the greater part of vacation; and perhaps, also, it might be well, somewhere between thirteen and seventeen, to keep them at home a year, and make them buckle down to steady labor. I could tell you of men eminently successful in their callings, who were trained in just this way, with advantage to their health, and certainly no damage to their mental improvement. And yet another difficulty occurs to you. It doesn't look reasonable that young fellows so different in turn of mind, and in their proposed callings, as the students of a college are, should all be put through exactly the same course of study. But remember, that the object is to develop and discipline faculties which all intelligent youths possess to some considerable extent, and which have to be exercised in all callings alike. Special training for particular pursuits may be distinct, going on partly at the same time with, and partly subsequent to, this general training, which will contribute to success in any kind of work. Besides, most of our colleges are beginning to provide for a change of the course, by making certain studies elective, or even by making the whole course elective, so that the studies of each youth may be more or less adapted to his peculiarities of mind, preparation, or destined pursuit.

OBJECTIONS TO COLLEGE LIFE. But there is no use in talking, you say, about your son's going to college. It is too expensive you can't afford it. Colleges are just intended for rich men's sons, or those that get their money easy in some way; you made your money by hard work, and can't afford to spend it so fast.

Why, the very object of college endowments is to cheapen education, for the sake of those who are not rich. If your son were to get instruction from a single v one of these select professors, with his talents and high scholarship, it would cost him twice as much a year as his entire college fees. Rich men could employ several such instructors if they chose, but you and I could not. And if our sons can have the privilege of being taught by these professors, it is for the reason that a large part of their support is drawn from endowment; and usually it is a support most meagre and unworthy, when we consider their choice abilities and severe labors. In fact, college education is one of the cheapest things in the country; and we who are comparatively poor get a great bargain in it, a first-rate article for one-third the cost.

Ah! but you didn't so much mean the tuition; it is the other expenses. Yes, and you begin with counting all that is spent for clothing, and forget that the fellow would spend money for clothes if he stayed at home.

If it be said that at home he would only need a Sunday suit, and could wear plain and cheap clothes all the week, I answer, so he can at college. If a student's general appearance and personal habits are good, if his hair and his hands, his boots and his linen, are always scrupulously clean, and the rest of his clothing, however cheap and even coarse, is well brushed and free from stains and spots, then, with good manners, he will be accounted a thoroughly

genteel young man, by all those whose opinion is worth regarding, young ladies included. Forty years ago, two young men entered the University of Virginia, paying their way with money saved from teaching, and during the first winter wearing plain jeans coats all the week, among those aristocratic and dressy youngsters from the Cotton States.

Both found hearty welcome in the professors' families, and formed choice friendships among the students, besides gaining unsurpassed academic honors; and one of them is now a distinguished educator in Virginia. And to-day there are students in great number at our colleges who spend scarcely a cent more on their clothing than they would do in a country home, and yet make a good appearance, and are respected and well received in society. As to the board, it is already very cheap at many colleges, and can be made cheaper still, if students choose to abstain from mere luxuries, and set their heads on economizing. A rapid and salutary change is going on in many parts of the country. It used to be the case that college fashions were mainly set by rich fellows, who went to college simply as a thing proper for a gentleman's son to do, and consequently others were ashamed to show their poverty by living plainly. I hope to see the day when, as in the German cities, a student can live on as few cents a day as he pleases, and it will be nobody's business; when not only those of moderate means, like your son, but the very poor, can work their way, by hard struggles and various helps and God's favor, through a college course. So it was centuries ago in Europe; so it is now in Scotland, in Germany, and to some extent in New England. The present head of one of our most important Baptist institutions stated in my presence that at one period of his student life he lived on bread and molasses for a considerable time.

Kingman Nott, when at the academy, lived on bread and milk, and when prices rose, then on bread and water, and bought them with money made by sawing wood.

Some English noblemen are remembered in history only by the fact that, when students at Oxford, they got their boots blacked by a charity student, named George Whitefield. Ho, for the poor young men! Look them out; call them forth where they have brains, and are cherishing vague, wild longings after an education which seems far on the other side of an impassable gulf; help them if you can, show them how to help themselves, and stir in them by encouragement that high resolution, which in the young and gifted laughs at impossibilities, and conquers the world. But after all, your son is not utterly poor; and when you come to think of it, college education may be so managed as not to be very expensive.. If, through his own good sense and your good influence, he is disposed to economy, he will assuredly find plenty of students at the present day to keep him company, and students who stand high both in the lecture-room and in society. If once you made up your mind that it was really and exceedingly desirable for him to go to college, you know very well that you could manage to provide the means. And how else, O thoughtful and loving father, can you use the same amount of money so much for his advantage? Pray, think that over. A college education, or a thousand dollars, in land or goods or cash which would be most profitable to him as he enters upon active life?

There is another class of objections which some make.

I know not whether you agree with them.

They say that at college the young man is very apt to form vicious habits and evil companionships. Now I have spent most of my active life in connection with, or in the immediate vicinity of colleges,

and I beg to express the full conviction that a young man is safer, as to companionships and temptations to vice, in any good college than in the average home. Of course, there are a few exceptional homes; I speak of the average, of the general rule. Some young men will get into bad courses wherever they may be. All the good influences at college cannot prevent it nor, if they stay at home, can father and mother and sister and pastor and sweetheart, all combined, keep them out of bad company and vicious practices. But in general, I repeat it earnestly, the morals of the average student are safer at a wellconducted college than at home. Some think this might be so if the college were at a retired village, but not when it is in a city: they tremble to think of the temptations of a city. But really there are no colleges now at retired villages. The railways that bring the students can bring all the apparatus of vice, and keep the students in easy and speedy communication with the cities themselves. Well may we tremble at the temptations to which our boys are now everywhere exposed; but when they are nearly grown, repression and seclusion are no longer possible; we must try to train them to sound principles and right habits from childhood, foster in them vivid recollections of a home where they are loved and prayed for, and let them fight their battle.

Remember, too, that if they may meet evil companions at college, they will assuredly meet many among the noblest young men of the land, who will set them an example of true manhood and gentlemanly bearing, and draw them, if they be worthy and willing, into the bonds of high and inspiring friendship.

Others are afraid the young fellow will come home with "city airs." Perhaps he may, if he was born a simpleton, in which case I do not urge sending him to college. But if he has good sense, he will only get something of refinement, of graceful bearing and social ease, and power of agreeably entertaining others will become more of a gentleman in his manners and tone; and will not that be an advantage to him? A grave objection with many excellent people, and one having the appearance of good ground, is that if you give young men a college education, they will "get above business;" they will want to engage in one of the "professions. Now, something of this sort has frequently happened; but there are several things to be considered about it. Sometimes the young man is right in turning away from what he and his friends had contemplated; for he has become intelligently conscious of being better suited to some other pursuit. In other cases, it is the effect of those wrong notions of which we have been speaking, and which I hope you will use your influence to correct; he thinks, as so many do, that college education is of no use to a business man, and perhaps foolishly imagines business pursuits to be less honorable and less worthy of his intelligence and cultivation than some profession. But the principal reason for such occurrences is that we have hitherto had a very inadequate supply of well-educated teachers and other professional men; the young man sees this, and his sense of the value of education makes him seek more directly to propagate it. When high cultivation becomes more common, and correct ideas more generally diffused, this evil will be, for the most part, corrected.

"But suppose my son doesn't want to go to college, what then?" If he needs it, if you see that he would be greatly profited by it, what is your duty? Argue with him, I should say, exhort him, plead with him, and if he is still unwilling, make him go. What, you cannot control a boy of sixteen or eighteen! Then you haven't trained him properly, and it is all the more important that you should get some professors to help you train him, before it is too late. Yes, make him go. And the time shall be when he will come to you, in your old age, or perhaps come and stand by your grave, and

tell his gratitude that you did not leave him to the follies of his youth; that by all the power of parental love and parental authority you constrained him to that which has been such a blessing to him through life. Oh! the dear memories that come up in saying this of a father who did not need to constrain, but who broke up a pleasant home, and spent his last years in most uncongenial employment and amid pecuniary losses, solely that his son might receive the education for which he had not dared to hope. How that son thanks him more and more every year how he thanks God for such a wise and noble father.

S. Come unto Me

Come unto Me

John A. Broadus

Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light. Matthew 11:28-30 This familiar passage of Scripture contains one of the most precious among the many precious invitations of our compassionate Redeemer. Many a feeble and fainting believer has been led by it to take fresh courage and "press toward the mark," many a burdened sinner has found in it that the gospel of Jesus is indeed "good news," "a word in season to him that is weary." And since the passage is so important and so precious, we may find our profit in attending a little to its phraseology, in endeavoring to make ourselves acquainted with its precise terms. The Saviour invites to him all "that labor and are heavy laden." In this he doubtless referred partly to the burden of ceremonies and observances which the scribes and Pharisees imposed upon their followers, as required by the traditions of the fathers, and as essential and sufficient for their finding favor with God. The law itself, St. Paul tells us, was, if looked upon as a means of salvation, too grievous a burden for any to bear; and these superstitious observances made it yet more grievous. Such persons, then, tolling and borne down beneath the burden of the ceremonial law, are here invited to the Saviour. But he had reference likewise to all men, Jew and Gentile, in every nation and age, who are burdened with sin. All such are invited to him, with the promise that he will give them rest, rest from their labor, and relief from their load. They wear the galling yoke of sin and Satan, and he bids them take his yoke upon them.

Wearing the yoke of another is an expression very often employed in Scripture (as all will remember) to denote subjection to him. The figure is taken, of course, from beasts of burden, as oxen; being applied thence to all who are the laboring servants of a master. Jesus is then bidding those who have been the "servants of sin," to obey him from the heart and be his servants; those who have been subject to Satan, to take him instead as their King. "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me." He recommends himself not only as King and Master, but as Teacher too. The gospel is frequently and properly represented as something to be learned; men need to be taught the way of salvation. Thus we read that God "will have all men to be saved, and to come to a knowledge of the truth." This knowledge of the truth, these lessons of salvation, must be obtained from the Great Teacher Jesus. And when he says, "For I am meek and lowly in heart," the Saviour means to show that he is fitted to be a Teacher, that so all may come and learn of him. In order that a Teacher may win the hearts of his pupils, and thereby the better make them love to learn and love what they do learn, he must unite to other qualities a certain mildness, and gentleness, and kindness. Such men, other things being equal, are always most beloved and most successful. There are some men who by their affection and gentleness seem able to win at once the love of a child. And when our blessed Saviour bids men learn of him, he encourages the timid and fearful to come to him, by telling them that he is meek and lowly in heart, mild and loving and

gentle, that he will be kind to them, and they need not fear. He would not be rough and overbearing and haughty as were the Doctors, the teachers of the law, he is not imperious and domineering and severe like many who have since professed to teach his doctrines: he is humble and affectionate, condescending and kind.

We may learn from these words the character of the lessons, as well as of the Teacher. It is the knowledge of himself that he will give; and as he is meek and lowly, i.e., gentle and humble, so those that come to learn of him will be taught lessons of gentleness, lessons of humility. Still the chief intent of this clause would seem to be what was mentioned first, namely to recommend himself as disposed to be kind and affectionate to all who might come to learn of him. "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me: [you need not fear to make me your Teacher, for I am meek and lowly in heart:] and ye shall find rest unto your souls." He promises to free them from their grievous tolls, to relieve them of their heavy burdens, to give them rest. To appreciate fully the expressiveness of this figure, one must imagine himself bearing a heavy burden, a weight such as he can hardly sustain, and that after bearing it till he is almost crushed to the ground, he throws it off, and rests. There are few things so delightful as this rest to one who has been heavy laden. And then suppose the burden is clinging to you, bound with cords you cannot sever, though you are bowed down under the load and vainly striving to throw it off, and that as you labor thus and are heavy laden, one offers if you come to him to loose the bonds and take away the burden, and let you rest-how sweet would be the thought! how quickly, how joyfully, how thankfully, you would run to him! But it is impossible that men should be without subjection to some higher power; by our very nature we look up to some Being that is above us. All who are not subject to God, are the subjects of Satan: and they who wish to be delivered from the dominion of the Evil One, must find such deliverance in having God himself for their King, as he intended they should when he made them. Accordingly, when the Saviour offers to give rest, he bids them take his yoke upon them, and learn of him, and they shall find rest unto their souls. And then he concludes the invitation by encouraging them to believe that this exchange will be good and pleasant; they labor under the galling yoke of Satan, and are heavy laden with the grievous burdens of sin, but his yoke is easy. This burden is light. Such, I think, is the meaning of the various passages of this invitation, which, familiar as it is, I may read again: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." (Matthew 11:28-30).

Having endeavored thus to explain the language of the text, I wish to say something upon two subjects connected with it, (1) who they are that are here invited to come and (2) what is meant by coming to Jesus.

I. The invitations of the gospel are addressed to all; the gospel is to be preached to every creature. God commandeth all men everywhere to repent, he promises that whosoever believeth on Jesus shall not perish, but have everlasting life, and "whosoever will," is invited to take of the water of life, freely. The purposes of Him who inhabiteth eternity, and who seeth the end from the beginning, will all be fulfilled. Those purposes we cannot declare, that God will have (i.e., wishes) all men to be saved, that he bids all the ends of the earth look unto him, that he that cometh unto Jesus shall in no wise be cast out. And it is worth observing that the gospel invitations, while they extend to all, are so varied. The same bountiful and gracious Being who suits the blessings of his providence to our various wants, does also adapt the invitations of his mercy to the varied characters and

conditions of men. Are men enemies to God?-they are invited to be reconciled. Have they hearts harder than the nether millstone?-he offers to take away the stone, and give a heart of flesh. Are they dancing gaily, or rushing madly, along the way that leads to death?-he calls upon them to turn, "Turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die?" Are they sleeping the heavy sleep of sin?-"Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead." Are men hungering with a craving hunger?-he tells them of the bread that came down from heaven. Are they thirsty?-he calls them to the water of life. And are they burdened with sin and sinfulness?-he invites them to come to Jesus for rest. It is those who are "bowed down beneath a load of sin," that are here especially invited to come to Jesus.

Sin is great and grievous burden: and no man can ever see it as it is and feel it in its weight without wishing to be relieved of it. My hearers, are there not many among you who have often felt this-who have often felt heavy laden with the load of your transgressions, and the burden of your sinfulness? Are there not those among you who feel this now? If you do not all feel so, it is because your perceptions are blunted, you do not see things as they are. You have been servants of sin for a long time-have you not found it a hard master? You have been wearing the yoke of Satan lo! these many years-have you not found that his yoke is indeed galling and grievous? How many things you have done at his bidding that you knew to be wrong? How often you have stifled the voice of your conscience, and listened to the suggestions of the Tempter! How often you have toiled to gratify sinful desires and passions, and found that still the craving, aching void was left unfilled!

What has sin done for the world and for you that you should desire it? It brought death into the world, and all our woe. It has filled the earth with suffering and sorrow. It has made it needful that Jesus, the only-begotten Son of God, should suffer and die, to make atonement for it. It has brought upon you much of unhappiness now, and many most fearful apprehensions for the future. By your sins you have incurred the just anger of Him that made you-already they rise mountain high, and yet still you go on in your sinfulness, accumulating more and more, heaping up wrath against the day of wrath. You shudder when you think of death, you tremble when you think of God, for you know well that you are not prepared to die, that you cannot meet your Maker and Judge in peace. And not only has sin brought on you all these sufferings and fears, but you cannot rid yourself of it. You have bowed your neck to the yoke, and now you cannot free yourself from it. Never did any old man of the sea cling so closely upon the shoulders of the deluded traveler, as the hideous form of sin clings to you, and you cannot shake it off, struggle as you may. No poisoned garment of ancient fable ever adhered so closely to him that wore it, sending death through all his frame, as does the garment of iniquity.

Sum it up again-what has sin done for you? It has made you unhappy, filling you with craving, unsatisfied desires, it has made you captive, and bound you with cords you cannot burst, it has brought upon you the indignation and wrath of Almighty God, which you cannot expiate. Is it not then a burden, of which you would like to be relieved? If so, hear the Saviour's own invitation, and come to him. He will take off the heavy load that crushes you, and you shall find rest to your souls. He will intercede in your behalf before God, he will take away your guilt by the sacrifice he has offered, he will "wash you thoroughly from your iniquity, and cleanse you from your sin."

Let all then, who are burdened with sin and sinfulness, who long to know how their transgressions may be forgiven and their souls saved, all who are inquiring what they must do, let them hear the

gracious words of the text, and come to Jesus. Do you fear that God is angry with you, and will not hear your prayer? It is true. God is angry with the wicked every day; and the sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination unto the Lord. You may not mock the offended majesty of God Most High, you may not dare to mock him by coming unto him in your own name, and trusting in your own righteousness. You ought to fear before him, and to tremble at the thought of coming to him thus. But you may come to Jesus-you are invited to come to him. He is the appointed mediator between God and man. Come and ask him to intercede for you. And then through him draw near to the throne of grace. Make mention of his merits, plead his atoning sacrifice, rely wholly on what he has done, and God's anger is turned away-he will hear, he will pardon, and your soul shall live. If then you are burdened with a sense of your unworthiness, come to Jesus, and you shall not come in vain.

All that labor, with whatever toil, all that are heavy laden, with whatever burden, may take this invitation as addressed to them. "Thou callest burdened souls to Thee, And such, O Lord, am I." Whatever it is that bears you down, the consciousness of sin, the terror of judgment, distressing doubts or manifold temptations, whatever else may torment your soul and weigh down your spirit, this invitation is for you. If you are burdened with affliction or sorrow or fearful apprehension, in short (to repeat it again and again) if you bear any burden, you are invited to Jesus. "Come unto me, all ye," etc.

It would be natural and reasonable enough for one thus frequently and earnestly invited to come to Jesus, especially for one who is "an alien from God, and a stranger to grace," who knows not the blessed Saviour in the pardon of his sins, who has never "come boldly unto the throne of grace," and obtained mercy and found grace to help in time of need, it would be natural enough for him to inquire now, "What is meant by coming to Jesus? Suppose I feel myself to be burdened, and want to seek relief, how shall I come to Jesus for rest?" This is the remaining subject of which I propose to speak. I shall not try to explain, for I can add nothing to that which is, in itself, plain already, but only to illustrate.

First then I say, come to him as men came when he was on earth. We sometimes hear it said, "Oh, that I had lived when Jesus was sojourning among men; how would I have gone to him for peace and prayed that I might follow him whithersoever he went! What a privilege it must have been to the people of Bethany, for instance, when again and again Jesus came among them, when they might, even in their own homes, sit as Mary sat at the feet of the great and good Teacher and learn lessons of heavenly wisdom!" Yes, it was a great privilege; and it is true that the case is somewhat different now. We cannot now go sensibly to Jesus as a man, living somewhere among us. We are not now to go from one part of the country or the world to another, in order to be where the Saviour is. There is no sensible coming to him now. But it is only a change from sight to faith-from a moving of the body to a moving of the thoughts and affections. It may be thought a great privation that we cannot go somewhere, as they did then, and find him. But is it not on the other hand a great privilege that we need not now go anywhere, we may always find him here? He is everywhere, and as much in one place as another. Men have often forgotten this great and consoling and gladdening truth. Many a weary pilgrimage has been made in the centuries that are past to the Holy Land, in the hope that forgiveness of sin and peace of conscience, which could not be found at home, might be found there. It is pleasant, and may do the heart good, to stand where Jesus stood, to weep where he wept on Olivet, to pray where he prayed in Gethsemane,

but he is here now as well as there. Wherever one seeks him there he may be found "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Wherever there is a tear of penitence, or a sigh of godly sorrow, wherever there is earnest prayer to him or the desire to pray felt in the heart, there is Jesus to see and to hear and to answer.

If then we lose the sensible coming, do we not gain greatly in that we can always find him where we are? And since this is so, since he is really and always near to every one that seeketh him, may I not say again, come to him as men came when he was on earth. Come with the same confidence in his power that they felt who asked him to heal their disease. There are many to testify that they have come and been heard, and none been sent empty away-do you come, and you too shall hear him say, "Thy sins are forgiven thee." Come with the same humility the Syrophenician woman felt, when she pled that the dogs, though they should not eat the children's food, might yet have the crumbs that fell under the table-and that she, though a Gentile, might yet have some humble share in that salvation which was of the Jews. Come with all the earnestness the poor blind man felt. He heard that Jesus was passing, and none could hinder him with all their charges, from crying, "Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on me." And when the compassionate Saviour stopped, and commanded him to be called, they said to him, "Be of good comfort, rise! he calleth thee." Even so, my hearer, Jesus commands you to be called, as you sit in your spiritual blindness. Just as Bartimeus threw away his cloak that nothing might hinder him, and went eagerly to Jesus, so you come at once unto him, and ask that you may receive your sight. You too shall hear him say, "Go thy way; thy faith hath made thee whole."

Again, and this is the last thing I shall say now, come to Jesus just as you are. Wait not to be ready-think not of being prepared-dream not of being fit, to come. The readiness, the preparation, the fitness, all must be his gift. How wrong to put off your coming to him till you have that which he alone can give. You are a burdened sinner-is it not so? Do you not feel the truth, here on my heart the burden lies, past offenses pain mine eyes-you are heavy laden with sin-then Jesus here invites you to come unto him. Do you say you are not sorry for sin as you ought to be? I know you are not. But come to Jesus, and ask that he will help you to repent. If you have no faith, ask that he will give you faith. All must come from him. Let him be your Lord, your life, your sacrifice, your Saviour and your all. You are a sinner, and Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners.

It is said (many here have doubtless read the account) that a brother of the famous Whitefield was once conversing, in great distress, with Lady Huntingdon. She told him of the infinite love and mercy of Jesus, but he replied, "I know all that; but there is no mercy for me-I am lost, I am lost." "I am glad to hear it, Mr. Whitefield, very glad to hear it." "How, my dear Madam, glad to hear that I am lost?" "Yes, Jesus came to save the lost." That word moved him; he believed on Jesus, and lived and died a Christian. And so may you, if you believe on him who is the Saviour of the lost and ruined. Then come to Jesus, come earnestly, come just as you are.

Just as I am, without one plea Save that thy blood was shed for me, And that thou bidst me come to thee, O Lamb of God, I come.

Come, and you will be heard-you shall find rest. He will not send you away. He came into the world to save sinners-he suffered and died to save sinners-he invited burdened sinners to him. Then take this blessed, this precious invitation to yourself, come to Jesus, and your soul shall live. "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst

come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely."

S. Delight in the Will of God

Delight in the Will of God

John A. Broadus I delight to do thy will, O my God! Psalms 40:8 This psalm tells of one who has suffered, been graciously relieved, and now responds in grateful praise and grateful obedience. This is not shown by mere externals of worship, but by delighting to do God's will, by having his law in the heart, by proclaiming his glorious character and gracious dealings (Psalms 40:1-10).

Psalms 40:5-9 apply to Christ. So it is with various psalms; often the language is exclusively prophetic of him. These words, therefore, are designed to be adopted by anyone, while at the same time it may look to the great example of the Lord Jesus Christ. Observe, that this delight is not merely to hear, but to do, the will of God.

I. In one sense, the will of God will always be done, Whether we do his will or not.

Here we touch a most difficult subject but we need not turn away from it; but we must be humble, and content to take what we can understand, and leave alone what We cannot.

We are compelled to speak of God's will in terms applicable to our own. This is done in Scripture. There are three distinct senses in which this term is employed. First, the will of purpose; it is always done. "Who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will"- "Who doeth his will in the army of heaven, and among," etc. (Daniel 4:35). Next, the will of desire, or wish, which is not always done-for inscrutable reasons he permits free agents to act counter to his wish-"How often would I, etc. but ye would not." "Not willing that any should perish," etc. "Who willeth all to be saved," etc. Last, will of command-the wish of one in authority, When expressed, becomes a command. Every command of God it is our solemn duty to obey-but, alas! It is not always done. Of course, it is human imperfection that makes these distinctions necessary, and they must not be pushed too far-yet they are, within limits, just distinctions, and should be borne in mind.

Now God's purpose, as distinguished from other senses, is not dependent upon us for accomplishment. It may be accomplished without us, by overruling and finding others willing. But God's will of desire, what is well-pleasing to him, we should seek to ascertain, and do. His will of command we should learn and obey.

How do we ascertain what is God's will? Partly from our own conscience, aided by general conscience of mankind, but this is by no means an infallible exponent of God's will. What has come to pass, is always in accordance with God's general purpose, however wrong the motives of agents-gives indication as to what we should do. To some extent we may seek the best judgment and advice of others. It is always important to have the mind stored with Scripture. Then we can pray and trust we are doing God's will.

II. We should always do God's will, even if it be not with delight. We seldom, if ever, do anything with perfectly correct motives and feelings. Yet with the most proper sentiments we can at the time command, let us still do our duty.

Sometimes we cannot rise above resignation. Especially when we have to bear what disappoints and distresses us.

Sometimes we may do his will with shrinking and reluctance. Human nature is weak. Even apart from sin, it naturally shrinks from danger, suffering, physical or mental. Even Jesus, to whom the text specially applied. "And now what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour? But," etc. Again, "If it be possible, etc. nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done." This cost an effort, and a struggle, for a time-yet he did not fail to do it.

Yes, we should always do God's will, even if it is not a delight. And often, the painful effort will change to pleasure, the duty commenced reluctantly will become a sweet joy! Yet, do not condition obedience upon its becoming delightful. It is the will of my God? Then his will I must do.

III. We should delight to do God's will.

We may be led to it.

1. By sense of right. The vexing question of ethical speculation does not here matter-whether God wills a thing because right, or it is right because he wills it. What he wills, is right. To do right is man's highest duty, and should be his greatest delight.

2. By feelings of interest. It is right to consult our own improvement and enjoyment. Lawful to be pleased at advancing these, provided we are doing God's will. Now always our true interest, in noblest sense, on largest scale, is to do God's will. Hence self-love should conspire with a sense of right in causing us to delight in God's will.

3. By feelings of benevolence. I hope no one present is wholly ignorant of the pleasure derived from benefiting others. "And learn the luxury of doing good" (Goldsmith). Now in doing God's will, we may be sure we are promoting the well-being of our fellow men-whether we can always perceive the connection or not. If it is God's will, it shall be best for all we love, for all mankind, that this should be done. What a pleasure, then, it should be, to do his will.

4. By feelings of gratitude. My brethren, let us think of all our providential and spiritual blessings. And while our hearts glow with gratitude, for all God has done, and is doing, and promises to do for us, shall we not be able to say, "I delight to do thy will, O my God!" In doing God's will, we follow the example of Jesus-seen in his whole life, and declared in his own words. (John 4:34) Remember him at Jacob's well-fatigued, needing rest and food, yet busy doing good, and yet saying to his disciples, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work." In doing this, we are dear to Jesus. (Matthew 12:46-50) "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." We become as near as the dearest kindred.

Oh, it is sweet to do God's will. Oh, ye who delight to do his will, go on, and it shall grow more and more delightful-go on, and the path you tread shall grow more and more a path of light, till it shall lead you into the dazzling glories of the celestial world; and there, oh there, in perfect obedience you shall find perfect delight. And meanwhile, however, the number shall be multiplying on earth, of those who delight to do God's will. The prayer our Saviour taught his disciples to pray shall rise from many a pious heart, shall stimulate many a toiling brain, shall nerve many a weary laborer, in Christian and in heathen lands, till Christianity, everywhere triumphant, shall cover the earth in a

flood of glory, till God's will shall be done on earth, as it is done in heaven. The Doctrines of Grace and Passion for the Souls of Men

John A. Broadus "For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren."
Romans 9:3

Concern for the salvation of others is not prevented by a belief in what we call the doctrines of grace; is not prevented by believing in divine sovereignty, and predestination and election. Many persons intensely dislike the ideas which are expressed by these phrases. Many persons shrink away from ever accepting them, because those ideas are in their minds associated with the notion of stolid indifference. They say if predestination be true, then it follows that a man cannot do anything for his own salvation; that if he is to be saved he will be saved, and he has nothing to do with it, and need not care, nor need any one else care.

Now, this does not at all follow, and I will prove that it does not follow, by the fact that Paul himself, the great oracle of this doctrine in the Scripture, has uttered these words of burning passionate concern for the salvation of others, so close by the passages in which he has taught the doctrines in question. Look back from the text, run back a few sentences and you will find the very passage upon which many stumble: "Moreover, whom he did predestinate" -- there are people who shudder at the very words -- "them he also called, and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified."

Just a little while after he uttered those words from which men want to infer that the man who believes it need not feel concerned for his salvation or the salvation of others, just a little after, came the passionate words of the text. Nor is that all, for you will find just following the text, where he speaks of Esau and Jacob, that God made a difference between them before they were born, and where he says of Pharaoh that God raised him up that he might show his power in him, and that God's name might be declared through out all the earth. "Therefore he hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth." Some good people fairly shiver at the inference, which seems to them to be inevitable from such language as that. But I say the inference must be wrong, for the inspired man who uttered this language, only a few moments before had uttered these words of the text. And whenever you find your heart or the heart of your friend inclined to shrink away from these great teachings of divine Scripture concerning sovereignty and predestination, then I pray you make no argument about it, but turn to this language of concern for the salvation of others, so intensely passionate that men wonder and think surely it cannot mean what it says. The trouble is in this and many cases that we draw unwarranted inferences from the teachings of the Bible, and then cast all the odium of those inferences upon the truths from which we draw them. Now, I say that whatever be true, for or against the apostle's doctrines of predestination and divine sovereignty in salvation, it is not true that they will make a man careless as to his own salvation or that of others; seeing that they had no such effect on Paul himself, but right in between these two great passages come the wonderful words of the text.

[an excerpt from his sermon entitled, "Intense Concern for the Salvation of Others" in Sermons and Addresses (Hodder & Stoughton: New York, 1886)]

S. Education in Athens

Education in Athens.

THERE is nothing more natural or appropriate, at these annual meetings, than that our thoughts should mainly dwell upon topics connected with education. Not only must the very atmosphere we breathe, all the associations of the place and the occasion, recall the lively interest which years ago we felt in this subject, but our experience amid the activities of life must be continually impressing us more deeply with the importance of obtaining the most thorough mental culture and the most complete mental furniture. And if gratefully recognizing the benefits received from our own early training, we cannot but desire that others may enjoy yet more abundant privileges. We gather again, those who have wandered farthest and those who have remained nearest, around the domestic hearth; we look with pride upon these younger brothers who fill now the places that once were ours, and far from feeling any jealousy of their perhaps superior attainments, far from cherishing any aristocratic notion of rights of primogeniture in education, we can heartily wish that, as is wont to happen in this democratic and growing country, our cherishing mother may be able to provide the best advantages for her younger sons. Whatever, then, is related to education in general, whatever promises to cast the least ray of light upon the higher education among ourselves, as it is and as it ought to be, can hardly fail, I have thought, to be for us a welcome theme.

Now the educational methods and machinery of cultivated modern nations have received large attention, since they furnish illustrative examples which are most nearly parallel and models which are most easily imitated. But it has appeared to me that something at least might be learned from considering the methods employed and the material possessed among the foremost nations of antiquity. A very little reflection sufficed to show that one particular people of the ancient world afford not only what is most interesting, but almost all that can be instructive; and for the sake of definiteness, it seemed best to confine the view to a single leading city and a comparatively limited period.

I propose to speak, therefore, of the higher education in Athens during the period of its greatest prosperity, say the century from about 450 to about 350 B. C. It is a very brief, and I know a very imperfect account, which alone I can expect to give; but I have hoped it would possess some interest, and might perhaps suggest some profitable reflection. A problem presents itself here for our solution. The Greeks, and especially the Athenians of this age, have left monuments of mental power which the world can never cease to admire. Though ignorance may sometimes sneer, and self-complacent modernism may sometimes assail, yet one need not be a mere praiser of the past to assert that the productions of the Athenian mind have hardly ever been surpassed, and not very often been equalled, by the noblest kindred works of modern times. Whence came this wonderful power?

What was there, in the influences to which they were subjected, corresponding to these great results? Now if a distinction be made between what we call education in the technical sense and

those more general influences which accomplish so much in developing the mind and directing as well as stimulating its activity, then it is to be observed that these last were perhaps more potent among the Athenians than any other nation of the world. If there be an exception, it is in our own people; and, indeed, the most superficial observer must always be struck by the numerous points of resemblance, in this respect, between the Athenians and ourselves. It is very difficult, in either case, fully to estimate the powerful effect of the influences in question. The peculiar genius of the race its enthusiasm, its restless activity, its self-reliance must form an important element. The working of their democratic institutions, the fact that every citizen, besides frequently attending the popular assembly and having a voice in the direction of national affairs, so as to feel the dignity and responsibility of his position, was called to take part very largely in the administration of justice, sitting frequently in the immense juries of from five to fifteen hundred, and required, whenever a cause of his own was on trial, to appear not simply by counsel) but in his own person, and plead for himself, all this would be an element of almost incalculable importance. And the circumstances of the age were not only favorable, but stimulating. Commerce and tribute, during the years which mainly gave character to this period, filled Athens with wealth, so that men possessed the leisure and the means necessary to intellectual pursuits. The yet fresh memories of that great struggle, in which their fathers had shown such bravery in battle and such heroic fortitude in suffering, in order to maintain their liberties against the terrible power of the Persian; the frequent successes and then maddening losses, and the final and almost hopeless ruin which made up the history of the Peloponnesian war; the anxiety and strife connected with the Theban and Macedonian supremacy, these made it throughout an age of excitement. But after making the largest allowance for the unusual power of these general influences, one cannot resist the conviction, that there must have been something in their education, strictly so called, corresponding to the wonderful excellence of their intellectual achievements. We must look into the facts, so far as they have come down to us, in order to ascertain whether this conviction is just.

If one should begin by examining the scattered extant allusions to elementary education in Athens, he must be struck by the extraordinary attention which was bestowed upon the subject, and the very general acquaintance, among the citizens, with the elements of knowledge. Great philosophers constantly interested themselves in devising plans for the better conduct of elementary instruction. Schools for the young were always established by private enterprise, but there were special laws having reference to them, even from the time of Solon, and special supervisors for their control, appointed by the State. We read in Plutarch's Themistocles, that when the women and children of Athens fled to Trcezene at the time of the Persian invasion, a part of the hospitality with which they were entertained was, that the Trcezenians paid persons to teach the children. If the story can be relied on, it certainly affords a very remarkable proof of the interest felt, by the exiles and their hosts, in the constant instruction of the young.

And, this being the case, one is not surprised to find that at the period of which we speak, a very large proportion of the citizens, in the proper sense of that term, appear to have been able to read and write. To notice no other evidence, the fact is proven by the introduction, as early as 510 B.C., of the remarkable institution known as the Ostracism. It would have been folly to resort to a secret ballot, in order temporarily to banish one or the other of two powerful political rivals and thus secure political tranquillity, if any large number of the citizens had been dependent upon others to prepare their ballots, and thus liable to be imposed upon by designing partisans. With reference

now to the higher education, there are two departments of inquiry, the supply of instructors, and the material of instruction. Of instructors, we have reason to believe that there was a much larger number than the cursory reader of Greek history and literature might suppose. There were many included under the general name of philosophers. Among these, every one will think of Socrates and Plato, as belonging to this age. Though the former never constituted regular classes, yet we know that young men were accustomed to attach themselves to him, and to follow his daily wanderings in the agora and the gymnasium, conversing with him themselves, and listening to his conversations with others; so that besides the general influence he exerted, in awakening and stimulating the minds of almost the entire community, there was always a circle of those who might be considered, in a strict sense, his pupils in philosophy.

Plato held conversations and lectures in the Academy, to which all could listen who chose. We read of him as on one occasion delivering a lecture in the Peiraeus on the Good; and one is more sorry than surprised to find that his audience gradually wasted away tho philosopher had chosen a subject too abstract for the popular taste. In addition to these public labors, he had a band of disciples who regularly assembled in his own garden at Colonus, there to partake of a frugal meal, and discourse together on subjects of philosophy. There are other famous philosophers of this age, who resided at Athens, and taught their peculiar opinions. Anaxagoras is stated to have been the instructor of Euripides and Pericles, and many others of the most eminent men of the time. Zeno of Elea is recorded to have spent some years in Athens, unfolding the doctrines of his philosophy to such men as Pericles and Callias, from the latter of whom he received for his instructions a large sum of money, and also to the youthful Socrates. The accomplished and excellent Democritus would seem to have sojourned there a while, and even casual intercourse for a limited period with a man of his extraordinary attainments and beautiful character, must have been a means of marked improvement to the rising young men of the day. And may we not take it for granted that there were many others, citizens and strangers, addicted to philosophical studies, and accustomed to give at least informal instruction to the young, whose names have not come down to us? They who have lived in history were the men of originality, the men of splendid powers, the men who introduced new doctrines in philosophy, or wrote valuable treatises on opinions already current; must there not have been a much more numerous class, just one degree inferior, who were well acquainted with all the teachings of the different schools, perhaps warmly attached to the doctrines of the Ionian school of Pythagoras or the Eleatics, and anxious to win over every young man of promise to their own opinions? These would often give far more information as to the true nature and extent of the various systems than the more original thinkers, who would commonly allude to the tenets of their predecessors, as Socrates does to those of Anaxagoras, only for purposes of refutation or ridicule. Thus we may see that the class called philosophers formed a numerous corps, so to speak, of able and active instructors.

Again, there were many persons who made teaching their occupation. A man who had gained some reputation, perhaps, as master of an elementary school, or had become specially fond of a particular subject, would undertake to give instruction to young men, separately or in classes. We find incidental allusions to some of these, as teachers of music (in the modern sense), of geometry, of oratory, &c. It is plain from the manner of allusion that they were numerous; but only one here and there is known to posterity, from his good fortune in having some pupil who became famous. As many an humble English clergyman has a name in history from his being the early

tutor of a great statesman, as a plain New England schoolmaster will be remembered because of his connection with Webster, so there is now and then to be found, from among the old Athenian instructors, some name which had floated down the allengulfing tide of time only because attached to the ever-buoyant, imperishable names of Pericles or Plato, of Aristotle or Demosthenes. It is a thought not strange to the bosom of any reflecting instructor, a thought tending to humility, and yet to honest pride in the true power of his calling, that centuries to come men may recognize as his chief claim to their gratitude, the influence he exerted upon another; yea, that highly and deservedly honored as he is now, posterity may remember him at all, only for having been the teacher of one who sits now, a modest lad, scarce noticed among his pupils.

Perhaps the most influential of these professional teachers, and certainly those who have the largest place in history, are the so-called Sophists. Among the numerous instances in which recent historical research has overturned received opinions, there are few more striking than the inquiry which Mr. Grote has made, in his unrivalled history, into the true character of these celebrated men; and it may not be amiss to state the conclusions he has reached and the outline of his argument. Doubtless, in attacking the popular notion, he has gone somewhat to the other extreme. We have more than one remarkable case of this among the distinguished historians of the present generation. Ever since the days of Niebuht it has been the fashion to assail all established historical opinions; and wherever plausible grounds can be found for questioning, there at once to reject. Pleased at detecting the errors of ancient authorities, many a writer seems to forget that himself can err in the conclusions drawn from their statements; delighted to expose the prejudiced views of previous historians, he may yield, half unconsciously, to prejudices of his own. When weary of the misrepresentation and general injustice which so frequently attach to contemporaneous judgments, we often console ourselves by thinking of the future, and “ the impartial voice of history.”

Yet it is but a poor approximation to impartiality that is ever actually found. No achromatic arrangement has been devised, whereby the historian, as he looks into the distant past, may be able to see things precisely in their true colors. But to return. The term sophist, which is for us so opprobrious, and which from the days of Plato began to be confined to a particular set of men, originally denoted, in the general and honorable sense, a wise man, a man of talent. It was applied to poets and statesmen, and constantly used by Herodotus in speaking of the “ seven sages.” But where general ignorance prevails, there will always be a secret dislike to the few men of superior attainments and abilities, which gradually becomes more decided till it is avowed. Thus by degrees there came to be associated with the term sophist, a certain invidious feeling. Then other words, such as philosopher, were preferred for the good sense, and sophist became the stock term of reproach applied to any person, who possessed acknowledged power and was eminent as a teacher, but for whatever reason was personally unpopular. Thus Aristophanes, in the “ Clouds,” called Socrates a sophist; and in a subsequent age, “Timon, who bitterly satirized all the philosophers, designated them all, including Plato and Aristotle, by the general name of sophists.” Now Socrates, and still more Plato, greatly disliking the eminent professional teachers of their time, have succeeded, by their justly powerful influence, in fastening upon them this odious name. The cause of their dislike was two-fold. The men in question taught for pay. Of course, those of them who became most celebrated would at times receive high pay; and in some cases they went from one city to another, where there was a prospect of obtaining large sums for their instructions.

The result would be, that these ablest men commonly taught only the wealthy.

All this was extremely repugnant to the notions of the two great philosophers. Socrates held that the relation between preceptor and pupil must be like that of intimate friends, or even of lovers; and that this could not possibly be the case, unless the instruction were gratuitous. With our modern ideas and experience, we should of course utterly dissent from this philosophic fancy.

True, there is still a certain unwillingness to see men receive for the duties of this profession a compensation at all approaching to equality with that which the same ability and attainment and devotion might secure in some other calling; but we do not require them to teach altogether for love. We do not expect a profound and accomplished man, every day and all the day long, to leave his home to Xantippean care, and, poorly clad and with scanty fare, to wander among the people, giving instruction to all who might desire it. Not even to escape the horrors of a home like that of Socrates, nor to have the exquisite pleasure of proving other people less wise than themselves, could men be expected to lead such a life of privation and penury. In this respect, then, the prejudice against the teachers called Sophists, was certainly unjust. The other ground of dislike was the peculiar character of their teachings, as contrasted with those of Plato and his great master. Socrates was a moral reformer, Plato a splendid social theorizer, proposing to re-model society altogether; while the persons they stigmatize undertook merely to prepare young men for performing their duties as citizens, for achieving success and reputation in Athens as it was. How much soever we may admire the doctrines of the philosophers, we cannot account the latter to have been in itself an unworthy task. There is no proof that the ethical precepts they inculcated were immoral; all the fragments which remain are of an opposite tendency. By the discipline they gave, and the knowledge they imparted, their pupils acquired a power which certainly could be used for maintaining the wrong as well as the right; but in cases where such perversion occurred, it was no more an argument against their teachers, than was the misconduct of Alcibiades a proof, as so strenuously urged, of some corrupting tendency in the teachings of Socrates. It may be that in training the young men for skill in discussion and effective oratory, they sometimes adopted the mistaken plan of teaching them to defend the weaker side and argue in favor of what was known to be untrue; but it cannot be shown that their instructions had any direct and purposed tendency to confound moral distinctions. The accusation that their pupils were trained to "make the worse appear the better reason," from which especially has come the modern use of the word sophist, was made also against Socrates, and as he himself remarks, was the charge constantly made against persons devoted to philosophy. And whatever reproach may attach to a readiness to defend either side of a cause, it must be borne by one of the most learned and honored professions of both ancient and modern times.

It may be concluded, then, that we have no evidence that there was anything corrupting in the influence of these much-abused men. And certainly the general effect of their instructions was very great. Thoroughly acquainted with all the learning of the age, devoting all their energies to the instruction, for the time being, of a few select individuals, Protagoras, Gorgias and their compeers were educators of no mean order. As to public speaking, some of them appear to have taught the analysis of a discourse into its parts, with various practical rules for the proper management of each; and this was a great advance upon all previous treatment, and a necessary preparation for the work of the great master of rhetoric. And they could add to their precept the example of an elaborate and ornate style of oratory which was not without its power, and for a time became very

popular. Bad taste in this respect was perhaps the greatest fault of their teachings. Such a style was the very opposite of that beautiful simplicity and directness, that absence of all artificial ornament, for which Aristotle contended, which Demosthenes so strikingly exemplified, and which forms the chief charm of all the better Grecian literature.

Upon the whole, it must be evident that, at the period of which we speak, Athens abounded in men who occupied themselves as instructors in the higher education.

Indeed, we know that from every part of Greece and the colonies, men of ability and ambition flocked to this great city, where their literary tastes would find sympathy and their labors reward, and the approbation of whose citizens would constitute the highest meed of fame. We learn, too, that men were accustomed to send their sons from distant cities to Athens to be educated; so that already the city began to be, what in the age of Cicero it had fully become, the University of the World. The places at which instruction was commonly given were peculiar. When the hour of noon was fully past, and the business of the agora completed, almost all the men of leisure in the city might have been seen taking their way without the walls, to one or another of the three great Gymnasia. Some of these went to the bath, others to participate in, or witness, the gymnastic exercises, while many others tarried in the peristyle. This outer court of the Gymnasium consisted of a spacious lawn surrounded by buildings. On three of its sides were arcades with large halls, many of them open to the sky, and having stone benches, running along the walls, or arranged in a semi-circular form. In these numerous public halls, men would seat themselves for conversation, and here might be found many a philosopher or professor, with a band of pupils around him, and perhaps a crowd of listeners near, engaged in earnest dialogue or lecture. When weary of formal lectureroom instruction they would wander forth among the shade-trees of the lawn, conversing still upon the subject which had occupied them before. Socrates, if we may judge from his general course, probably frequented all the gymnasia in turn; though there appears to have been some one place where he was most commonly to be found, and which Aristophanes humorously called Socrates' thinking-shop. Two of the great gymnasia have become famous as the chosen resort of Plato and of Aristotle; and every little palaestra seems to have been employed for the same purpose, and often appropriated by some particular instructor. Besides, teachers of every class frequently gathered their pupils and friends at their own houses, or at the residence of some person of literary tastes, and there spout the hours in familiar conversation and at times in regular instruction. But what formed the subject of these conversations and lectures? What educational material did the Greeks of this age possess? What progress had they already made in the several departments of knowledge? To this inquiry we turn. Instead of pausing to explain the peculiar phraseology which they employed, it will be more convenient to use the modern sub-divisions and terms. With the most remarkable properties of Numbers, and the processes which admit of being performed upon them, the Greeks of this period had made considerable acquaintance. The fanciful theory of Pythagoras and his followers, that all things have their origin in numerical relations, that every physical existence and every mental attribute is due to some combination of numbers, would naturally lead them to investigate in that direction with the greatest diligence. Besides those several operations which lie at the foundation of arithmetic, they seem to have possessed methods of extracting the square and cube root, and to have been familiar with the theory of arithmetical and geometrical proportions and progressions. The elements of arithmetic were carefully taught in the schools for boys; and its higher questions appear to have awakened

interest and received large attention among the most cultivated men. Of Geometry they knew much more. Every one is aware that our modern treatises on synthetic geometry contain, to say the least, no very great improvements upon the work of an old Greek. It is true that Euclid wrote considerably later than the period we are contemplating (for it is now settled that he was a different person from Euclides of Megara, the pupil of Socrates), but we might be sure, from the very nature of the case, that a treatise so complete as his Elements cannot have been the creation of a single mind. And in fact there is abundant evidence that Geometry had been largely studied from the earliest times, especially from the time of Pythagoras, and that enough was known before the days of Plato to prepare for his reputed discovery of some of the properties of the conic sections. Somewhat earlier than the middle of the fifth century B.C. (460) we read of a systematic treatise on Geometry, prepared by Hippocrates of Chios, and similar works are ascribed to later authors. Plato insisted very much on the importance of this science, not only for practical, but for educational purposes, and (according to the familiar story) refused to admit any one into the inner circle of his philosophical pupils, who was not a Geometer. When in his old age he was invited to visit and instruct the younger Dionysius at Syracuse, he set the monarch his first lessons in Geometry. Thus it appears, that during this age geometrical studies were pursued with great zeal, and rapid advances were continually made even in the higher departments of the science, while there existed compends for elementary instruction.

Astronomy had likewise become a favorite subject.

There is no good reason to doubt the truth of the story that Thales predicted an eclipse of the sun; of course it must have been by some empirical method. In the sixth century B.C, the age of Anaximander, there are said to have been instruments for determining the time of solstices and equinoxes; and as early as 432 B.C. the golden period was devised by Meton. They had divided the visible heavens into constellations, and marked out a Zodiac, which is still retained. Accurate observations upon the motions of the planets, though five of them were so familiarly known, do not seem to have been made till a somewhat later period. But already there were distinguished Geometers who taught something of astronomy, and whose instructions came to be in great request; and many minds were busy with astronomical inquiries. The clear atmosphere of Attica was very favorable for watching the heavenly bodies; and one or another of the surrounding mountains might well serve, as Lycabettus was used by Meton, for an observatory. In other branches of Physical Science very little was known that we should account satisfactory or valuable. A spirit of inquiry had been awakened, and miscellaneous observations were made in every direction, which doubtless aided in furnishing material for the numerous and valuable works of Aristotle upon physical subjects, as, for instance, upon Natural History. When we find the persons composing the so-called Ionian school, from Thales to Anaxagoras and onward, spoken of as natural philosophers, we must understand little more than that they occupied themselves with general physical speculations. Universal science had not yet been divided into various distinct departments; indeed, the making of such a division would require no small previous knowledge, even as one who is preparing a discourse has gone far towards mastering his subject when he has fairly marked out its natural divisions. Looking at the universe as a whole, and influenced by that desire for unity, which finds its true satisfaction in the idea of a great First Cause, the earlier Greek philosophers were constantly seeking some simple primordial principle, which would account for the origin of all existing things. When some of them taught that this principle is one of

the more subtle forms of matter, as water or air or fire, it was not pure a priori speculation; but they seem to have always observed at least a small number of facts, and upon these built their theory.* So that we have here only an extreme result of that tendency to hasty generalization, and then unwarranted inference, which, in some departments of physical science, is not wholly restrained, even amid the correct principles and careful researches of our own day. And while these theories were, in many respects, absurd and utterly fruitless, and served to divert attention from that accurate and patient observation which alone can lead to any correct acquaintance with the material world, yet they were by no means without value as a sort of mental gymnastics.

We have thus entered upon the Greek Philosophy. Of course, no more can be attempted, in speaking of this great subject, than to call attention to its extent and value, as being indeed the chief material of Athenian education. It is a well-known matter of dispute how far the Greeks were indebted for their philosophy to the Orientals. Ritter contends, with great earnestness and force, that it originated almost entirely among themselves. Coleridge used to declare that he could not believe it was otherwise. Admitting, however, what seems at least probable, that a certain influence was exerted by Oriental ideas, both in the rise of Greek speculation, and subsequently through particular men, as Pythagoras and Plato, yet certainly their philosophy was their own, in the sense that it had a regular development, in accordance with the genius of the people and their general progress. Even in the pre-Socratic philosophy we find an orderly succession of doctrines, either by natural development or the antagonism of reaction, corresponding precisely with the alternations of philosophic opinion in all subsequent ages. There was ultra-sensationalism and ultra-idealism, with various attempts to combine the two. There was a school recognizing an imperfect sort of theism; another, with teachings more or less distinctly atheistic, and more than one whose tendencies were decidedly to pantheism.

Whatever value, then, as an instrument of education, is assigned to modern speculation, belongs likewise, in no small measure, to even this earlier philosophy of the Greeks, presenting, as it did, the same subjects of investigation and essentially the same systems of belief, though with a much less extensive development, and in a much less perfect form. And it was not only valuable, but attractive. The men of that time were largely occupied, as philosophers have always been, with the interesting task of exposing the erroneousness and absurdity of opposite opinions, and this with no lack of the most pungent personality. The fact, too, that these speculations were so much at variance with prevailing opinions, would lead men not only to make acquaintance with them, but, when they possessed any plausibility at all, to investigate them with a sharp and searching attention. So great is the power of paradox in stimulating inquiry, that we have seen eminent instructors at times cast their ideas into a purposely paradoxical form, with the design of breaking up settled prejudices and arousing to examination. Now, when a young Greek, accustomed to those old legendary notions, which vaguely described all things as the offspring of certain imaginary persons, was made acquainted with the doctrines held by one or another of the early schools of philosophy, when he heard, for instance, of some original substance and of impersonal forces, as accounting for all existences, he would almost certainly be led into curious inquiry and earnest reflection; and when these speculations came to be denounced and persecuted as impious, that would only give them an additional charm. Is there not in these considerations sufficient explanation of the fact that the doctrines referred to were through life eagerly studied by such a man as Pericles, and sufficient reason to believe that they largely contributed to the

expansion and discipline of his great mind? That the philosophical teachings of Socrates and his illustrious pupil were immensely valuable for purposes of education will be recognized at once and by all. Let it only be observed that their most profound and difficult speculations possessed always some element suited to awaken the liveliest interest. They taught political and social philosophy to young men whose special ambition, in most cases, was for political advancement, and for whom these subjects formed a part, so to speak, of professional study. Their ethical and aesthetic inquiries were often made to spring from some actual occurrence or real object, which seemed to render them living questions. And every one who has read Plato will remember the vivacity of manner with which Socrates is represented as discussing the most abstruse subjects, and the familiar, quaint, even whimsical character of many of his illustrations. A delight in abstract inquiries, a love of dialectical investigation for its own sake as well as for its fruits, a consequent sharpening of all the mental powers, and a general elevation of spirit at least in some degree commensurate with the ennobling tendency of the doctrines themselves, must have been derived from any careful study of the Socratic and Platonic philosophy. Every well-informed man has doubtless already as exalted an idea of its educational influence upon that and all subsequent ages as any attempted estimate could possibly give.

There were other subjects to which much time was devoted among the Athenians, and from which they cannot have failed to derive large benefit. We have, however, no very definite information concerning the extent to which these were made matter of systematic instruction by the teachers of young men. They studied their own noble literature. In the elementary schools, a large portion of their time was occupied in committing to memory the writings of the great poets, epic, lyric and dramatic; so that we read of young men who were able to repeat the entire Iliad and the like.

There is a well-known and touching story, that when the Athenian soldiers taken captive at Syracuse in the year 413 B.C. were sold into slavery, many of them gained the favor of their masters, and some their liberty, by repeating large portions of the dramas of Euripides, who was very popular in Sicily, and that several of these lived to thank the great poet on their return to Athens. Besides the obvious improvement of memory and refinement of taste, this exercise at school formed a means of acquiring that accuracy and elegance of pronunciation which the Athenians so rigidly required, and which, in the Greek language, must have been so difficult. It prepared them also for the introduction and appreciation of those felicitous quotations from the older poets which so abound in the orators and philosophers. But these early lessons were not all; in some cases, at least, lectures on literature were delivered by the higher instructors. Hippias is represented by Plato as lecturing to crowded audiences on Homer and various other poets, giving much archaeological information which might illustrate those old writers, presenting critical estimates of the comparative value of different poems and of the character of the Homeric heroes. It seems reasonable to conclude that the practice was not unusual. The benefit derived from these lectures would be greatly augmented by the fact that every man who heard them had a familiar previous acquaintance with the literature which formed their subject. Add to all this the general effect of reading and of the drama, and it cannot be questioned that here was a most important means of education. Even so much as then existed of that glorious literature, whose thoughts of power and forms of beauty still afford valuable discipline and abiding delight to all civilized nations, must have been far more influential among a people who could perfectly sympathize with its inner spirit, a people familiar with the scenes it depicted and for whom it possessed the peculiar charm

that always attaches to our national history and our native tongue.

Much attention was also given to the arts. Almost every Athenian youth learned something of the graphic arts and of music, and a philosophy of each was already recognized. Phidias, Parrhasius and others established canons in their several departments of art, and musical science, both in its physical and metaphysical relations, was largely studied. Aristotle has left us an elaborate argument on the importance of a practical acquaintance with these subjects, which in his day were beginning to be neglected. He says, for example, that taking the very lowest view, these accomplishments are a source of exceeding pleasure to ourselves and others, and that it should be a part of education to fit men not only for the proper pursuit of business, but also for the becoming enjoyment of leisure. One might recall, in connection with this, a saying of Pericles, in the remarkable funeral oration. He accounts it one of the peculiar glories of Athens that their laws provide for such frequent intermissions of care, by means of numerous and elegant recreations, whose daily delight charms melancholy away. Another point of the philosopher's argument is that rhythm and harmony tend to regulate and refine the mind, while the graphic arts lead us up to the contemplation of beauty, as letters to the contemplation of truth. The example of the Greeks, it may be remarked, will go very far to show that the study and practice of music, which among ourselves is so commonly neglected and so often despised, is not incompatible, to say the least, with profound wisdom or with practical fitness for the business of life.

We see, then, that however limited in comparison with the attainments of modern times, the field of acquired knowledge was really of great extent. With a considerable amount of Mathematics and Astronomy, and an active interest in the investigation of these and numerous kindred subjects, with Philosophy in all its divisions and Art in all its branches, and with an already valuable Literature, there was material for a course of instruction protracted through many years.

If, now, we combine with this result the conclusion previously reached as to the abundant supply of instructors, I think it will sufficiently appear that the Athenians of the age in question possessed such facilities for enlarged and thorough education as may account for the extraordinary degree, not only of mental power, but of mental discipline, which is so manifest in their history and remaining works. It would hardly be extravagant to assert, that in real training of mind, in mastery of principles and knowledge of men, in capacity for every form of mental effort, from the most refined speculation to the conduct of affairs, they were as highly educated a people as the world has yet seen. The subject I have endeavored thus summarily to present might suggest a variety of reflections bearing upon our own educational interests. To a few of these I shall now allude.

Instruction among the Athenians was chiefly oral.

Books they had, but they were rare and costly. Much of their reading was with the peculiar disadvantages as well as peculiar benefits of using borrowed books. It was a matter of necessity that they should occupy themselves mainly with oral discussion. The multiplication of books and their cheapness has perhaps been the chief cause of that entirely opposite practice which now so largely prevails. Of course it is not necessary to discuss the merits of the two methods in this presence. The prominence of lecturing, in every department of the University, has beyond question contributed not a little to its success, stimulating to that sharpened attention in the lecture-room which intelligent visitors have so often remarked, and leading to a thorough comprehension of general principles on the part of students, while it almost necessitates laborious

personal study, year after year, on the part of those who teach. One is surprised to find it said, by persons elsewhere who still hold to the opposite course, that this method proposes to throw away text-books altogether, when a judicious combination of the two is constantly advocated and attempted, a combination varying in the relative proportion of its elements according to the nature of the particular subject. Nor is it less strange to hear it urged, that the method is appropriate only for those who have decided maturity of mind, since a brief experiment would suffice to show that nowhere more than in elementary schools is oral instruction profitable and necessary. One might be inclined at times to suspect that a latent dread of the labor it requires is the true ground of opposition, did not the high character for ability and faithfulness of some who oppose, render the supposition inadmissible. Moreover, the Athenians derived much of their knowledge from free conversation, not only between an instructor and his pupils, but in the social intercourse of cultivated men in general. Every one has observed the lack of this at the present day, particularly in our own country. Between the Professor and his class, it is, perhaps, mainly impracticable, and the great advantages of our modern institutions must make compensation. In general society the growing infrequency of intercourse for conversation upon elevated topics appears to result from several causes. We live in an age of feverish activity and incessant toil, when all leisure is apt to be reckoned loss. New and attractive books and periodicals constantly accumulate upon the table and engross every moment that can be snatched from pressing duties. Mingling little together, and with an ever-widening literature in the several professions and in the various departments of knowledge, our better reading is less and less in the same direction. Already there is often little common ground save politics and general news. The whole tendency is to a diminution of that intellectual sympathy which ought to subsist among men of cultivation, however diverse their callings. Even if we looked to nothing beyond obtaining valuable information, surely there is more to be learned from conversation with intelligent friends than from the hurried reading of every ephemeral publication which obtrudes itself upon our notice. Another cause is, that a higher morality forbids the excesses which have so commonly been connected with the intercourse of literary men. Certainly we had better isolate ourselves completely than revive the scenes of the Greek symposion or the English club; but it would be humiliating to acknowledge that excessive animal indulgence is indispensable to elevated intellectual communion. It may be said that the whole matter will regulate itself aright; but I may at least solicit your reflection, whether some remedy cannot be found for what does appear to be an evil. The educational history we have been surveying suggests also the important fact that true education is not necessarily associated with vast acquirements. The famous saying of Macaulay that a modern school-girl knows more of Geography than Strabo, is in one sense true, but in another and higher sense it hides a dangerous error; for he who would measure education must not forget that it has three dimensions, and be sure to take account of its depth. There is hardly any lesson which our age needs to impress upon itself more constantly than that thoroughness is not to be sacrificed to extensive attainment. We remember, gentlemen, those of us particularly who were deficient in early advantages, the delusive hope of boyhood, that there would come a time when we should have read all books, and become masters of all knowledge. "We learned long ago that this can never be; yet often one re-awakes to fresh disappointment, and finds that he has been dreaming that sweet dream of childhood still. It is painful to think that we must live on and die, and leave many a wide field of human knowledge untraversed and unknown. This longing to learn everything is in itself a noble element of our nature, and leads to noble results; but it requires to be checked by the stern voice

of duty.

It is this feeling, combined with an indolent preference of that which is comparatively easy, that induces some persons to spend their lives in skimming the surface of every science and all literature, nowhere pausing for thorough examination. It is this that produces the popular admiration of men who have the reputation of omnivorous reading, while they may not be, in any just sense of the term, scholars. And in no respect are its effects more likely to be injurious than upon the interests of the higher education. Students, where there is liberty of choice, are constantly disposed to attempt more than within the time assigned they can properly accomplish; professors have to struggle continually against a desire to make their course unduly extensive; while cultivated and enthusiastic spectators, who have forgotten their experience in the one capacity and are perhaps destitute of experience in the other, impressed with the value of some branch of a subject which is not included, call, and call with forcible argument and eloquent appeal, for enlargement. Now, when it is urged that additional studies shall be pursued in additional time, no lover of knowledge can fail to give a hearty approbation. When it is proposed to crowd other subjects into the same already crowded space, the project is very questionable. When it is desired that we shall seek some vague general benefit, in such a condition of things as to involve, whether that be the intention or not, a sacrifice of thorough study, any such scheme deserves to be resisted, firmly and forever. In endeavoring to give a valuable course of instruction in any department of knowledge, the instructor must always keep in view three objects; and where the subject is unprofessional, and he is confined within such narrow limits as the present spirit and customs of our people impose, they ought to be held, if I correctly judge, in the following order of relative importance, first, to secure mental training; second, to awaken a love for the subject, which may lead the student to prosecute it hereafter; last and least, to furnish information. In teaching, for instance, one of the ancient languages, to those who cannot yet be induced to give to it more than a limited time, to make the student acquainted with whatever valuable truths the literature of that language contains, though very desirable in itself, must certainly be reckoned of inferior importance. If this were the principal object, there would be much force in the argument often urged against all study of those languages, that translations would suffice. The question then is, Which will accomplish most in the way of mental culture and in awakening a relish for the classics, to spend the time which can be commanded in reading as widely as possible, though with a very imperfect knowledge of the language itself, or to make an accurate and philosophical acquaintance with the language the primary object it being remembered that in order to this no small amount of reading is necessary, and that so much at least of the literature is read with a tolerably thorough comprehension and just appreciation? As to intellectual training, no one will question that the latter method is more useful. I think it can easily be shown that the same thing is true where some do question it, as to the cultivation of taste.

If you should go with some young friend to a gallery of art, having but a comparatively short time at your disposal, and desiring to procure him the largest amount of benefit and enjoyment, your course, if unreflecting as the mass of men, would probably be to carry him through a rapid survey of numerous works, telling him the names of the great artists, and pointing out their most celebrated productions, and giving him all the critical common-places of would-be connoisseurs. Your friend would go away little inclined to come again, and with scarcely anything of real benefit, but marvellously prepared to shine in a certain kind of society by a display of his remarkable

familiarity with matters of art. But if you select a considerable number of the finest works and fix his attention upon these till he shall, to some extent, drink in their deep inner significance and beauty, he will turn away, not imagining that he knows much, but with some true culture of taste, with a heightened love of the beautiful, and probably with a strong desire to visit again the spot where he found so much of genuine improvement and serene delight. Even so, if we desire nothing more than the ability to make large talk concerning even the most unfamiliar classic authors, and to ornament our pages with a plentiful sprinkling of classic allusion and quotation, then it will suffice to run rapidly over many works and read treatises on Greek and Roman Literature. But if we desire that true cultivation of taste, the faculty of taste, which the classics are capable of affording, we must study at least some works with such a patient attention as shall at length issue in appreciative contemplation and in sympathy with their peculiar genius. And let it not be objected that in order to this appreciation there is no need of critical study, as the great scholars of two centuries ago entered most fully into the classical spirit, while they knew very little of what we call philology. The objector appears to forget that condition which I have repeatedly mentioned, and which, however deplorable, can be corrected only by very slow degrees, the lack of time. Milton and the other great scholars of his age spent a large portion of their lives in reading Latin and Greek authors, becoming almost as familiar with those * languages, particularly the former, as with English itself. Thus they were brought into sympathy with the genius of the classic languages, precisely as in the case of their native tongue, by the gradual effect of this exceeding familiarity. Very similar, though within narrower limits, seems to be the plan pursued in England now. By an almost exclusive devotion during many years, their classical scholars attain to an extremely accurate and familiar knowledge of the languages, learning to feel the force of their idiom, not by philosophical examination, but by an immense amount of practical drilling.

It might appear presumptuous to say that, even for them, a larger infusion of philosophy would augment the benefit their system already confers. It is sufficient to say that, among us, such a course as that pursued by Milton or by the modern English scholars is at present utterly impracticable. If we would, with far less time at command, still attain to the privilege of communion with the very spirit of classical literature, our best, if not our only method, is by critical, philological study. For it must be remembered that philology includes not only the anatomy, but the physiology of language not merely the study of etymological formations, to the beginner often so repulsive, to the proficient so interesting, but of the precise significance of peculiar modes of expression, with the exact meaning and force of particles, and the relations of these to the inner life and informing spirit of the language. Is it not obvious that this affords the best possible means of entering into the genius of a literature, and securing a genuine culture, not only of intellect, but of taste? * We are all agreed, gentlemen let it be distinctly understood that it is desirable our young men should read the classics far more widely than they have ever done, and that, in order to this, as well as on other accounts, they should come to the university later, and remain longer, than is their wont. For the attainment of such a result, let us exert our united influence of every kind and in every place. For the rest, the standard of graduation in this department has been slowly rising with almost every year; the amount of reading necessary to a degree is already great; we may expect that this standard will continue to be elevated, and the requisite reading to be widened, as rapidly as the time students can be induced to give will possibly permit. Thus may they secure the largest intellectual and aesthetical cultivation now, and thus, precisely as fast as our people shall be prepared for it, the course of -classical instruction, while never ceasing to be thorough, may be

indefinitely extended. Shall not such a plan, with all its valuable results in the past and all its promise for the future, receive general approbation? Or shall we ask that our young men may spend the time they now devote to the classics in somewhat more extensive and far more imperfect reading, when, if there is force in the brief argument we have considered, the consequence will be a positive diminution, not only of intellectual improvement, but of that very aesthetical culture which all consider important, and which some reckon paramount? That is the practical question upon which alone, so far as I know, there is any difference of opinion; and to the many among us who have some tolerable acquaintance with the subject, the decision of that question may be cheerfully committed.

One or two other topics of remark suggest themselves, which I shall only indicate. The Greeks were in many respects pioneers of knowledge. Many subjects, particularly of mathematical and physical science, which for us involve no difficulty because their nature has been fully explained, were for them problems calling forth the mightiest energies, and demanding the most protracted application. Is it not true that strength of mind is still best attained, not by confining ourselves to those regions in which all difficulties have been removed by others' toil, but by approaching the boundaries of knowledge, and striving to extend its domain? It is sometimes lamented as a deplorable fatality that men cannot be restrained from laboring still at questions which the experience of ages appears to prove to be insoluble. Yet even though the effort should continue to be fruitless, is not that struggling effort itself a gain, because producing such vigor of intellect as nothing but pioneering work could ever give. It would be a fact worth considering, if it is true, that the unconquerable tendency of which men complain is in reality singularly fortunate; that where we often find disappointment and despair, there too we find the largest real benefit. The thorough education of the period we have been considering did not prepare the Greeks for producing an epic poetry which should rival the creations of a past age. The greatly improved educational resources of subsequent centuries could never re-animate the decaying spirit of Grecian literature. There are influences at work among men far mightier than what we call education. It is not in the power of systems of instruction to reproduce the literary types of a remote time or a distant people. Nor is this at all to be regretted, where, in place of extinct forms, there is something equally valuable. Why need the Athenians of the age of Pericles lament that there was no new Homer, when they had the immortal dramatists? Why complain, a few generations later, that no other Socrates or Pericles arose, when Aristotle and Demosthenes were there? So with our own country. If the condition and character of the nation have directed the attention of our ablest minds to politics, is it nothing that we have produced a political literature such as the world never witnessed before? Why lament that the mighty governing forces of social progress have appointed our people no different work, if they have performed with unequalled success the task that was set them? Have we not reason here to be satisfied with what our father accomplished, and be hopeful for our own future? A v no man ever forget that it is the business of education merely to give a harmonious development and thorough discipline to the powers of the national mind, not so much attempting any particular bias, as leaving it for the irresistible tendencies of the age to determine in what direction those powers shall be exerted. And now gentlemen, let us unite in the desire that on this, as on every occasion of our annual assembling, we may turn away profoundly impressed with the duties we personally owe to the cause of education and to this University. It is pleasant to see so many of our number in high places here, of instruction and of control.

It is cheering to hope that zeal tempered with prudence, and the spirit of progress chastened by conservatism, are to render truly illustrious this dynasty of the Alumni. But it is in the power of us all so to cherish the spirit of letters, so to prove the value of the training here received, that this noble Institution, which made us proud and happy in younger years by the bestowal of her unrivalled honors, may, at least to some extent, receive honor in return from the achievements of our ripened manhood and our advancing age.

S. First Four Professors Southern Baptist

The First Four Professors of The Southern Baptist Seminary Memoir of James P. Boyce By John A Broadus, 1893

[From T. J. Shanks, editor, A College of Colleges, (A Collection of Lectures), 1887, pp. 83-105. This book was provided by Steve Lecrone, Burton, OH. — jrd] The preparation of James P. Boyce for this position appears from all that we have seen of his history and character. Recall his thorough general education at the College of Charleston and at Brown University, his useful experience as editor in Charleston and full theological course at Princeton, his four years as pastor in Columbia, and now four years as theological professor in Furman University, two of them spent in laborious teaching there, and two in agency work for the proposed institution. He presented a remarkable combination of business talent, with thorough education and wide reading, and with experience as a preacher and professor, and was singularly adapted to be at once the Chairman of the Faculty and Treasurer of the Seminary, and its Professor of Systematic and of Polemic Theology.

We have seen that Basil Manly, Jr., now thirty-three years old, had been graduated at the State University of Alabama, and had taken a full theological course at Newton and Princeton. After a rich pastoral experience, including four years in the famous First Baptist Church of Richmond, Va., he had now been for five years the principal of the Richmond Female Institute, taking a large part in the higher instruction. He was already well known to be a man of great versatility and varied attainments, as strong in will as he was gentle in spirit, and sure to be warmly loved by his associates and pupils.

William Williams was now thirty-eight years old, a native of Georgia, and a graduate of the University of Georgia. He practised several years as a lawyer, having been graduated in the Law School of Harvard University. From 1851 he was a pastor in Alabama and Georgia, and since 1856 had been Professor of Theology in Mercer University, then located at Penfield, Ga. His legal studies and practice had disciplined his great mental acuteness. He had extraordinary power in the clear and terse statement of truth, and when kindled in preaching or lecturing he spoke with such intensity as is rarely equalled. He was also a man of great purity of character, certain to command the profoundest respect.

John A. Broadus was thirty-two years old, being a few days younger than Boyce. A native of Virginia, and from early youth a school-teacher by inheritance, he had been graduated in 1850 as M. A. of the University of Virginia. After another year of teaching he was pastor of the Baptist Church at Charlottesville, the seat of the University, from 1851 to 1859. During the first two years of this period he was also assistant-instructor in Latin and Greek, under the revered guidance of the famous Dr. Gessner Harrison. For the two years for 1855 to 1857 he again resided in the University as chaplain, his place in the Charlottesville church being filled by Rev. A. E. Dickinson. Then two remaining years in Charlottesville, and he went to the Seminary.

===== [From John A. Broadus, Memoir of James P. Boyce, 1893; reprint, n.d. - jrd]

S. God

GOD 1. Who is God? God is the only Being that has always existed, and He is the Creator and Preserver of all things.

2. How do we know that God exists? We know that God exists from the worlds He has made, and from our own sense of right and wrong; and the Bible above all tells us of God.

3. Have men any reason for denying God's existence? It is foolish and wicked to say there is no God. Psalms 14:1; Romans 1:20.

4. How may we learn the character of God? We learn the character of God partly from His works, mainly from His Word.

5. What does God know? God knows all things, even the secrets of our hearts; God is omniscient. Hebrews 4:13; Ecclesiastes 12:14.

6. What power has God? God has all power; God is omnipotent.

7. Where is God? God is everywhere, and all things are present to Him; God is omnipresent. Genesis 16:13; Psalms 139:7.

8. What do we know as to the holiness of God? God is perfectly holy; the angels praise Him as holy. Isaiah 6:3; Revelation 4:8.

9. Is God just? God is always perfectly righteous and just. Psalms 45:17.

10. Is God loving and good? God is love, and He is good to all. 1 John 4:8; Psalms 45:9.

11. Is God all love? God's justice is as truly a part of His nature as His love. Revelation 15:3.

12. How ought we to feel and act toward God? We ought to love God with all our heart and serve Him with all our powers. Deuteronomy 6:5; 1 John 5:3.

13. Is it our duty to fear God? It is our duty to obey God in filial fear, and to fear His wrath if we sin. Ecclesiastes 12:13; Hebrews 10:31.

S. He Ever Liveth to Intercede

He Ever Liveth to Intercede

John A. Broadus

Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. Hebrews 7:25

Years ago, in the city of Philadelphia, I went to hear an eminent musician. He played with genius and skill some magnificent music, but the pieces were nearly all new to me, and, as often happens in such cases, it required so much effort to comprehend the idea of the piece, that I could but partially enjoy its beauty. At length, upon being loudly applauded, the musician returned, and seating himself at the instrument, struck out in full tones the opening notes of "Home, Sweet Home." I shall never forget while I live the thrill that passed through the audience. I seemed to feel that it was approaching me, seemed to feel when it reached and embraced me. That was a theme all could comprehend, and rich for us all in a thousand delightful suggestions and associations; and, strangers as we were, the hearts of the vast assembly seemed melted into one as we listened to those swelling tones. My brethren, I wish it might always be so with us when one begins to speak to us of Jesus. There is many a subject of public discourse that well deserves our attention. Especially the topics drawn from the Bible and usually presented from the pulpit are all important and should all be interesting. Whatever pertains to God and his province, to his gracious dealings with man in the past, and his purposes of mercy for the future, whatever to the condition and wants of our race as sinful and immortal, should awaken our minds and impress our hearts. Difficult and mysterious as some of these topics are, they are useful; and if we resist the temptation to wander into speculation or descend into secularity, they will give us pleasure and do us good. But Jesus-it is a theme which all alike can understand, in which all alike are profoundly concerned, a theme associated with all the sweetest recollections of our spiritual life, with all the brightest hopes of our immortal future. Ah! we are perishing and helpless sinners, and it ought to thrill through our very hearts, to link us in living sympathy, and kindle our souls into a glow of love and joy to hear of Jesus, our divine, our loving, our precious Saviour. It ought to be not mere poetry, but the true expression of genuine feeling, when we sing, Jesus, I love thy charming name;

'Tis music to mine ear;

Fain would I sound it out so loud That earth and heaven might hear. And my text today treats of Jesus. The Jewish Christians to whom this Epistle was addressed were strongly urged, both in the way of persecution and persuasion, to apostatize from Christianity, and return to Judaism. Among the arguments employed for this purpose, it was urged that Christianity had no priesthood, no sacrifice or temple, and so was really no religion at all. The inspired writer of this Epistle meets these arguments, and, in fact, turns them into proofs of the superiority of Christianity. Thus, in regard to the priesthood, he shows that Christianity has a priest, a great High Priest, immensely superior to the Levitical priesthood. His office is held forever. He has offered, once for all, the

wonderful sacrifice of himself, which is forever sufficient. He has passed through the heavens into the true sanctuary, bearing his own precious, atoning blood. Then Christianity is superior in this, as in other respects, to Judaism, that is, to the Mosaic dispensation if regarded as complete in itself, and designed to be permanent; and so the sacred writer urges his brethren not to apostatize, interspersing everywhere throughout his arguments the most earnest exhortations to hold fast their profession, the most solemn warnings of the guilt and ruin of apostasy. For us as well as for them, grievous is the guilt and hopeless the ruin of abandoning the gospel of Christ, our sole hope of salvation.

One of the points he makes to prove this superiority of Christ and Christianity, is that from which the text is an inference. The Levitical priesthood was held by many persons in succession, "because that by death they were hindered from continuing"; but Jesus, "because he abideth forever, hath his priesthood unchangeable. Wherefore he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." The phrase translated "to the uttermost" signifies "perfectly," "completely"; he can save completely, can complete the salvation of them that come unto God through him. And the thought of the text is that he is able to complete their salvation, because he ever lives to intercede for them.

Perhaps we are accustomed to look too exclusively to the Saviour's atoning death, not dwelling as we should upon the idea of his interceding life. See how the apostle speaks in Romans: "For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." And again: "Christ Jesus that died, yea rather that was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." He who loved us and gave himself for us ever liveth to accomplish the objects for which he died; as the mediatorial priest, he is ever interceding for the salvation of them that come unto God through him; as the mediatorial king, having all authority given unto him in heaven and earth, he controls all things so as to carry forward to completion the work of their salvation. My brethren, it is just such a Saviour that we need. From the first moment when we approach God through him, onward through life, and in a certain just sense onward without end, we continually need God's mercy and grace for the Saviour's sake. If we dwell on this, we shall be better prepared to rejoice that our great High Priest ever lives to intercede for us, and thus can complete our salvation.

1. We are tempted. And what hope have we of conquering temptation, save "through him that loved us"? Remember what our Lord said to his disciples, with regard to the sore temptations that would soon befall them: "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat; but I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not." As Satan is described as seeking permission from that Sovereign Ruler, without whose permission all his might and his malice are powerless, to tempt Job with peculiar trials, in the hope that he could bring him to renounce the Lord, so here as to the disciples: "Satan asked to have you"-and the term, as well as the connection, shows that he was permitted to have them, "that he might sift you as wheat."

Jesus himself is represented by John the Baptist as engaged in a similar process: "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his threshing-floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." But how different is the object in the two cases! Satan sifts with the hope of showing that all is really worthless, fit only for destruction. Jesus sifts in order to separate the precious from the vile, and preserve the pure wheat for the

garner of heaven. And often what Satan meant as a sifting for evil is overruled by the stronger power so as to be for good.

How was it with Peter? The Saviour said: "But I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not"; and though his faith mournfully gave way, it did not utterly give out. I am not excusing Peter at all. We may be sure he never forgave himself. It was a sad and shameful fall; but Jesus had made supplication for him; and how different the result in his case from that of Judas. He, too, was one of those whom Satan obtained to sift them, and the result proved him to be all that Satan could wish. When he saw the consequences of his horrid crime, and had time to reflect upon it, he was sorry; but it was not the tender grief of a truly penitent heart which would have brought him back with humble submission-it was the sorrow of the world that worketh death-it was remorse that drove him headlong into self-destruction. But Peter, when the cock crowed after his third denial of his Lord and that injured one turned and looked upon him, Peter went out and wept bitterly, with the sorrow "that worketh repentance unto salvation," the sorrow of a deeply humble and really loving heart. There was a great change from that time in Peter, for the Lord had prayed for him, and divine grace not only preserved him from utter spiritual ruin, but overruled his own dreadful wickedness to his spiritual good.

Observe with what special emphasis the Saviour's intercession for the tempted is spoken of in this Epistle. The persons therein addressed were, as we have seen, peculiarly and sorely tempted-tempted even to forsake Christianity, through which alone they could find salvation; apart from which "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectation of judgment and a fierceness of fire which shall devour the adversary." The Jewish high priest, being taken from among men, "could bear gently with the ignorant and erring, for that he himself also was compassed with infirmity." So our great High Priest took upon him human nature partly for this very reason, that he might sympathize with the tempted, and that we might feel sure he does sympathize. "Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, as he is able to succor them that are tempted."

It is because of his atoning sacrifice and sympathizing intercession that we are urged to hold fast our profession as Christians, and encouraged to come to God with entire confidence. This is done in words that have been very dear to tempted hearts in every age since the holy man of God spake them as he was moved by the Holy Ghost. "Having, then, a great High Priest who hath passed through the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession. For we have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace that we may receive mercy, and may find grace to help us in time of need."

Ah! mighty, to the most favored, are the temptations of life. Many belong to all periods; others mark some special season. Many are "common to man"; others belong to some particular condition or calling. "The heart knoweth its own bitterness"; yea, and its own trials, and its own weakness. Be this our support-our Saviour lives, he sympathizes with us, he intercedes for us; let us draw near unto God through him, unto God who has said, "As thy days, so shall thy strength be." The soul that on Jesus hath leaned for repose, I will not, I will not desert to its foes; That soul,

though all hell should endeavor to shake, I'll never, no never, no never forsake.

2. But many times, sad as is the confession, we yield to temptation, we sin; and "the soul that sinneth, it shall die." Must we then despair? Must the hopes we had cherished be abandoned, and this new sin be the terror of our souls? Listen! The apostle John wrote an Epistle for the express purpose of restraining his brethren from sin; yet he does not cut off those who are conscious they have sinned from the hope of forgiveness and salvation. He says: "My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye may not sin. And if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world."

Now we know what an advocate was, according to the usages of the Roman law, and is among ourselves, viz.: one who undertakes the management of another's case in court, and pleads his cause. So Jesus is our advocate with the Father. But, as in other cases where spiritual things are illustrated by temporal, the analogy is not perfect; there are differences. Our advocate does not argue that we are innocent, but confessing our guilt, pleads for mercy to us; and he does not present our merits as a reason why mercy should be shown us, but his merits. "He is the propitiation for our sins." His atoning death does, as it were, render God propitious, or favorable to sinners. Not that God is unwilling to show favor to poor sinners, and only prevailed on to do so by the death and intercession of his Son. Oh no! far from it. "Herein is love," says John in the same Epistle, "not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." It was because God loved us, and wanted us to be saved, that he devised this way of saving us. And God is made propitious, favorable to us, not when he is made willing to save, but when it is made right that he should save us, and therefore we need not die, but may have everlasting life. When a sinner is pardoned, simply for the sake of the atoning and interceding Saviour, there is in that no encouragement to God's creatures to sin, as if it were a little thing and could be readily passed over, but a most solemn and impressive exhibition of the dreadful evil of sin, since it was only through the atonement and intercession of the only-begotten Son of God that any sinner could be forgiven, an exhibition at once of God's love to the perishing, and of his justice, that "will by no means clear the guilty."

Bearing in mind the difference between the pleading of our great advocate and any parallel which human affairs presents, we may look at a story of Grecian history, which has been often used to illustrate the Saviour's intercession. The poet Aeschylus had incurred the displeasure of the Athenians. He was on trial before the great popular tribunal, consisting of many hundreds of citizens, and was about to be condemned. But Aeschylus had a brother, who had lost an arm in battle-in the great battle of Salamis, where the Greeks fought for their existence against the Persian aggressors. This brother came into the court, and did not speak words of entreaty, but letting fall his mantle, he showed the stump of his arm, lost in his country's defense, and there stood until the Athenians relented, and Aeschylus was suffered to go free. So, my brethren, imperfect and unworthy as is the illustration, so we may conceive that when we are about to be condemned, and justly condemned for our sins, our glorious Brother stands up in our behalf, and does not need to speak a word, but only to show where he was wounded on the cross, Five bleeding wounds he bears, Received on Calvary;

They pour effectual prayers, They strongly speak for me;

"Forgive him, O forgive," they cry, "Nor let that ransomed sinner die!"

Here, then, is hope for us. "If any man sin," much as he ought to deplore it, he need not despair. Our advocate with the Father ever liveth to make intercession for them that come unto God through him, and through him we may find mercy. And here is no encouragement to sin, but the very contrary. If we truly trust in, truly love our interceding Lord, we shall be supremely anxious for his dear sake to turn from sin, to live for him who died for us; yea, who ever lives as our Saviour.

3. This suggests another respect in which is seen our need of our Lord's perpetual intercession. We make such slow progress in attaining holiness-holiness, which is the noblest thing men can aspire to-holiness, "without which no man shall see the Lord." Many a Christian, as he sorrowfully sees how often he yields to temptation, how his character breaks down afresh where he thought it had grown most firm, is at times inclined to think it impossible that he should ever become really holy. But remember how Jesus prayed the night before his atoning death, "Sanctify them in the truth; thy word is truth." "I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil." Think you that he, who ever lives to intercede for his people, does not still pray this prayer, that they may be sanctified and kept from the evil? Do you doubt that he prays for them still, as he did when on earth? His people's wants have not changed, and as for him, he is "the same yesterday and today and forever." Find me a young man far from his home whose mother used to pray for him when they were together, and try to make him believe that she does not pray for him still. "No, no," he would say, "if she is living, she prays for me."

Brethren, he who prays for us "ever lives." When the Jews gathered at the temple on the great day of atonement, and the high priest went into the holy of holies to pray for the people and himself, did the people doubt whether he was praying? Why, for that very purpose he had withdrawn from their view. So for that very purpose our High Priest has entered "not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us." And do not say that the Jewish high priest was absent but a few minutes, while it is long since Jesus went away. On the scale of the ages it is but a little while since he entered the heavenly sanctuary, having "been once offered to bear the sins of many," and any moment he may "appear a second time apart from sin unto salvation." Let us be sure that while absent he perpetually carries on his work of intercession.

Think of him, then, as still praying, "Sanctify them in the truth. Keep them from the evil." In all our disheartening failures to keep good resolutions, even when we may be tempted to think it scarce worth while for us to try to be holy, let us remember that Jesus prays for us, and, "forgetting the things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, let us press toward the mark." Ah! brethren, though it might often seem to us the bitterest irony now for a man to call you and me the saints of the Lord, yet, if indeed we are in Christ, and thus are new creatures, we have but to trust in his intercession for the sanctifying Spirit, and earnestly strive to "grow in grace," and we shall make progress; yea, sadly imperfect as is now our conformity to the Saviour's beautiful image, "we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." O burdened spirit, crying, "Wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" be sure to add, "I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." The Saviour will continue to intercede, the Spirit will help your infirmities, and you shall at last be pure from sin, and safe from temptation to sin, a saint of the Lord forever.

4. When we are in sorrow it is a blessed thing that Jesus ever lives to pray for us. He was himself while on earth, "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief." And he showed the truest, tenderest sympathy with the sorrows of others. Who does not think at once of that touching scene at Bethany? "Jesus wept," in affection for the departed, in sympathy with the bereaved. And presently, standing by the tomb, he said, "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me." Then he had been praying, asking that he might be able to raise Lazarus from the dead. We do not expect him now to pray that miracles may be wrought in behalf of the bereaved. We do not expect him now to give back the buried brother to his sisters, or to the widowed mother her only son. But shall it not be a consolation to us all in our afflictions, to feel assured that he now intercedes for us; that now, too, the Father hears him, and that by the gracious influences of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, this affliction shall work for us glory? And though we cannot now see his tears, nor hear his loving voice, as did the mourners at Bethany, neither do we need to send a messenger many miles, and wait, day after day, and go forth into the suburbs to meet him; he is everywhere alike near, and ever ready to pray for us to his Father and our Father, to his God and our God.

5. When we come to die, he is "alive forevermore." One of his servants, when near to death, saw "heaven opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God," where he represents and intercedes for his people. And so in departing he committed his spirit to him, as now exalted and glorious and ready to receive it. And so, amid all the cruel injustice and suffering, he was calm and forgiving. And so, though they were stoning him to death, "he fell asleep." Oh, whenever you are called to die, brother, and however, whether among loving friends in your pleasant home, or far away in loneliness and want, whether with ample forewarning or in the suddenness of a moment, think of your interceding Saviour standing on the right hand of God, and say, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," and you too shall fall asleep.

6. Even this is not the end of his work for his people. There shall be a "redemption of the body." Many have been sad during the time of war, because the bodies of their loved ones lie so far away, lie perhaps undistinguished among the huge masses of the unnamed dead. But he who receives the departing spirit to himself will also care for the mouldering body. His resurrection is a pledge of the glorious resurrection of his people. "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also who through Jesus have fallen asleep, will God bring with him." "Who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory." Then, the spirit reunited with the risen and glorified body, "so shall we ever be with the Lord." And he who saved them will be ever living to keep them safe, unto all eternity. My friends, how shall we think of Jesus? What conception shall we cherish of him whom "having not seen, we love," who ever liveth to intercede for us? Many centuries ago, on the eastern slope of Mount Olivet, toward Bethany, twelve men stood together, one talking to the others. Presently he lifted up his hands and blessed them; and with hands still uplifted, and words of blessing still lingering on his lips, he was parted from them and rose toward heaven, till a cloud received him out of sight. Years passed, and one of the eleven was an exile on a lonely island. It was the Lord's day, and he was in the Spirit. Hearing behind him a mighty voice that seemed to call him, he turned, and lo! one like unto the Son of Man, it was the Saviour who had parted from him long years before. He was arrayed in robes of majesty, and girt about with a golden girdle; his whole head shone white as snow with celestial glory; his eyes were as a flame of fire; and his feet like unto burnished brass, as if it had been refined in a furnace; and his voice as the voice of many waters; and his countenance as the sun

shineth in his strength. Yes, the feet that once wearily trod the dusty roads of Judea now shone like molten brass. The eyes that were full of tears as he gazed upon doomed Jerusalem now gleamed as a flame of fire. The countenance that writhed in agony as he lay prostrate on his face in the garden, that was streaked with the blood that fell from his thorn-pierced brow, was now as the sun shineth in his strength. And the voice as the voice of many waters-it was the same voice that in gentleness and love had so often encouraged the sinful and sorrowing to draw near-it is the same voice that now calls us to come unto God through him, and declares that he is able to save us completely, since he ever lives to intercede for us.

O my hearer, slight all the sounds of earth, all the voices of the universe; be deaf to the thunder's mighty tones, and stand careless amid "the wreck of matter and the crush of worlds"-but oh, slight not the loving voice of Jesus.

S. He Ever liveth to Intercede

He Ever liveth to Intercede.

Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them Hebrews 7:25.

YEARS ago, in the city of Philadelphia, I went to hear an eminent musician. He played with genius and skill some magnificent music, but the pieces were nearly all new to me, and, as often happens in such cases, it required so much effort to comprehend the idea of the piece, that I could but partially enjoy its beauty. At length, upon being loudly applauded, the musician returned, and seating himself at the instrument, struck out in full tones the opening notes of "Home, Sweet Home." I shall never forget while I live the thrill that passed through the audience. I seemed to feel that it was approaching me, seemed to feel when it reached and embraced me. That was a theme that all could comprehend, and rich for us all in a thousand delightful suggestions and associations; and, strangers as we were, the hearts of the vast assembly seemed melted into one as we listened to those swelling tones. My brethren, I wish it might always be so with us when one begins to speak to us of Jesus. There is many a subject of public discourse that well deserves our attention. Especially the topics drawn from the Bible and usually presented from the pulpit are all important and should all be interesting. Whatever pertains to God and his providence, to his gracious dealings with man in the past, and his purposes of mercy for the future, whatever to the condition and wants of our race as sinful and immortal, should awaken our minds and impress our hearts. Difficult and mysterious as some of these topics are, they are useful; and if we resist the temptation to wander into speculation or descend into secularity, they will give us pleasure and do us good. But Jesus it is a theme which all alike can understand, in which all alike are profoundly concerned, a theme associated with all the sweetest recollections of our spiritual life, with all the brightest hopes of our immortal future.

Ah! we are perishing and helpless sinners, and it ought to thrill through our very hearts, to link us in living sympathy, and kindle our souls into a glow of love and joy to hear of Jesus, our divine, our loving, our precious Saviour. It ought to be not mere poetry, but the true expression of genuine feeling, when we sing, "Jesus, I love thy charming name;

'Tis music to mine ear; Fain would I sound it out so loud That earth and heaven might hear." And my text to-day treats of Jesus. The Jewish Christians to whom this Epistle was addressed were strongly urged, both in the way of persecution and persuasion, to apostatize from Christianity, and return to Judaism. Among the arguments employed for this purpose, it was urged that Christianity had no priesthood, no sacrifice or temple, and so was really no religion at all. The inspired writer of this Epistle meets these arguments, and, in fact, turns them into proofs of the superiority of Christianity. Thus, in regard to the priesthood, he shows that Christianity has a priest, a great High-Priest, immensely superior to the Levitical priesthood. His office is held forever.

He has offered, once for all, the wonderful sacrifice of himself, which is forever sufficient. He has passed through the heavens into the true sanctuary, bearing his own precious, atoning blood. Then Christianity is superior in this, as in other respects, to Judaism, that is, to the Mosaic dispensation if regarded as complete in itself, and designed to be permanent; and so the sacred writer urges his brethren not to apostatize, interspersing everywhere throughout his arguments the most earnest exhortations to hold fast their profession, the most solemn warnings of the guilt and ruin of apostasy. And for us as well as for them, grievous is the guilt and hopeless the ruin of abandoning the gospel of Christ, our sole hope of salvation.

One of the points he makes to prove this superiority of Christ and Christianity, is that from which the text is an inference. The Levitical priesthood was held by many persons in succession, "because that by death they were hindered from continuing; " but Jesus, " because he abideth forever, hath his priesthood unchangeable. "Wherefore he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." The phrase translated " to the uttermost " signifies "perfectly," " completely; "he can save completely, can complete the salvation of them that come unto God through him. And the thought of the text is that he is able to complete their salvation, because he ever lives to intercede for them.

Perhaps we are accustomed to look too exclusively to the Saviour's atoning death, not dwelling as we should upon the idea of his interceding life. See how the apostle speaks in Romans: " For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." And again: " Christ Jesus that died, yea rather that was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." He who loved us and gave himself for us ever liveth to accomplish the objects for which he died; as the mediatorial priest, he is ever interceding for the salvation of them that come unto God through him; as the mediatorial king, having all authority given unto him in heaven and earth, he controls all things so as to carry forward to completion the work of their salvation. My brethren, it is just such a Saviour that we need. From the first moment when we approach God through him, onward through life, and in a certain just sense onward without end, we continually need God's mercy and grace for the Saviour's sake. If we dwell on this, we shall be better prepared to rejoice that our great High Priest ever lives to intercede for us, and thus can complete our salvation.

1. We are tempted. And what hope have we of conquering temptation, save " through him that loved us?"

Remember what our Lord said to his disciples, with regard to the sore temptations that would soon befall them: " Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat; but I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not." As Satan is described as seeking permission from that Sovereign Ruler, without whose permission all his might and his malice are powerless, to tempt Job with peculiar trials, in the hope that he could bring him to renounce the 'Lord, so here as to the disciples. " Satan asked to have you " and the term, as well as the connection, shows that he was permitted to have them, u that he might sift you as wheat." Jesus himself is represented by John the Baptist as engaged in a similar process: " Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his threshing-floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." But how different is the object in the two cases! Satan sifts with the hope of showing that all is really worthless, fit only for destruction. Jesus sifts in order to separate

the precious from the vile, and preserve the pure wheat for the garner of heaven. And often what Satan meant as a sifting for evil is overruled by the stronger power so as to be for good.

How was it with Peter? The Saviour said: "But I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not; and though his faith mournfully gave way, it did not utterly give out. I am not excusing Peter at all. We may be sure he never forgave himself. It was a sad and shameful fall; but Jesus had made supplication for him; and how different the result in his case from that of Judas. He, too, was one of those whom Satan obtained to sift them, and the result proved him to be all that Satan could wish. When he saw the consequences of his horrid crime, and had time to reflect upon it, he was sorry; but it was not the tender grief of a truly penitent heart which would have brought him back with humble submission it was the sorrow of the world that worketh death it was remorse that drove him headlong into self-destruction. But Peter when the cock crowed after his third denial of his Lord and that injured one turned and looked upon him Peter went out and wept bitterly, with the sorrow "that worketh repentance unto salvation," the sorrow of a deeply humble and really loving heart. There was a great change from that time in Peter, for the Lord had prayed for him, and Divine grace not only preserved him from utter spiritual ruin, but overruled his own dreadful wickedness to his spiritual good.

Observe with what special emphasis the Saviour's intercession for the tempted is spoken of in this Epistle. The persons therein addressed were, as we have seen, peculiarly and sorely tempted tempted even to forsake Christianity, through which alone they could find salvation; apart from which "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectation of judgment and a fierceness of fire which shall devour the adversary." The Jewish high priest, being taken from among men, "could bear gently with the ignorant and erring, for that he himself also was compassed with infirmity." So our great High Priest took upon him human nature partly for this very reason, that he might sympathize with the tempted, and that we might feel sure he does sympathize. "Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." And it is because of his atoning sacrifice and sympathizing intercession that we are urged to hold fast our profession as Christians, and encouraged to come to God with entire confidence. This is done in words that have been very dear to tempted hearts in every age since the holy man of God spake them as he was moved by the Holy Ghost. "Having, then, a great High Priest who hath passed through the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession. For we have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us THEREFORE draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace that we may receive mercy, and may find grace to help us in time of need."

Ah! mighty, to the most favored, are the temptations of life. Many belong to all periods; others mark some special season. Many are "common to man; " others belong to some particular condition or calling. "The heart knoweth its own bitterness; " yea, and its own trials, and its own weakness. Be this our support our Saviour lives, he sympathizes with us, he intercedes for us; let us draw near unto God through him, unto God who has said, "As thy days, so shall thy strength be."

“ The soul that on Jesus hath leaned for repose, I will not, I will not desert to its foes; That soul, though all hell should endeavor to shake, I'll never, no never, no never forsake.”

2. But many times, sad as is the confession, we yield to temptation, we sin; and “ the soul that sinneth, it shall die.” Must we then despair? Must the hopes we had cherished be abandoned, and this new sin be the terror of our souls? Listen! The apostle John wrote an Epistle for the express purpose of restraining his brethren from sin; yet he does not cut off those who are conscious they have sinned from the hope of forgiveness and salvation. He says: “ My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye may not sin. And if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world.”

Now we know what an advocate was, according to the usages of the Roman law, and is among ourselves, viz., one who undertakes the management of another's case in court, and pleads his cause. So Jesus is our Advocate with the Father. But, as in other cases where spiritual things are illustrated by temporal, the analogy is not perfect; there are differences. Our advocate does not argue that we are innocent, but confessing our guilt, pleads for mercy to us; and he does not present our merits as a reason why mercy should be shown us, but his merits. “ He is the propitiation for our sins.” His atoning death does, as it were, render God propitious, or favorable to sinners. Not that God is unwilling to show favor to poor sinners, and only prevailed on to do so by the death and intercession of his Son. Oh no! far from it. “ Herein is love,” says John in the same Epistle, “ not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.” It was because God loved us, and wanted us to be saved, that he devised this way of saving us. And God is made propitious, favorable to us, not when he is made willing to save, but when it is made right that he should save us, and therefore we need not die, but may have everlasting life. When a sinner is pardoned, simply for the sake of the atoning and interceding Saviour, there is in that no encouragement to God's creatures to sin, as if it were a little thing and could be readily passed over, but a most solemn and impressive exhibition of the dreadful evil of sin, since it was only through the atonement and intercession of the only-begotten Son of God that any sinner could be forgiven an exhibition fit once of God's love to the perishing, and of his justice, that “ will by no means clear the guilty.”

Bearing in mind the difference between the pleading of our great Advocate and any parallel which human affairs presents, we may look at a story of Grecian history, which has been often used to illustrate the Saviour's intercession. The poet Eschylus had incurred the displeasure of the Athenians. He was on trial before the great popular tribunal, consisting of many hundreds of citizens, and was about to be condemned. But Eschylus had a brother, who had lost an arm in battle in the great battle of Salamis, where the Greeks fought for their existence against the Persian aggressors. This brother came into the court, and did not speak words of entreaty, but letting fall his mantle, he showed the stump of his arm, lost in his country's defense, and there stood until the Athenians relented, and Eschylus was suffered to go free. So, my brethren, imperfect and unworthy as is the illustration, so we may conceive that when we are about to be condemned, and justly condemned for our sins, our glorious Brother stands up in our behalf, and does not need to speak a word, but only to show where he was wounded on the cross “ Five bleeding wounds he bears, Received on Calvary; They pour effectual prayers, They strongly speak for me; 'Forgive him, O forgive,' they cry, ' Nor let that ransomed sinner die! ’ “Here, then, is

hope for us. "If any man sin," much as he ought to deplore it, he need not despair. Our Advocate with the Father ever liveth to make intercession for them that come unto God through him, and through him we may find mercy. And here is no encouragement to sin, but the very contrary. If we truly trust in, truly love our interceding Lord, we shall be supremely anxious for his dear sake to turn from sin, to live for him who died for us; yea, who ever lives as our Saviour.

3. This suggests another respect in which is seen our need of our Lord's perpetual intercession. We make such slow progress in attaining holiness, which is the noblest thing men can aspire to holiness, "without which no man shall see the Lord." Many a Christian, as he sorrowfully sees how often he yields to temptation, how his character breaks down afresh where he thought it had grown most firm, is at times inclined to think it impossible that he should ever become really holy. But remember how Jesus prayed the night before his atoning death, "Sanctify them in the truth; thy word is truth." "I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil." Think you that he, who ever lives to intercede for his people, does not still pray this prayer, that they may be sanctified and kept from the evil? Do you doubt that he prays for them still, as he did when on earth? His people's wants have not changed, and as for him, he is "the same yesterday and to-day and forever." Find me a young man far from his home whose mother used to pray for him when they were together, and try to make him believe that she does not pray for him still. "No, no," he would say, "if she is living, she prays for me."

Brethren, he who prays for us "ever lives." When the Jews gathered at the temple on the great day of atonement, and the high priest went into the holy of holies to pray for the people and himself, did the people doubt whether he was praying? Why, for that very purpose he had withdrawn from their view. So for that very purpose our High Priest has entered "not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us." And do not say that the Jewish high priest was absent but a few minutes, Awhile it is long since Jesus went away. On the scale of the ages it is but a little while since he entered the heavenly sanctuary, having "been once offered to bear the sins of many," and any moment he may "appear a second time apart from sin unto salvation." Let us be sure that while absent he perpetually carries on his work of intercession.

Think of him, then, as still praying, "Sanctify them in the truth. Keep them from the evil." In all our disheartening failures to keep good resolutions, even when we may be tempted to think it scarce worth while for us to try to be holy, let us remember that Jesus prays for us, and, "forgetting the things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, let us press toward the mark." Ah! brethren, though it might often seem to us the bitterest irony now for a man to call you and me the saints of the Lord, yet, if indeed we are in Christ, and thus are new creatures, we have but to trust in his intercession for the sanctifying Spirit, and earnestly strive to "grow in grace," and we shall make progress; yea, sadly imperfect as is now our conformity to the Saviour's beautiful image, "we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." O burdened spirit, crying, "Wretched man that I am who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" be sure to add, "I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." The Saviour will continue to intercede, the Spirit will help your infirmities, and you shall at last be pure from sin, and safe from temptation to sin, a saint of the Lord forever.

4. When we are in sorrow it is a blessed thing that Jesus ever lives to pray for us. He was himself while on earth, "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief." And he showed the truest, tenderest sympathy with the sorrows of others. Who does not think at once of that touching scene at Bethany? "Jesus wept," in affection for the departed, in sympathy with the bereaved. And presently, standing by the tomb, he said, "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me." Then he had been praying, asking that he might be able to raise Lazarus from the dead. We do not expect him now to pray that miracles may be wrought in behalf of the bereaved. We do not expect him now to give back the buried brother to his sisters, or to the widowed mother her only son. But shall it not be a consolation to us all in our afflictions, to feel assured that he now intercedes for us; that now, too, the Father hears him, and that by the gracious influences of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, this affliction shall work for us glory? And though we cannot now see his tears, nor hear his loving voice, as did the mourners at Bethany, neither do we need to send a messenger many miles, and wait, day after day, and go forth into the suburbs to meet him; he is everywhere alike near, and ever ready to pray for us to his Father and our Father, to his God and our God.

5. When we come to die he is "alive forevermore."

One of his servants, when near to death, saw "heaven opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God," where he represents and intercedes for his people. And so in departing he committed his spirit to him, as now exalted and glorious, and ready to receive it. And so, amid all the cruel injustice and suffering, he was calm and forgiving. And so, though they were stoning him to death, "he fell asleep." O, whenever you are called to die, brother, and however, whether among loving friends in your pleasant home, or far away in loneliness and want, whether with ample forewarning or in the suddenness of a moment, think of your interceding Saviour standing on the right hand of God, and say, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit" and you too shall fall asleep.

6. Even this is not the end of his work for his people. There shall be a "redemption of the body." Many have been sad in the last twenty years, because the bodies of their loved ones lie so far away, lie perhaps undistinguished among the huge masses of the unnamed dead. But he who receives the departing spirit to himself will also care for the mouldering body. His resurrection is a pledge of the glorious resurrection of his people. "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also who through Jesus have fallen asleep, will God bring with him." "Who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory." Then, the spirit reunited with the risen and glorified body, "so shall we ever be with the Lord." And he who saved them will be ever living to keep them safe, unto all eternity. My friends, how shall we think of Jesus? What conception shall we cherish of him whom, "having not seen, we love," who ever liveth to intercede for us?

Many centuries ago, on the eastern slope of Mount Olivet, towards Bethany, twelve men stood together, one talking to the others. Presently he lifted up his hands and blessed them; and with hands still uplifted, and words of blessing still lingering on his lips, he was parted from them and rose toward heaven, till a cloud received him out of their sight. Years passed, and one of the eleven was an exile on a lonely island. It was the Lord's day, and he was in the Spirit. Hearing behind him a mighty voice that seemed to call him, he turned, and lo! one like unto the Son of Man it was the Saviour who had been parted from him long years before. He was arrayed in robes of majesty, and girt about with a golden girdle; his whole head shone white as snow with celestial

glory; his eyes were as a flame of fire; and his feet like unto burnished brass, as if it had been refined in a furnace; and his voice as the voice of many waters; and his countenance as the sun shineth in his strength. Yes, the feet that once wearily trod the dusty roads of Judea now shone like molten brass. The eyes that were full of tears as he gazed upon doomed Jerusalem now gleamed as a flame of fire. The countenance that writhed in agony as he lay prostrate on his face in the garden, that was streaked with the blood that fell from his thorn-pierced brow, was now as the sun shineth in his strength. And the voice as the voice of many waters it was the same voice that in gentleness and love had so often encouraged the sinful and sorrowing to draw near it is the same voice that now calls us to come unto God through him, and declares that he is able to save us completely, since he ever lives to intercede for us. O, my hearer, slight all the sounds of earth, all the voices of the universe; be deaf to the thunder's mighty tones, and stand careless amid "the wreck of matter and the crush of worlds" but O, slight not the loving voice of Jesus.

S. How The Gospel Makes Men Holy

HOW THE GOSPEL MAKES MEN HOLY.

O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. Romans 7:24-25. Language is intensely passionate, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?" Then with the sudden transition of passion, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

"How shall I be good?" is a question that used sometimes to rise in your mind when you were a child, sometimes when nobody would imagine you were thinking of such things as that. "How shall I get to be good?" And it is a question which, amid all the commotion of this runaway life of ours, comes back to us very often, comes back even to people whom you would not suppose to be thinking of such things at all. The grossly wicked men, the men who are the slaves of vice, many of them, perhaps all of them, have their moments when there is a sort of longing that rises in their souls to be good, and when the hope returns, indestructible, that somehow or other they will get to be good after all. It became a sort of jest a few years ago, I know, to speak of "the wickedest man in New York," but I wonder sometimes if the wickedest man whoever he might happen to be, considered as God considers does not sometimes want to be good. For many of us it has been much more than a vague longing that comes back again and again. It has been an earnest effort, sometimes a fearful struggle, when we have been trying to be good, and we have wondered whether something would not come in the course of the varied experiences of life, that would render it easier for us to conquer in this struggle, easier to become good. As a man lives on, he cannot help thinking it is so hard now he cannot help thinking it will become easier to be good. And when changes occur in his outward life he hopes now to find it easier. He sets up a new home, it may be, and has a vague feeling that there he will be able to be good. He marries a pious woman, may be, and although he may not say a word about it, he has a sort of notion that perhaps that will be blessed to him, and he will become pious too. He loses a parent whom he leaned on, maybe he loses a little child that lay in his bosom, and amid the strange feelings that rise up then, and which he would not tell any one about, he thinks, "Now surely I shall become good." And so, as the experiences of life come and go, men still hope to be good. Who is there here to-day that does not hope to be good? Who is there here to-day that at this solemn moment, when we are thinking about the soul and its immortality, does not feel that to be good is the loftiest human aspiration and the best earthly attainment? O tell me, do you not feel it?

Now I have something to say about this great question; not to cite my own experience nor to give my own ideas, but I want to get your attention fixed on the apostle Paul's account of this matter, including some details of his own experience about it. Let us see how he treats the question. Here, in the Epistle to the Romans, the early chapters of the Epistle are occupied with what we call justification by faith, telling how, by believing in Jesus Christ, a man may be justified that is, may be regarded and treated in the sight of God's law as if he were a just man. And then the next question that will arise to any reflecting mind, and which the apostle at once thought of, is, Ah! but

how does this bear on the matter of making a man good, in his real personal character? It looks at first like a sort of legal fiction, the idea of considering a man as just in the sight of God's law, though he is not just, because of Jesus Christ in whom he believes. And then remains the question how a man is to be made righteous in his own character, how he is to be made holy. Many persons say that this is the weak point of the Gospel, that the Gospel tends to lessen the inducements to seek personal holiness, by undertaking to make a man just simply upon believing, by offering him amnesty. They talk as if the Gospel offer of free pardon for somebody else's sake, yea, and of title to everlasting life for somebody else's sake, were an encouragement to do wrong. There are many men holding the subject at arm's length who maintain that the Gospel tends to prevent us from trying to do right by thus offering salvation gratuitously.

Now the apostle Paul goes on to show in the first place the absurdity of such an idea; to show that when men talk as if it were a small thing to believe in Jesus Christ the Lord, they don't understand what they are talking about. He shows by several different illustrative arguments that if a man believes in Jesus Christ, that means something; that it means a power in his life, that it involves a change in his inner character. He says first that if we are believers, we are dead to sin and have risen to a new life. He reminds his readers that this great thought was symbolized by that affecting ceremony in which they entered upon the professed life of a Christian. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized unto Jesus Christ were baptized unto his death? "Our baptism referred to Jesus Christ, and don't you know that it referred especially to his death and resurrection? " That like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Do you not know that your baptism, at the outset of your Christian life, meant that you had died to sin and risen up from a grave like the symbolic grave in the waters, and that you were henceforth to walk in newness of life?

Then he takes a second illustration. We were slaves to sin; but now, by believing in Jesus Christ, we have changed masters; we have become, so "to speak, the slaves of holiness, the slaves, as it were, of God. We have a new Master, and we shall render service to him.

If a man is a believer, it means something. It means that he has changed masters. And yet again he says the case is like that of a woman whose husband died, and who is now married to a new husband; the children she now bears are no longer the children of the old husband, but of the new. If we are believers, we are indeed dead to the law; but we are married to Christ, and the fruit of our life is to be borne to him.

So, then, if anybody ever tells you that this Gospel of free grace is an encouragement to men to do wrong, tell him it cannot be so for a man who believes this Gospel, for that means something. But the apostle by no means stops at that. Not only is it absurd to say that salvation by grace will encourage a man to do wrong, but justification by faith, salvation by grace, furnishes the only way in which a man can really become holy. The apostle shows this negatively and then positively. In this remarkable passage in the seventh chapter of Romans, over which so many religious controversies have been waged, and over which what is ten thousand times better than religious controversies have bent many troubled, yet trusting hearts as they found themselves exactly portrayed in this passage the apostle first points out what is the best that the law can do to make a man holy.

What is the best that a man can do in the way of becoming holy, by just trying to do right, simply trying, in his own strength, to do what he learns from God's law to be right? There are people who are trying to do that, some of them honest in it, some of them very earnest. They have got their notion as to what is right, and are trying to do right. Some of them look in the word of God; they push aside what they call its mysteries and all matters pertaining to doctrine, and take out of it only its rules of right, and they say: "Now I am trying to live according to these rules of right."

What is the best they can do? Here is the apostle's answer. In the first place, he says, God's law, which is holy and just and good, will make a man see how bad he is. The child yonder will perhaps know what is meant by a plummet, and may have seen a man building on a wall and hanging down his plummet to see if his wall was perpendicular. "And judgment I have set to the line, and righteousness to the plummet." God's word applied to a man's life will help him to see whether he has been upright. Or the law of God is like a carpenter's straight edge, and, laid on his character, will enable him to see where his character deviates from rectitude. Ah, me! whosoever will honestly apply this test, the result will be a deep and painful consciousness that he does not come up to it. But more than that happens. By the strange perversity of human nature, through the terrible sinfulness of sin, God's law not only makes us see how bad we are, but actually makes us worse. This is the thought that startles us here. God's law makes us worse instead of making us better. It stimulates sinfulness by restraint. Have you not often observed how restraint stimulates men to act contrary to it? Not long ago a lad of my acquaintance was talked to by his father about smoking, with an earnest request that he would not form the habit. Afterwards he said to his mother, "I am so glad that papa did not say I must not smoke, for if he had said I must not smoke, I could not have kept from it, but he simply said he wished I would not; I am so glad." There was a great deal of human nature in that.

There is a story of an old woman in one of the German towns who had lived to be seventy years old without going outside the ancient wall of the city. The fact was told to the Grand Duke, who sent the old lady word that he wished the fact to go down to history and begged she would be sure and not go out during the rest of her life. You may know what would happen. She got to thinking about it, and in a short time she went out. But, alas! not merely in ludicrous ways does this propensity of ours show itself, but in terrible earnest. The more a man knows something is wrong, sometimes the more it seems he cannot help doing it. If you should go into a darkened room, that had long been shut up, and with a broom should begin to clean it out, there might be a nest of vipers in one corner lying still in the darkness, but when you disturbed them they would thrust out their forked tongues and hiss and threaten to destroy you. So when God's law comes with its demand upon us to clean out the sin from our souls, how our sinful propensities, that were asleep maybe, will wake up and threaten us! The apostle says, "I was alive without the law once I thought I was leading a true spiritual life and that I was a good man but when the commandment came to me, sin revived (came to life again), and I died. I saw that all my spirituality was nothing, I was not a good man at all." Is this the fault of the law of God? Paul says, No; the law of God is all right; the commandment of God is holy and just and good the law is just as good as it can be, it is God's own law. It is not the fault of the law, it is the fault of sin. And this shows what a terrible thing sin is, that it takes the very rule of God that is given to direct our life, and perverts it into the occasion of doing worse "that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful." Ah, when God has reached down to this sin-ruined world of ours and given his own rule of what is right, men take that

and pervert it and become worse than they would have been without it. Does not sin thus show itself to be exceeding sinful? So the result is that man finds in himself a struggle which the apostle himself describes; there rise up desires to do right, and then there arise sinful dispositions, contrary to God's law; and these stimulate one another until sometimes his whole bosom is a battle-field.

Ah! the battle-fields in human bosoms! Do you know what it means? Don't you know? That is what the apostle proceeds to describe. "What I want to do," he says, "I do not do, and what I don't want to do I keep doing. I am fighting against myself; there are good tendencies in me, but there are evil tendencies in me, and I war, and I struggle, and I wrestle O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" That is the climax; that is the highest that ever soul of man reached on earth in trying to be good in his own strength to come up to such an intensity of fearful, painful struggle that he would cry out in the agony of utmost desperation, "O wretched, wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me?" Does any one sit coolly here to-day and say there is a touch of extravagance there? Well, it is the apostle's extravagance. And oh, the more a man strives to be what he ought to be, while losing sight of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the more he will find himself in sympathy with that wild, passionate cry of a struggling, tortured soul.

There has been a good deal of controversy between what are called Calvinists and what are called Arminians, as to whether this passage I have just been speaking of gives the experience of a renewed man or of an unrenewed man. I think the truth is, as some recent writers have been showing, that it does not really give either, but gives the experience of any man, either renewed or unrenewed, who is looking to the law to make him holy.

Renewed men often fall back upon that. They lose the firm hold on justification by faith, and they get to thinking to save themselves, to make themselves holy by their own merit. Then no wonder they fall down in despondency and almost in despair. Unrenewed men, on the other hand, are often trying to do right according to what they see to be right according to their own knowledge of God's word. And any man who tries to be holy in his own strength, this is his experience. Such a conflict there is in the bosoms of men, and of the best men, yea, a battle-field in every bosom here on earth.

Nowhere is sin completely triumphant, and nowhere, yet, has holiness completely triumphed. But, oh! the difference between those beaten back on the field of battle, beaten back and ever back, who can see no hope of aught but destruction, unless something strange they cannot anticipate should occur, and those who triumphantly rely on the help of God, and are certain of success. O the difference! And so Paul breaks forth, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Let us then turn to the other thought of the apostle, as to what the gospel can do towards making a man holy.

He makes three points about this.

First, the gospel sets a man free from condemnation, because of his past sin. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." The first thought of a man who begins to think of leading a new life is, "What am I to do with all these sins I have already committed?" But the gospel of Jesus Christ frees us from the guilt of sin, from condemnation because of our sin. There is now no condemnation. The gospel comes to the ruined debtor to pay all his debts in a

moment; it comes to the prisoner to break the bonds that bound him and to open the doors of his prison and set him free. And then, in the next place, the gospel comes with a new moral power. The apostle speaks of a third law that comes in like a reinforcement: "But the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath emancipated me from the law of sin and death." This new reinforcing power is the Spirit of God. He calls it the law of the Spirit. The law of God and the law in our members are in fierce conflict, and there comes a new moral power to give us the victory. My brethren, we do not preach as much as we ought, nor think half as much as we ought, about the Spirit of God. I do not want you to talk less or think less of the atoning death, or the interceding life, or the tender sympathy, or the beautiful example, or the divine power of the divine Redeemer; not less of that, but more of the Spirit of God. Why, Jesus himself said a very remarkable thing about the Holy Spirit when he was just taking leave of the disciples. On that night he said: "Nevertheless, I tell you the truth."

Now, when a dignified, self-respecting person condescends to say: "I am telling you the truth," there must be some very special occasion for it. He knew he was about to say something hard for them to believe, "Nevertheless, I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come to you." He himself says you are better off as it is with the Holy Spirit, the great Counsellor and Guide and Comforter, in his special mission, than if he had not come, and Jesus himself were still on earth. Think of that; cherish the Spirit's mission; pray, above all things, when you pray, that your Heavenly Father will give the Holy Spirit to you, that you may be strengthened. I say again, we think too little about that great idea and element of the gospel. We go struggling on, forgetting that mighty reinforcement that our gracious God offers us in our life's battle, "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus." The next time you are specially tempted cry out mightily for the help of the Spirit of God. And when you are despondent, and fancy you can never get to be what your soul longs for, remember what the Spirit of God can make out of even such materials as your character and your life.

One more point. The apostle mentions a new and mighty incentive which the Gospel presents, when he says, a little further on: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." My friends, there are four ways in which it is conceivable that a man should serve God. One of them is practically impossible, that you should serve God with fear and trembling as a subject serves a tyrant. There are people who look upon God in the light of a despot; but they cannot really serve him thus. Again, are we to serve God as a poor, cowering slave serves a hard master, from fear of punishment? Nay, no man would truly serve God, simply from fear that God would punish him if he did not. The third way a man may conceivably serve God is in the hope that he will reward him. But nobody would ever truly serve God, if it were simply and alone from a desire of reward, not even from a desire to reach the blessed heaven. The other way to serve God, of which the apostle speaks, is to serve him out of filial love; to serve him, not as the subject serves a tyrant, not as the servant his master, not as a hireling for pay, but to serve him as a loving son serves a kind father, out of filial love. That is the great idea which Christianity brought into the world on this subject. That is the new motive which Jesus Christ brings to bear on the souls of men, to try to do right out of filial love to their Father. And so Paul proceeds to speak of the "Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." The apostle's heart is very tender here. He has been depicting those terrible struggles which he himself had had in other days with his own sinful propensities; his heart is now very tender, and so he falls back upon his mother tongue. He is

writing in Greek; but he uses the Aramaic word, Abba. If you were talking French or German, and were beginning to speak of things that very much touched your heart; if you began, for instance, to speak of your dead mother, whose very name makes you quiver, you would not then speak in French or German; you would not say mother in French or German; you would use the word you used when a child. So the apostle here uses the Aramaic language he had spoken in childhood: “the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba.” This is what he used to say when he was a boy, and he translates it afterwards, “Abba, Father.”

I met a young man not long ago, a friend of mine, who told me his father had recently died, and a little after his wife's father. My young friend was talking about it until he could not talk. He broke down with emotion as he told me how lonely he felt now that both were gone and he had no one to lean on, no one to look up to.

Even some old men, when they get into trouble, think about the father they used to go to, and say, “I wish I could ask him what he thinks about the matter.” The Scriptures take hold of that thought and tell us we are not to look to God simply as a master who will punish, not merely as one who will reward, but to look to God as our Father, Father, Father in heaven.

So, then, if a man looks to the law to make him holy, the highest result will be a cry of anguish, “Wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me?” But turning to the gospel, he sees hope of being delivered and becoming holy, and may say, “I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

S. Imitation Of Christ

IMITATION OF CHRIST 1. Did the Saviour live a real human life? Yes, the Saviour lived a real human life, but without sin of any kind.

2. Was he tempted to sin? He was tempted in all points just as we are, but he always overcame the temptation. Hebrews 4:15.

3. Is it the duty of Christians to imitate Christ? Yes, Christ has left us a beautiful and perfect example, which we ought to imitate. 1 Peter 2:21; 1 Corinthians 11:1.

4. How may we hope to imitate Christ? We may hope to imitate Christ by the help of the Holy Spirit. Luke 4:1.

5. What example did the Saviour set as to obeying parents? The Saviour did as his parents directed, and "was subject unto them." Luke 2:51.

6. What example did he set as to the Scriptures? The Saviour attended a Bible class, and had great knowledge of the Scriptures even when a child. Luke 2:46; Luke 2:47.

7. Did he use the Bible when tempted or suffering? Yes, the Saviour quoted the Bible three times against the tempter, and twice while on the cross.

8. What is his example as to public worship? Our Lord's custom was to go into the synagogue on the Sabbath day and worship. Luke 4:16.

9. What example did Christ set as to private praying? Christ prayed often and much, sometimes through a whole night.

10. What example in doing good to men? Jesus all the time "went about doing good." Acts 10:38.

11. What example as to the love of enemies? Jesus prayed for the men who were crucifying him, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Luke 23:34.

12. What example as to loving Christians? Christ laid down his life for us, and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. 1 John 3:16; John 13:34.

13. What is our highest hope for the future life? "We shall be like him." 1 John 3:2.

S. In Jesus' Name

In Jesus' Name

John A. Broadus

Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you. Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name: ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full. John 16:23; John 16:24 The text is a part of our Saviour's last discourse to his disciples. In order to understand it one should read John 14:1-31, John 15:1-27, and John 16:1-33.

These words present four topics of reflection on prayer in Christ's name.

I. Up to this time men had not asked in Christ's name. "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name." Our Saviour's mediatorial character had not been fully understood and recognized. Disciples had come to him with requests, and some of them were requests which only the divine Being could grant, such as "Increase our faith." It was difficult, perhaps impossible, for them fully to understand the Saviour's relation to prayer and to salvation, while he was yet with them. It was difficult for them to realize his divinity, to think of him as being everywhere present. Moreover, the especial ground of his mediator-ship was his atoning death, and this they never understood till after it occurred. While Christ's mediatorship, which is always the ground on which prayer is really heard, was not yet recognized, now they were taught to "ask the father in My name."

II. What is implied in asking in Christ's name?

1. It implies acknowledgment of personal unworthiness. It says that a man does not expect to be heard in his own name. Men who reject doctrine of mediation often say that they are magnifying God's mercy; but is it not magnifying man's merit? Here lies the greatest cause of dislike to the doctrine of atonement. You find such men always cherish high opinion of human excellence.

It is this conceit of personal merit, actual or attainable, that keeps men away from reliance on Christ. Self-reliance, it cannot too often be urged, is the great obstacle to salvation. Now to ask in the name of Christ is to cast this away, to acknowledge personal unworthiness.

2. It implies acquiescence in the divine provision for our acceptance. This cannot be said to require any particular degree of acquiescence with the nature of this provision. Many who just recognize the bare fact that we are heard for Jesus' sake and not for our own, this they accept upon declaration of God's Word. But Scriptures do teach much concerning its nature. Christ the mediator is both God and man-and therefore appropriate that through him man should draw near to God. But to consider more narrowly, take the saying of John, "Adversary with the Father." Observe that the man conscious of sin, thinks of his Adversary as righteous-and more, as the propitiation for our sins. Again, take the view presented in Hebrews, to my mind the clearest and most attractive in the Scriptures. We have a great High Priest, Jesus the Son of God-he has passed into the heavens, has offered in the true sanctuary the everlasting sacrifice, which needs not to be repeated, and so he is able to save those who come unto God by him. But not only is he

able to save; he has compassion on us, "touched with a feeling of our infirmities," etc. Now notice the apostle's conclusion from these two great facts, that we have a High Priest who is able to save and desires to save-"Let us therefore come boldly to the throne of grace," etc. Observe, it is the throne of grace, and we have come to obtain mercy, yet we come with confidence because we have such a mediator. This precious promise is sometimes misunderstood or caricatured, as if the Supreme Sovereign were vindictive, disposed to treat nien harshly, and only brought into a different mind by the pleadings of his Son. Observe John 16:26-27. All that believe in Christ, that ask in his name, are loved of the Father. And more-it was God's love that led to this provision. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." And thus he "commendeth his love to us." At the same time, he is angry with the wicked, and must punish, while pitying and desiring that they might turn and live. There is a difference between love of complacency and a love of compassion.

III. Encouragement to ask in Christ's name. "Whatsoever ye shall ask," etc. Of course, this must be taken with certain limitations. This is true of many general statements of Scripture; we need not be surprised at this, for the same thing is constantly done in all use of human language. However, we are not left to our own judgment concerning the limitations. We are taught by the same inspired apostle who recorded the text. "If we ask anything according to his [e.g., Christ's] will," 1 John 5:14; 1 John 5:15. Now we know that some things we may ask, may not be always God's will to bestow, such as temporal blessings. But spiritual blessings are always asked according to his will. Do we ask conversion? "He is not willing that any should perish." Do we ask progress in piety? "This is the will of God, even your sanctification." Final salvation? "Even so it is not the will of our Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones [viz., those who believe in him] should perish" (Matthew 18:14).

Then be encouraged to ask in Christ's name. My hearers, why do you not all pray? Are you ashamed to pray? Are you afraid to pray? A man may well be afraid, but there is the mediator-ask in his name. Is there nothing you need, which can be obtained only by prayer? Then pray!

IV. The result of asking in Christ's name. "That your joy may be full."

Here is a promise of joyful joy, even though the disciples were sorrowful. All through this discourse, he was directing their thoughts to the future, declaring that their sorrow should be turned into joy. How fully this came to pass, even by the very event which now caused them bitter sorrow. It became the especial source of joy to them and to all mankind. This is a peculiar case-yet often God causes gladness to spring up from the midst of grief. To many affliction has proved to be a blessing, often leading to conversion or new consecration. The gay shrink from religion, imagining that all joy would be gone; the pious cling to religion, knowing that it can gild the clouds of life's inevitable sorrows with a heaven sent joy. Yes, piety brings joy. But more narrowly, "Ask, etc. that your joy may be full." What is the relation of prayer to joy? We might say that the very fact of communion with God is joy. Confidence of acceptance through the mediator is a source of delight. But it is by the answer to our prayers that our joy may be full. (1) Ask for clearer practical views of justification by faith. Lack of this produces the gloom of many Christians. Ask those who have been brought out of such seasons into joy and peace. (2) Ask for sanctifying influences of God's Spirit, that you may be drawn near to God and kept near, filled with all the fullness of those blessings which God bestows. "Keep yourselves in the love of God, praying in the Holy Ghost."

Ask most of all things for these, and your joy may be full. Whatever be your lot, you shall have joy in believing. Brethren, it is clear that we "have not, because We ask not"? "Ask etc. that your joy may be full." And though from weak faith and feeble petitions we should come short of joy complete on earth, yet..."in thy presence is fullness of joy," etc.

Behold the high privileges of the Christian to ask in the name of Christ and to know this joy.

S. Intense Concern Salvation Others

Intense Concern for the Salvation of Others. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren. Romans 9:3. THIS is known to students of the Scriptures as one of the passages which are commonly accounted difficult, one of the hard places. A preacher would not be likely to take such a passage as his text, unless he supposed it possible to present a simple and natural explanation of it, and to draw from it as thus explained some useful, practical lessons. Before I try to do this, it may be allowable to offer two or three hints as to the course we ought to pursue in studying the difficult passages of Scripture, hints that would, indeed, apply to all our Scriptural studies. My first hint would be this: Be willing to let the Scripture mean what it wants to mean. You may say, "that, of course," but it is very far from being a matter of course. Be willing to let the Scripture mean what it wants to mean. We come to it knowing beforehand what things we like and what things we dislike, and if we find in the passage something not in accordance with the ideas we have been reared in, or that now have possession of our minds, we say, "Well, of course it can't mean that," and then we begin to search for some other meaning. The plainer the passage, the harder to find anything else than what is plainly meant, and so we go off and say, "What a difficult passage of Scripture!" Has not that often happened to you? It has happened to me. I have waked up to find, after long years of study, that something I always thought was a very hard passage was plain enough, only I had never been willing to allow it to mean what it wished to mean. My second hint would be: Take good account of the connection. We are peculiarly prone to neglect the connection in dealing with Scripture, because we have the Bible printed most unfortunately, I think in little scraps of broken sentences, set before us as if they were separate paragraphs which is not done in any other book in the world and broken up also in larger portions which are called chapters, where the connection is often completely severed, and yet we cannot help imagining there must be a new subject at the beginning of a new chapter.

Moreover, we are accustomed to hear short passages taken as texts, and too often interpreted without regard to the connection. The connection is sometimes the entire book. I doubt if there is one sentence in the epistle to the Hebrews, and there are very few in the epistle to the Romans, which can be really understood without taking account of the whole epistle. But often the connection is only some sentences before and after. Now, if you consider the connection, it is wonderful how it will help you to understand a difficult passage. You go above the difficult place; you launch on the stream above, and come floating down, and your boat is borne over the rocks. If you cannot determine the precise meaning of the words, you will see what is the general thought of the passage as a whole, and that is the main consideration. The last hint I shall mention is, that we must take good account of the state of the writer's mind, when he says these things. What is he thinking about? What is he aiming at? How is he feeling, when he uses this language? I am sure, if any of you have tried it, you will find that the more care you exercise, when reading the Scriptures, in trying to enter into sympathy with the thought and feeling of the sacred writer, the better you will be prepared to see what he really means.

Now, all these hints I have ventured to offer are of importance to us in studying the text: "I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren."

Observe he does not say "I wish." Not he. He could not say that. But he almost says it. The original could not be better translated in any other words than those used in our version. The apostle seems to be like one who is on the point of saying something wrong. He rushes, as it were, towards the brink of saying that he wishes to be accursed for his brethren, only he does not say it stopping on the brink because it would be wrong, because his devout heart would shrink back from the idea of being accursed from Christ, even for his brethren. Now, why does the inspired apostle use this strange language? Why does Paul almost say a terrible thing, so terrible that many people, as they come upon it, and begin to inquire into the meaning, all out of sympathy with the passion of the writer, imagine that they must explain it away that it must be impossible for him to approach even to the brink of saying what would be so dreadful. The epistle to the Romans is taken up in its doctrinal portion with the great thought of justification by faith, that men are justified simply by believing in Jesus. The apostle discusses that in the first five chapters. We had a text from that portion some Sundays ago. Then, in the next three chapters he discusses the bearing of this justification by faith upon the matter of sanctification, showing how it works in helping us to be good.

We had a text from that portion not long ago. In three more chapters he now discusses the bearing of justification by faith upon the privileges of the Jews. The Jews considered themselves far superior, in point of religion, to any nation in the world, and they would begin to see at once that if the apostle's doctrine be true, and a man is accepted through simple faith in Jesus Christ, then a Gentile might exercise that as well as a Jew, and so a Gentile would be as good as a Jew. We cannot imagine how they would shrink back from any doctrine with such a conclusion, that a Gentile is as good as a Jew. We do not know of any national or race prejudices in our time that are so strong as the prejudices then existing between Jew and Gentile. They would especially dislike such teaching from Paul the apostle.

They would say he is a renegade himself to the religion of his fathers. He is a traitor to his people. They were indignant at the idea of his saying that a Gentile could be saved as well as a Jew. When Paul said, the following spring, in his address at Jerusalem, that Jesus had told him to go to the Gentiles, they broke out in rage, and he had to be saved by the Roman garrison. The apostle knew how intensely they would dislike this idea, and so he wanted to assure them in entering upon this topic the bearing of justification by faith upon the privileges of the Jews he wanted to assure them that he loved his own people, and although he is bound to acknowledge, -as he is going to acknowledge, that the great mass of his people are rejecting the Messiah, while Gentiles all around are believing unto salvation, yet he acknowledges this with inexpressible pain and grief. That is the way he feels. That is what he wants to impress upon them. He sees what is coming for his nation. This epistle was written twelve years before the destruction of Jerusalem, and only eight years before the war that led to that destruction. The apostle saw that soon their hot fanaticism would break out in desperate rebellion against the Roman authority, and sooner or later they must be crushed out and ground to atoms.

Here was a man who saw that his own nation, his own race, bound to him not merely by nationality in the ordinary sense, but by ties of blood through long and pure descent, was going to ruin. His

race alone of all the great races of the earth can trace their history back to a historic ancestor; for all the other peoples find their ancestry lost in darkness, but the Jews could go back in history to their common father. His race had great and glorious deeds connected with its history in the past, and had yet more glorious promises for the future in connection with the Messiah. And this man, who loved his people, who loved them so intensely that when the Lord appeared to him in a vision, and said, "Go preach to the heathen," he remonstrated and did not want to obey, and had to be driven by persecution, clearly sees that the Jewish nation is about to perish. Not only does he see that national destruction awaits them, but he sees that the great mass of them are slighting their own Messiah, now that he is come, are rejecting the salvation that is in him alone, and plunging madly into the darkness of eternity. He feels all that. And listen how he speaks, in introducing this subject, "I say the truth in Christ I lie not." A man of self-respect never condescends to assure people that he is telling the truth and not lying, unless there is some extraordinary reason for it. "I say the truth in Christ I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh; who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh the Messiah came, who is over all, God blessed forever." You see that ordinary language does not suffice to express his emotion. In his swelling passion of soul he rushes to the very brink of saying what would be wrong to say, and shrinks back from saying it. That seems to me to be the plain meaning of the passage, and all that is necessary to understand it is sympathy with the sacred writer's state of mind.

Now, as thus explained, the passage is rich in instruction. I shall only gather out three or four of its lessons, all of which connect themselves with one thought: intense concern for the salvation of others.

1. And first. Concern for the salvation of others is naturally enhanced by patriotism. If a man feels at all as a Christian ought to feel in the way of desire for the salvation of all his fellow-men, through common human sympathies and common wants and destinies, then he will naturally feel more of such concern for those who are allied to him by ties of nationality; dear to him through feelings of patriotism his own people. And all the more if they are also dear to him by ties of personal affection if they live in his own locality, if they share all his peculiar interest*, his difficulties, his joys.

Still more if they are his friends, and most of all if they are his kindred. All the reasons we have for desiring the salvation of mankind at large exist in such cases, and then all these additional reasons enhance the concern we naturally feel for their salvation. My friends, not only Paul felt thus, but he who stood on Olivet and looked out on the splendid capital of his country, which he knew was doomed to destruction, shall we not suppose that he felt some peculiar interest in his own people?

Why not?

2. Again. Concern for the salvation of others is not prevented by a belief in what we call the doctrines of grace; is not prevented by believing in divine sovereignty, and predestination and election. Many persons intensely dislike the ideas which are expressed by these phrases. Many persons shrink away from ever accepting them, because those ideas are in their minds associated

with the notion of stolid indifference. They say if predestination be true, then it follows that a man cannot do anything for his own salvation; that if he is to be saved he will be saved, and he has nothing to do with it, and need not care, nor need any one else care.

Now, this does not at all follow, and I will prove that it does not follow, by the fact that Paul himself, the great oracle of this doctrine in the Scripture, has uttered these words of burning passionate concern for the salvation of others, so close by the passages in which he has taught the doctrines in question. Look back from the text, run back a few sentences and you will find the very passage upon which many stumble: "Moreover, whom he did predestinate" there are people who shudder at the very words "them he also called, and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified." Just a little while after he uttered those words from which men want to infer that the man who believes it need not feel concerned for his salvation or the salvation of others, just a little after, came the passionate words of the text. Nor is that all, for you will find just following the text, where he speaks of Esau and Jacob, that God made a difference between them before they were born, and where he says of Pharaoh that God raised him up that he might show his power in him, and that God's name might be declared throughout all the earth. "Therefore he hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth." Some good people fairly shiver at the inference, which seems to them to be inevitable from such language as that. But I say the inference must be wrong, for the inspired man who uttered this language, only a few moments before had uttered these words of the text. And whenever you find your heart or the heart of your friend inclined to shrink away from these great teachings of divine Scripture concerning sovereignty and predestination, then I pray you make no argument about it, but turn to this language of concern for the salvation of others, so intensely passionate that men wonder and think surely it cannot mean what it says. The trouble is in this and many cases that we draw unwarranted inferences from the teachings of the Bible, and then cast all the odium of those inferences upon the truths from which we draw them. Now, I say that whatever be true, for or against the apostle's doctrines of predestination and divine sovereignty in salvation, it is not true that they will make a man careless as to his own salvation or that of others; seeing that they had no such effect on Paul himself, but right in between these two great passages come the wonderful words of the text.

3. The third lesson is, that concern for the salvation of others will sometimes rise to intense passion. The Apostle Paul is not always saying, "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel." He said that under certain circumstances. Nor does he anywhere else use such an expression as this of the text. So, as I said, concern for the salvation of others will sometimes rise to intense passion. And more generally, let us say, piety has elements of passionate feeling. I suppose that piety is threefold, there is thought, and feeling, and action. Different persons are inclined to prefer one or the other of these three, according to their own natural constitution, their education, prejudices, etc.; but all three are necessary to a symmetrical Christian character and Christian life.

Some persons will say, if you talk with them, "O, I do love Christian thought I love to hear a preacher who presents to me inspiring thoughts, especially if there is some new thought." And then some of them are carried away with the idea that they want modern thought, as they call it, instead of Scripture. But meantime it is true that we also need feeling. A man who finds himself inclined to prefer what he calls thought in connection with Christianity, and to neglect Christian feeling and Christian action, ought to see to it lest his character be deformed because wanting in

essential elements, and ought to cultivate in himself a regard for feeling and for action. Many cultivated people in our time, as they look with ill-concealed disgust upon the poor negroes, with their wild passionate way of expressing religious feeling, had better see to it lest they themselves be ruinously lacking in the element which appears in the blacks to be too exclusive. Then there are those who care nothing about anything but feeling. They say, "I love to hear a man that makes me feel." * Their danger is that they will not know what they are feeling about, because it is not Scripture truths that make them feel, and such feeling will not lead to pious action.

Emotion in religion is proper and necessary, and I do not condemn those who value it highly; but such persons must see to it that they have truth, which is the circulating life-blood of piety, and that their feelings shall lead to corresponding earnest and intense activity; for emotion about religion, as in anything else, if it does not express itself in activity, will not only be worthless, but will injure the character. Others there are who talk of nothing but action, work, work. Now, work is a noble word, but the danger of these persons is, that they will forget to love Christian truth and to cultivate Christian feeling. The same thing is true as to bodies of men. You can easily think of a great religious denomination in our country, who care mainly for thought, instruction, knowledge. A noble idea it is, but possibly their danger may be that they will underrate Christian feeling. You can very easily think of another powerful and useful denomination of Christians whose great idea is feeling. Everything is made to contribute to working up emotion, and their danger is that they will neglect the importance of holding truth, even if they do not neglect the importance of activity. The same thing is also true about certain periods of Christian history. You can find periods when all the Christian world seemed devoted to the idea of doctrine, when men disputed through a lifetime about the doctrines of Christianity, when all the great divisions of the time centred themselves upon the difference between two words of Scripture. You can find other periods where Christianity seemed to run altogether into mystical feeling; when good people gave themselves up to solitary lives, or retired to the privacy of their homes, and thought that all that could be done was to try to cultivate Christian sentiment in private. And ours is an age which runs towards activity. The Christian idea now is work. I thank God that we live in such an age.

It is good to live in a time when the idea is to work. It is a noble privilege to live in such a period. But our danger is that we shall not care for Christian truth, and that in our fancied superiority to all mere emotion we shall shrink away from those great sentiments, that passionate Christian feeling, which alone will stir us up to intense, loving and persevering Christian activity.

4. One more lesson. Concern for the salvation of others, such as Paul here expresses, must have had some good ground in the nature of things. Ah! my friends, you cannot tell me that the man who wrote those words thought that everybody was going to be saved at last.

If he did not believe in divine mercy and divine love; if he did not believe in the salvation that is in Jesus Christ in the glory and the power of his grace, and his everlasting intercession then who ever did? He did believe in these. And yet do you think a man could have felt that passionate distress to which he here gives such strong utterance, if he had thought, as so many well-meaning people think now-a-days, that God is so good and merciful, that somehow or other, may be not at first when they die, but sometime or other, it will be well with everybody at last? Paul did not think so. He could not have thought so. And I venture to say Jesus Christ did not think so. If we are determined that we will cling to certain ideas, because they suit our natural feeling, then I am

persuaded we must turn our back upon the authority of the word of God. There must be some ground for such concern as Paul felt. I shrink from telling what it is. I think of the awful terms which the Scriptures themselves sometimes employ, the images of horror, the words of everlasting fire and I do not wish here and now to speak of them. But there must be some ground for this passionate concern for men's salvation which Paul expresses. And if men ought to feel so, and if devout people do feel so with reference to others, then tell me how those others ought to feel as regards themselves? My friends, who do not care anything about your souls, you must be madmen and irresponsible, or else you ought to care.

I humbly confess to-day, in behalf of my Christian hearers, that we do not feel on this subject as we ought to feel. It is only now and then that we catch glimpses of the reality. "Life is oft so like a dream, we know not where we are," and we do not realize things, and so we do not feel the concern we ought to feel. We are wanting in our duty to you in this respect. And yet you do not know how much concern we do feel. Many and many a time have persons who are here to-day, when they found themselves in the presence of those they loved, wanted to say something, their very life has trembled with the desire to say something, and they have shrunk back. May be they were afraid they would meet no sympathy. This may have been true in some cases. And yet, my brethren, I suspect it has sometimes happened that you shrank from speaking when that very one you loved was secretly wishing that you would speak, but from a like shrinking to yours, perhaps from a fear that you would suppose he cared more than he did, or from a strange sensitiveness with regard to the feelings that lie deepest in our hearts, would offer you no encouragement. But I venture to say to such as are not Christians, there are those that do feel a deep yearning, an unutterable concern sometimes for your salvation, and O, my friends, you ought to feel concern for yourselves.

S. Intense Concern Salvation Others

Intense Concern for the Salvation of Others A Sermon by John A. Broadus For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren. — Romans 9:3. THIS is known to students of the Scriptures as one of the passages which are commonly accounted difficult, — one of the hard places. A preacher would not be likely to take such a passage as his text, unless he supposed it possible to present a simple and natural explanation of it, and to draw from it as thus explained some useful, practical lessons. Before I try to do this, it may be allowable to offer two or three hints as to the course we ought to pursue in studying the difficult passages of Scripture, — hints that would, indeed, apply to all our Scriptural studies. My first hint would be this: Be willing to let the Scripture mean what it wants to mean. You may say, "that, of course," but it is very far from being a matter of course. Be willing to let the Scripture mean what it wants to mean. We come to it knowing beforehand what things we like and what things we dislike, and if we find in the passage something not in accordance with the ideas we have been reared in, or that now have possession of our minds, we say, " Well, of course it can't mean that," and then we begin to search for some other meaning. The plainer the passage, the harder to find anything else than what is plainly meant, and so we go off and say, "What a difficult passage of Scripture!" Has not that often happened to you? It has happened to me. I have waked up to find, after long years of study, that something I always thought was a very hard passage was plain enough, only I had never been willing to allow it to mean what it wished to mean. My second hint would be: Take good account of the connection. We are peculiarly prone to neglect the connection in dealing with Scripture, because, we have the Bible printed — most unfortunately, I think — in little scraps of broken sentences, set before us as if they were separate paragraphs — which is not done in any other book in the world — and broken up also in larger portions which are called chapters, where the connection is often completely severed, and yet we cannot help imagining there must be a new subject at the beginning of a new chapter. Moreover, we are accustomed to hear short passages taken as texts, and too often interpreted without regard to the connection. The connection is sometimes the entire book. I doubt if there is one sentence in the epistle to the Hebrews, and there are very few in the epistle to the Romans, which can be really understood without taking account of the whole epistle. But often the connection is only some sentences before and after. Now, if you consider the connection, it is wonderful how it will help you to understand a difficult passage. You go above the difficult place; you launch on the stream above, and come floating down, and your boat is borne over the rocks. If you cannot determine the precise meaning of the words, you will see what is the general thought of the passage as a whole, and that is the main consideration. The last hint I shall mention is, that we must take good account of the state of the writer's mind, when he says these things. What is he thinking about ? What is he aiming at? How is he feeling, when he uses this language? I am sure, if any of you have tried it, you will find that the more care you exercise, when reading the Scriptures, in trying to enter into sympathy with the thought and feeling of the sacred writer, the better you will be prepared to see what he really means.

Now, all these hints I have ventured to offer are of importance to us in studying the text: "I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren." Observe he does not say "I wish." Not he. He could not say that. But he almost says it. The original could not be better translated in any other words than those used in our version. The apostle seems to be like one who is on the point of saying something wrong. He rushes, as it were, towards the brink of saying that he wishes to be accursed for his brethren, only he does not say it — stopping on the brink because it would be wrong, because his devout heart would shrink back from the idea of being accursed from Christ, even for his brethren. Now, why does the inspired apostle use this strange language? Why does Paul almost say a terrible thing, so terrible that many people, as they come upon it, and begin to inquire into the meaning, all out of sympathy with the passion of the writer, imagine that they must explain it away — that it must be impossible for to approach even to the brink of saying what would be so dreadful. The epistle to the Romans is taken up in its doctrinal portion with the great thought of justification by faith: that men are justified simply by believing in Jesus. The apostle discusses that in the first five chapters. We had a text from that portion some Sundays ago. Then, in the next three chapters he discusses the bearing of this justification by faith upon the matter of sanctification, showing how it works in helping us to be good. We had a text from that portion not long ago. In three more chapters he now discusses the bearing of justification by faith upon the privileges of the Jews. The Jews considered themselves far superior, in point of religion, to any nation in the world, and they would begin to see at once that if the apostle's doctrine be true, and a man is accepted through simple faith in Jesus Christ, then a Gentile might exercise that as well as a Jew, and so a Gentile would be as good as a Jew. We cannot imagine how they would shrink back from any doctrine with such a conclusion, that a Gentile is as good as a Jew. We do not know of any national or race prejudices in our time that are so strong as the prejudices then existing between Jew and Gentile. They would especially dislike such teaching from Paul the apostle. They would say he is a renegade himself to the religion of his fathers. He is a traitor to his people. They were indignant at the idea of his saying that a Gentile could be saved as well as a Jew. When Paul said, the following spring, in his address at Jerusalem, that Jesus had told him to go to the Gentiles, they broke out in rage, and he had to be saved by the Roman garrison. The apostle knew how intensely they would dislike this idea, and so he wanted to assure them in entering upon this topic — the bearing of justification by faith upon the privileges of the Jews — he wanted to assure them that he loved his own people, and although he is bound to acknowledge, as he is going to acknowledge, that the great mass of his people are rejecting the Messiah, while Gentiles all around are believing unto salvation, yet he acknowledges this with inexpressible pain and grief. That is the way he feels. That is what he wants to impress upon them. He sees what is coming for his nation. This epistle was written twelve years before the destruction of Jerusalem, and only eight years before the war that led to that destruction. The apostle saw that soon their hot fanaticism would break out in desperate rebellion against the Roman authority, and sooner or later they must be crushed out and ground to atoms. Here was a man who saw that his own nation, his own race, bound to him not merely by nationality in the ordinary sense, but by ties of blood through long and pure descent, was going to ruin. His race alone of all the great races of the earth can trace their history back to a historic ancestor; for all the other peoples find their ancestry lost in darkness, but the Jews could go back in history to their common father. His race had great and glorious deeds connected with its history in the past, and had yet more glorious promises for the future in connection with the Messiah. And this man, who loved his people, who loved them so

intensely that when the Lord appeared to him in a vision, and said, "Go preach to the heathen," he remonstrated and did not want to obey, and had to be driven by persecution, clearly sees that the Jewish nation is about to perish. Not only does he see that national destruction awaits them, but he sees that the great mass of them are slighting their own Messiah, now that he is come, are rejecting the salvation that is in him alone, and plunging madly into the darkness of eternity. He feels all that. And listen how he speaks, in introducing this subject, "I say the truth in Christ — I lie not." A man of self-respect never condescends to assure people that he is telling the truth and not lying, unless there is some extraordinary reason for it. "I say the truth in Christ — I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh; who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh the Messiah came, who is over all, God blessed forever." You see that ordinary language does not suffice to express his emotion. In his swelling passion of soul he rushes to the very brink of saying what would be wrong to say, and shrinks back from saying it. That seems to me to be the plain meaning of the passage, and all that is necessary to understand it is sympathy with the sacred writer's state of mind.

Now, as thus explained, the passage is rich in instruction I shall only gather out three or four of its lessons, all of which connect themselves with one thought: intense concern for the salvation of others.

1. And first. Concern for the salvation of others is naturally enhanced by patriotism. If a man feels at all as a Christian ought to feel in the way of desire for the salvation of all his fellow-men, through common human sympathies and common wants and destinies, then he will naturally feel more of such concern for those who are allied to him by ties of nationality; dear to him through feelings of patriotism — his own people. And all the more if they are also dear to him by ties of personal affection — if they live in his own locality, if they share all his peculiar interests, his difficulties, his joys. Still more if they are his friends, and most of all if they are his kindred. All the reasons we have for desiring the salvation of mankind at large exist in such cases, and then all these additional reasons enhance the concern we naturally feel for their salvation. My friends, not only Paul felt thus, but he who stood on Olivet and looked out on the splendid capital of his country, which he knew was doomed to destruction, shall we not suppose that he felt some peculiar interest in his own people? Why not?

2. Again. Concern for the salvation of others is not prevented by a belief in what we call the doctrines of grace; is not prevented by believing in divine sovereignty, and predestination and election. Many persons intensely dislike the ideas which are expressed by these phrases. Many persons shrink away from ever accepting them, because those ideas are in their minds associated with the notion of stolid indifference. They say if predestination be true, then it follows that a man cannot do anything for his own salvation; that if he is to be saved he will be saved, and he has nothing to do with it, and need not care, nor need any one else care. Now, this does not at all follow, and I will prove that it does not follow, by the fact that Paul himself, the great oracle of this doctrine in the Scripture, has uttered these words of burning passionate concern for the salvation of others, so close by the passages in which he has taught the doctrines in question. Look back from the text, run back a few sentences and you will find the very passage upon which many

stumble: "Moreover, whom he did predestinate" — there are people who shudder at the very words — "them he also called, and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified." Just a little while after he uttered those words from which men want to infer that the man who believes it need not feel concerned for his salvation or the salvation of others, just a little after, came the passionate words of the text. Nor is that all, for you will find just following the text, where he speaks of Esau and Jacob, that God made a difference between them before they were born, and where he says of Pharaoh that God raised him up that he might show his power in him, and that God's name might be declared throughout all the earth. "Therefore he hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth." Some good people fairly shiver at the inference, which seems to them to be inevitable from such language as that. But I say the inference must be wrong, for the inspired man who uttered this language, only a few moments before had uttered these words of the text. And whenever you find your heart or the heart of your friend inclined to shrink away from these great teachings of divine Scripture concerning sovereignty and predestination, then I pray you make no argument about it, but turn to this language of concern for the salvation of others, so intensely passionate that men wonder and think surely it cannot mean what it says. The trouble is in this and many cases that we draw unwarranted inferences from the teachings of the Bible, and then cast all the odium of those inferences upon the truths from which we draw them. Now, I say that whatever be true, for or against the apostle's doctrines of predestination and divine sovereignty in salvation, it is not true that they will make a man careless as to his own salvation or that of others; seeing that they had no such effect on Paul himself, but right in between these two great passages come the wonderful words of the text.

3. The third lesson is, that concern for the salvation of others will sometimes rise to intense passion. The Apostle Paul is not always saying, "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel." He said that under certain circumstances. Nor does he anywhere else use such an expression as this of the text. So, as I said, concern for the salvation of others will sometimes rise to intense passion. And more generally, let us say, piety has elements of passionate feeling. I suppose that piety is threefold: there is thought, and feeling, and action. Different persons are inclined to prefer one or the other of these three, according to their own natural constitution, their education, prejudices, etc.; but all three are necessary to a symmetrical Christian character and Christian life. Some persons will say, if you talk with them, "O, I do love Christian thought — I love to hear a preacher who presents to me inspiring thoughts, especially if there is some new thought." And then some of them are carried away with the idea that they want modern thought, as they call it, instead of Scripture. But meantime it is true that we also need feeling. A man who finds himself inclined to prefer what he calls thought in connection with Christianity, and to neglect Christian feeling and Christian action, ought to see to it lest his character be deformed because wanting in essential elements, and ought to cultivate in himself a regard for feeling and for action. Many cultivated people in our time, as they look with ill-concealed disgust upon the poor negroes, with their wild passionate way of expressing religious feeling, had better see to it lest they themselves be ruinously lacking in the element which appears in the blacks to be too exclusive. Then there are those who care nothing about anything but feeling. They say, "I love to hear a man that makes me feel." Their danger is that they will not know what they are feeling about, because it is not Scripture truths that make them feel, and such feeling will not lead to pious action. Emotion in religion is proper and necessary, and I do not condemn those who value it highly; but such persons must

see to it that they have truth, which is the circulating life-blood of piety, and that their feelings shall lead to corresponding earnest and intense activity; for emotion about religion, as in anything else, if it does not express itself in activity, will not only be worthless, but will injure the character. Others there are who talk of nothing but action, work, work. Now, work is a noble word, but the danger of these persons is, that they will forget to love Christian truth and to cultivate Christian feeling. The same thing is true as to bodies of men. You can easily think of a great religious denomination in our country, who care mainly for thought, instruction, knowledge. A noble idea it is, but possibly their danger may be that they will underrate Christian feeling. You can very easily think of another powerful and useful denomination of Christians whose great idea is feeling. Everything is made to contribute to working up emotion, and their danger is that they will neglect the importance of holding truth, even if they do not neglect the importance of activity. The same thing is also true about certain periods of Christian history. You can find periods when all the Christian world seemed devoted to the idea of doctrine, when men disputed through a lifetime about the doctrines of Christianity, when all the great divisions of the time centered themselves upon the difference between two words of Scripture. You can find other periods where Christianity seemed to run altogether into mystical feeling; when good people gave themselves up to solitary lives, or retired to the privacy of their homes, and thought that all that could be done was to try to cultivate Christian sentiment in private. And ours is an age which runs towards activity. The Christian idea now is work. I thank God that we live in such an age. It is good to live in a time when the idea is to work. It is a noble privilege to live in such a period. But our danger is that we shall not care for Christian truth, and that in our fancied superiority to all mere emotion we shall shrink away from those great sentiments, that passionate Christian feeling, which alone will stir us up to intense, loving and persevering Christian activity.

4. One more lesson. Concern for the salvation of others, such as Paul here expresses, must have had some good ground in the nature of things. Ah! my friends, you cannot tell me that the man who wrote those words thought that everybody was going to be saved at last. If he did not believe in divine mercy and divine love; if he did not believe in the salvation that is in Jesus Christ — in the glory and the power of his grace, and his everlasting intercession — then who ever did? He did believe in these. And yet do you think a man could have felt that passionate distress to which he here gives such strong utterance, if he had thought, as so many well-meaning people think now-a-days, that God is so good and merciful, that somehow or other, may be not at first when they die, but sometime or other, it will be well with everybody at last? Paul did not think so. He could not have thought so. And I venture to say Jesus Christ did not think so. If we are determined that we will cling to certain ideas, because they suit our natural feeling, then I am persuaded we must turn our back upon the authority of the word of God. There must be some ground for such concern as Paul felt. I shrink from telling what it is. I think of the awful terms which the Scriptures themselves sometimes employ, — the images of horror, the words of everlasting fire — and I do not wish here and now to speak of them. But there must be some ground for this passionate concern for men's salvation which Paul expresses. And if men ought to feel so, and if devout people do feel so with reference to others, then tell me how those others ought to feel as regards themselves? My friends, who do not care anything about your souls, you must be madmen and irresponsible, or else you ought to care.

I humbly confess to-day, in behalf of my Christian hearers, that we do not feel on this subject as we ought to feel. It is only now and then that we catch glimpses of the reality. "Life is oft so like a dream, we know not where we are," and we do not realize things, and so we do not feel the concern we ought to feel. We are wanting in our duty to you in this respect. And yet you do not know how much concern we do feel. Many and many a time have persons who are here to-day, when they found themselves in the presence of those they loved, wanted to say something, their very life has trembled with the desire to say something, and they have shrunk back. May be they were afraid they would meet no sympathy. This may have been true in some cases. And yet, my brethren, I suspect it has sometimes happened that you shrank from speaking when that very one you loved was secretly wishing that you would speak, but from a like shrinking to yours, perhaps from a fear that you would suppose he cared more than he did, or from a strange sensitiveness with regard to the feelings that lie deepest in our hearts, would offer you no encouragement. But I venture to say to such as are not Christians, there are those that do feel a deep yearning, an unutterable concern sometimes for your salvation, and O, my friends, you ought to feel concern for yourselves.

=====

[From John A. Broadus, Sermons and Addresses, 1888, pp. 110-123. The book was provided by Steve Lecrone, Burton, OH. — jrd]

S. Jesus: Saviour

Jesus: Saviour

John A. Broadus And thou shalt call his name Jesus for he shall save his people from their sins.
Matthew 1:21

It is familiar fact that Hebrew names were commolly significant, a natural and pleasing custom. This being no longer a usage with us, we often give names of great and good men who have lived in other days. Sometimes heroes of fiction. This too is beautiful. Names often make an impression upon those who bear them. So with many Who have borne the names of warriors, orators; sometimes of preachers, and other good men. But names have often been falsified; and more often, there are those who dishonor some renowned and venerable name which has been given to them. These things are not wholly unimportant. And especially might we observe that one name, not individual, but of a party, is often borne in vain-the name Christian. Truly it is many times "a word and nothing more." But the name here directed to be given was not in vain. The word Jesus means Saviour. And truly did he become a Saviour. He is Jesus Christ, the Saviour anointed-he ever lives to save. In the reasons assigned for giving him this name, there are taught great and glorious truths. Let us attend to them.

I. He shall save. Emphatic in the original.

1. He, and not we ourselves, save us. We could not have accomplished the work. And it is not a joint affair, by the union of his merit and ours. He alone saves.

2. He is the Saviour, and not our faith in him. Danger of exalting faith into an agency, and giving it credit for our salvation, while it is but a relation to him Faith ought not to be regarded as a meritorious work, "paying part of our debt." Such an expression is most unfortunate. He is the author of eternal salvation. Let us not think there is merit in ordinances, nor in exercises, but Jesus is the Saviour. Let us look to him, receive him, submit to him, make him our all and in all.

3. He is to be seen, not as exalted, but as humbled-not as living a life of splendor, but as dying a death of shame. The expectations of his earthly friends were to be disappointed; his cherished, even strengthening hopes to be blasted, but when the sword of acutest suffering was piercing his soul, then would he be accomplishing his great work, thus becoming the author of salvation. Jesus Christ, and him crucified-the climax of his life, the center of his work. Of his death alone did he appoint a memorial-not of his miracles, not of his brief hour of seeming earthly triumph, but his disciples in all ages must meet and eat bread and drink wine to "show forth the Lord's death." Yes, it is our dying Lord that is the Saviour-yet not dead, for he rose again, he burst the bars of death, he is alive forevermore.

He then shall save. In his own discourses we observe what with reverence may be called a sublime and holy egotism. Fitly does he speak of himself, for he is the Lord and with beginning and end, author and finisher. In him be our trust, to him the glory-yea, his beloved name shall be in the

chorus of the everlasting song.

II. He shall save his people. No longer in a national sense, as the Jews would have supposed. "He gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify etc. a peculiar people," etc. All that receive him, that believe on his name become his people-"power to become the sons of God." What an honor, what a happiness, to be of the people of Jesus! The Queen of Sheba thought that Solomon's servants were blessed. How much more are they happy who belong to the people of God, heirs apparent to thrones and crowns in heaven, joint heirs with Jesus Christ, and already blessed with angels as ministering spirits. So angels as they come on their missions of love, with what interest may we suppose them to gaze on those here and there whom they know to be heirs of salvation. They are sadly few, yet found in every rank and condition-in kings' palaces, and wandering in the wilderness-rich like Abraham, or poor like him whom the angels bore to Abraham's bosom-learned and ignorant, master and servant-yea, now in every quarter of the globe-with their diverse languages and customs, etc., yet they love Jesus and serve him, they are his people, greatly blessed now, and to be greatly exalted hereafter. Who of you would not be of his people? Then come to Jesus; turn, quickly now, unto the Lord, receive Christ as your Saviour.

III. From their sins.

1. From the penalty of their sins. It is well to reflect upon and seek to realize the awful truth that we deserve to die, to suffer eternal damnation. Suppose we should reflect upon it, each for himself. "I have sinned against God-I know I have." Excuse and extenuate as I may, I know I am a sinner. I deserve to suffer the penalty-to be consigned forever to the damnation of hell. I do not fully know what that will be; but remorse itself will be terrible-remorse, etc. And then positive punishment-something as bad as an undying worm, and quenchless fire. And I cannot cease to sin-and if I could, what shall make amends for my past sin? Ah yes, my friends, we all deserve to perish-but Jesus! he died to save us from perdition. Let us flee to him.

2. From the dominion of sin. Ye shall die in your sins, a most terrible doom. It were a very inadequate salvation merely to be delivered from positive punishment, and be left sinful. If we have right ideas of sin, we must greatly desire to be saved from our sins. And this Jesus came to accomplish. (a) If we love him, we have new motives to resist our sinful tendencies. (b) Jesus has procured for them that believe on him the special indwelling of the Holy Spirit the Sanctifier. For his gracious influences we may pray, and hope to become more and more holy-to gain more and more the mastery over our sinful dispositions, till the hour of death shall be the hour of perfect deliverance, and we enter upon an eternal existence of sinlessness, of purity. That, that will be heaven.

S. John Broadus on Landmarkism

John Broadus on Landmarkism

Letter of 1876 John A. Broadus wrote to James P. Boyce after some Landmarkers had criticized something he said in class. A portion of the letter:

"As to my 'syllogism.' In Homiletics, under Argument, I put on the board many specimens of argument, chiefly about real and religious questions (as more intelligible and useful), such as Romanism, Pedobaptism, close communion, etc. The last 2 sessions I have added an argument for "Landmarkism," as an example in which if the premises be granted, the conclusions must follow, and the only question is whether the premises are true. Somehow so I put it:

1. No one has the right to preach unless he is authorized by a church.
2. Pedobaptists societies are not churches.

Therefore, Pedobaptist churches have not a right to preach, and we ought not to recognize them as preachers.

I said that if I believed both premises, as many esteemed brethren do, I should stand up to the conclusion squarely, as they do. That some brethren deny the 2nd premises, and some deny both. That I for my part fully admit the 2nd, but do not believe the 1st. And then I both times said I introduced this matter, on which our brethren are divided in opinion, merely as an illustration of argument, and I think it a good one, and not because I wanted anyone to adopt my views."¹

=====

¹ Letter, John A. Broadus to James P. Boyce, 15 July 1876, James Petigru Boyce Collection, Archives and Special Collections, James P. Boyce Centennial Library, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky.

S. Justification And Santification

JUSTIFICATION AND SANCTIFICATION

1. What is meant in the Bible by justification? God justifies a sinner in treating him as just, for Christ's sake.
2. Can any person be justified by his own works? By works of the law shall no flesh be justified. Romans 3:20.
3. How are we justified by faith? Believing in Christ our Saviour, we ask and receive justification for his sake alone. Romans 3:24; Romans 5:1.
4. Has this faith that justifies any connection with our works? The faith that justifies will be sure to produce good works. Galatians 5:6; James 2:17.
5. What is meant by sanctification? To sanctify is to make holy in heart and life.
6. What connection is there between sanctification and regeneration? The new birth is the beginning of a new and holy life.
7. Is justification complete at once? Yes, the moment a sinner really believes in Christ he is completely justified.
8. Is sanctification complete at once? No, sanctification is gradual, and ought to go on increasing to the end of the earthly life. Php 3:13; Php 3:14.
9. Is it certain that a true believer in Christ will be finally saved? Yes, God will preserve a true believer in Christ to the end. John 10:28; Php 1:6.
10. What is the sure proof of being a true believer? The only sure proof of being a true believer is growing in holiness and in usefulness, even to the end. 2 Peter 1:10.
11. To what will justification and sanctification lead at last? justification and sanctification will lead at last to glorification in heaven. Romans 5:2; Romans 8:30; Matthew 25:21.

S. Lessons for the Tempted

Lessons for the Tempted

John A. Broadus

Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall. There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it. 1 Corinthians 10:12; 1 Corinthians 10:13

Here is a text which speaks to our need. Though temptation comes, we do not understand it and are often not prepared for it. Through Paul, God is giving us guidance to help us. There are four points suggested by the text as regards temptation.

I. We recognize here that God suffers us to be tempted, "God is faithful; he will not suffer you to be tempted above that you are able." Then God suffers us to be tempted. This is a distinction which does not amount to a great deal, I confess, and yet which is useful and helps us somewhat in relieving the dark mystery of evil in this world, that God permits evils of which he is not the author. We shrink back with horror from the idea of regarding him as the author of evil, we cannot believe it; and it helps us a little to think that God permits evils of which he is not the author. He suffers us to be tempted. The apostle James says that God tempts no man. "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man." The word "tempt," as you all know-and the same thing is true of the words in the original language-signifies "to test," "to put to the test"-as when you test a gun. This testing may be done with a good or an evil design. A man may put a great charge of powder into a gun for the purpose of ascertaining whether it is strong and can stand the test! or he may do it for the purpose of ascertaining whether it is weak, for the purpose of destroying it. So human character may be tested with friendly feelings, to try its strength, or with hostile feelings, in order to show its weakness and to destroy it. In the bad sense of the term God tempts no-body, but he suffers us to be tempted. Shall we inquire why he does this? We might say that temptation is one of the conditions of existence in this world. We cannot see how it would be possible to live here without being tempted. Jesus Christ himself, who was sinless, who came into this world to live but a little while and to die, endured temptation, not once merely, but many times-tempted to do what was wrong in the desert, tempted in the garden to shrink from what he had undertaken to do. Temptation is a condition of our existence.

Moreover, temptation is a discipline. That is one of the reasons why we may say God permits us to be tempted. Here again we have the example of Jesus. We are told in the Epistle to the Hebrews that Jesus learned from what he suffered. His human nature needed discipline like ours, and it found discipline in temptation as we do. He learned from what he suffered, and thus being made perfect he became the author of eternal salvation. So much for the first point: God suffers us to be tempted.

II Now the second point: We should be afraid of temptation. "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall." There are two forms of peril against which we need to caution ourselves. It is a perilous thing to question the reality and the power of temptation. Why, my friends, if there be such a being as Satan, if he has such designs against us and against God as the Scriptures plainly declare, then what could please him better than that men should deny his existence? What could help him more? But I said there were two forms of peril. If it is perilous that we should be heedless about temptation, its reality and its power, it is peculiarly perilous that we should feel a self-confident presumption that we can overcome it. "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall." Ah! a man who is afraid he will fall may, perhaps, take care, but a man who thinks he stands will seldom take heed.

III. The third point in the text is, that we must not excuse ourselves when we are tempted. We must not excuse ourselves with the idea that it is impossible to resist temptation. We must not imagine that we have nothing to do with it and that temptation comes as a power from without and presses in upon us, and we are helpless. Temptation becomes temptation to us only as something within us rises up to meet the allurements from without. James tells us: "Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away by his own desire, and enticed." He is seduced by his own soul's desire, and only his own soul's desire can really lead him to sin. The power from without may be mighty, and yet the man is a free man and yields to temptation only when something within him goes forth to meet that which comes from without. Yet how common a thing it is to imagine we cannot help yielding to temptation. It is not impossible to resist temptation. At any rate when we do not resist, it is our fault. If we really have not now the power to resist, this may be only a punishment for having failed to resist in other days when we might have done it.

Again, we must not excuse ourselves as we are so often inclined to do, with the idea that our temptations are very peculiar. "There hath no temptation taken you," says the apostle, "but such as is common to man." Yet how very general is the notion that our trials and our temptations are certainly the most peculiar and the hardest to bear that any poor, wretched human being has ever had to face. It seems to be a universal human tendency. You cannot help thinking that people whose character is very different from yours, whose surroundings are different, do not have strong temptations. Of course, particular forms of temptation are mightier to one person and less mighty to another. But take the sum total, and if we saw things as the high angels see them, if we saw things as God sees them, we should never delude ourselves with that dream.

IV. Now, finally, trusting in God we can conquer temptation. For God will help us, the text implies, both by his providence and by his grace. "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make the way of escape, that ye may be able to bear it." My friends, God has often done that for us already. If you have advanced far enough in life to see the meaning of your past life, can you not look back and see how, when God's providence brought you into temptation, there has also been provided the way of escape? That is what the text implies that he will do for us if we trust in him, the faithful God. If enlightened by his Word and if seeking his grace to guide us, though we meet with temptation, there will be somewhere, somehow, a door opened that we may escape. Oh, blessed be God that he is controlling all these mighty forces of evil which move around us, so that the temptations themselves sometimes counteract one another. The more we are tempted the more we are safe sometimes. Ah! when we are sorely tempted, God will not fail to open the way of escape, if we

have a heart to seek for it, a soul that longs to find it. Not only by his providence, but by his grace, God will help us in our temptation. If strengthened by God's grace, if filled with a hatred, a mortal hatred of sin, we struggle against it, then we shall trample temptation under foot. We shall know the discipline of character which comes from temptation conquered. "Happy is the man," says the apostle James "that endureth temptation: for when he has stood the test, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him." Therefore, he said, "My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations." If we trust God's providential help and his gracious Spirit, then we can see how temptation may be the means of making us better; and, rising up in grateful joy and trust, we may rejoice with James, "Knowing that the testing of our faith worketh patience. But let patience have a perfect work, that we may be perfect and entire, lacking in nothing. If any man lack wisdom-wisdom to take these wholesome views of temptation, wisdom to find the way out of temptation, wisdom to see the meanings of temptation and gain its lessons-if any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." My brethren, I ask not today for you and that we may have a life without trial and temptation. I should be afraid to ask it; for "whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth"; and it is the law of earthly existence that we shall be tempted. But I humbly ask for myself and for you that we may have grace to help us watch and strive against temptation, grace to trample it under foot, grace to conquer it.

S. Let us have peace with God

Let us have peace with God.

Therefore being justified by faith, let us have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Romans 5:1.

IT is nearly four centuries ago now, that a young professor from the north of Germany went to Rome. He was a man of considerable learning and versatile mind.

Yet he did not go to Rome to survey the remains of antiquity or the treasures of modern art. He went to Rome because he was in trouble about his sins and could find no peace. Having been educated to regard Rome as the centre of the Christian world, he thought he would go to the heart of things and see what he could there find.

He had reflected somewhat at home, and had talked with other men more advanced than himself, on the thought that the just shall live by faith; but still that thought had never taken hold of him. We read some of you remember the story quite well how one day, according to the strange ideas that prevailed and still prevail at Rome, he went climbing up a stairway on his knees, pausing to pray on every step, to see if that would not help him about his sins. Then, as he climbed slowly up, he seemed to hear a voice echoing down the stairway, "The just shall live by faith; the just shall live by faith." And so he left alone his dead works, he arose from his knees and went down the stairway to his home to think about that great saying: "The just shall live by faith."

It is no wonder that with such an experience, and such a nature, Martin Luther should have lived to shake the Christian world with the thought that justification by faith is the great doctrine of Christianity, "the article of a standing or a falling church." It is no wonder that John Wesley, rising up with living earnestness, when England was covered with a pall of spiritual death, should have revived the same thought justification by faith.

Yet it is not true that the doctrine of justification by faith is all of the Gospel. It is true that the doctrine of justification by faith is simply one of the several ways by which the Gospel takes hold of men. You do not hear anything of that doctrine in the Epistles of John. He has another way of presenting the Gospel salvation, namely, that we must love Christ, and be like him, and obey him. I think sometimes that Martin Luther made the world somewhat one-sided by his doctrine of justification by faith; that the great mass of the Protestant world are inclined to suppose there is no other way of looking on the Gospel. There are very likely some here to-day who would be more impressed by John's way of presenting the matter; but probably the majority would be more impressed by Paul's way, and it is our business to present now this and now that, to present first one side and then the other. So we have here before us to-day Paul's great doctrine of justification by faith, in perhaps one of his most striking statements, "Therefore, being justified by faith, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." My friends, we talk and hear about these Gospel truths, and repeat these Scripture words, and never stop to ask ourselves whether we have a clear idea of what is meant. What does Paul mean, when he talks about being justified?

There has been a great deal of misapprehension as to his meaning. Martin Luther was all wrong in his early life, because he had been reared up in the idea that a justified man means simply a just man, a good man, and that he could not account himself justified or hope for salvation until he was a thoroughly good man.

Now, the Latin word from which we borrow our word “justified” does mean to make just, and as the Romanists use the Latin, their error is natural. But Paul’s Greek word means not to make just, but to regard as just, to treat as just. That is a very important difference, not to make just, but to regard and treat as just. How would God treat you, if you were a righteous man; if you had, through all your life, faithfully performed all your duties, conforming to all your relations to your fellow-beings, how would he regard you and treat you?

He would look upon you with complacency. He would smile on you as one that was in his sight pleasing.

He would bless you as long as you lived in this world, and, when you were done with this world, he would delight to take you home to his bosom, in another world, because you would deserve it. And now as God would treat a man who was just because he deserved it, so the Gospel proposes to treat men who are not just and who do not deserve it, if they believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. He will treat them as just, though they are not just, if they believe in Christ; that is to say, he will look upon them with his favor; he will smile upon them in his love; he will bless them with every good as long as they live, and when they die he will delight to take them home to his own bosom, though they never deserved it, through his Son, Jesus Christ. That is what Paul means by justification. And when Martin Luther found that out he found peace. This Epistle to the Romans had always stopped his progress when reading the New Testament. He would read, in the Latin version, “For therein is revealed the justice of God/” and he felt in his heart that God’s justice must condemn him. But now he came to see what was really meant by the righteousness of God, the righteousness which God provides and bestows on the believer in Jesus. A sinful man, an undeserving man, may get God Almighty’s forgiveness and favor and love, may be regarded with complacency and delight, though he does not deserve it, if he believes in the Lord Jesus Christ. That is justification by faith.

It is one thing to take hold of this matter in the way of doctrinal conception and expression, and of course, God be thanked! it is another thing to receive it in the heart. There are many people who get hold of it all in the heart with trust and peace that never have a correct conception of it as a doctrine. Yet I suppose it is worth while that we should endeavor to see these things clearly. Other things being equal, they will be the holiest and most useful Christians who have the clearest perception of the great facts and truths of the Gospel. So I recommend to you that whenever any one tries to explain to you one of these great doctrinal truths, you shall listen with fixed attention and see if you cannot get a clearer view of the Gospel teachings on that subject, for it will do you good.

Now let us come to the second thought here, viz., being justified by faith. A man might say, if God proposes to deal with those who are not just, as if they were, why does he condition it upon their believing the Gospel of Jesus Christ? Why cannot God proclaim a universal amnesty at once, and be done with it, to all his sinful, weak children, and treat them all as if they were just, without their believing? I don’t think this is hard to see. God does not merely propose to deal with us for the time

being as if we were just, but he proposes in the end to make us actually just. It would be an unsatisfactory salvation to a right-minded man if God proposed merely to exempt us from the consequences of our sins and not to deliver us from our sins. You do not want merely to escape punishment for sin without ever becoming good; you want to be righteous and holy; you want to be delivered from sin itself as well as from the consequences of sin. And this Gospel, which begins by its proclamation that God is willing to treat men as just, although they are not just, does not stop there. It proposes to be the means by which God will take hold of men's characters and make them just, make them holy. You may, for the moment, conceive of such a thing as -that God should make a proclamation of universal amnesty, and treat all men as if they were just; but that would not make them any better. The Gospel is not merely to deliver us from the consequences of sin, but to deliver us from the power of sin. You can conceive of an amnesty as to the consequences of sin, which should extend to persons that will not even believe there is such an amnesty; but you cannot see how the Gospel is to have any power in delivering us from the dominion of sin, unless we believe the Gospel.

It can do so only through belief. Therefore it is not possible that a man should be justified without belief.

I think it is useful that we should thus try to see that this is not a matter of mere arbitrary appointment on the part of the Sovereign Power of the Universe, but that the condition is necessary that it cannot be otherwise. "Being justified by faith," it reads; and we cannot be justified without faith, because the same Gospel is also to take hold of us and make us just. And now, some one who feels a little freshened interest in this subject, some man who has never got hold of the Gospel faith says to himself: "I wonder if the preacher is going to explain to me what believing is, what faith is. I never heard any one succeed in explaining faith." Well, if you will pardon me, the best explanation of faith I ever heard was given by a negro preacher in Virginia. As the story was told me, one Sunday afternoon, a few years ago, some of them were lying on the ground together, and one of them spoke and said, "Uncle Reuben, can you explain this: Faith in de Lord, and faith in dedebbil." "To be sure I can. There is two things: in de fust place, faith in de Lord, and then faith in de debbil. Now, in the fust place, fustly, there is faith. What is faith? What is faith? Why, faith is jes faith. Faith ain't nothing less than faith. Faith ain't nothing more than faith. Faith is jes faith now I done splain it." Really, that man was right, there is nothing to explain. Faith is as simple a conception as the human mind can have. How, then, can you explain faith? You are neither able to analyze it into parts, nor can you find anything simpler with which to compare it. So* also as to some other things, that are perfectly easy and natural in practical exercise, and cannot be explained. What is love? Well, I won't go into an elaborate metaphysical definition of love, but if I wanted a child to love me, I should try to exhibit myself in such a character to him and act in such ways that the little child would see in me something to love, and would feel like loving. There would then be no need of an explanation of what love is Did you ever hear a satisfactory definition of laughter? If you wanted to make a man laugh, would you attempt to define laughter to him? You might possibly succeed in making a laughable definition; but otherwise definitions won't make a man laugh. You would simply say or do something ludicrous, and he would laugh readily enough if he was so disposed; and if the man be not in a mood for laughing, all your explanations are utterly useless. And so what is faith? There is nothing to explain.

Everybody knows what faith is. If you want to induce a man to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, you must hold up the Lord to him in his true character, and then, if he is in a mood to believe, he will believe, and if he is disinclined to belief, all your explanations will be fruitless. The practical result may even be obstructed by attempts to explain. What is faith? You know what faith is. Every one knows.

Well, then, a man might say, "If you mean by faith in the Lord, the simple idea of believing what the Scripture says concerning him, the idea of believing its teachings about the Lord Jesus Christ to be true, if that is what faith means, then all of us are believers, all have faith." I am afraid not. I am afraid there are some here who have not faith. Has a man faith in the Lord Jesus Christ who simply does not disbelieve in him?

I may not deny that what the Gospel says is true, but is that believing? Yonder sits a gentleman; suppose some one should come hastily up the aisle, calling his name, and say, "Your house is afire." The gentleman sits perfectly quiet and looks unconcerned, as people so often do when listening to preaching. The man repeats it: "I say your house is afire." But still he sits in his place. Some one near him says, "You hear what that man says. Do you believe it?" "Yes, I believe it," he carelessly replies, and does not stir. You would all say, "The man is insane, or certainly he does not believe it; for if he did, he would not sit perfectly still and remain perfectly unconcerned." Even so when the preacher speaks of sin and guilt and ruin, of God's wrath and the fire that is not quenched; or when he stands with joyful face and proclaims to his hearers that for their sin and ruin there is a Saviour; and they say they believe, and yet look as if it were of no concern to them at all, at all; then I say they do not believe it the thing is not possible. They may not disbelieve it; they may not care to make an attempt to overturn it; they may be in a sort of negative mood; but they do not believe it. With that statement I suppose there are a great many of us who concur and who will at once say, "Often I fear that I do not really believe it. If I did believe it, the Gospel would have more power over my heart and more power over my life than it does have. And what, oh, what shall I do?" The preacher has to remind you of that father to whom the Saviour came when the disciples had tried in vain to heal his suffering child. Jesus said to him: "All things are possible to him that believeth;" and he replied: "I believe; help thou my unbelief." That should be your cry: "I believe; help thou my unbelief." The man would not deny that he believed, and yet felt bound to add that he knew he did not believe as he ought to. Now the comfort is, that he who sees all hearts accepted that man's confessedly imperfect faith, and granted his request. That has often been the preacher's comfort as he uttered the same cry, "I believe; help thou my unbelief;" and God give it as a comfort to you! But do not content yourself with such a state of things, with any such feeble, half-way believing. Nay, let us cherish all that tends to strengthen our faith in the Gospel; let us read the Word of God, praying that we may be able to believe; let us say from day to day, as the disciples said: "Lord, increase our faith." The text proceeds: "Therefore, being justified by faith, let us have peace with God." Instead of the declaration, "We have peace with God," the best authorities for the text make it an exhortation, "Let us have peace with God;" and so the Revised Version reads. Some critics admit that the documents require us so to read, but say that they can see no propriety in an exhortation at this point that it seems much more appropriate to understand the apostle as asserting a fact.

Yet I think we can see moaning and fitness in the text as corrected: "Being justified by faith, let us have peace with God."

Let us have peace with God, notwithstanding our unworthiness. My friends, we cannot have peace with God so long as we cling to the notion that we are going to deserve it. Just there is the difficulty with many of those who are trying to be at peace with God. They have been clinging to the thought that they must first become worthy, and then become reconciled to God; and they will have to see more clearly that they must come to Christ in order that, being reconciled, they may be made good, may become worthy. We may say there are two conceivable ways to have peace with God. It is conceivable to have peace with God through our worthiness, and it is conceivable and also practicable to have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, though we be unworthy. Then let us have peace with him, although so unworthy, through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Again, let us have peace with God, though we are still sinful and unholy, though we know we come far short in character and in life of what God's children ought to be. We must be, ought to be, intensely dissatisfied with ourselves; but let us be satisfied with our Saviour, and have peace with God through him; not content with the idea of remaining such as we are, but, seeing that the same Gospel which offers us forgiveness and acceptance offers us also a genuine renewal through our Lord Jesus Christ, and promises that finally we shall be made holy, as God is holy, shall indeed be perfect, as our Father in heaven is perfect. Let us rejoice in the gracious promise of that perfect life, and, while seeking to be what we ought to be, let us have peace with God. Our sanctification is still sadly imperfect the best of us well know that, and probably the best of us feel it most deeply; but, if we believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, our justification is perfect. We can never be more justified than we are now justified, though we shall be more and more made holy as long as we live, and at last made perfectly holy as we pass into the perfect world. My brethren, do think more and talk more of that. It is an intensely practical matter, not only for your comfort but for the strength of your life. If we believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, although we are painfully conscious that we are far from being in character and life what we ought to be, yet, through the perfect justification which we have at once, we shall in the end by his grace be made perfectly holy.

Let us have peace with God, though we have perpetual conflict with sin. What a singular idea! Peace with God, and yet conflict, yes, perpetual conflict, with a thousand forms of temptation to sin, temptations springing from our fellow-men, and temptations springing from spiritual tempters perpetual conflict, and yet peace with God. Is not that conceivable? Is not that possible? In this conflict we are on the Lord's side; in this conflict the Lord is on our side; and so, though the battle must be waged against every form of sin, we may have peace with God. And finally, let us have peace with God though he leaves us to suffer a thousand forms of distress and trial.

“ Let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom also we have had our access by faith into this grace wherein we stand: and let us rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but let us also rejoice in our tribulations; knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, proving; and proving, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Ghost which was given unto us.” Surely man may have peace with God, though he be left to suffer. For none of these things can separate us from God's love. Who shall separate us from Christ's love? “ For I am persuaded that neither death nor life, neither angels nor principalities nor powers, neither things present nor things to come, neither height nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.” When we are in trouble, let us take fast hold upon that great thought, that trouble does not divide us from the love of God. Yea, God's peace can conquer

trouble, and guard us, as in a fortress, against its assaults. “ In nothing be anxious; but in everything, by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God. And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall guard your hearts and your thoughts in Christ Jesus.”

S. Loving Jesus Christ

Loving Jesus Christ

Jesus saith to Simon Peter: Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him: Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him: Feed my lambs. John 21:15

All through the summer night, the seven disciples had toiled in vain, moving their boat from one place to another, casting their net on this side and on that. However, with a fortune not uncommon in their calling, they had taken nothing at all. In the dim light of the early dawn they saw a man standing on the shore and did not know who he was. But presently he spoke to them in a kindly tone, in a familiar way, and said, "Children, have you any food?" They answered, a little grimly I suppose: "No." And he said, "Cast the net on the right side of the boat and you shall find." There was something in his tone, it may be or something commanding in his manner—and although they had toiled so long in vain, they obeyed him. And now they were not able to draw the net into the boat for the multitude of fishes. The character of two leading men among these disciples is here depicted as it is elsewhere in the sacred history. John, who had great sympathy with the Lord, and great spiritual insight, was the first to recognize who it was. He said, "It is the Lord." Simon Peter, as soon as this fact became known, could not wait for the rest but plunged into the sea—always impulsive and impetuous. When they came to the shore, there were fish broiling on the coals, and some bread, and they ate their humble morning meal together. It is a very homely story. It does not look as if there were much going on there, and yet the greatest things in this world, you know, have usually sprung from simple surroundings. And the best lessons of life are often to be had in lowly circumstances.

One lesson which our Lord teaches us here by his own example is, that we ought to take great pains in rebuking a friend for his fault. It is a difficult task to tell a man of his fault in such a way as to do him Loving Jesus Christ the most good. Many persons fail when they come roughly and blindly with their rebuke and do harm rather than good. Others see so clearly what a difficult task it is that they shrink from ever attempting it. Most of us go through life knowing that we ought to tell this person or that person about some fault or other, and we are afraid. Now our Lord has shown that he recognized it as a difficult task by the pains he has taken here to adjust all the circumstance, so that they might themselves suggest what he wanted his friend to remember for his good. Some two years before, on the shore of the same lake, there had been a like miracle when he first entered upon the service of the Lord to be a fisher of men. So the little fire around which they stood in the dimness of the early dawn clearly called to mind the incidents of a few weeks before, he had stood with others in the early morning around a little fire and the terrible thing that had happened then. When the Lord asked three times if he loved him, Peter was grieved, not merely, I suppose, because it seemed to indicate that there was room for doubt whether he really did love him, but because the three times recalled those fatal three times that he had denied his Lord. So these circumstances, carefully selected, brought it all back to his mind without the Master's needing to tell him in express words at all. Now I do think there is here a

lesson for us of great importance. Let us not imagine we can perform a task with ease about which our Lord took so much pains. Let us not shrink from our duty when we see how careful he was to make all the circumstances conform to his task, with such loving consideration, with such delicate skill.

Simon Peter also gives us a lesson here, a lesson in humility to this effect. When a man is in a right mood about spiritual things he will shrink from all comparison between himself and others. Jesus said to him, "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these?" You know there is an ambiguity in this expression, and it exists in the Greek exactly as in the English. It may mean, more than these love, more than thou lovest these men, or more than thou lovest these pursuits. But the circumstances of the story leave no doubt as to what is meant. Peter had professed a few weeks before that he did love the Lord more than the other disciples. He had distinctly declared it, and no doubt he was sincere. When Jesus predicted that they would forsake him, Peter said, "Though all men forsake thee yet will I never forsake thee." And so he singled himself out above the other disciples, as loving the Lord more than any of them. And of that he is here reminded. But when Peter comes to answer, he leaves the comparison out this time. He says, "Lord, thou knowest that I love thee." He is in no mood for comparisons now. A truly humble man never is. He will be the last person to be thinking of such a thing, and if forced to make comparisons he will tell you that he is less than the least of all disciples, but that he does love the Lord, and the Lord does love him and he means to be a better servant.

There are many other such lessons in this narrative, but let us look immediately at the question, "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?" My friends, it has been a long time I know, long according to the centuries of human history since this question was asked. Few of us have ever stood, or ever will stand, beside the little lake of Galilee where this question was asked. Yet it is a question which lives through the ages, a question which by God's providence has come down recorded in the sacred story, a question which our loving Redeemer ever asks. It is a question which I stand humbly in his name today and desire to press home to every man, woman, and child-and I want an answer, and before God I will have an answer, from your heart of hearts. Do you love the Lord Jesus Christ? Do you love him? But how can a man love one whom he never saw? How can he? You love many persons whom you never saw. Think of men whose books you have read and though they live far away or died long ago, still you love them dearly. Consider heroes in history, whom you have never seen, and yet you love them for their noble deeds and noble character. To be sure we can love those whom we have never seen. But another may say, "I do not hold upon this aspect of the gospel. If you talk to me about religious life; about moral living; about good deeds in the service of Jesus Christ, that seems natural for me. I see the propriety of it. If you talk about comprehending and believing the truths of the gospel, I understand that, but loving Jesus Christ, it looks to me like a sort of weak sentiment." Well, of course, religious affections will vary just as natural affections do. Men differ widely in the way in which they manifest their love to those at home. There are some persons to whom it is not natural to say much about it, and quite unnatural to deal in any tender gush of sentiment, and yet it is a thousand pities if they do not love just as truly and just as warmly as those who show it most tenderly. They show it by deeds, by an occasional kind word or look, but the love is there. And so, however differently it may be shown, we all may and we ought to and we must love Jesus Christ the Lord.

Why should we love him? Well, there are many reasons. Jesus Christ is the world's great teacher. We love our teachers, not in childhood always, for sometimes then they seem to represent to us only authority, constraint, coercion, but as we grow older there grows upon us a love of the teachers of our childhood. I went back last summer to the place where my youth was spent and saw many early friends but greatly missed a man who is still living but could not be there, a man whom I always meet with a curious love that grows on me as the years grow, the teacher of my early childhood. It is strange how one's heart does warm toward any man or woman that guided us in the times of our earliest recollection. We love our teachers, and Jesus Christ is the world's great teacher. He has taught us high and mighty motives to morality, such as were never known apart from him, even love to him, and to his Father and our Father. He has taught us our true relations to God, and the way back to God's favor. He brought life and immortality to light. How we ought to love him!

Jesus Christ is the pure example of perfect goodness. We all love goodness. Even men who are not trying to be good love goodness, even men who pretend to be worse than they are, in their hearts love goodness. But all the goodness we see besides his is mingled with imperfection, and we cannot but perceive it at times. Here is perfect goodness. Oh, how the truest sentiments of admiration ought to go out toward one, who, in human form, has been exposed to human temptations, but yielded to no temptations, and remained perfectly good. This is why we should love him!

Even though these things should bring us to love Jesus Christ, I aim' afraid that of themselves alone they never would. For after all they do not represent his great work in this world, his great relation to mankind. Jesus Christ is not simply the world's great teacher and the world's noblest example of purity and goodness, but far above this, Jesus Christ is a Saviour. His name Jesus meant "Jehovah saves." It was given him because he should save his people from their sins. "He came to seek and to save that which was lost." He died that men might live. "He ever liveth to intercede for them that come to God through him," that for his sake their souls may be saved. He is a Saviour. Alas! are there any here today who care nothing about salvation, who take no interest in the idea? I remember visiting the British Museum and standing one day in the Etruscan room, crowded with specimens of Etruscan and early Greek pottery, which were charming to anyone who has the least love for art or the slightest tincture of classical learning's. Presently two young men of rough appearance came to the door, and looked in, and one of them said to the other, "Tom, what would you give for all these old dishes in here?" The other replied, "Hum! I wouldn't give two pence for the whole lot." He saw no beauty in them that he should admire. You remember what the prophet said would be true concerning the great one. "We saw no beauty in him that we should admire him," that was to come, and alas! how true it is even today.

If a young man in the fullness of life and strength, and careless of everything but the pleasures of the passing moment, had come along this afternoon, driving out from the park and passed West Twenty-third Street, perhaps the last idea that would have occurred to him would be that the street is rather famous for physicians. What would he care about physicians? But let there be a sudden accident, a sudden overturning of the carriage, a limb broken, and someone coming to lift him up, then his first question would be, "Is there a good doctor close by? Can you get him quick?" So if people begin to see something of their sinfulness, and to care something for their salvation, then Jesus Christ, the Saviour of men, becomes an object of interest and love. Ah! my friends, why

should we shrink from looking at that fact of our sinfulness? Is it wise for a sick man to go step by step to destruction when there is a remedy that might save him? I know it seems extravagant, but there are those here today who have had moments when they felt their whole being poisoned by sin, and their whole life blasted, who have struggled to lift themselves up above and trample down temptation until they have been despairing and humiliated and disgusted with themselves. If any such despairers will turn their looks away from themselves to Jesus Christ the Saviour of sinners and give themselves to the one task of serving him asking that they may know and do his will, leaving it to him by his grace to make them what they ought to be, then they will begin truly to love him. O soul of man, who shall give account of yourself to your God? Oh, that you would see yourself a sinful being: that you would address yourself to the Saviour and learn to love him as your Saviour and your God. When in beginning thus to love him, we set ourselves to doing his will, every act of obedience reacts upon the love which prompts them. When, because he bids us do it, we come and go down into baptismal waters, and rise meaning for his sake to walk in newness of life, how it helps us to love him. How many here can remember the thrill of delight and the new strength with which they found themselves doing this simple thing in obedience to his command? When they gathered around the simple bread and wine and took it as a simple reminder of his dying love, doing this in remembrance of him, they have loved him more because they were acting out their love in accordance with his commandments. If that is true in ceremonies, it should be true in life, in the actual deeds of real life. Whatever we do and whatever we refrain from doing for his sake and by his help, it shall react to make us love him more.

How should we show our love to him so well as by doing good to his people? Prove your love to the Saviour by doing good to your fellow Christians. Judge them kindly, O ye Christian people, by all your own conscious weaknesses and all your stumblings, judge them kindly, and when they are weak, help them along. Doing this in love for the Lord you shall learn to love him more. That also is illustrated in the experience of ordinary life. Why, I could find you in this great city of yours a thousand examples. I could show you tomorrow evening as the day draws to its close some humble home where if you and I should go and stand and look in through the open window as the dusk came down, we should see a quiet woman approaching middle age busy with household tasks. Her cheeks are shrunken from their youthful beauty, and her complexion is faded a little. She lives in poverty and knows full well what is meant by the hard times of which we are all now speaking. But as we look in through the window she seems not sad, she seems to enjoy what she is doing. She is preparing the evening meal with toil-worn hands for the husband that is coming, and the thought of him, how it sweetens her labor—to be doing this for him, how tender it makes her heart. Presently she begins to sing and breaks off in the middle of a line, and there comes to her faded cheek a new freshness and there is a new light in her woman's eye. They used to sing that song together, when the world and they were young. Ah! love's service is pleasant service, and what we do out of love makes us love them more. This is one of the sweetest conditions of our earthly life, and it applies with all its fullness and richness to the Lord Jesus Christ. When we are doing something out of love for him we love him better. Sacrifice, self-denial, act powerfully upon the love that prompts them. That is true not only of great things but also of little things. If you stir yourself from sloth and go to the Sunday school to teach for love of the Redeemer, it will always make you love him better. If you turn away from the social gathering that is not necessary, or from some place of amusement, to go to the evening prayer meeting, it will make you love him more. If you seek out the poor and try to do them good because they are Jesus Christ's poor, you will love

Jesus Christ more. If in these trying days you deny your-self gratification's though they are within your means and you would have a right to indulge in them, that you may have more to give to the thousand Christian enterprises that are struggling for existence, then your sacrifice and your self-denial will intensify your love for Christ. Whatever you do, whatever you deny yourself, out of love, it will strengthen the love that prompts it. But let me close as the Lord himself closed the conversation. After telling Simon Peter what he must do out of love for him, he said, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee; When thou wast young, thou girdest thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not." Dimly, and yet plainly, it meant that he should be crucified. And was that all that the loving Lord had to promise as a reward for a man who professed that he did love him? Thou lovest me, then serve me faithfully, and for so doing, When thou art old thou shalt be crucified. It looks strange. "This spake he, signifying by what death he should glorify God." Ah! that sheds light on it; a man that loves the Lord Jesus Christ is a man that means to live so as to glorify God. He promised Simon Peter a death of suffering and outward shame, but in that death he should glorify God. My brethren, we live in a world of failures. How many businessmen in this city fail sometime or other. We live in a time of failures. Everything in this world is in danger of failing except one thing: a man who is really living to glorify God-that man will not fail, that end will be accomplished. It may not be in the way you had fancied or preferred, but in the way which he sees to be more for your good and more for his glory. You wanted to glorify him in a long life crowded with useful deeds; he may appoint that you shall glorify him by an early death. You wanted to glorify him with ample means, which you would scatter far abroad with holy love; he may want you to bear poverty with dignity. You thought you would glorify him in a life of health and strength, doing good in the world; and he may have thought to try you amid the sufferings of a sickbed. It is not for a laborer in the vineyard to choose himself where he will work, but only to work where he is placed. We know not what awaits us, but if in simplicity and godly sincerity, in such calling and circumstances as providence assigns us, we do make it our aim to glorify God, then whatever crashes and falls around us, life will not be failure, but will show our love and glorify our Saviour!

S. Man

MAN 1. How did men begin to exist? God created Adam and Eve, and from them are descended all human beings.

2. What sort of character had Adam and Eve when created? Adam and Eve were made in the image of God, and were sinless.

3. Who tempted Eve to sin against God by eating the forbidden fruit? Eve was tempted by the Devil, or Satan, who is the chief of the fallen angels, or demons.

4. What was the beginning of Eve's sin? The beginning of Eve's sin was that she believed Satan rather than God. Genesis 3:4; Genesis 3:5.

5. What was the first sign that Adam and Eve gave of having fallen into sin? Adam and Eve showed that they had become sinful by trying to hide from God. Genesis 3:8.

6. What was the next sign? Adam and Eve tried to throw the blame on others. Genesis 3:12; Genesis 3:13.

7. How did God punish their willful disobedience? God condemned Adam and Eve to death, physical, spiritual, and eternal. Genesis 2:17; Romans 6:23; Ephesians 2:1.

8. How does this affect Adam and Eve's descendants? All human beings are sinful and guilty in God's sight. Romans 5:12.

9. How does this sinfulness show itself? All human beings actually sin as soon as they are old enough to know right from wrong. Romans 3:23.

10. Will those who die without having known right from wrong be punished hereafter for the sin of Adam and Eve? Those who die without having known right from wrong are saved in the way God has provided.

11. Can any human beings be saved through their own merits from the guilt and punishment of sin? No; the second Adam, the Son of God, is the only Saviour of sinners. Acts 4:12; Genesis 3:15.

S. Ministerial Education

Ministerial Education

Give diligence to present thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, handling aright the word of truth. 1 Timothy 2:14.

I WISH first to indicate some of the leading thoughts in this passage of Scripture, in the second chapter of second Timothy, beginning at the 14th verse. The apostle is speaking to Timothy, not only with reference to his own duty, but to the qualifications of the men who are to be selected as ministers of the gospel, and whom he must instruct. Addressing Timothy himself, he says: "Give diligence to present thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed." The image is obvious to all. A minister of the gospel is compared to a mechanic, a skilled workman, a man who has stood the test and is approved, and then his skill in his work is shown by the added phrase, "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, handling aright the word of truth." The term means literally "cutting straight," as you read in the margin. Perhaps the phrase came from the idea of a carpenter cutting a straight line with his saw; possibly from Paul's early trade. It required a very skillful workman to cut straight with scissors the rough hair cloth of which they made the Cilician tents. Whatever be its origin, the term denotes, in a general way, skillful work a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, cutting straight, handling aright the word of truth. A skilled workman is the minister. Then the apostle proceeds to indicate for Timothy himself, and for the faithful men to whom these things are to be committed that they may teach others also, the importance of knowing how to avoid seductive and ruinous errors.

He says of these, "charge them that {hey strive not about words," mere logomachies, "to no profit. Shun the profane babblings." Presently he mentions examples, Hymenseus and Philetus, who had thought that the resurrection was a mere spiritual resurrection and past already, and had overthrown the faith of some, and Timothy and the other ministers must know how to shun these hurtful errors. If they do so, they shall be like the gold or silver vessels, honored in the Master's house. Another point about them is that they must not be given to mere babbling. "Foolish and ignorant questionings refuse, knowing that they gender strifes." The word is literally "fightings" or "battles," and the Lord's servant must not strive, must not be a fighter. In another sense, of course, we all know that the Scriptures teach that we must fight, but you see what is meant here. It is so easy for a man to be a fighting minister!

Some men are fighting ministers for the very reason that they have not what the apostle here enjoined. The Lord's servant must not be a fighter, but must "be gentle, apt to teach, forbearing in meekness, correcting them that oppose themselves." Many a man is a fighting preacher because he does not know how to do anything else. It requires some wisdom and some skill to teach aptly, to correct with gentleness and meekness the errors of those who oppose themselves, and try to win them to the truth; but just to fight requires no skill at all.

You see, then, this passage presents very varied qualifications for the minister of the gospel spiritual and mental qualifications combined. Of the mental qualifications, you see that it indicates some that belong to men by nature and others that come by cultivation; and as to the qualifications that come from cultivation acquired skill these come partly in the actual exercise of the duties of the minister, but they may come all the better if there be special early training for it. Take the image of the mechanic. "The only way to learn to preach is to preach," the fathers used to say. Certainly. The only way to learn to saw is to saw, or to learn how to make horse-shoes is to make them. At the same time, it is the experience of mankind that while some men take up these pursuits and acquire some skill merely from their practice, yet it is usually better for a man who proposes to be a mechanic, to work in his early attempts under the guidance and with the correction and encouragement of those who are far ahead of him in experience; and if men have found that so in all the mechanical arts, why should we be surprised to find it so in the great work of life of which the apostle speaks? "A workman that needeth not to be ashamed." Our passage, then, brings before us the great subject of the qualifications and the training of ministers of the gospel. Where do we stand to-day, my brethren, as to ministerial education? What is the duty of to-day in regard to it? As to our past, there is in it much to be thankful for, and of course much to lament. I believe, for my part, that the theory of the Baptist churches as to the ministry of the gospel is a right theory, substantially. That theory has always been that the ministry of the gospel ought not to be restricted to men who have been over a certain fixed course of mental training in order to it, but that every one should be encouraged to preach who feels moved to preach, and whom the churches are willing to hear. At the same time, it has always been the theory that every minister of the gospel should seek to be a competent and enlightened man in general, and in particular that he must be a man who has sound views of the teaching of the Scriptures, and knows how to explain them to others. Our brethren have never held that it was a good thing for a minister to be ignorant, but they have held that it was not a disqualification for a minister to be destitute of this or that particular kind of mental training, provided only that he had some power to preach, and people were willing to hear him. That theory I think is right. It is what the Scriptures enjoin. It is what was true of the early teachers of the gospel not only the inspired men, but others. It has been an absolute necessity for this new country of ours.

I have profound respect for the ministry of the Presbyterian and Episcopal brethren, for instance, but I wonder sometimes what in the world would have become of the masses of the people in America if all the religious persuasions had done as they have done with reference to the ministry. They have had for themselves a cultivated ministry, in general, and they have had all the benefit of this select and exclusive arrangement as to the ministry, and some of them all the pride of it which is natural. But if it hadn't been for the great Methodist and great Baptist bodies, and some others like them, who have encouraged men to preach that were destitute of this artificial course of training, what in the world would have become of the masses of the people? It has been bad enough as it was; it would have been flat ruin if all denominations in our new country, where most of the lawyers and most of the doctors have been men without any special training, had insisted that it should be otherwise with the ministry.

I am not ashamed, therefore, of the fact that I belong to a body of Christians which has a great number of comparatively uneducated ministers. I think that in our past this has been unavoidable. I think it has been a necessary part of trying to see the gospel as it is and do our duty to the people

among whom we were cast. But things are changing. Oh, how fast they change! A man who comes from my part of the world to this, finds that all his knowledge of geography has vanished. He does not know anything about the country at all.

States that were thought new when some of us can remember, are old States now, and all around me I hear people talk of "going West," which seems strange to me. Things are changing, changing fast as to education, and we must change with them, and if our Baptist churches have not wisdom to see that the conditions which justified our past as to our ministry are changing and rapidly ceasing to justify them, then they will pay the penalty of their lack of wisdom. It may be that we have gone too far even in the past, and that some are going too far now in encouraging the entrance of men into the ministry who are unfitted for it; some unfitted by their grievous ignorance, and others still more ruinously unfitted I pray you agree with me in the statement by their lack of sense. For I can find you ignorant men who ruin the Queen's English and yet have sense and character and have done great good; and I can find you men that can speak passable English enough, and even prate about the learned languages, but from sheer weakness and silliness have always been a disgrace to the ministry. It may be that some of us are going too fast now, in some parts of the country, towards the opposite extreme inclining too much to take up the other idea, that all ministers ought to have a certain artificially-fixed kind and grade of preparation for their work. It may be, my brethren, that in connection with institutions of learning we are somewhat prone to go from the one extreme to the other; and if that be so, we ought to look the danger in the face and guard against it.

What I wish to speak of, then, is our present duty as to ministerial education. And I have three points of remark about it. first, Ministerial education must go hand in hand with general education. It ought to keep in advance; but it cannot be, as a general thing, far in advance of the education of the people. They must go together.

Why, with our free system of choice, you cannot get the churches to prefer a well-educated man, unless they have some education themselves. A man who has been reared among intelligent people and has been well educated, and who then goes to preach among the very ignorant, is startled to find how prejudiced they are against his ideas and against him. You will pardon a very homely illustration of it, egotistical in addition.

I remember to have had the honor, twelve or fifteen years ago, to be elected pastor of a very large country church in Upper South Carolina the largest country congregation I ever saw where there were many noble people, too; but they had just been gathered in by hundreds, by good men, and never taught from the pulpit that there were any Christian duties to perform. At the end of a year of earnest attempt to preach there, with many encouraging results, I had the cheering intelligence that a good sister in the neighborhood had said, with reference to the justly beloved old man who had preceded me, that she "had rather hear dear old Uncle Toll give out one verse of a hime than to hear that 'ar Greenville preacher go through a whole sarmon." You will pardon me, for I wanted to illustrate the fact that ignorance, like a shell-fish, secretes a coating of prejudice that hardens all around it. If you could make all your ministers educated, as long as the mass of people are comparatively uneducated, they would often not want them. So the two must go together.

Moreover, it is a thing very easy to happen, and which sometimes does happen with all our precautions against it, that a certain class of men are educated away from the people. It is not true

of the highest class of men. The highest class of men, whatever they may learn, will not forget the language of the people, and will not fail to be able to bring all their highest efforts in reach of common minds. But it is true of some men of very respectable ability that, struggling themselves after what they call "education" they get away from all sympathy with the common mind. They don't know how to talk to the people. This happens with some, not from lack of intelligence of some kinds; it is from lack of imagination, from lack of intellectual sympathy with other minds, from lack of the power to comprehend the way that people in general look at things. I have known men very noble men in all their aims and aspirations, and men very wise in some respects who could not get hold of the people at all, because they didn't know how people in general think about things, and couldn't present things as the people have to see them. And then I suppose it must be admitted that sometimes a man who is educated away from the people thereby shows his essential lack of sense.

Here is another difficulty. Our ministers can seldom receive their boyhood education with a view to the ministry. They are usually called into that work when they have about reached young manhood; and if now they are to be educated, all the education of their boyhood must have been such as they have obtained without reference to the ministry. As long as people in general have but little of education nothing beyond elementary instruction so long will most of the young men who come into the ministry and wish to prepare for it have, for their earlier boyhood training, only what is to be had among the people at large. I speak of one of the most familiar painfully familiar phenomena to all who are called to instruct young ministers. What a common thing to see a fine young man under this disadvantage! You can see it in his eye that he is a man.

You can see it in his tones that he wants to make the best of himself. You can see how he works; but there are the disadvantages of his comparative lack of training in his boyhood, and how to overcome them is the question. Many men never can fully overcome them, and they are humiliated sometimes because they cannot spell. Only some people can spell the English language, I believe. It is a torture and an outrage upon human nature that ought not to be perpetrated many generations longer, that people should be required to spell the English language as it now stands. I say, then, that if our ministers are to have earlier education boyhood education of a valuable kind, they must obtain it without reference to the ministry, and so there must be facilities for this among the people at large. I wished to explain how it is that ministerial education ranks itself necessarily with the general -education of the people, and the experience of our churches has shown the fact. Almost every institution of learning that our Baptist people in America have founded has been founded with special reference to the ministry of the gospel; but then they have found that they must associate this with the education of others also. One of the wants of to-day is high-schools that shall be preparing our half-grown youths for whatever they are to do in the world, and then as many of them as are afterwards called into the ministry of the gospel will have the benefit of these schools; high-schools whether they are to be supported by the public at large or founded by Christian people, is a question of locality and circumstances high-schools that will forbear to call themselves colleges; that will not attempt to take upon themselves the functions of colleges; that will consent to do the humble, but so needful work of giving really thorough instruction in the elements of knowledge, and if they must add some other things for those pupils who will study there alone and will never go to college, they should still give to these mainly the thorough training in the elements of knowledge; high-schools that will teach

history for I find more fault with my pupils from lack of knowledge of history than almost anything else; for how can a man know anything unless he knows history? high-schools which shall give thorough training in English composition, so that people can speak and write decently their own language; which for those who wish to study the classic languages, shall teach the elements of those languages. President Wayland used to say I am using familiar incidents for my purpose that there must be a mystery about Greek grammar.

“ For,” he said, “ a boy learns Greek grammar at the common school. Then he goes to the academy, and learns Greek grammar; then at college Greek grammar again, and then to the theological seminary, and still he must learn Greek grammar. There must be something very mysterious about Greek grammar.” If there were only high-schools in which the teachers were willing to teach Greek grammar to those who are attempting to learn it, I know a certain class of men who come a little later on in our ordinary processes of education, who would have much occasion to thank the teachers of the high-school.

This, then, is my first point of remark, that ministerial education must go hand in hand with general education; therefore people who are specially interested in the education of the ministry must be equally interested in the education of the people; and our colleges need few things so much to-day as the help of high schools that shall prepare young men to enter college with a due knowledge of the elements of education. My second point is this Ministerial education must not be cannot be the same for all. Let us not go from one extreme to the other. There are differences that are felt, and what are you going to do about them? You have no power to coerce your young men. Some of them don't feel that they need this; how can you make them feel it. There are wide differences in circumstances.

Some men are called into the gospel ministry comparatively late in life, and we must not get away from that good idea of our fathers that this is the right thing. Some of the noblest ministers of the past have entered on the work of preaching when they were of middle age, but not a few of us are getting towards the idea that every minister must go through a certain artificial course of training, fixed exactly, and have even thought that the idea of a man's entering the ministry at middle age must be discarded. Many enter the ministry somewhat late in life, and are so embarrassed by their domestic relations that, for an extended course, they are without the necessary means. Then there are differences in men's natural mental structure which make it unwise that you should carry them all through the same process of education. There are men who would really be hampered by an attempt to make scholars of them. I have known far away from here, of course ministers of the gospel who really were worse for having learned Latin, because they wasted their time in attempts to do that which they never did do successfully, or they were conceited with the notion that they knew something which they really did not know, and there is an old saying, which you must pardon again, that “ there's no fool like a fool that knows Latin.”

So, then, I insist upon it that we Baptist people, in trying to elevate our ministry, must not go from the extreme to which our churches once inclined towards the other extreme. If we do, we shall be false to all our history; we shall be false to what we conceive to be the teaching of the gospel; we shall be recreant to the demands of the approaching future. My brethren, we must not have some artificial notion of education, and allow it to be converted into a mechanical process, which is always the tendency. People talk as if educating a man was just taking him through a certain fixed

machine, all men through the same machine, and coming out at the same point with the same training. That is false to all the prodigious variety in the faculties and tendencies of mankind. We must constantly guard against the tendency to make education, in all its departments and in all our institutions, a mechanical process, instead of a process of growth and the training of a living thing. Every body who knows anything about teaching knows that the main thing in all our early instruction is not knowledge, but discipline, and yet how constantly people are overlooking this! You ask the ordinary average person what children go to school for, and he will tell you that they go there to get a knowledge of certain things. That is not the main thing. The main thing is the discipline of mind, as every body who will think about it must perceive. When a young man goes out, after his course of training in a carpenter's shop do you inquire how many tools he has, or whether he has a lot of lumber ready to make up? You inquire whether he has learned his trade and knows how to handle tools and work the material that he will get as he needs it. The analogy is not perfect, I know, because in the training of the mind that which we use in the training becomes tools and materials for the work of the future, and we have in this to combine the acquisition of materials with the discipline of our faculties and the acquirement of skill. But while we combine them we must beware of confounding them, as men are prone to do.

Come now to my third point Our institutions for ministerial education[^] or, more generally, our institutions of higher education, must be greatly improved without delay. There are no men who feel that so much as the men who have been struggling on amid a thousand difficulties, and have often done very noble work, and brought about, by God's blessing, quite good results, amid all their disadvantages. If you knew, as I could tell it, of the sore struggles through which many of our professors have passed, called to attempt three times as much in teaching as one man can possibly do to his own satisfaction, and yet how, under all these burdens, they have put forth their utmost power and have done good work I think you would find it a theme for pathetic reflection. Our institutions need more instructors, in order that the work may be divided out, in order that each man may have the opportunity to devote himself to certain things and know them thoroughly, and work at them with the intense delight that comes to a man when he feels that he is making progress in the subject he loves. The tendency of our time is to specializing knowledge, as every one knows. I have a friend, a geologist, who gained his professorship in one of our leading American institutions by the fact that he was not only a geologist, but had confined himself to the department of geology which pertains to fossils and, among fossils, to fossil botany. And so by working at fossil botany he has gained a name in Germany and a noble place at home. This illustrates the tendency of all knowledge now. Men have to work more and more within narrow limits, if they are to make progress in these times or even to keep up with the progress that others are making; and so, in order that our professors may become "specialists" in our colleges the only thing that can be satisfactory we must have more professors. This is a crying need of the present time. And they must have more time in order to be better prepared. If you expect your professor in a college to meet classes three or four hours a day like a school-master, how can he lecture? How can he come with his mind all full of one theme, and all the reserved nerve force of his body and energy of his soul gathered up and concentrated upon one burning hour, in which he will carry home his subject to the hearts of those who hear him, and kindle in them that glowing enthusiasm which is the joy of a young man, and will be the inspiration of his life? Your hard-worked professor may kill himself in the effort to do that, but he cannot do justice to himself nor to his pupils nor to his Master nor to you. And we must have professors who are better paid, so that they shall have

the means of commanding comforts? without intense solicitude about it; so that they shall be able to live fitly in the better society of their community without finding it a burden; so that they may give their undivided energies to their duties.

Well, you see the absolute necessity that follows. Our institutions must be better endowed. They must be far more largely endowed. We must get hold of many of these people of ours who mean right, but who are not informed in this respect, and we must widen out their minds like the broad Mississippi Valley, to see the greatness of education, that they may give largely. Some of our brethren think that they have large notions already of what institutions of learning ought to be, but they have only begun to see, and it is our duty to hold up a high standard, and spread out a broad view of what these institutions must be made. The endowment of institutions of learning is a thing needed for the sake of the poor. There are many who fancy that somehow these colleges and universities are gotten up for the benefit of the rich; but it is not so. They are for the benefit of the poor, and I speak for the poor. As for the rich, they do not need any word from me. Here, for instance, is a man who wants education, and firstclass education. He must go to a great city to find that, if there are no endowed institutions. He could find that nowhere but in a large city. If the professors are to be supported by the tuition, that tuition must be very high, and if the student is to have three or four teachers of eminent talents, he will have to pay three or four hundred dollars in tuition. The son of a rich man can do that, but what is to become of the son of a poor man? The institutions of learning come in to open their halls free of rent. The chief support of those professors will be from the endowment, and the man who is comparatively poor can thus obtain the benefit of contact with master minds, and instruction from men of high talents, which would otherwise be for him absolutely impossible.

It is for the poor, I say, that our institutions are endowed. When you go to a rich man say, " Do your duty as one whom God has blessed with riches, and endow an institution for the sake of the poor all around you," and you may add, " Maybe your own son, that goes there from the home of his wealth and with all the benefits around him of ample means, will learn to study from some of those poor young fellows, his associates, who make him work by showing him what it is for a man to work." Last February I was a great deal in contact for some weeks with eminent men of business, and there came to me this thought about our institutions of learning, which you may have for what it is worth. When we go to a man of means and ask him to give largely for the endowment of an institution of learning, we are not begging. I protest I am no beggar. When I go to a rich man and say, " Come help us, won't you, in this enterprise," I present to him a joint-stock concern, a very popular idea now-a-days, an investment which will yield him large dividends, and which will last a long time. I say, "Here are our men who have given their whole lives to the work of instruction. They have toiled early and late through long years to qualify themselves for teaching certain things, and they are willing to put their lives into this not simply a little of what they are, but all of what they are they will put into it, and the very fortunes of their families. Now, if you will put some money into it, then you and they will be in a joint-stock company, and you will be doing together what you cannot do without them, and what they cannot do without you, but together you will be doing a work that will bless humanity. They are no more dependent on you than you are on them, but you will be brothers united in a common work and receiving results in common." I think that is the right view of the matter, and that there are great-hearted men of wealth who would rejoice in the idea that they were investing in that which would yield large dividends to them and the world

and which would last through long ages. For there are no investments in the civilized world so permanent as investments in institutions of education and religion. The old universities of Italy and of France and of England have lived eight or nine centuries have lived through all changes, through all revolutions of governments, through all upheavals of society, and there they are to-day. No revolutionist has ever dared to attack them. No new government has ever done aught but wish them well and perchance help them on. A man who wants to put money which God has enabled him to gather where it will last when he is gone, doing the work that he has chosen for it in the long centuries to come, must choose a mode of investment in some institution of education or religion; and if it be combined, an institution of education and of religion, of course all the better.

Now, my brethren ministers and laymen, men and women we must take hold of such thoughts as these, which would come to any of us upon reflection, and go among our people and stir their souls with the thought of the opportunity there is for them, the many to give a little, but especially the few to give much, for it is only from the large gifts of the few that institutions of education have received ample endowment; to stir their souls to see what God gives them opportunity to do, and what God's high providence sends down, like the sunbeams out of heaven, for a direction to them. Not all rich people are selfish or mean; not many rich people are narrow-minded or ignorant; but they are busy busy with their own affairs, burdened with their own great burdens and somebody must go and tell them of these openings for investing money, better than they can invest it anywhere else in all this world, for the highest good of man and for the highest glory of Christ.

S. Necessity of the Atonement

Necessity of the Atonement

John A. Broadus The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth from all sin. 1 John 1:7 My hearers, what is the most wonderful event that ever occurred on earth, that ever happened in the universe? The history of our race is so full of wonderful events-you might well pause for your answer. My answer would be this: by far the most wonderful thing that has ever happened in the universe, is the atoning death of Jesus Christ the Lord. If without philosophizing, if in simplicity you will take what God's Word declares concerning it, you will not only see this to be so, perhaps you will feel it to be so. If you will remember who he was-the thought would startle us if we were not so used to it-if you will remember how he died, how the Lord of life and glory, the sinless one, how he died in suffering and shame, and above all if you will remember what he died for, what his death is declared in the Scriptures to mean for the universe and for us, then you will believe that this is the great wonder of all wonders. And yet, God be thanked, it may be the simplest matter of each individual human heart's everyday experience to rest upon that wonderful thought. There are many things we can never comprehend as to their nature, which are yet unquestionable as facts and essential to our existence. To declare before heaven and earth that all our hopes are turned upon the atoning death of Jesus Christ, a man may do that, may live on that atoning death, although it be a mystery he cannot solve.

I wish to speak today of the atonement of Jesus Christ. But that is a large theme. I wish to speak of one particular aspect of it, of the necessity of an atonement by the propitiatory death of Jesus Christ. Though the theme looks abstract at the outset, and may be uninviting, I pray your diligent heed, for we are dealing with the substance of the gospel. The thought of our age turns itself against this necessity of the atonement to a great extent. Many of the tendencies of our time incline men to question whether there is any virtue in sacrificial atonement for sin, and there is nothing more common than to hear superficial people, even good people, saying that they do not see how God the Heavenly Father of men should not forgive us, just as we earthly fathers forgive our children, without requiring some great provision as the basis of this forgiveness. After all, we can learn on such a subject as this only from the Bible. Men in all ages have for the most part recognized the necessity of an atonement. They have shown their recognition of it in very distorted forms, often they have had grossly erroneous conceptions of deity and of their relations to deity. Their ideas of sacrifice and propitiation have been sadly erroneous, grotesque sometimes, often horrible, always degrading. But these are but distortions of a true and right sentiment, of which the human soul is conscious. And then God's Word comes to confirm this instinctive persuasion that there is need of an atonement. The idea of propitiation and of sacrifice which all nations have had finds its counterpart in the divine Word. In the Jewish purifications and the Jewish sacrifices there was not really made an atonement for sin, but they signified an atonement for sin which did not then exist, they pointed forward to an atonement for sin in the future which God Was to accomplish. And now for us that something future has come and the true atonement which all these things prefigured has been fully explained in the complete Word of God. In the light of the

New Testament facts and under the guidance of New Testament ideas the necessity of an atonement may be practically clear to our minds. Two chief points are to be distinguished, the priest and the sacrifice.

1. First, the priest. According to the Old Testament conception of propitiation, certain men were separated from their fellow men and made mediators between men and God. Now the New Testament counterpart of that idea of propitiation gives us two senses in which the word "priest" may be considered. In one sense there is but one priest, Jesus Christ; in another sense all Christian people are priests, and all equally. In one sense, I say, the New Testament counterpart is that the only priest is Jesus Christ. So we have for the New Testament economy the atoning and interceding word of Jesus Christ. "Seeing then that we have a great High Priest, that is passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession." As the Jewish high priest went through the veil into the most holy place and offered sacrifice, so our High Priest has passed through the heavens into the true sanctuary of that eternal world. His sacrifice is not the blood of bulls and of goats which could never take away sin, which could only symbolize and represent the idea of atonement, his sacrifice is his own blood; himself the High Priest and himself the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. Not only has he begun this work for the atoning of men, but he lives ever the same High Priest, not dying like the Jewish priest and turning over his work to others but by his continual intercession "he is able to save to the utmost them that come to God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." In that sense the whole conception of a propitiation centers upon the propitiation of the Lord Jesus Christ, there is no other priest. No one must come between that priest and our souls. Will you pardon me an incident that at this moment comes back to my mind. Some years ago, as I was starting to come to New York, a gentleman came up and said, "I want to introduce you to two young ladies. I want to put them under your charge." He explained that some very kind persons in Baltimore were providing for the education of the girls whose families were refined but were now without means. So I brought them along in my care. I knew where they were going-they were going to a convent school. Before parting from them I thought it right to say this much at least-one was an Episcopalian and the other a Presbyterian-I said, "Now whatever ideas you may get in going away, try to cling to the thought that nobody shall come between you and Jesus Christ; you do not need anybody between you and him, try to cling to the idea that you will not have anyone between you and him." One of them said, "Of course not, because that would be a Roman Catholic notion, wouldn't it?" Alas! one of them is a Roman Catholic today and the other was carried home, I understood, to prevent it. I have no word of bitterness for the persons who believe and honestly teach those things, but it seems to me that their teachings strike at the heart of the gospel, and that I must say without reserve there is but one priest, Jesus Christ himself, and nobody has any business to come between my soul and him. In another sense you are all priests, all alike. Alas! for the fact that so many of those whom we call Protestants have revived the Old Testament idea of human priests, set apart from their fellow men, and even call the New Testament minister a priest. The idea to which the human heart is so inclined is that the propitiation of Jesus Christ is not enough for us poor souls, and we must have some fellow man to be a mediator between us and God, to make expiation for our sins. I am glad to get anybody to pray for me, but I want no prayers of a so-called priest more than of any other man. No official station according to the New Testament idea gives a man's prayers more efficacy than they would have without the official station. A man's piety is more effective than his position. How ready people are to think that the

minister's prayers, even where they don't call him priest, have a peculiar efficacy. According to the New Testament conception there is in one sense, then, but one high priest and we need no other, and in another sense we are all alike high priests to offer up spiritual sacrifices for ourselves and one another.

2. Turn now to the other conception, the conception of sacrifice; what does that mean in the light of the New Testament? It may be regarded in various ways.

(a) The sacrificial death of the Redeemer is in one sense a ransom for sinful man, a redemption, a purchase of his salvation. It is the idea of buying and selling, but especially the idea of ransoming from captivity. "Jesus paid it all," the little child of today gets hold of the thought Jesus paid it all, All the debt I owe.

Jesus died and paid it all, Yes, all the debt I owe. This is a very familiar thought to human experience, and it often comes home to us in simple forms. I am in debt, and all the debt I owe, Jesus paid it. I am a captive, I am a bondman, Jesus died to ransom me. You must not press the idea too far or you will be misled. But within limits it is just and instructive. We are bound captives, and Jesus is our ransom. He purchased our salvation.

(b) Again, the atoning death of Jesus Christ propitiates God. It makes God favorably inclined toward us. It makes God propitious toward those with whom for their sins he must otherwise be angry. It is a very common notion today that anger is wrong: that it is out of the question to speak of God as really feeling anger, and that must be in Scripture a mere figure of speech. But my friends, anger is right sometimes, anger is sometimes necessary. I would not give much for a man who is not sometimes thoroughly angry. A man that knows not how to burn with moral indignation at the wickedness he sees around him and the wrongdoing, there is something wrong in him. Anger is compatible with love. Parents are often angry with their children and yet love them all the time. We find that the apostle knew that it was possible to be angry, and sin not. Anger, I say, is compatible with love. It is altogether a mistake to suppose that anger is always wrong. It is a mistake to think you should not punish a child when you are angry. What was anger given you for but to stimulate you to punish when you should? Because anger is often carried to excess it does not follow that it is all wrong, but it follows that you must control it. The whole thing is illustrated by the example of our Saviour, who was one day surrounded by a crowd of the unsympathizing and unbelieving, and it is said that he "looked around upon them with anger, being grieved at the hardness of their hearts." That is it, anger and yet grief: grieved and at the same time angry. That is what we need to be: angry and still loving. Anything less than that is a one-sided notion of truth and duty. And that being so, why should men shrink from the thought that God is angry with sin; that he hates sin; that it excites indignation in him, and that something was necessary in order to make God favorable toward sinful beings. Here again we must not press it too far: and we must not press anything too far when dealing with images. It is a gross caricature to say that God the holy Father hates his children and will not be gracious to them until the Redeemer propitiates him into doing what he does not wish to do. The Scriptures tell us he was sent to be the propitiation for our sins because God loved us. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be a propitiation for our sins. Yet it is true at the same time that the propitiation was needed because he hated our sins and was angry with them.

(c) Once again, this atoning death of Christ is set before us as necessary to vindicate the right. The most majestic and dignified conception that enters your soul is the conception of moral obligation. There is the word "ought"- "I ought to do this, and ought not to do that." If a man's soul in its deepest fibers responds thrillingly to that sentiment, he has got something in him. The right ought to prevail. Alas! how often, how sadly, how wretchedly, it is otherwise. Our observation of life often leads us to see how wrong goes up and right goes down and we think there ought to be a compensation somehow for such a state of things, under the government of the supreme sovereign, the high and holy God. If our moral nature requires this and cannot be satisfied without some such idea, so does the law of God require it. What propriety is there in having a law if there is to be no punishment for those who violate it? Without some such idea as this the moral government of God would lose its stability. So too there must be something to make it right that God should forgive sin and save the sinner, so that he "may be just," as the Scriptures say he is, "and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus."

I do not undertake to explain it all; it is a problem that deals with the relations of the finite and the infinite, the relations between sin and holiness, between time and eternity, and if a man thinks he is going to explain and comprehend it in all its relations, of course he deludes himself. If a man is slow to accept it as a fact, until he has it all explained to him he may never accept it. You cannot explain the great fundamental facts of existence, and it is so here. But while not attempting to explain the atonement, we can see how it acts, as a redemption of sin-ruined man, as a propitiation of the holy and sin-hating God, as a vindication of the right. And thus seeing, we rest with satisfaction upon the great fact of the atonement, as revealed in the Scriptures.

There are two great reasons why men do not see the necessity of the atonement; these are inadequate views of sin and inadequate views of God. Let me speak of these. It is a terrible thing for a man to become so familiar with the idea of sin that he says glibly, "I am a sinner," and does not think what it means. It is yet more terrible when he deludes himself into denying the fact. I remember asking a young man who came to see me some years ago if he was a Christian. He answered, "I hardly suppose you would think me one." I said, "If you are not a Christian, you know you are a sinner." "Well," he said, "that depends." Poor sophisticated fellow! When people don't much believe that they are sinners, then it is utterly useless to talk to them about atonement. They see no necessity for it, of course not, if they feel that they personally have no need. Alas! how natural it is for us to have inadequate views of sin. We are so accustomed to it in ourselves and in life all around us. A man says, "Yes, I am a sinner, of course I am, all men are sinners," and that thought that all men are sinners breaks the force of self-condemnations of conscience, and the custom of prevailing immorality weakens our perception of the evil of sin. It is very hard at all times, and especially in an age so inclined to materialism, to have adequate views of sin. It is only in proportion as we realize the evil of sin that we see the necessity of atonement, and on the other hand a hearty recognition of the atonement gives us more adequate views of sin. The other great reason why men fail to see the need of atonement is that they have inadequate views of God. I am weary of this everlasting talk about God as simply merciful and loving. Weary because that is only one side of the truth. God is not only merciful and loving, God is just. God is holy, and it is quite as needful to appreciate his holiness and his justice as it is to appreciate his love and mercy. My friends, we live in times when a dreamy humanitarianism prevails, when false notions of clemency are perverting the lives of very many well-meaning men. There are people who shrink from the

notion of capital punishment, who believe it is wrong to inflict capital punishment for anything. A French writer has well said, "I should be pleased to see capital punishment discontinued, and the sacredness of human life respected, if the murderers will make the beginning." A sentimental pity for criminals may be a very hurtful thing. So likewise we are often told now that children must never be punished in school, and scarcely ever punished by their parents at home. What is to become of us if we give way to these milk-and-water notions, and lose sight of holiness, justice, and right? But as I have already said, I do not attempt to explain the nature of the atonement. I only wanted to remind you of some of the reasons why, according to the Scriptures, it is necessary that there should be an atonement. If a man says to me, "Do you understand the exact nature of the atoning work of Christ so that you can give me the philosophy of it?" I answer, "No, of course not, but if God is satisfied with the provision he has made, if it is his own provision, and if he proclaims it as sufficient, that is enough for me, and why should not that be enough for you? God says to you and to me, 'The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.'"

I remember reading a few years ago the story of a party of Hindus, who were traveling along one day, and one of them was stricken down and fell by the way. The other natives looking carelessly at him went along in their selfish fashion, but a missionary stopped by the poor man and kneeling by him said, "What is your hope for eternity? Have you any hope for eternity?" And feebly, with dying breath, the dusky native gasped, "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin. 'Where did you learn that?' the missionary asked. But he could tell no more and died. In the bosom of his garment the missionary found one leaf out of the New Testament in the man's own language, and there were the words that had struck into the soul of the man, the words that had helped him, living and dying-the words of our text today. "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

Ah! my friends, amid all the blessings of this great country, the light of science and the light of literature, amid all the nobleness and real sweetness of what we call culture, amid all the blessedness of Christian homes and Christian society, there is no higher thought for you and me than that uttered to the missionary as he knelt by the poor Hindu's side. Let us take those words as ours for life, and for death, and for-ever: "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

S. On Reading the Bible by Books

On Reading the Bible by Books THE main support of all individual Christian life, the main-spring of all high Christian work, must be the truth of God. Truth is the life-blood of piety. Truth is always more potent and more precious when we draw it ourselves out of the Bible. I rode out yesterday afternoon with a kind friend among the glories of the famous avenue of Cleveland, and then away into the beautiful country region which they hope is to be Cleveland Park some day, until we passed presently a little fountain where the water, coming fresh and sweet and bright, was bursting from the hillside. The water we drink in the houses here from the lake is delightful, but there it was a fountain. There is nothing like drinking water out of a fountain. And I remembered what my Lord Bacon has said: " Truth from any other source is like water from a cistern; but truth drawn out of the Bible is like drinking water from a fountain, immediately where it springeth." Ah, this Christian work we have to-day in the world will be wise and strong and mighty just in proportion, other things being equal, as it is directed and controlled and inspired by what we draw ourselves out of the Word of God! I have come to speak to people who want to study the Bible, who do study the Bible, who love the Bible, and would fain love it more and know it better. I am not to speak to Biblical scholars, though such are present, no doubt; I am not to speak to persons of great leisure, who can spend hours every day over their Bible; but to busy workers, most of them busy with the ordinary pursuits of human life, in their homes or places of business, and all of them busy, I have no doubt, in the varied work of Christian people in the world, and they wish to know how busy people, often interrupted in their daily reading of the Bible, and often limited for time, can make the most of this daily reading. Therefore, they will be willing, perhaps, to listen.

I am to undertake, by request, to set forth one of the many ways of reading the Bible, which I think may have special advantages, which is often too much neglected, and which may contribute to give us intellectual interest in the Bible, and to make its study spiritually profitable. I want your kind aid in doing this, my friends. I am going to speak of an intensely practical matter in as thoroughly practical a manner as I know how, and when I am done, I shall be exceedingly glad if one and another of you will ask me questions about the subject, or about anything that has been said. The Bible is one book; but the Bible is many books.

It is an interesting subject of reflection to look back upon the process by which men ceased calling it books and began to think of it as a book. You know that the Greek name for Bible, Ta Hagia Biblia, means the sacred books; and when they borrowed the Greek term into the Latin Biblia Sacra, it was still plural the Sacred Books. How has that Biblia come to be a singular word in our language? When the various writings of inspired men had all been completed and began to be thought of as one collection, complete in itself, and when men began to know that singular and beautiful harmony which pervades so wonderfully all this great collection of books, written by so many men, through so many long centuries, perceiving that it was not only a complete collection of books, but that they were all in perfect harmony with each other, then the idea grew upon the Christian mind that this was really one book. A very noble thought that is, to be cherished and made plain to each successive generation the internal harmony of all these various writings of

inspired men. But then we must not forget that, after all, it is many books. They were written separately; they were most of them published separately; they were originally read separately from each other; they had a separate character, a substantially separate meaning and value, a practical influence over those who read them, and they ought to behead as separate books.

Then each one of them must be read as a whole if we would understand them well. You cannot understand any book if you read it only by fragments I mean the first time you read it. A cultivated gentleman of this city remarked at dinner to-day that he was reading for the third time that beautiful book of piety, "The Memorials of a Quiet Life," reading it for the third time, fifteen minutes of every day, he said. That is very well when he is reading it for the third time; but if he had read it fifteen minutes of every day the first time, he could not have entered so fully into the meaning of the book. The celebrated John Locke has a saying on this subject in the preface to his commentary on the Epistles of Paul. He said he had found from his experience that in order to understand one of the Epistles of Paul, it will not do to take it in fragments. Why, suppose (the philosopher goes on) that a man has received a letter from an absent friend, whom he loves very much a letter full of valuable instruction to him, and that he reads a page to-day and then lays it down; the next day he, takes another page and begins at the beginning of the second page, and does not notice much what was at the end of the first page; the third day he begins at the top of the third page and reads that. How much will he know about the letter when he is done. He tells you, perhaps, "I have been reading a letter from So-and-so a letter full of valuable instruction," and you ask him what it is about; he does not quite know what it is about, and no wonder, with such a process of reading.

You must take the Epistles, says Locke, as you would take any other letter. You must take them each as a whole, and sit down and read each from beginning to end, and see what it is about. And then, if it is very valuable, you will take it afterwards in parts, not necessarily in pages, but in parts according to the subject of which it treats, and you will see what it says about this subject, and what it says about that subject, etc. That seems to be very plain common sense, and yet what a pity that the idea has not struck more widely into the minds of the Christian world! Will you pardon a little personal reminiscence? I think that those who grow old ought to take occasion to bear their humble personal testimony to the way in which good is sometimes done for and through young men. It is a long time ago now I am almost afraid to tell you how long ago that I was a college student at the University of Virginia. One day, coming home from a lecture, Dr. McGuffey, Professor of Moral Philosophy, speaking to a student who was contemplating the ministry, said, "I want you to get Home's Introduction, and hunt up a paragraph quoted there from John Locke about the importance of reading the Bible, a book at a time, taking each book as a whole. Now, be sure to get it, and read it." The young man got it, and read it, and the thought went into his heart of reading the Bible in that way, and took hold upon him; and in order to show the impression that was made, he must mention as result that a few years later, by a series of Sunday night sermons on the life and writings of the Apostle Paul, before Conybeare and Howson were heard of in the world, treating each epistle as a whole, in the place where it occurred in the history, he crowded the aisles and crowded the doors of the church and built a new church; and a few years later still, another result was that the young man was drawn very reluctantly from the pastoral work he loved, and will always love better than anything else in this world, to be a teacher of others in this same work; and the man cannot tell to-day, as he looks back, how much of the direction his life has taken is due to the recommendation the professor gave to his student, as they walked home from

the lecture.

Oh, ye people that have to do with the world's young men, you never know what some little word you speak is going to do in shaping the whole character and controlling the whole life of the man who walks by your side! But I wish not to argue this matter, but to offer some practical illustrations of it. Let us just take up together, now, some books of the Bible, and by your very kind permission, I will address myself to the average reader, the person of average intelligence.

Take the First Book of Samuel. You want to read that book through at a sitting. How long will it take you? Forty-five or fifty minutes. Read it as you would read a Sunday-school book that one of your children brought home from Sunday-school, right straight through before you rise. Say to yourself, "What is this book about?" You find it is about Samuel, and presently it passes on to tell about Saul. Samuel continues to be his contemporary. After awhile young David comes into the history, and it goes on so till Samuel passes away and you reach the death of Saul with the end of the book. So that book has treated about Samuel, Saul and David, and you have got some idea of the general history of each of these persons, up to the death of Saul, and the time when you know that David succeeded him. Then you go to reading it again, the next day we will suppose, for you are a busy person. You take the book the next day, begin at the beginning and say, "Well now, the first part of this book is about Samuel. Let me look over it here, and see into what portions of Samuel's life it divides itself." You see pretty soon that you have first an account of Samuel's birth and childhood; secondly, you have an account of Samuel's active life as ruler of Israel; and then, thirdly, you have an account of Samuel's old age, when he had anointed Saul as King of Israel, and lived on as Saul's prophet, and finally came in contact with the youth of David. Those are the three periods of Samuel's history presented his youth, his active life as ruler, and his old age as a prophet. You take up the account of his youth, and you purpose to read as much as you can of that for this first reading. Now the best way would be to read the book three times, if you are patient enough. I know this is a terribly impatient age, and I am afraid you will not do that. I am afraid you will wish to make only two readings of the book, and we will suppose that you adopt that course, although the other is better. While you are reading this life of Samuel, then, in its several portions, you will be studying Samuel's character as a prophet, a ruler and a good man. You will be paying some attention to Samuel's mission and office in the unfolding of the history of the people of Israel; for he occupies a very unique and interesting position. You will at the same time be attending, paragraph by paragraph, without bothering yourself much about chapters, to the practical lessons which are presented to you.

"What is there here for me to imitate? What is there here for me to learn? What is there in this trait of Samuel's character, what in this experience of Samuel's life, that I ought especially to lay to heart?" You are now getting the lessons out of one portion of the life, but with a reference to the other portion, taking it all as a whole. When you have completed the life of Samuel in that way, you pass to the life of Saul. You find you have Saul's early years and Saul's later history as a division into two parts. Perhaps you mark down on a bit of paper with a pencil, or you mark down on the fly-leaf of your Bible itself, the divisions in this way. Then you take one after another and study them. And so with the history of David as it comes in; the struggles of David's early years; then passing as you would have to do into the other book, Second Samuel, the history of David's prosperity in middle life, and finally, the history of his sore adversities in his later years. You will thus see how the struggles of his early years prepared him for his day of prosperity, and how the

sins of his day of prosperity brought on his adversity and bitter sorrow, and you begin to take David's life as a whole, and see the connection of the different parts of it see how the different traits of character, good and evil, come out one after another, and apply each, one after the other, to yourself. Now, I suppose that this would be a much wiser way of reading the First Book of Samuel, than just to read one or two chapters to-day, and the next day begin to read at the next chapter, and not stop to see what there is in the former, which is the way (present company, of course, excepted!) a great many people read their Bible. But let us turn to another kind of book. Take one of the Epistles of Paul. You will find that the books of the Bible must be treated, for our purpose, in a great variety of ways, according to their peculiar character.

Take, now, the First Epistle to the Corinthians. We will suppose that you sit down and read it straight through, and just let the chapters go. What are the chapters, and who was the chapter-maker? Not the inspired writer, as everybody knows. Chapters and verses are convenient enough, provided we use them as servants and do not allow them to be masters. You read it straight through and see what it is all about, and you will find as you read that Epistle that it treats of a number of entirely distinct subjects. They have nothing to do with each other so far as you can see. You take your pencil and mark them down as you go along. You find there are four chapters for the chapter-maker made but one grave mistake in that epistle, which is saying a good deal to his credit, more than can be said in other places there are four chapters which treat of the divisions among the Corinthians, and the fact that they made these divisions with reference to the several preachers. This leads Paul to speak of his own way of preaching.

He would not accommodate himself to their notions of preaching, a lesson which preachers sometimes have to remember in this cranky world. Then you find two chapters in which he speaks of special evils that existed among them evils of licentiousness, and evils of getting their personal difficulties settled by heathen judges, instead of getting them settled by their own brethren for the honor of Christianity. He said, in the first place, that they ought not to have personal difficulties to settle, and, in the next place, if they had them, they ought to get them settled by their own brethren and not go to the heathen for it.

Then you find 1 Corinthians 7:1-40 treats of questions pertaining to marriage, about which they had written inquiring of the apostle. Then you go on and you will see that 1 Corinthians 8:1-13, 1 Corinthians 9:1-27 and 1 Corinthians 10:1-33 talk about the question of eating meat which had been offered to idols. That was a grave practical question among them, far graver than many questions that we dispute about now-a-days, though to us it is dead and gone, just as many of our questions of dispute will be dead and gone in the coming centuries, and men will wonder what in the world made those good people of the nineteenth century spend so much time over matters that will seem to them of no consequence whatever. Those three chapters treat of the eating of meat offered to idols, and in connection with that the apostle indicates the right course by the course that he pursued. By the way, let me mention what his argument is there. It is familiar to most of you. He says: "Now grant that this meat offered to idols is not different from any other meat. The idols are nothing, and the meat is just the same as it was before it was laid on the altar. Yet if your weak brother cannot get over the old idolatrous associations, cannot eat it without a revival of the old reverence for the idol, and without its carrying him back to sin, oh! had you not better let it alone, even if it is innocent for you, for the sake of your brother?" And I think sometimes, Oh! that we could content ourselves with that principle in regard to some practical questions of to-day that

argument which our fathers employed about the use of intoxicating drinks, for instance; grant that it may be innocent for you, yet if it leads your brother into sin, cannot you let it alone for your brother's sake? "Then besides," the apostle says, "you had better not be too sure that this thing is innocent for you, for, before you know it, it may get you into trouble too." That is what I should call "A calm view of Temperance." But this by the way.

Then, to proceed with the Epistle, you find that 1 Corinthians 11:1-34; 1 Corinthians 12:1-31; 1 Corinthians 13:1-13; 1 Corinthians 14:1-40 treat of abuses that had arisen at Corinth in connection with their public worship. A variety of abuses are mentioned. Most of them refer to the disorderly conduct of their public worship, when ever so many of them would want to speak at once, and they would not sit down as gracefully as I saw gentlemen do this afternoon in the social meeting. They would go on talking together, and were not willing to give up to each other. Some of them were proud that they had special gifts, and others jealous because they did not have the like, and the apostle tells them that all this must be managed in decency and in order, and that Christian love is a far brighter, sweeter, nobler thing than all the special gifts. Just here please let the chapters alone, for what you call 1 Corinthians 13:1-13 comes right in as a part of his teaching about this matter of the displaying of gifts, the ambition, the jealousy, etc, and you have no business reading the first portion of that chapter without noticing how it links on with what precedes at the end of 1 Corinthians 12:1-31, and without noticing how the end of it is connected with the chapter that follows. It blazes like a diamond on the bosom of Scripture, but then it fastens Scripture together.

1 Corinthians 15:1-58 treats of the Resurrection, and the sixteenth contains some practical information, etc.

Now you have half a dozen entirely distinct subjects here. You have observed that, and you have marked it down. Then you take the subjects up one at a time, and study them.

You will find some other epistles in which you cannot make that sort of absolute division this topic, and then another topic, and then a third topic but the writer goes from one thing to another, and then perhaps comes back to the first subject. Still, in a good many of those cases, you can find that there is some one thought that is the keynote to the whole. Take the Epistle to the Philippians, for example. It is quite short; you can read it all through in less than half an hour. You ask yourself, What is this all about? What is the main idea here? for you perceive that you have not here several topics, as in First Corinthians. The main idea, however, is Christian joy.

"Rejoice in the Lord." Wonderful idea, when you remember that the man who wrote the letter to the Philippians was a prisoner chained, his life subject to the caprice of the most terrific tyrant the world has ever seen. And he was writing to a church poor and persecuted, which had sore trials awaiting it in the future.

Yet, in the midst of all this, Paul writes to his persecuted brethren, and the key-note of what he says is, "Rejoice in the Lord." It is true that, in the middle of the Epistle, he apologizes for saying it so often. He says, "To write the same things to you, to me indeed is not grievous." He thought it might be grievous to them.

Before he gets through with it he says it two or three times more, and at the end he breaks forth, "Rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say, Rejoice!" Our beloved brother Paul, inspired by the Holy Spirit of God, was yet a man of like passions with ourselves, and as our Saviour himself

showed humanness none the less genuine because so blended with the Divine nature, in the unity of his one person, and that humanness of his sweetly draws us toward the Divine; so it is with the humanness of the sacred writings too, and we may feel the touch of human thinking, and the glow of human feeling, and not lose at all our reverence for the divinity that is in it all.

What is the key-note of the Epistle to the Ephesians?

It is the unity of Christians. The dispute of many years whether the Gentiles should become Jews is not ended, but the apostle urges that the Christians are one, Jew or Gentile. That was the widest idea that ever existed among Christians in this world. None of our divisions of sect, of country or of race is half so hard to overcome as was that question of the junction of Jewish Christian and Gentile Christian, and the apostle's great thought in that Epistle is that all are one in Christ Jesus. The Epistle was intended apparently to be sent around as a sort of circular letter to many churches, but that is the key-note. I do not say that everything in Ephesians is about unity directly and immediately, and if you get hold of that idea, the danger is that you will carry it too far, and will find it in many places where it is not. At least, if you do not, brethren of the laity, you will be wiser than brethren of the ministry often are. But you will find another kind of books. We are supposing you are examining for yourself. Of course, it will be very convenient if you get some of the works which give analyses of the books of the Bible, and tell the topics they treat of. That is helpful, especially helpful in enabling one at the outset to see how to take hold of the matter. But, oh, it is so much better to have a little rude analysis you have made yourself; because that treats of the thing the way it looks to your mind, and you are able with that, though it may not be half so good as one you may find in the work of another, to get more of the sacred thought which this book suggests to your own mind. In many of these sacred books you cannot find one key-note, nor a division into separate topics, but you will find some subject that pervades the whole and gives unity to it in some other way.

Let us take the great Epistle to the Romans. Some people think the Epistle to the Romans is tremendously hard to understand. I remember a time when I found it right hard to believe. I used to say that certain portions of it were the most difficult writing I knew of in any language that is the way young fellows talk, you know, and sometimes old fellows have not gotten over it. I used to say that certain portions of it were surpassingly obscure. And why? It seems to me now and I mention it because the thought may be worth considering that there never would have been any great difficulty in seeing what the apostle meant to say, if I had only been willing to let him alone and let him say what he wanted to say. But I had my own notions as to what ought to be said on that subject, and what ought not to be said, and you see the plainer he was in saying what he wanted and what I did not want, the harder I found it to make him mean something else.

You find at once, as you read this Epistle rapidly through, that it breaks into two parts. Eleven chapters contain doctrinal arguments and instruction and then five chapters treat of practical matters only slightly connected with the doctrinal matters. The first eleven doctrinal chapters treat of justification by faith, and the first three of them give the whole substance of this doctrine.

They show that the Gospel reveals the righteousness of God, which is by faith, and then they show why men need justification by faith because they cannot find justification in any other way their works will condemn them, and if they find it at all, it must be by faith. This takes up Romans 1:1-32 and Romans 2:1-29 and a part of Romans 3:1-31, and then the remainder of Romans

3:1-31 tells about this provision which God has made for justification by faith, and how beautifully this provision works to take all the pride out of repentant souls and humble them into receiving the great salvation that God gives. Romans 4:1-25 and Romans 5:1-21 only give further illustration of justification by faith. They say that Abraham himself was really justified by faith (one whole chapter is given to this), and that this matter of our being justified through the effect of Christ's work of salvation is only paralleled by the effect of Adam's sin upon his posterity. This takes a great part of the fifth chapter. These are mere illustrations, you see, from the case of Abraham and from the effect of Adam's sin illustrations of the idea of our being justified through faith in the Saviour. Then you come to Romans 6:1-23, Romans 7:1-25 and Romans 8:1-39. You find that they treat of justification by faith from another point of view, viz.: In its bearings on the work of making men holy, i. e., of sanctification. Then the next three chapters are on the privileges of the Jews and Gentiles. So you see that the Epistle divides into different departments of the one topic, and after you have read it through several times, and tried to find out the line of thought in it, and been willing to let the apostle mean what he wants to mean, whether you like it or not, I think you will find that the subjects considered are not so very difficult. Of course, there are questions we can ask about them at once that nobody can answer, but we must content ourselves with what is taught us.

Take another kind of book: The Epistle to the Hebrews. There you find there is a line of argument, and one set of practical applications that runs through the whole letter, so that there are not half a dozen sentences in the Epistle which you can properly understand without reference to the entire thought of it as a whole. You must have that before your mind all the time. Now what is the practical object of this Epistle? Well, after trying persecution upon the Hebrew Christians, they tried argument, and persuasion; they used cunningly devised reasoning against Christianity. You can see it yourself, if you look at the Epistle and think about it. They said, We used to think that your Christianity was only one form of Judaism; but since you seem to have got the idea of cutting loose from Judaism and setting up your Christianity as a religion by itself, why, don't you see that it is no religion, that it is entirely inferior to the religion of our fathers? You had better give it up, and come back and be Jews and nothing but Jews. The religion of our fathers was given through the holy angels at Mount Sinai. Are you going to turn away from it? The religion of our fathers was given through the great and revered Moses. Are you going to abandon Moses? The religion of our fathers is a religion, with its magnificent temple, its smoking altars, its sacrifices, its incense, its robed priesthood, its splendid ritual. The religion of our fathers is a religion indeed! And what is your Christianity, if it is to set up for itself? Hadn't you better abandon Christianity? And the sacred writer replies, Nay! I will take their own arguments, and turn them all against them. He says, " The religion of our fathers was given through the angels at Mount Sinai, but Christianity was given through the Son of God, and as the Son of God is revealed in the Old Testament to be incomparably superior to the angels, so is Christianity superior to Judaism. The religion of our fathers was given through the great and revered Moses, but Moses was only, as it is said in Deuteronomy, a faithful servant in all the house, and the founder of Christianity is above him as the son of the household is above the servant. The religion of our fathers has its outward forms of worship, but they are only the pictures of the realities in the glorious world beyond those clouds through which our great High Priest passed, like the Jewish high priest through the veil of the temple, where lies the true Holy of Holies in the other world. And thither he has gone, bearing not the blood of bulls and goats, but his own precious blood, offered not every year, but once for all,

and all sufficient, and there he stands, not for a little time while they wait without till he appears again, but there he ever liveth interceding for them that come to God through him, and so is able to save to the uttermost." Don't you see that he takes every one of their own arguments and turns them right against them to show the superiority of Christianity? And the practical bearing of it, all the time, is, Therefore don't abandon Christianity and go back to be a mere Jew; don't give up your faith in Christianity; see the evils of unbelief and apostasy. As I said, there is hardly a sentence in the whole Epistle, the full purport of which can be understood unless you bear in mind its relation to this line of argument.

Let me give another illustration in that direction. I think in practical experience one of the hardest books in the Bible to treat as a whole, is the book of Job. Yet I do not think it very difficult to get the general outline of the book if you address yourself to that task, provided you will not allow the beautiful poetic phraseology to prevent you from seeing the line of thought. You see that in the first place you have the prosperity of Job described, and then the sore trials that were allowed to come upon him. How sore they were, and how he stood all the trials! Then you have his friends coming to him and treating him better than people among us sometimes treat their friends who are in affliction. For they go and talk them half to death, and Job's friends sat how many days and nights was it? before they even spoke a word; and then they go to talking about him. The theme of their talk is one of the greatest subjects of sorrowful human thought in all the ages of the world. What is the meaning of sore afflictions when God lets them come upon men? It is a question that has not been answered yet one of the questions the full answer to which, if it ever enters into finite minds, must be reserved for the better light of the better world. But how much light is given upon it in that book? You see that these friends of Job are mistaken on this subject, and they say many things about it that are not strictly true. They are said from a perverse point of view and with a mistaken idea of the matter. I have heard people quote sayings of those men as sayings of Scripture, when it ought to be understood that the Scripture says that those friends of Job said certain things on that occasion, and how far they are exactly right will have to be judged by looking at the book as a whole, and cannot be judged otherwise. Now take one man at a time and ask, what does he say? And then how does Job reply to him? You will find that at first they take hold of the subject delicately. They say, "The Almighty is just; he prospers all good men; he never sends sore trials upon a man unless that man has deserved it." They do not say yet, " You have deserved all these sore afflictions." They hint it. And then Job begins to reply; he gets warm with the argument; he sees what they are hinting at; he says: " I have not committed any enormous sins, greater than men around me, to bring on me these great afflictions." Then they come squarely to the point and say, " Oh, Job, you had better confess it. The Almighty has found you out.

"We never knew that you were a very bad man; we thought you were a very good man. Everybody thought so; but the Almighty has laid his finger upon you, and that shows that you have committed great sins, and you had better confess them now, and maybe you will be forgiven." Job warms still more; he lifts his hand to high heaven, and says: " God knows that I have not committed any such great sins as you speak of at all.

Oh, that I knew where I might find him, that I might get away from you who will not do me justice, and do not understand me. Before him I could argue my case." And so the discussion goes on, in an extremely interesting way, the great thought being, whether great sufferings do prove that a person has been guilty of extraordinary sins. Then a young man comes in, and it is a lesson which

old men would do well to lay to heart the young man talks more wisely than all the old men had done, though he does not explain the matter yet; still he says: "Ah, the Almighty is greater than we, and we must not expect to understand all about him; we must try to submit ourselves to his ways, even though we do not understand them." And then Jehovah himself appears.

I remember how, when I was a lad, I was first reading the book of Job, with some help in getting the idea, and when I reached this point my heart took a leap. I said: " Now Jehovah himself appears, and he will clear the whole matter up." But he does not; he simply says: "Who are you? What are you talking about?"

What do you know? What power have you? What wisdom have you to survey the universe and compass eternity? Why should you expect to understand everything? Remember how great am I and remember how little are you, and bow yourselves in humility, even where you cannot understand." And oh! friends and brethren, amid all our wide, wild questionings in life and rightful questions too, if they are not mad the loftiest knowledge in human life is to learn how to be willing, when we cannot understand Jehovah's ways, to bow to Jehovah's will, and put our sole trust in him.

There is only one more book that I shall mention for illustration. Do you read the book of Revelation in your family much? Do you preach about it much in your pulpit? I do not know whether to hope that you do or do not, because a great deal of the preaching about this book, and writing about it that I have come in contact with, would better have been let alone, according to my judgment; but the greatest evil that happens about it is, that a great many good people are led to neglect the book of Revelation. I asked a very able minister once, " Do you pay much attention to the book of Revelation?" He said, " No. I have no opinion of these calculations of prophecy, that have been made a hundred times over, and a hundred times over have turned out failures. I don't believe those men know anything about it, and I am sure I don't. And so I think I had better read somewhere else."

Meantime, get your little child to say, if your child has heard the Bible read much, whereabouts you shall read the next time, and see if the child does not say, " Please turn over there to that last part and read that again."

There is much in the book of Revelation that takes hold upon children. Allow me to mention a personal reminiscence of something that touched me very much.

Years ago, when my family included servants, I used to try very hard to get the servants and the children interested in the family worship. I tried the parables; I tried the life of our Lord; I tried many other parts of the Bible; sometimes they were interested, and sometimes not, and at length it occurred to me, " Now I will see if they will not be interested in the Revelation, that contains so much beautiful imagery." So I began, and I found that the servants and the children were very much interested for several days. I tried to explain a little, and I could do that very well for the first few chapters about the churches, etc, and could explain the scene of worship in heaven in the fourth and fifth chapters.

Then we got on into the opening of the seals and the sounding of the trumpets, and I stopped explaining, for a reason that you can perhaps conjecture. But I did not stop reading. They told me to go on with it. They all seemed to be interested. At length, after many days, we were far over in

the middle of Revelation, and I was reading some of that splendid, solemn, impressive imagery that is there presented like the unrolling of a mighty panorama, scene after scene of wonder and power, and struggle and conflict, and hope and promise and one day as I was reading I looked up through my tears and all the circle, from the aged grandmother down to the little child, were in tears too. You may say we did not know exactly what it was about. Yes, we did.

It was about God about God looking down on this world of ours, about the sorrows and struggles of this human life and the fact that God sees it all, is watching and controlling it all. I have mentioned this for a purpose. I beseech you, read the book of Revelation. If you have no definite views as to the predictive portions of the book (and I have not, I confess), let them alone, but read for the sake of practical instruction; that the book may bring Jesus, the exalted Redeemer, close to you; that it may make clear to you the idea that heaven is the headquarters of the Christian, from which the angels come as messengers to bring the word of command, and carry back word as to what is going on in this battlefield of life. The book of Revelation tells us that these sorrows, temptations and trials are to end at last in complete victory, and in everlasting peace and joy. And to get sentiments like these, oh ye cultivated men and women, in this cultivated age of ours to get tender, devoted, loving sentiments like these deeply impressed upon loving hearts, is worth all culture that falls short of them.

Now, I have just two or three remarks to make in conclusion. If we read the Bible by books, first taking each book as a whole, then seeing how it is divided up, then taking the several divisions and treating them, and so coming down to details, we shall learn in that way, and learn for ourselves how to interpret the several parts of Scripture with reference to their connection. Everybody will agree that you ought to look at the connection of a passage of Scripture. I remember one day my father said he did not like to find fault with preachers, but he wished some of them would pay more attention to the connection of the text, as the preacher that morning did not do. I suppose they have grown wiser since that day, and always do pay attention to the connection now. But in talking about it my father said, "Now, I can prove to you out of the Bible it was an illustration to a little child that there is no God." He got his Bible, opened it to a certain place, put his finger down and said, "Come here and read;" and the boy read, "There is no God," and it began with a capital T, too, as if it were a complete sentence. Then my father lifted his finger and said, "How is that? 'The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.'" "Now," he said, "don't you see, you must always attend to the connection." That was a very simple lesson, certainly. What is the connection of a passage of Scripture? Only the other part of the sentence? Well, there are preachers sometimes who do not attend even to the other part of the sentence, and it may be true of some other persons besides preachers. But is that all the connection, only a sentence before or after a particular passage you are considering? Sometimes that is all, but in other cases it is a page or two that is the connection, and, as I have said, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and in the book of Job, it is the whole book that is the connection; you cannot be sure that you are getting the precise point of view and the real meaning of any one of the sentences, unless you take it as a part of the whole, and with reference to the whole line of thought and practical design. You see how important it is that we should learn to study every particular expression of Scripture in its connection. It is a very beautiful thing to pick out the passages of Scripture that treat of some particular subject, as you can do with the help of a concordance, and put them together in a mosaic. It is like taking many pebbles and combining them, as the Romans were fond of doing,

into a mosaic. That is a very delightful thing, only be sure about your material. Take care that you see where these things come from, and that you have got them right. No man would be so unwise as to take out of the Epistle of Paul, "A man is justified by faith without the works of the law," and then take a fragment out of James, "We know that a man is justified by works and not by faith only," and lay those two together and say, "How beautiful is the harmony of Scripture!" We know we must see what Paul was talking about and to whom he was talking, and to what sort of persons James was talking, and what he was talking at, in order to judge what each meant by this particular form of expression; we dare not put those two passages side by side and neglect the connection. Now in many other cases the difficulty and danger are not so obvious, but they may be just as real. So often, when a man with his concordance is picking out passages that all contain a certain word or refer to a certain subject, and laying them all together in a beautiful picture to please the eye, it is as if he made a mosaic in this fashion: Here is a pebble and there is a diamond; here is a crumb of sugar and there is a flower bulb; and those make a mosaic, do they? A mosaic is a beautiful thing, but your materials must be harmonious.

You must know where these things come from. You must understand their connection, or else you will break living things all to pieces, in order to build up the dead fragments into a dead thing.

Then another remark. Each of these sacred books has its special aim and practical value, and we ought to try to get the practical impression that each of them is designed to make. For instance, each of the Gospels presents certain aspects of the life, character and work of our Lord. Those aspects are often overstated in the books about them, but you can catch the matter practically. Next year when we shall all be studying the Gospel of Mark, in Sunday-School lessons, the attention of half the Christian world will be turned to those particular aspects of the life, character and teachings of Jesus which are presented in that Gospel. You read one Gospel to see how that presents Jesus, and each of the other Gospels to see how it presents him, and if you have done that and then try to blend them all together in your loving faith, and reverence and humble desire to live like him, God being your helper, and to bring others with you to follow him too, you have made the most beautiful harmony of the Gospels that ever is made in this world. So as to other portions of the Scripture. "We ought to get the devout and practical inspiration which each particular book is designed to give, and these, one after another, will unite themselves together in the symmetry of a complete Christian character, and the fulness and power of a true Christian life.

It is not an accident, brethren, that in this age, in which infidelity has anew become blatant and arrogant, the Bible is more studied than ever it was before. It is not an accident that there is a new demand, throughout the Christian world, springing up for Biblical, expository preaching. There has not been such a desire outside of Scotland, the great and noble home of expository preaching, for many generations. It is not an accident that these Bible-readings, which have done so much in our time, and will do so much, have become popular just now. People don't know about believing the preacher nowadays, and a great many people don't know about acknowledging the authority of a church as they once did; but the people who come to hear the gospel, if you bring them something right out of the Bible, not a broken, dead fragment, but a part of the living whole, full of the true, divine life, and show them its meaning as God has taught it, and lay that meaning, explained, upon their hearts and their lives, the people everywhere respond to that; they like it; they feel that that is good. It is not an accident that in a time when infidelity is so bold and noisy, there has come this revived love of Bible-study and Bible-preaching, Bible-readings, Bible-classes and Bible-work in

general.

They say that the cultivated mind of the age has had enough of the Bible. Does it look as though people had stopped reading the Bible? You see men in the streetcars reading the New Testament. When I passed through Cincinnati on Monday, I ran to a book-store to get a copy of the Revised New Testament, and I saw a man buy, before my eyes, the last copy they had, out of a thousand sold over the counter that morning. God be thanked for this revived demand for it. But, oh, men and brethren, we do not read the Bible as we ought to read. It is easier to eulogize the Bible than to love it.

It is as easy to praise as it is for some poor, silly opposer to make sport of the Bible. Dr. Johnson said that a man of real wit would be ashamed to make jests about the Bible, because it is too easy to do. It is just as easy to eulogize the Bible and then to neglect it.

I have spoken with the hope that I might by God's blessing awaken in some of you at least a greater desire to read the Bible attentively, and I pray God that we may all turn away with an earnest promise in our own souls, before him who knows the heart, that in the remainder of our lives we will try to love his word more, to read it more wisely, and to live more according to its blessed teachings.

If anybody wishes to ask questions about these matters, and you are willing to listen a few minutes, I shall be glad to answer them if I can.

Q. You spoke of analyses. What analyses would you recommend?

A. The analyses which are contained in Home's Introduction are very good for this purpose. It is an old book which can be picked up anywhere. The analyses in Angus's Bible Hand-book are short and very good for this purpose.

Q,. If a person has read the Bible through two or three times, and has a general idea of it, would you advise his stopping that plan, and spending the time on separate books?

A. The best of all ways, of course, would be to read the Bible in three different ways at once, if a man had time for it to read very rapidly through the Bible once or twice a year, also read some books carefully, and daily some small portions as a part of private devotions. But I should say that most persons would find it better, instead of continuing to read it through in the way you mention, to take a book and study in the way I have indicated.

Q. What book would you advise a young convert to begin with?

A. Well, that would depend upon his previous Bible knowledge and general intelligence. But I think that there is nothing so important for the young Christian as to read the story of Jesus himself as told in the Gospels. The whole thought and feeling of our time seems to gather itself about the idea of Jesus. That is the citadel of the Scriptures for attack and defence, and that is the heart of the Scriptures for love. I should say to the young convert, " Read the Gospel of Mark; then read Matthew, Luke and John."

Q. Would you advise haste in going from one book to another before you have got the best judgment on one?

A. It would depend upon your knowledge of Scripture whether you should go rapidly. It would depend upon your own staying qualities, too.

Q. If you wanted to impress a skeptical man, who was seeking sincerely for light, with the inward truth of the Scripture, what book would you advise him to begin with?

A. Oh, I should give him the Gospels, and tell him, " Try to get near to Jesus Christ; try as you read it to seem to be looking at him and listening to him."

Q. Would you advise the reading of books of the New Testament and books of the Old together for the light they throw on one another?

A. That is very desirable sometimes. Leviticus and Hebrews may be read together very profitably; or Matthew and Isaiah. There are different expedients that each person will discover and adopt according to his own judgment and advantages.

Q. Do you recommend the use of the marginal references?

A. They are very desirable indeed, provided you pay attention to the connection which you find referred to.

You must not take them as scraps, and put them where they are cited as if they belonged there. You must remember where they do belong.

Q. What brief word of counsel would you give in regard to the use of commentaries?

A. Well, it would be this: Be sure you get the very best commentaries there are; for there are commentaries and commentaries.

Q. Will you please recommend one?

A. Well, that is a very hard thing to do here. Use your commentaries all that you can, provided you do not read them instead of reading the sacred text. Head the Bible itself in its own connection, and commentaries to help. I remember a singing-master from whom I took lessons when a lad. When the ladies would not beat time, he used to stop and say, " Why don't you beat time? Ladies, if you can't sing and beat time both, stop singing and beat time." If you can't read the Bible and commentaries both, let commentaries alone.

Q. Would you advise the marking of Bibles?

A. Yes; mark them in every way.

Q. Would you not advise much prayer and communion with God in the study of the Bible, in order to a better understanding of it?

A. Oh, assuredly I should advise prayer and communion with God. I ought not to have taken that for granted. I blame myself that I did not say that. We ought to pray to God every time, for that is the heart of the matter.

Q. A young man asked me to ask you, how should we learn to love the study of the Bible?

A. Well, that is a good question; but, like a good many others of the wisest questions, the answer cuts deep. To love the reading of the Bible more, we v must love him more of whom it tells us. And then, by reading the Bible more, we shall learn to love him more. And then, by trying to live the way the Bible 'tells us to live, we shall read it with more satisfaction and understanding. For if any man is willing to do the will of God, he will know concerning the doctrine.

Q. Would you advise regular hours for Bible study?

A. Oh, yes, yes, yes. Regular hours for reading the Bible, and irregular ones to boot. It depends upon your mode of life what hour is to be chosen.

Q. Would you recommend the morning hour rather than the evening?

A. That depends upon whether you are an early riser. I do not think you can lay down any law in regard to that matter. Everybody must find out for himself what his circumstances and his habits will allow him to do most profitably.

S. One Jesus

One Jesus

John A Broadus And of one Jesus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive. Acts 25:19 A new military governor had come to Caesarea. The people knew well enough that it was important for all those who had anything to do, especially with the government, to make the acquaintance of this man and try to gain his favor. For in all such cases the character and good will of the ruler was a matter of consequence. Among the persons who hurried to Caesarea to meet the governor Festus was a native ruler, a young man named Herod Agrippa.

He was a great grandson of the celebrated Herod the Great, and was at that time allowed by the Romans to be a king, subject to them, over the northeastern portion of his ancestor's dominions. Agrippa came and spent a number of days at Caesarea. He had been educated in Rome, but as there were no newspapers, there would be much information which Agrippa could obtain from the governor respecting the state of society and the gossip of the capital. On the other hand there would much that Agrippa could tell the governor about the curious people he had come to rule over, a people well known over the world for their excitability and extraordinary stubbornness, a people hard to govern and hard to understand. And so the days went on with varied talk and counsel and feasts and baths and theater and gladiators, and all the apparatus of Roman luxury which Herod the Great had gathered in his capital city of Caesarea.

After Agrippa had been there many days, we are told it occurred to Festus-possibly he was coming to be a little at a loss for new subjects of conversation-to mention to the young king a singular prisoner whom his predecessor Felix had left there in prison, a man named Paul, whom he found to be exceedingly unpopular with the Jewish rulers though he could not exactly understand why. For when the Jewish rulers were summoned before him according to the Roman custom, he found they had no accusation to make against the man, no civil offense-but they had certain questions of their own superstition and about one Jesus who was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive. One Jesus. How little did the Roman governor dream that as a fly preserved in amber he was going to be remembered in the world's history simply because of his connections with Paul the prisoner and with this Jesus!

Things have changed since then. The long progress of what we call the Christian centuries has brought its changes and we live in what calls itself a Christian land after Jesus Christ. And yet, O my friends, it is very sorrowful to think how many there are, even in this so called Christian land, who seem to care very little more about Jesus Christ than poor Festus did. Busy, some of them are with philosophical thought, and some with schemes of statesmanship, and some with the charms of literature, busy with the harassing pursuits of life, with its perplexing cares, with its bewildering pleasures, busy with everything else and hardly ever a thought at all of Jesus. What I wish to say is simply this: there is no one who has a right to think lightly of Jesus, and I wish to offer some reasons why that is so. In the first place, Jesus is the most important personage in human history. The obscure and insignificant one, of whom Festus spoke so carelessly, has

founded this world's most wonderful empire. The carpenter of Nazareth is a king of men. You will remember what Napoleon said, and those words have often been repeated, as he spoke to one of his friends during life, "Alexander, Caesar, Charlemagne, and myself founded empires, but they were force, upheld by force, and when the force was withdrawn, how soon they all mouldered away. Jesus Christ has founded an empire of love, and it lives through all the ages, and nothing seems able to destroy it." Yea, from him went forth the influences which have given to what we call Christian civilization, its highest dignity, its truest power. Much we have derived, no doubt, from Grecian literature and art, and Roman law, and something from our Gothic ancestors, but the chief power in Christian civilization comes from that Jesus.

Yea, the men nowadays who fancy they can do without Christianity, who prate that they have risen above Christianity to a higher plane than it has reached, seem not to know that all the elevated ethical conceptions and sentiments of which they boast and which they suppose make them independent are but the result of this same Christianity which they disdain. They are like a silly schoolboy who has but half learned a few of the teacher's lessons, and then fancies he knows more than the teacher and can henceforth do without him. Yea, the thoughtful world is coming to see somewhat more clearly that Jesus is the Center of the world's history. Bossuet made that remark, and it has often been repeated: that the cross of Jesus Christ is the center of the world's history. All lines of preceding events seem to converge to that cross, and from it diverge all the great events of the world's subsequent history.

It is a kindred thought to say that Jesus is the center of the Scriptures. Everything in the Old Testament points forward to him: everything in the New Testament proceeds forth from him. You cannot understand the history of the Old Testament, if you think of it merely as a history of Israel. It is a history of redemption, that is its characteristic idea, and in Jesus Christ it has found its consummation, its climax, its completeness. Jesus is for us indeed the pledge of the divine authority of the Old Testament. Does a man say, "How do you know that what we call the Old Testament is from God?" I answer, the Jews were just as familiar in our Lord's time, as we are, with the phrase "The Scriptures." "The Scriptures," used so often in the Old Testament, and we know from Jewish chronicles that what they meant by Scripture was the Hebrew books which we call the Old Testament, and this selfsame scripture Jesus declares is from God and cannot be broken. I stand hearing his testimony to its authority and am content.

Men rise up in every successive age and say science has at last discovered—they seem to imagine that science will never make any discoveries after their age—science has at last discovered certain facts which are incompatible with the Old Testament. Jesus declares the Scriptures cannot be broken, and I believe that whenever physical science has truly interpreted the works of God, which is only partially done as yet as every thoughtful man knows, and philological science has rightly interpreted the Word of God, that people who are prepared for it will see that there is no conflict. In the meantime the conflict we hear so much about grows out of the hasty conclusions of those who but partially understand God's workings, and still more partially understand God's providence. Jesus says that the Scripture is God's Word and cannot be broken and I am content. I am dependent upon no man's knowledge. Let knowledge come and welcome, only when it comes to be knowledge then we will turn to God's Word and study the passages and we will see about the so-called conflict. So trusting in Jesus, we make sure concerning the miracles he wrought. People say, and it is not an unnatural question, how do you know but that the persons who witnessed the

miracles of Christ were deluded, not to say deceivers? Well, much might be said about their character, and about the fact that both friend and foe united in bearing witness to these things, but apart from all these Jesus himself declared, over and again, that he did work these miracles by the favor of God, and who is going to say that he was deluded and who is going to say that he was a deceiver? His character bears testimony to the reality of his miracles, and his character and his miracles like two sides of an arch holding each other up, support the whole fabric of Christianity. Against his character, all human opposition breaks and is shattered like surf against a rock. The few men that have ventured to try to say something against the character of Jesus, their tongues have not been palsied but their words have been manifestly weak and vain.

It is not strange that the history of Jesus himself, the center of Scripture, has come to be the great subject of inquiry among the friends and foes of the Christian religion. Th our time you have all noticed how many books have been written in the last generation on the life of Christ-the like of it never seen before-in Germany and France, in England and America. There is a work about to be published now in this city about the life of Christ, more elaborate in some respects than any before published. And why so much of this? Because the world is beginning to feel that Jesus is the center of Scripture; that Christianity is in the world and the character and the work of Jesus himself. The men who question its power and who deny its authority are coming to see that Christianity is in the world though, and has been a mighty power in the world, and though often grievously perverted and misdirected, is on the whole a beneficent and blessed power, and they have got to account for it. That means study the history of Jesus.

Yea, Jesus is the whole fact. The proud young French king said, you remember, when someone spoke of the State, "I am the State," but, not with arrogance, not with egotism, in simplicity and truth, Jesus said: "I am the way, the truth and the life." Jesus is the gospel. The gospel is not a creed simply, is not a society of priests, the gospel comes to us embodied in a person. Jesus is himself the gospel; receiving him we receive the power of God unto salvation. Have we a right to think lightly of Jesus who is the most important personage of the world's history, who is the center of the Scriptures? And thirdly, Jesus is a being unique in the universe. God the pure spirit, is only God, and man, strange being that he is, is only man; but Jesus-the Scriptures require us to believe it-Jesus is both, truly God and truly man. I do not wonder that persons shrink away from that fact, it is stupendous, it is inconceivable in one sense, yet it is the plain teaching of God's Word. He is not simply a man, he has risen from us to divinity. He is not simply God taking upon him some outward semblance of humanity. He is truly God and truly man-truly each. His divinity: why friends, it lies plain on the surface of God's Word. Plain people, unsophisticated, who just read it right along and take it as it is, cannot well help seeing that. I pray you remember, God's word was not written for learned divines, for skillful commentators, for skeptical inquirers, God's word was written for the people It is a handbook for practical guidance.

Therefore, whatever lies plain on the surface of God's Word, not in one phrase alone but in many places, that is exceedingly apt to be what is meant. Bible learning is all a good thing in its place, but after all if we want to get practical truth for our own guidance out of God's Word we shall be most likely to get its meaning more clearly and truly if we take the plain meaning of the passage that lies on the surface to any unsophisticated observer. You might as well pluck the throbbing heart out of this bosom and call what is left a living man as to take the divinity of Jesus Christ out of this book and call the rest God's Word. It is set forth in a thousand ways in all parts of the

Scriptures and if anyone should ask me to mention three or four passages why here they are: "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God. And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us-full of grace and truth." And when Thomas after his long doubting was convinced, he cried, "My Lord and my God." If he to whom he said it had been a mere man, he would have shrunk from such an idolatrous utterance, but he commended him for saying it. On the other hand the Scriptures as plainly set forth Jesus as having a human nature. The Christian world has long been half oblivious of the humanity of Christ. It is only until now that men are beginning to realize the humanity of him who is also divine-the carpenter of Nazareth who worked with hard hands over homely toil. A great many of those who try to lead the masses offer speculative delusions and talk against Christ and Christianity. Why don't they tell the people that the founder of Christianity was in the truest sense a working man and the friend of the poor? His humanity made it possible that he should be really tempted. Why could not any human nature be tempted? Our first parents in their Eden, in their purity, were tempted and fell. The high angels were tempted and fell out of heaven. The humanity of Christ could not morally be overcome with sin due to the influence of the Holy Ghost, yet the humanity of Christ could be tempted, and the temptation could be a reality. As man he could take Our place before God, he could suffer in our stead, he could die and rise again for us, and his divinity gave to that suffering, atoning death and resurrection a dignity and significance. My friends, these souls of ours crave a perfect example. We need imperfect examples such as the Scriptures furnish and life furnishes us every day, of every grade and condition, but then our souls crave an idea of perfection, and there it is, a perfect example, at the summit of them all-a perfect example in the humanity of our Lord and Saviour. As man he gives assurance of his sympathy with his having been tempted only once like as we are, yet without sin. Oh, how wonderful is the fact! I often pause to dwell on it, that not only do tempted ones in this life bow safe around the glorious throne, but one who was tempted here sits upon the throne, and we know that he can sympathize with our infirmities, with our temptations, with our trials, and being unique, in all, exists the God-man. When he stood upon the Mount of Olives do you not remember how he said: "All authority and power in heaven and earth is given unto me," and "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world"? Who over all the nations, who over all ages, has a right to think lightly of Jesus? In the fourth place, Jesus has wrought a work that is unparalleled in its nature and in its importance. It is the most wonderful that has ever occurred in the universe. It is not creation, it is redemption. It is reconciliation between the holy ruler of the universe and the beings who have broken his law. A work so wonderful it is that the Scriptures give us an intimation that the most exalted creatures of God that do exist, look down amid all the world's wonders and wonder most at this. Nay, with the strange perversity which we human beings show about many things, there are many persons who cannot believe it because it is so wonderful. It seems impossible that the maker and ruler of the universe should have chosen such a stage to do these things. The theater is too small; the stage is too insignificant for such a drama as the atonement, they say. Well, nearly all the most important things in this world have had comparatively an unimportant theater. Daniel Webster had evidently thought of this when he wrote these words to be placed on his tombstone: "Philosophical argument, especially that drawn from the vestures of the material universe, and the apparent insignificance of our world have sometimes shaken my reason for the faith that is in me, but my heart has always assured and reassured me that the mission of Jesus Christ is a divine reality."

There is no need to have our faith shaken when we remember what I have said; the most insignificant spot of earth may be the scene of earth's greatest events. And this little earth came to be, as the Scriptures declare, the scene of the mightiest event of the universe, the reconciliation of God's creatures to himself.

Now once more, Jesus sustains, and must sustain, a personal relation to each one of us. I do not mean as a matter of history-there is a sense of course in which every person has a relation to each of us-but I mean as the loving Saviour. He must by the very necessity of things sustain a personal relation to each of us. We can as well shake off our own being as to prevent the necessity of that personal relation to him. We can determine its character, we can be his friends, by the grace of God, otherwise we are, we cannot but be his enemies. There are those who think they can live neutral with reference to Christianity, who think they can treat Christian mysteries, and people in general, with a certain respect, and be kind and courteous, and play neutral. But O my friends, it is not my saying, merely Jesus himself has said "he that is not with me is against me." "He that gathereth not with me, scattereth." There is no neutrality. We must be his friends or we are his foes, delude ourselves as we may. The most important question of life is, "What is a man's relationship to Jesus?" And that turns upon another question, "What does a man think and feel about himself?" Jesus came not to call righteous men, but sinners to repentance. If I am a sinner, if I have been trying hard to do right, and have learned more and more how hard it is for me to do right, if my own conscience condemns, therefore God who is greater than my heart must condemn me. If I am troubled how my guilt shall be removed, and my sinfulness, then Jesus is for me, and then I am for Jesus. But if I feel that I am a good kind of person, fond of comparing myself with my fellow men, looking upon my faults as reasonable defects, then no wonder I get so fanciful theories about Jesus. Then I am not in the position from which he came to relieve me.

O my friends, what is your relation to Jesus? It is the question of all questions: what is your relation to Jesus? It is a question which you should settle in your honest heart, and the decision you reach you ought to proclaim to your fellow men: for he said: "Whosoever shall confess, I will myself confess, and whosoever shall deny me"-and to refuse to confess him is to deny him- "him will I also deny before the angels which are in heaven." O my friends, what is your personal relation to Jesus? It is a question which you can postpone now, if you will, but it will come back again and again. It is a question which will face you. You will face it in the day for which all other days were made; in the day when before the Saviour, you shall stand, and he your judge. In that day every knee shall bow, and shall confess, willing or unwilling, that Jesus is Christ his Lord, to God the Father. O my friends, prepare for that day by turning to Christ now! What is your personal relationship to Jesus? Confess him now!

S. Outline of the Life of Christ

Outline of the Life of Christ By John A. Broadus, 1887 From the Preface: "The 'Summer School for College Students,' held at Northfield, Massachusetts, from June 30 to July, 12, 1887, was an occasion in many respects without precedent. During the twelve days of its continuance, at least four hours each day were spent in listening to addresses and discussions. . . ."

John A. Broadus was one of the speakers; three of his lectures were printed in a twenty-two chapter book entitled A College of Colleges. The sessions were led by D. L. Moody; T. J. Shanks was editor of the book. The "Outline of the Life of Christ" was later developed into Broadus' famous work, A Harmony of the Gospels. — Jim Duvall

Address by the Rev. Dr. Broadus — Harmonies of the Gospels — Infancy of Jesus — His Childhood and Youth — Retirement and Preparation — Six Periods of His Public Ministry — Long Tours' and Incessant Activity — Reasons for His Circuitous Movements — Helps to Study Recommended. The four Gospels are independent works. Each of them is a complete whole. Beware of superseding the text as we find it with harmonies. We must study those Gospels each in itself, and then mentally combine the impressions. Once in Mr. Story's studio in Rome some visitors asked him if he could make a bust of their father from photographs without seeing him. "Yes," he said, "with some difficulty, after a fashion. But you must let me have photographs of heads and busts from every point of view." If you take all the pictures of Christ in the Bible — by prophets, evangelists, apostles, and in the book of Revelation — you will get a far better conception of Him than if you had only one writer.

Why, then, should we attempt a harmony of the Gospels or a life of Christ at all? 1. Because we naturally wish to get a general historical outline of the life of Christ. We do not want to have merely vague and confused recollections derived from the different Gospels. 2. To explain discrepancies. Everybody notices, when he comes to compare the Gospels, apparent contradictions. A few years ago there was a school of German writers who lived on the discrepancies of the Gospels. Trial by jury was not introduced in Germany till after the revolution of 1848. Had these writers been in the habit of judging different accounts of the same series of events, as every one is in this country, they would have seen that discrepancies are not only inevitable, but that they are positively necessary to authenticate any account. If four different witnesses should tell exactly the same story in all particulars, I wouldn't believe any of them — I would think they had put their heads together, or had been taught a lesson. It is necessary for belief in four different accounts of a long series of events, that there should be some things that at first don't seem to agree. Of course, if those discrepancies could be shown to be hopeless, downright, inexplicable contradictions, it would be another thing. But many things that at first were hard to explain, have been explained. Many apparent conflicts between one part of the Bible and another, that puzzled me during my early studies, have been cleared up while my hair is growing gray. Certain difficulties were the whole stock in trade of a large section of critical objectors fifty years ago, which you will scarcely ever hear a word about now. As to discrepancies, let me make a remark. I am not bound to show

that my theory of explanation is the only right one. There may be several ways of explaining a difficulty. If I prefer one way, I have no call to attack another. It is enough that one is reasonable. 3. We naturally wish, in the practical use of the Gospels, to combine all the material in regard to any particular scene or discourse in the life of Jesus. If you take up some scene and read all the accounts, and put them together so as to get the whole effect, you are so far making a harmony of the Gospels. It is, therefore, convenient and desirable that this work should be done throughout. We must, however, expect difficulties in various points. We must learn to distinguish between things where we can be certain, and things where we cannot be certain. Some points are certain; others are more or less probable. Two books I would recommend are: 1st. Robinson's "Harmony," either in English or Greek, Riddle's new edition, Hartford; 2d. G. W. Clark's "Harmony," which is better at some points. Where you find these agree, you can be pretty confident they are right; where they differ, there is room for difference.

Q. Have you examined "The Four Gospels in One"?

Dr. Broadus — There are several books of that kind. One time in my life I was very fond of them. But the trouble is, they sink the individuality of the several Gospels — the different stand-points and the different tone. I think it is a great deal better to have the extracts complete, and compare them yourself. Thus you will see the difference and the connection in each case. I should, therefore, upon the whole, not advise the use of books of that sort. The other way is more trouble, but you get better results, and you don't think you know so much, which is one great point.

[The lecturer used a wall-map of Palestine to illustrate the geography of the life of Christ, and proceeded to speak of its chronology.] The time of our Saviour's birth was certainly in the fifth year before the ordinary annus Domini, which was fixed in the fifth or sixth century by error. Herod died in the spring of 750, as is shown by Josephus's reference to an eclipse of the moon that occurred near the time of his death, and astronomy shows which year that was. So the birth of Christ must have been in the year 749=B.C. 5. The annus Domini cannot be changed as a chronological error now. We can only say it was a mistake, and that the birth of Christ was five years earlier — possibly a little more, but certainly that much.

Luke says that Jesus was about thirty years old when He began His ministry. According to that He began Anno Domini 26. Now, His ministry lasted three years and a fraction, so far as we know, provided the feast of John v. 1 was a Passover, which it probably was. Other wise we should only know of its lasting two years and a fraction — if that feast be not taken as a Passover. If you say the ministry was three years and a fraction, then it began at or in the latter part of A.D. 26, and ended at the Passover of A.D. 30 — in the spring of that year, about our Easter.

Now, let us take up the leading periods in the life of our Lord. The first began with the birth and childhood of Jesus. You find introductory matter in each of the Gospels. Matthew begins with a genealogy reaching back to Abraham, and Luke with one reaching back to Adam. John goes back to eternity. Mark plunges in medias res. The introductory matter of Luke includes the annunciation, and the story of the birth of John and the birth of Jesus. By the way, the saying of Simeon is by most people incorrectly understood. It was not, "Now, do Thou let Thy servant depart in peace"; but, "Now, Thou lettest" — a recognition of the fact that now the event had come which the Lord had let him live to see. Then you have the story of the Magi, and of the flight into Egypt, I remember an illustration here. During the war, when the United States troops took possession of

Beaufort, S. C., a great many wealthy families were living there temporarily. I heard as time went on that some of them had to part with their family jewels to get the plainest food, as was natural under the circumstances. The gifts of the Magi were a means of support to Joseph and his family in Egypt. We cannot conceive of the difficulty that must have been experienced by a little family in leaving home and going into another country and there trying to find something to do. Those gifts may fairly be regarded as a Providential means of support. Then we come to the massacre of about five hundred little boys in Bethlehem, and the return of Joseph and his family northward from Jerusalem. Where is Nazareth? Take a pear and slit it lengthwise, leaving a crooked stem. In the lower half of that pear you have exactly the shape of the valley of Nazareth. From the high western mountains the growing youth could have gained extensive views in all directions. To the south were the mountains of Ebal and Gerizim. On the east He could see the mountains beyond the Jordan. On the west lay the grand Mediterranean — very blue and beautiful. On the north appeared the snow-clad range of Hermon.

I divide the public ministry of Jesus into six parts. We pass the quiet years of preparation, concerning which little is known, though much has been conjectured. Compare the apocryphal gospels and the silly stories that have gathered in connection with them, with the inspired narrative, and then see the grand simplicity of the Gospels themselves. The Jews had a foolish notion that a man was not grown until he was thirty — I don't dare to say that I sometimes think they were, right. At all events the Deliverer of mankind was actually in the world, living retired, and never appeared till He was thirty years of age, although He foreknew that He was so soon to die. How we ought to be thrilled with the thought that the Saviour lived and died a young man! Though He knew His public career would be but a brief three years, still He lived on quietly preparing, and still He waited while John the Baptist was preparing too. These are the six divisions

1. The introduction of our Lord's ministry: the work of John the Baptist, the baptism of Christ and His temptation. The localities of these events are not certainly known. Here occurs John's testimony to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, in consequence of which Jesus gains a few disciples, with whom He goes to the wedding at Cana, and then to Capernaum, which becomes the principal home of His public ministry.

2. The early ministry of Jesus, which is described in the Fourth Gospel alone, and lasted several months — perhaps eight months. Jesus visits the Passover and expels the traders, holds the conversation with Nicodemus, and afterward labors long and successfully somewhere in Judea, until at length He makes and baptizes some disciples. John hears of this, and expresses his satisfaction. The Pharisees hear of it; and to prevent a premature excitement of their hostility, Jesus leaves Judea for Galilee. Meantime John is imprisoned — Josephus says at Macherus, which was a few miles east of the northern end of the Dead Sea, and of which the ruins have lately been for the first time fully described by the English traveller, Tristram, in his "Land of Moab." On our Lord's way to Galilee He stopped at Jacob's well, where occurred his conversation with the woman, which is a model of skill and felicity in the introduction of religion into ordinary conversation.

3. The great ministry in Galilee. This is described in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. John touches it only at one point: The feeding of the five thousand. This probably lasted about eighteen months — that is, if the feast in John 5:1 was a Passover. Our Lord's headquarters were at Capernaum. During

this time He made three journeys around Galilee, which Josephus says contained over two hundred cities and large villages. Our Lord's labors must have been far more extensive than we should imagine from the few specimens of His miracles and discourses that are expressly reported. This is shown by the general statements in Matthew 4:23 and Matthew 9:35, which are in strong language. During this time He selected the twelve disciples, and gave the Sermon on the Mount as a sort of opening lecture in their theological training. Toward the close of this period He sent them out two by two to go before Him; and after their return continued His instructions throughout His ministry, slowly preparing them for their work. The first great group of parables belong to this period — found in Matthew xiii. and Mark iv. — and they treat of the Kingdom of God in its beginnings.

4. Excursions made by Jesus from Galilee occupying six months, and described by Matthew, Mark, and Luke. We can see several reasons for His leaving Galilee at this period. Herod Antipas, the tetrarch, had taken up the notion that Jesus was John the Baptist risen from the dead, and would be uneasy about Him; and so Jesus keeps out of his dominion. The masses of the people were becoming fanatical, thinking that He must be the Messiah, and would gather armies and destroy the Romans. The Jewish rulers were ready to use all this against Him with the Roman authorities. Our Lord often had to withdraw from the excitement produced by His ministry, because the popular interest, which was more political than religious, threatened to precipitate a crisis and end His ministry before He had finished His work for the people and the instruction of the twelve. We may also notice that this was summer, and in every one of the four excursions Jesus went to a mountain region. Capernaum was far below the Mediterranean, with tropical products, and there was an obvious propriety in getting to the mountains. He first went across the lake; but the multitude followed Him, amounting to five thousand, and thus retirement had to be abandoned. The second excursion was to Tyre; but a Syrophenician mother found Him out. In the third excursion He went northward through Sidon, and away north to Galilee and around into Decapolis, northeast of the lake. There again the multitude gathered, and He fed the four thousand. Then the fourth excursion was northeastward, to the neighborhood of Cesarea Philippi. He stayed here some time, giving much instruction to the twelve; and here occurred the Transfiguration, which was probably on some mountain of the Lebanon range.

[Mr. Moody — Make it Mount Hermon.]

5. The later ministry in Judea, and ministry in Perea. This occupied six months. It is described in Luke 9:51 to 19:27, and in John 7 to 10. This is much better arranged in Clark's Harmony than in Robinson's. We have only to understand that events and discourses here given in Luke, similar to preceding ones in Galilee, were repetitions such as would be very natural in an other part of the country. No one can properly understand the teachings of Jesus who has not had some experience as a public religious teacher himself — a field-preacher, a street-preacher. The mere professor, who never did any practical preaching, will constantly misjudge as to points of this kind. To this period belongs the second great group of parables, given only in Luke, and referring chiefly to the life of individuals.

6. The last week in Jerusalem, and the crucifixion. Our Lord has long kept away from the hostility of the Jewish authorities until His ministry should be ended. But now His hour is come, and He goes straight forward to the end. He seems to have spent every night at Bethany, and in the

daytime to have taught in the courts of the Temple for several days. Here occurs the third great group of parables, which refer again to the Kingdom of God in its future prospects. Of course this period ends with the last day of our Lord's passion, with the Lord's supper and farewell discourses, with Gethsemane and Calvary. It may with confidence be said that we have of late years found the true site of Calvary — on the northern extension of the Temple hill. This view was adopted by Chinese Gordon, and is held by Principal Dawson, and by the Rev. Selah Merrill, of New England, recently United States Consul at Jerusalem. Very probably it is correct. The concluding period of our Lord's life embraces His resurrection, His ten appearances during the forty days, and His ascension. More attention ought to be given in our religious thought and discourse to the resurrection of Christ as the central pillar of Christian evidence, and an important item of Christian doctrine. Books on this subject to be recommended, are: Milligan's "Lectures on the Resurrection of our Lord"; Westcott's "The Gospel of the Resurrection"; another work by the same writer, "Revelation of the Risen Lord," which treats of the ten appearances; Canon Liddon's "Easter Sermons" (two small volumes); and Candlish's "Life in a Risen Saviour," being lectures on the 15th chapter of 1st, Corinthians. These are all English works; all, or nearly all, are reprinted in this country, and they are not costly.

=====

[From T. J. Shanks, editor, A College of Colleges, (A Collection of Lectures), 1887, pp. 74-82. This book was provided by Steve Lecrone, Burton, OH. — jrd]

S. Paramount Permanent Authority Bible

Paramount and Permanent Authority of The Bible by John A. Broadus, D.D., LL.D. This is a subject of no small importance to all Christian people, if we are to have any Bible at all. Without disrespect to other Christians, I may say that the subject is peculiarly important to Baptists. Two or three years ago, I sat at table by the side of one of the most honored Presbyterian ministers in America, who came across the Atlantic, and from a high position has looked widely and kindly over the state of religion in this country. He remarked that an interesting religious phenomenon in the United States is the unity of the Baptists, while having no central authority, and no common creed; and then asked: "Don't you think it would be well to get some common creed that would signalize this oneness of Baptist doctrine?" I replied: "That would be glorifying the remarkable phenomenon by destroying it." How can we account for this unity? Our churches are independent — quite sufficiently so. Our unity results from emphasizing downright conformity to the Bible itself. This is vital to the existence of Baptists. By ignorant or prejudiced critics it is often charged that we make much ado about mere ceremonies. To us it is not a question of ceremonies, but of insisting upon obedience to the Scriptures. That is the link that binds our independent churches together. Of all people, Baptists are peculiarly interested in the authority of the Bible, because this causes them to exist, and keeps them united.

Whenever men attempt to discuss a subject, it is needful to be agreed upon a starting point. Now, I address myself to people who believe that the Bible is the word of God; not merely that it contains the word of God, which wise persons may disentangle from other things in the book, but that it is the word of God. If you do not believe this, I am not now arguing with you; I speak to those who do so believe. It does not follow that our interpretations are infallible. It is entirely possible that we may have no creed nor system of theology, no professors, nor even preachers, nor even newspaper writers, nor writers of tracts, that can always interpret the Bible with infallible success. But our persuasion is that the real meaning of the Bible is true. This being the case, something else immediately follows, viz., the Bible is to us the highest authority for religious truth. Wherever it undertakes to teach, its teachings are true. It does not attempt to teach on all subjects. It uses popular language, which must be interpreted accordingly. But, whatever it intends to teach, that is paramount in authority. If this were not so, we should really have no Bible.

Other authorities may be recognized and duly regarded; but not on any equality with the Bible. There is the authority of Reason. Let everyone of us beware, lest we despise reason. That were a blunder. It is reason that must ascertain for us that there is a revelation, and must determine that meaning of revelation. Reason is greatly guided by piety, which brings us into general sympathy with revelation; and aided by the special influence of the Holy Spirit. Thus reason has a high and important office. But, when it has ascertained the existence and the meaning of revelation, it must stand back and acknowledge itself subordinate in authority.

There is the authority of Christian Consciousness. This phrase was, I believe, made current by [Frederick] Schleiermacher, and is oftenest used to-day in the line of its original employment.

Schleiermacher did not believe in the inspiration of Scripture, in any strict sense. He accepted the facts of Christianity as he found them in the "Christian consciousness" of the community. But where did this consciousness come from? The Brahmin's elephant upheld the world rested on the back of a turtle, and the turtle swam in the ocean; but where did the ocean come from? The Christian consciousness must have derived its impressions from the Bible; and yet Schleiermacher took this consciousness as authority, rather than the Bible itself. Wherever I find much use made of this phrase, I find a similarity to Schleiermacher's views of inspiration. Now, we must not make light of Christian consciousness. It is entitled to respect, and may be instructive; but it cannot be for us an authority co-ordinate with the Bible.

Another authority with many persons is the tendency of the times. It is an attractive idea to most people that our age is far in advance of all others. Macaulay said that a school boy twelve years old now knows more of geography than Strabo. Yes, and no. In some respects he knows more, but in others not half so much. The nineteenth century is far superior to the other centuries in some things — as in physical science, and the practical applications of science to invention, — or in politics and social philosophy. But it does not follow that this century is superior to all previous centuries in thinking. In some respects our age has not time to be wiser. But it is so pleasant to persuade ourselves that "wisdom will die with us," and that it was born with us too; to think that all that has preceded was but preparation for us, and that all that follows will be but a reminiscence of what was known and done in the far end of the nineteenth century. A celebrated preacher (recently passed away) was fond of saying that we are wiser than the apostles. We do more than the apostles in chemistry and geology, in mathematics, and perhaps in politics. But it does not follow that we know more than they of the real nature of man, and of our essential relations to God. That a gifted man who professed to believe in the Bible should fall into the fallacy of confounding these things is a wonder of wonders.

Many persons declare that what calls itself culture is the highest source of information; especially those who have the form of culture, but deny the power thereof. As in all such cases, they are apt to insist upon the form just in proportion as they lack the spirit. Real culture is the modestest of all graces; slowest to imagine itself superior to all things, human and divine. For some, "the church" is an authority. That wonderful compound of many elements of Christianity with the genius of ancient Rome, which calls itself the Roman Catholic Church, claims inspiration, and practically assumes to be superior to the authority of the Bible. Well, to those who believe in an inspired church this may seem true. But if you do not believe it is inspired (as I do not), the church in whatsoever sense is not an authority parallel with the Bible.

There are persons who claim individual inspiration, and insist upon its dictates as authority for themselves and for others. Those who call themselves "Friends," believe that they are inspired, when they say "the Spirit moves me;" that is claiming inspiration. I need not argue that question. But you can observe something like this in certain good people among us. Some devout man will say: "I have made this project a matter of prayer. You must not oppose this; it is an answer to prayer." That comes a great deal nearer to Quaker ground than the excellent man is aware.

Now, as to all these real or supposed authorities, we must take heed that we do not place them on a level with Scripture, or make them a ground for setting Scripture aside. But some will ask, Is there to be no progress? There was progress in giving revelation; in adding to; modifying;

completing the earlier by the later revelation, even as Jesus said in the Sermon on the Mount, "I came not to destroy the law, but to complete." But it is another thing to claim that there must be progress after the revelation had been completed. This point is alluded to in the latest Epistle of the New Testament. They speak of "the word which ye heard from the beginning;" and urge that we must "contend earnestly for the faith delivered once for all." In the Second Epistle of John we are told (Revised Ver.), "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God." A "progressive orthodoxy" that forsakes or adds to the teaching of Christ becomes heterodoxy. But is there to be no kind of progress now in regard to religious truth? Certainly there should be progress in knowing what revelation means, and in doing what revelation requires. Progress! It is a noble, inspiring thought. But human nature may err about this, as elsewhere. Some are crazy about "advanced thought," about keeping up with the times. They do not ask in what direction all this advance is tending. We often see a sort of craze for following the newest fashion in religious thought, that almost equals — I will not complete the comparison. On the other hand, there are people who cannot in any respect progress beyond the opinions of former times — the teachings of the "Fathers." Norman McLeod remarked that some bid us greatly reverence the Fathers, and yet two hundred years from now they will be quoting us as Fathers. The great Charles Hodge said he thanked God that no new idea in theology had started from Princeton. With all respect, I doubt the wisdom of that utterance. Why may we not hope to improve in the understanding of the Bible? My sympathy is rather the Pilgrim pastor who said: "I am very confident that the Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of his holy word." In our own century, we have seen as much real progress in the interpretation of Scripture. Researchers in the valley of the Nile and the plain of Mesopotamia have thrown light on Scripture history, not only helping it substantiate its truth, but to illumine its meaning. Our modern scientific syntax has favored the understanding of Scripture. Those who dislike orthodoxy cannot now be so loose in their exegesis; and consequently they have become more loose as to the authority of the Bible. We have also learned from physical science. The world was once aghast at certain statements of astronomy; but no one now imagines that the ordinary astronomy teaches anything contrary to the Bible. The same thing is largely true of geology. It is amusing to look back upon the successive theories of theology in our century, and then to remember how certain super serviceable apologists have busily reconciled these now exploded theories one after another, with the Bible. The cloud is like a camel — yes, like a camel. Nay, it is like a whale — yes, very like a whale. These experiences should help us as to another matter. I believe in — something about evolution. I do not know how much to believe about it. I am waiting for evolution to evolve itself. Let us not be over hasty to reconcile the Bible with the present theories of evolution.

Social and political changes have also prepared us to interpret the Bible more wisely. This is no new thing. Even in the days of revelation, men were taught by Providence. John the Baptist has no special revelation as to how his mission was to end. He did not know, till he found himself in the dungeon — not till the executioner entered his cell. He learned from Providence. The first Christians agreed to disagree about certain things. The Jewish Christians were to continue practicing circumcision and observing the ceremonies; the Gentile Christians not so. They received no revelation as to the termination of this state of things, but learned through the destruction of Jerusalem, when the Temple was overthrown, and the ritual became impossible. So, in later times, has the light of Providence assisted men in the interpretation of Scripture. Three centuries ago, the divine right of kings was taught, and the passive obedience of subjects. The

English Jameses and Charleses trampled on the people, because "the powers that be are ordained of God, and he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." But the slow unfolding of the ages has taught us to understand differently. The first Christians, like the Jews, questioned whether it was right to serve heathen rulers. It was this idea that the apostles undertook to correct; and their sayings must be interpreted accordingly.

Another illustration belongs to our own times. Forty years ago there was a great controversy concerning the teaching of Scripture as to slavery. Francis Wayland advocated one view, Richard Fuller another. Neither of them was extreme enough to satisfy a large proportion of his followers. Ten years later, and calm interpretation on either side was made nearly impossible by the fires of passion. How strangely Scripture was then handled, both North and South! But Providence has cleared the atmosphere. We are no longer considering a living question of politics and morals, but a question of ancient history. And if I remember aright the great President Wayland's view, it is probable that many of us, in all parts of the country, are coming around to about that conception. Providence changes our stand-point, and we see Scripture in a different light. So as to some burning questions of to-day. One of the phenomena of present Christian feeling is a great sensitiveness as to suffering. Some good people can scarcely bear the idea of punishment at all; and many are utterly opposed to capital punishment. This extreme sensitiveness about human suffering, in conjunction, I fear, with a diminished sense of the awfulness of human sin and the holiness of God, has led many to shrink from the idea of eternal punishment. Such feelings naturally occasion a re-investigation of Scripture. It is right thus to look at Scripture in connection with current convictions and feelings. There is, to be sure, a great danger of perverse interpretation. Our inquiry ought not to be whether Scripture does not teach what we would have it teach; we must try to let the Bible mean on any question what it wants to mean. For example, some have devised a theory of "a second probation" for the heathen in the future life. In such a case, it would be allowable, if we find even a few hints in the Bible regarding a tenet which there appear to be strong outside reasons for accepting; and if there be no positive Scripture teaching to the contrary, that we should rely on the hints. So we do, as to the recognition of friends in heaven. There are a few hints — we strongly incline to believe it — there is nothing in the Bible to contradict. Now, if the same were true as to future probation, we might accept it. But what is the fact? The application of this theory to the heathen is flatly contradicted in Romans 1:1-32; Romans 2:1-29. When men argue that divine justice requires a second probation for the heathen, then how about those in Christian countries, who never knew of Christianity, except in forms so corrupted as to be a hindrance instead of a help? Carry this out logically, and you reach Universalism in one way or another. But God's word opposes itself to Universalism, by all its solemn utterances about eternal life and eternal punishment. So this theory of a second probation, for which no Scripture proof can be even claimed beyond a few obscure and dubious hints, are, on the other hand, contradicted and forbidden by plain teachings of the Bible. Let us never forget, in our disputations, that this is an unspeakably solemn subject. Eternal punishment, in itself an awful thought, carries with it eternal sin. Across this great darkness, I see but two rays of light. One consists of the truth, too often overlooked, that there will be immensely different degrees of punishment. The other relief is found in the thought that we of to-day may carry the blessed gospel to the heathen who are now living. The great principle, in all such inquiries, is that, while it is lawful to re-investigate the meaning of Scripture in the light of current opinion and feeling, it is not lawful to put anything as authority above God's word. Many people fail to make this distinction, and glide insensibly from

re-interpretation of the Scriptures, into setting the Scriptures aside. Thus, you will hear some persons say of Paul, as he speaks in Corinthians of marriage: "Oh, Paul was an old bachelor." They do not know that they are not only guilty of shocking bad taste, but of rationalism of the most offensive kind. There is great danger, when we do not find Scripture to suit us, that we shall unconsciously pass from the task of interpretation to the liberty of setting aside.

Take another case, in which careful interpretation will correct a common error. How often we hear people saying that the early Christians were Communists. This was formerly for us a mere speculative question. But communism now approaches us as a practical matter; and a new investigation of Scripture will speedily show that the early Christians were not Communists. The words of Peter to Ananias, "While it remained, was it not thine own? And after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?" necessarily involve private ownership on the part of Ananias. The fault found was simply with his lying. The phrase, "had all things in common," is simply a strong expression for extraordinary generosity, which answered to an extraordinary demand. Many from Galilee, and from foreign countries, were tarrying several years at Jerusalem, till Providence taught them through persecution to go forth; and meantime, they had no means of support. Multitudes of the poor in Jerusalem were habitually supported by contributions from foreign Jews; and their share in these was cut off when they became Christians. This situation called for great generosity. And you find a string of Greek imperfect tenses in the record (Acts 2:1-47; Acts 5:1-42), showing that from time to time, one disciple or another would even sell real estate in order to meet the pressing need. They regarded their property as held by them for the common benefit. This is the only meaning possible, in light of Peter's words to Ananias. So, likewise, as to the questions of divorce, temperance, etc. It is one thing to re-interpret the Bible, and another thing to set aside its authority.

Many persuade themselves that some particular departure from the Scripture requirement is, after all, but slight, and seems, at present, a practical necessity. Such was evidently the feeling of some Christians in the second century, whose apparently slight deviations have since grown to vast proportions. In the portion of Asia Minor where Ignatius dwelt early in the century, and which was the home of the earliest heresies, one of the elders seems to have been exalted over the others as a means of maintaining unity, and keeping out heresy; and he alone was to be called bishop. This probably seemed a necessary, and not a very important, change. But behold how this bishop business spread and grew, until it filled almost the whole Christian world; and even passed in the might power claimed by the Bishop of Rome. Justin Martyr, near the middle of the century, in his beautiful description of the worship of the Christians, uses some obscure expressions about the bread and wine in which we can now discern the germ of transubstantiation. The so-called "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," probably belonging to the second half of the century, in giving instructions about baptism, says that if enough water cannot be had for baptism, they may pour water three times upon the head. This might seem to the writer only a slight alteration, for convenience; but see how it grew and expanded, and what consequences it has had throughout Christendom! These things show us the importance which may attach to small beginnings in departure from the word of God.

Look at the lower Mississippi in the time of flood. Its turbid waters rush along between levees, while fair fields spread away far below the surface of the stream. At a certain point, the water begins to trickle through the topmost soil; and, being neglected, it cuts a little channel. Look! it

grows! it deepens! it widens into a great crevasse! Now bells are rung! The neighboring planters gather, and seek to stop the break; but it is too late! The waters pour through, and all the homes are islets, and the fair land is desolated; and long will it be before the great inundation subsides, and the vast break in the levee can be filled. Yet it all began in a slight trickling through the soil. O brother, principii obsta! Let us stop the beginnings [of] departure from the teaching of God's word.

===== [John A Broadus - A booklet by the American Baptist Publication Society.]

S. Passages For Learning By Heart

PASSAGES FOR LEARNING BY HEART

It is an excellent thing for the young to commit to memory many portions of Scripture. The following passages are recommended as suitable, and it is hoped that many will learn some of them, and add other selections as thought best. The Ten Commandments, Exodus 20:1-17.

Psalms 1:1-6; Psalms 16:1-11; Psalms 19:1-14; Psalms 23:1-6; Psalms 25:1-22; Psalms 27:1-14; Psalms 32:1-11; Psalms 34:1-22; Psalms 51:1-19; Psalms 84:1-12; Psalms 90:1-17; Psalms 92:1-15; Psalms 95:1-11; Psalms 100:1-5; Psalms 103:1-22; Psalms 115:1-18; Psalms 116:1-19; Psalms 130:1-8; Psalms 139:1-24; Psalms 145:1-21.

Proverbs 3:1-20; Proverbs 6:6-11; Proverbs 10:1-32; Proverbs 11:1-31; Proverbs 20:1-30; Ecclesiastes 12:1-14.

Isaiah 40:1-31; Psalms 53:1-12; Isaiah 55:1-13.

Matthew 5:3-16; Matthew 6:1-34; Matthew 7:1-29; Matthew 25:1-46; Matthew 28:18-20.

Mark 4:22-25; Mark 4:32-42.

Luke 15:11-32; Luke 16:19-31; Luke 18:1-14; Luke 24:13-35.

John 1:1-18; John 4:1-15; John 20:1-23. Acts 17:22-31; Acts 20:17-38.

Romans 5:1-11; Romans 8:28-39; Romans 12:1-21.

1 Corinthians 13:1-13; 1 Corinthians 15:1-58; 2 Corinthians 5:1-21.

Ephesians 3:4-21; Ephesians 6:10-20; Colossians 3:1-4; Colossians 4:2-6.

1 Thessalonians 4:13-18; Titus 2:11-14.

Hebrews 4:4-16; Hebrews 11:1-40; Hebrews 12:1-3.

1 John 1:5-10; 1 John 2:1-6; 1 John 3:13-24; 1 John 4:1-21.

Revelation 1:9-20; Revelation 7:9-17; Revelation 20:11-15; Revelation 21:1-27; Revelation 22:1-20.

===== [American Baptist Publication Society, 1892. - jrd]

S. Providence Of God

PROVIDENCE OF GOD 1. What is meant by the providence of God? God cares for all His creatures and provides for their welfare.

2. Does God's providence extend to the wicked? God gives to the wicked, sunshine and rain and all the common blessings of life, thereby calling them to repentance. Matthew 5:45; Psalms 45:9; Romans 2:4.

3. Does God exercise any special providence over the righteous? God makes all things work together for good to them that love Him. Romans 8:28; Psalms 23:1.

4. Is God's providence confined to great things? God notices and provides for even the least things. Luke 12:7.

5. Is there really any such thing as chance or luck? There is no such thing as chance or luck; everything is controlled by the providence of God.

6. Does God act according to purposes formed beforehand? God has always intended to do whatever He does. Ephesians 1:11; 1 Peter 1:20.

7. Do God's purposes destroy our freedom of action? We choose and act freely, and are accountable for all we do. Joshua 14:15; Romans 14:12.

8. Does God cause evil? God permits evil, but does not cause it.

9. Does God ever check and overrule evil? God often prevents evil, and often brings good out of evil. Genesis 45:5; Psalms 76:10.

10. What is the greatest example of God's bringing good out of evil? The crucifixion of Christ is the greatest example of God's bringing good out of evil.

11. How ought we to think and feel about the providence of God? We ought always to remember our dependence on God, and to trust His providential guidance. James 4:15; Jeremiah 10:23.

12. When God in His providence sends upon us something painful, how ought we to feel? When God sends on us something painful we ought to be patient, obedient, and thankful. 1 Samuel 3:18; 1 Thessalonians 5:18.

S. Regeneration

REGENERATION 1. What is meant by the word regeneration? Regeneration God's causing a person to be born again.

2. Are such persons literally born a second time? No, the regenerated are inwardly changed as if they were born over again.

3. In what respect are men changed in the new birth? In the new birth men have a new heart, so as to hate sin and desire to be holy servants of God. Ezekiel 11:19; Ezekiel 11:20.

4. Is this new birth necessary in order to salvation? Without the new birth no one can be saved. John 3:3.

5. Who produces this great change? The Holy Spirit regenerates. John 3:5; John 3:6.

6. Are people regenerated through baptism? No, only those whose hearts are already changed ought to be baptized.

7. Are people regenerated through Bible teaching? Yes, people are usually regenerated through the Word of God. 1 Peter 1:23; James 1:18.

8. Can we understand how men are born again? No, we can only know regeneration by its effects. John 3:8.

9. Does faith come before the new birth? No, it is the new heart that truly repents and believes.

10. What is the proof of having a new heart? The proof of having a new heart is living a new life. 1 John 2:29; 2 Corinthians 5:17.

S. Repetance And Faith

REPENTANCE AND FAITH

1. What is it to repent of sin? Repenting of sin means that one changes his thoughts and feelings about sin, resolving to forsake sin and live for God.
2. Does not repenting mean being sorry? Everyone who truly resolves to quit sinning will be sorry for his past sins, but people are often sorry without quitting.
3. What is the great reason for repenting of sin? The great reason for repenting of sin is because sin is wrong, and offensive to God. Psalms 51:4.
4. Is repentance necessary to a sinner's salvation? Those who will not turn from sin must perish. Luke 13:3; Ezekiel 33:11.
5. What do the Scriptures mean by faith in Christ? By faith in Christ the Scriptures mean believing Christ to be the divine Saviour, and personally trusting in him for our salvation.
6. Is faith in Christ necessary to salvation? No person capable of faith in Christ can be saved without it. John 3:6; Hebrews 11:6.
7. Can those who die in infancy be saved without faith? Yes, we feel sure that those who die in infancy are saved for Christ's sake.
8. Are they saved without regeneration? Infants are not saved without regeneration, for without holiness no one shall see God.
9. Can we see why persons capable of faith cannot be saved without it? Persons capable of faith must by faith accept God's offered mercy; and His truth cannot become the means of making them holy unless it is believed.
10. Is refusing to believe in Christ a sin? It is fearfully wicked to reject the Saviour and insult God who gave His Son in love. John 3:18; 1 John 5:10.
11. Do faith in Christ and true repentance ever exist separately? No, either faith or repentance will always carry the other with it. Acts 20:21.

S. Science and Christianity

Science and Christianity * By John A. Broadus, 1879 AN eminent man of science who is a church-member and a decided and outspoken Christian presents by no means the unusual spectacle that some persons suppose. A certain class of writers and speakers seem really to have persuaded themselves that a new "irrepressible conflict" has arisen between science and Christianity, and that he who is a friend to the one must be an enemy to the other. The ground of this persuasion is not far to seek. Some men have thought they saw in the real or supposed results of scientific research a new means of attacking Christianity, to which they were commonly opposed on other accounts, and have very naturally been anxious to associate with their inferences and speculations the dignity and prestige which so justly belong to science. And then certain unwise defenders of Christianity have rushed to the rescue, and instead of attacking the unwarranted applications and assumptions of their opponents, have committed the -----

* Dr. J. Lawrence Smith, of Louisville, after receiving a great variety of scientific honors in Europe and at home, was in 1879 made a corresponding member of the French Institute, Academy of Science, the highest scientific distinction in the world, and one which few Americans have attained. On his return home, many eminent citizens of Louisville made a banquet in his honor; and, in response to a toast, "The Church," the following address was delivered. Dr. Smith had long been an active and useful member of the Walnut Street Baptist Church, and so continued until his lamented death in 1883. stupendous blunder of attacking science itself. Amid the din of their conflict it is hardly strange if some have supposed that there must be war to the knife between all Christians and all men of science. But meantime most of us are entirely peaceful. Certainly a very distinguished representative of physical science and a very humble representative of Christianity have sat side by side this evening in all peace and amity. A large proportion of the foremost scientific men of the age, in Europe and America, are known, believers in Christianity, and not a few are, like our honored guest, ready on all suitable occasions to advocate its claims. And, on the other hand, the great mass of really intelligent Christians everywhere are warm friends of science, whether physical or metaphysical, linguistic or historical, social, political or religious science. Why should it not be so? The very essence of Christianity is light; its very life-blood is truth; error and ignorance are among its greatest foes; and all true knowledge, however misconceived and misapplied for a time, is in reality its friend and helper, and sooner or later will be so acknowledged.

Let all cultivated men try to repress this mistaken notion of antagonism. Physical science has its own great field, its grand achievements and a possible future which no man can now imagine ; but there are facts of existence which its processes cannot explain or even detect. Men devoted to experiment and demonstration sometimes grow one-sided, as we are all prone to do, and deny all that does not come within their range. But physical science necessarily fails to account for our sense of right and wrong, our quenchless longings after immortality, our invincible belief in the Almighty, All-wise and All-loving. Our loftiest thought remains always a fragment till it finds completeness in the thought of Him; and our hearts — strange hearts, so strong and yet so weak,

with joys so sweet and griefs so bitter — our hearts can know no rest save as they rest in Him.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, you have meant to show respect for the Church, the aggregate of avowed Christians. There are two things which I think that Christians ought, in our day and country, especially to propose to themselves and to urge on all around them. One is that we must all strive to combine the highest, broadest Christian charity with firm attachment to truth and fidelity to honest convictions. It is one of the practical problems of our age to combine these, not sacrificing either to the other. And the second thing: At a time when political and social evils spread so wide and strike so deep, when some men who are not foolish despair of the republic, and some despair of society, and some ask whether life is worth living, it becomes us indeed fearlessly to point out the faults of our current Christianity, that they may be mended; but it becomes us also to conserve and maintain the legitimate influence of Christianity over all classes of our population. Let all men beware how they speak the word that is to lessen that influence. Things are bad enough with us as it is; they would be far worse if that influence were destroyed. But let us hope that amid the mutations and reactions of human affairs, and under the control of that Divine Providence at the thought of which we all bow in reverence, there may be an increase of living Christian faith and genuine Christian morality, of real education and enlightened patriotism, that will bring better and brighter days for us and for our children.

=====

[John A. Broadus, *Sermons and Addresses*, 1888, pp. 348-351. This book was provided by Steve Lecrone, Burton, OH. — jrd]

S. Should Women Speak Mixed Public

Should Women Speak in Mixed Public Assemblies? By John A. Broadus, D. D., L.L.D.

There is at present a strong tendency in some parts of our country to encourage women in the practice of public discourse to mixed assemblies. This connects itself more or less, with the movements for female suffrage, though some strongly favor the one who are opposed to the other. Christian civilization has by degrees greatly elevated the female sex; and now the demand is, in many quarters, that women shall be encouraged to do, if they like, anything and everything that men do. On the other hand, many of both sexes are persuaded that the Holy Scriptures, which have been the chief cause of the elevation of women, place certain restrictions about their public activities, and enjoin some kind of subordination of wife to husband. The question arising in connection with these movements of opinion and practice are many and various, and some of them appeal to powerful human prejudices and sentiments. It is by no means proposed that this tract shall take the wide range thus indicated. It will be confined to the question raised at the outset, and to the limitations with which that question is stated; and will be chiefly occupied with an attempt to explain the passages of scripture which appear to forbid women speaking in mixed assemblies. No thoughtful person would like to profess that in our country at the present moment he can make this investigation in a completely impartial and dispassionate manner; but it is obviously very desirable that writer and readers in such a case should earnestly strive to deal fairly with their own minds and with the truth of God. In 1 Corinthians 14:34 f, the apostle Paul says: "Let the women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be in subjection, as also saith the law. And If they would learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for a woman to speak in the church." In 1 Timothy 2:11-15 the apostle has been speaking of public worship, directing that "the men (i. e., the men as distinguished from the women, the Greek having a special term) pray in every place, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and disputing." He then directs that women "adorn themselves in modest apparel," etc. The amount of this seems to be that in public worship the men, who do the public praying, shall see that the hands they solemnly lift are not stained with sin, and that in their mutual instruction and exhortation there shall be no angry disputation. These are two special dangers with men. And the women are warned against one of their special dangers, viz. that in attending on public worship they will have too much of showy personal adornment. He then proceeds: "Let a woman learn in quietness with all subjection. But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness. For Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not beguiled. but the woman being beguiled, hath fallen into transgression; but she shall be saved through the child-bearing, if they continue in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety." The passages are here quoted from the Revised English Version, according to the English form, from which the American form makes only one not very important variation in each passage. The Revised Version does not materially differ in either of these passages from the Common Version, but several expressions are plainer or more exact. For instance, in I Corinthians the term "subjection" is used, the Greek having the same word that is translated subjection in the other

passage, and in 1 Peter 3:1, which shows the three passages to be exactly parallel in this respect. It may be observed that many apparently slight variations in the Revised Version arise from the desire to translate the same Greek word by the same English word wherever possible. Many alterations which superficial critics have denounced as trifling, thus become important to the careful comparison of similar passages.

Now it does not need to be urged that these two passages from the Apostle Paul do definitely and strongly forbid that women shall speak in mixed public assemblies. No one can afford to question that such is the most obvious meaning of the apostle's commands. All that can be said in opposition to the view that this is what he intended to teach, must rest either upon a supposed unusual sense of some one of the terms employed in the passages, or upon the connection, or upon some other source of information about the persons the apostle's aim.

Some have suggested that the word rendered "speak," in 1 Corinthians 14:34, "it is not permitted unto them to speak," denotes idle chatter as opposed to thoughtful and earnest speaking. It is enough to say that this proposed distinction is quite a failure. The word, which commonly means to talk, speak, etc., is sometimes used in classical Greek for chattering, and is sometimes applied to animals. But there are no clear examples of any such use in Biblical Greek, and the word is applied to apostles, prophets, the Saviour, God. See Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Others lay stress on the word "church" or "churches," and hold that the apostle means a formal public meeting, as distinguished from what we call a social meeting, such as a prayer-meeting, or the like. Applying a purely modern distinction, they say that a woman is forbidden to speak in "church;" but that does not forbid her speaking in prayer-meeting. The answer is that the New Testament knows no such distinction. In fact, the very abuses in public worship which the apostle seeks in 1 Corinthians 12:1-31 and 1 Corinthians 14:1-40 to correct, are such as could only have arisen in an informal meeting, where everyone thought himself at liberty to rise and speak. Moreover, the same word "church" (the Greek meaning an assembly) is applied to meetings in private houses, as that of Aquila and Priscilla, or that of Philemon and Apphia. So this distinction also fails.

Some remind us that in 1 Corinthians 11:5 ff, the apostle has spoken of women as "praying or prophesying" in the public assemblies. That is true, and our first business is to reconcile the apostle with himself. The word "prophesy" in the New Testament means to speak by divine inspiration. This the apostle repeatedly distinguishes on the one hand from utterances in an unknown tongue, and on the other hand from ordinary uninspired teaching. Some persons in the apostolic age were inspired to speak in unknown tongues, others in the language of those addressed. Among these last were some women, just as there are several cases of prophetesses in the Old Testament. In 1 Corinthians 11:1-34 the apostle speaks of such inspired women, and urges upon them that in their high excitement they must not disregard propriety of appearance and behavior; in particular, that they must keep the head covered in the customary manner. Now, unless the apostle has contradicted himself, we seem shut up to understand that the passage in 1 Corinthians 14:1-40 is a general direction, leaving out the case of women who prophesied, i. e., spoke by special inspiration. There is no such inspired speaking possible for us. True, it has been argued that when the apostle says (1 Corinthians 14:3), "He that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification," we may infer that anyone who speaks in an edifying way is prophesying, and that if a woman can speak so as to edify, she is exempt from the apostle's prohibition. The author this

argument had forgotten the first elements of his logic, which certainly taught him that he must beware of assuming a proposition to be convertible. All prophesying was edifying speech; but how in the world can it be inferred that all edifying speech is prophesy? Yellow fever is a malarial disease; shall we infer that all malarial diseases are yellow fever? A more plausible method of explaining away Paul's prohibition consists in maintaining that it applied only to the peculiar ideas and manners of that time. Thus some say it applied only to women at Corinth, a place famous for licentiousness, where it was necessary that Christian women should observe peculiar strictness of decorum in public places. But the apostle makes the same prohibition through Timothy for the churches in the region about Ephesus. And observe, he grounds his prohibition (in the passage from Timothy) upon facts connected with the Creation and the fall of Adam and Eve. Does not this absolutely forbid restricting his prohibition to Corinth and Ephesus, or to that particular age? The same consideration applies when the prohibition is likened to his direction in 1 Corinthians 11:1-34 that a woman must not appear in the public meeting without a covering on her head. We are told that this applied simply to the ideas and customs then prevailing. Let us not be so sure that such is the case. In point of fact, almost all Christian women seem to have a feeling that the apostle's direction applies to them, for they very rarely fail to wear in religious assemblies some form of head covering, which in the mutations of fashion has sometimes been vastly more diminutive than at present, but is never discarded. And whatever may be thought as to that point, we must remember that in the epistle to Timothy the apostle especially grounds his injunction upon primal facts in human history, and thereby cuts it off from being fairly regarded as temporary.

Two other attempts to explain away the apostle's prohibition are worth mention as indicating desperate straits. When he says, "And if they would learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home," some actually infer that women who have no husbands are left at liberty "to speak in the church." So then an unmarried woman may put herself publicly forward in a way which for married women would be "shameful!" A recent writer thinks it probable that the two passages in question have "suffered modification from transcribers." When a hard-pressed controversialist urges that some passage may be corrupt, without a particle of documentary evidence to that effect, he inevitably suggests that his own interpretations of the passage as it stands are not really satisfactory to his own mind. So the apostle's clear and consistent prohibitions stand unshaken, in their obvious sense. But consider just what he prohibits. Is it not this? He says a woman must not speak in mixed assemblies -- those in which men are present; because she is thus undertaking to "teach" men, to "have dominion" over them; and this is inconsistent with that "subjection" of the woman to the man which both passages enjoin, and which the Bible so often asserts. Then he does not forbid a woman to "speak" or to "teach" where women only are present. There is no prohibition of feminine discourse in female prayer-meetings or missionary societies. Only keep the men out. And beware of some "entering-wedge" in the shape of an editor or masculine reporter. As to crying out against the Bible for teaching "the subjection of woman," leave that to Ingersoll. The precise nature and proper limits of this subjection may not be generally understood, and would be an appropriate subject for earnest inquiry. But that the Bible does teach subjection, and that the apostle makes that his special reason for the prohibition before us, would seem to be quite beyond question. A Baptist lady in Kansas wrote that she read the foregoing as published in the Western Recorder. She stated that she is a clerk, and one of the trustees of a Baptist church, and words of hers spoken in a public meeting have been the means of spiritual good to other women. She wished to know what Paul

means in 1 Timothy 5:9-14; whether it means that widows ought not to be received into the church under sixty years of age. She and her sister are both widows, and (of course) are not sixty years of age; and she asks whether the church did wrong in receiving them as members. The answer is, that the apostle is there not speaking of church membership, but of a sort of arrangement, concerning which we have no other information, by which certain selected widows were supported by the church, and devoted themselves to caring for the poor and the sick. No widow was to be enrolled in this list unless she was at least sixty years old, and in her previous life had shown herself well suited to the duties they were expected to perform. The letter proceeds:

"I can not reconcile Christ's treatment and mention of women with Paul's. I think Paul must have written there his biased opinion, instead of the direction of the Spirit. Women were last at the Cross and first at the sepulchre of Christ. He spoke to one first after his resurrection. John gives a whole chapter, nearly, Christ's conversation with Mary and Martha, and not one word of what Lazarus said. Why are so many things that women said and did recorded if they were to be so silent on religious matters?"

Some persons will think it passing strange that this should be presented as an argument in favor of women's speaking to mixed assemblies, notwithstanding the express and repeated prohibition of the Apostle Paul. Yet substantially the same argument has been vehemently urged by writers of both sexes, and even in a book, by a minister. As to there being no record in John 11:1-57 of conversation with Lazarus, it will occur to some readers that Lazarus, during the Master's conversation with his sisters, was in his tomb. The real importance of this extract lies in the cool assumption that Paul was not inspired in his prohibitions! That cuts at the root of Christianity. The writer of the letter is here quite logical, and shows the real tendency of the whole movement she is defending. I have scarcely ever conversed with any advocate of women's speaking in mixed assemblies who did not, sooner or later, deny the Apostle Paul's inspired authority in this matter. That is the very reason why the question is of so great importance; and it must be my excuse for making extracts from a private letter. From the best information accessible, it may be stated that the present active movement in favor of the practice we are discussing originated among the Methodists, especially in the Northwest. Mr. Wesley's "class-meetings" consisted of a small number of persons of both sexes, under a "class-leader," and in these meetings, which were strictly private, the female members were expected to speak of their recent experiences, as well as the men. This is probably the historical origin of the claim now made in some Baptist churches, that women may properly "testify." The practice of women's speaking in mixed assemblies was greatly strengthened by the zealous efforts of the "Women Crusaders" for temperance in Ohio and elsewhere, so twenty years ago, and afterward by the Women's Christian Temperance Union. It is well known that Quakers have always encouraged women to speak in the public meetings when they felt moved thereto; also that Universalists and Unitarians have sometimes encouraged women thus to speak -- those bodies not acknowledging that they owe strict and minute obedience to the requirements of the New Testament. A good many Congregationalists now hold loose views of inspiration, and some of them have been ready to set aside the apostle's prohibition. In the zealous and honored temperance work above mentioned some Baptist ladies have united, through fervent sympathy with the objects, and usually without consideration as to the exact requirement of Scripture. More recently, some of the women's missionary societies have allowed the presence of men at their meetings, but other societies have strictly excluded men, the latter class still showing

a desire to obey the Scripture prohibitions. It can not be questioned that the great majority of Baptist ladies who have been gradually drawn into this movement for women's speaking in mixed assemblies, have been influenced by unreflecting sympathy, or by mere considerations of supposed expediency. Even one of our most admirable Baptist newspapers a few years ago said, with reference to this matter, "We must regard exigencies as well as exegesis." The writer did not weigh the full meaning of his words. A justly honored Baptist pastor was not long ago reported as saying (in substance) that he did not want to hear so much about texts on this subject; the thing does good, and that was enough for him. The Paedobaptists do much good. Many devout Romanists gain good and do good by holding up a crucifix to dying eyes; does that make the practice scriptural and justifiable for Baptists? Why will not Baptist people see the gross inconsistency of vehemently asserting the necessity of conforming to the New Testament in regard to church membership and the ordinances, while the coolly disregard express prohibitions in respect to another matter? Will our honored brethren and sisters please open their eyes, take their latitude and longitude, and see which way they are drifting?

"Ah, but," some will say, "this is a great movement; and it is going to grow. Shall we let the Methodists get all the benefit of it?" Grant for the sake of argument that it seems expedient, and will give denominational power. We let the Methodists get all the benefit of infant baptism, of Arminian theology, of centralized organization, because we think these things are contrary to the New Testament. If Baptists are going to abandon New Testament teachings for the sake of falling in with what they regard as a popular movement, the very reason for their existence has ceased.

It is a comfort to know that the great majority of Baptist women in our country as a whole are still distinctly opposed to this practice. Such is the case almost universally in New England (if I am correctly informed), quite generally in the Middle States, and with very few exceptions throughout the South and Southwest. Is it too much to hope that our excellent Baptist ladies who have fallen in with the movement in some parts of the country will stop while they can, will exclude men from their women's meetings, will decline to join in temperance addresses to assemblies composed of both men and women?

One other point. Some will say, "if we undertake to carry out such strict views, they will be found to conflict with the work which some women are almost everywhere doing as teachers of male Bible classes, as professors in co-educating colleges, and sometimes as missionary workers in foreign fields." I shall not now inquire how far these practices conflict with the apostle's prohibition. But if any of them do thus conflict, then instead of being relied on as precedent to set aside the apostle's authority, they ought themselves to be curtailed and corrected.

Source: Baptist Book Concern, Louisville, KY, 1880

S. Some Duties Of The Christian Life

SOME DUTIES OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

1. What is our duty as to speaking the truth? We must always speak truth and never lie. Ephesians 4:25; Exodus 20:16; Revelation 21:8.
2. Is it possible to act a lie without speaking it? Yes, to act a lie may be one of the worst forms of falsehood. Acts 5:3.
3. What is our duty as to speaking evil of others? We must never speak so as to wrong any person. James 4:11.
4. What is meant by profane speech? Profane speech is cursing or swearing, or speaking in an irreverent way of God, or of the Bible, or of anything sacred.
5. What does the Bible say about stealing? "Thou shalt not steal." Exodus 20:15; Ephesians 4:28.
6. Can you tell some things which this forbids? The commandment forbids all unfair buying and selling, and any failure to pay promised wages or perform promised work.
7. Is it wrong even to wish to take away another person's property? Yes, the Bible says we must not covet what belongs to another. Exodus 20:17.
8. May we properly strive to do better than others? Yes, we may strive to excel others, but we must not envy others nor try to pull them back. 1 Peter 2:1.
9. May we revenge ourselves on those who have wronged us? No, revenge is very wicked, and we must leave punishment of those who have wronged us with God. Romans 12:19.
10. Ought we to love our enemies just as we love our friends? We ought to love our enemies as God loves His enemies, and so be ready always to do them a kindness. Matthew 5:44; Matthew 5:45.
11. What is our duty as to purity? We must avoid all impure actions and words, thoughts and feelings.
12. How may Christians hope to perform these and all duties of the Christian life? Christians may hope to perform their duties by watchful effort and constant prayer for the help of the Holy Spirit. Matthew 26:41; Luke 11:18.

S. Some Laws of Spiritual Work

Some Laws of Spiritual Work* But he said unto them, I have meat to eat that ye know not. The disciples therefore said one to another, Hath any man brought him aught to eat? Jesus saith unto them. My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to accomplish his work. Say not ye, There are yet four months, and then cometh the harvest? Behold, I say unto you, Lift up your eyes and look on the fields, that they are white already unto harvest. He that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal; that he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together. For herein is the saying true, One soweth, and another reapeth. I sent you to reap that whereon ye have not labored: others have labored, and ye are entered into their labor. John 4:32-38. THE disciples must have been very much astonished at the change which they observed in the Master's appearance. They left him, when they went away to a neighboring city to buy food, reclining beside Jacob's well, quite worn out with the fatigue of their journey, following upon the fatigues of long spiritual labors. And here now he is sitting up, his face is animated, his eyes kindled. He has been at work again. Presently they ask him to partake of the food which they had brought, and his answer surprised them: "I have food to eat that ye know not." They looked around, and saw nobody; the woman to whom he had been speaking was gone, and they said: "Has any one brought him something to eat?" Jesus answered, "My food is to do the will of him that sent me, and to accomplish his work." And then, with this thought of work, he changes the image to sowing and reaping, and bids them go forth to the harvest.

Now, from this passage with its images, I have wished to discourse upon some laws of spiritual work, as here set forth. For we are beginning to see, in our time, that there are laws in the spiritual sphere as truly as in the mental and in the physical spheres. What are the laws of spiritual work which the Saviour here indicates? I name four, I. Spiritual work is refreshing to soul and body.

"My food is," said the tired, hungry one, who had aroused himself, "to do the will of him that sent me, and to accomplish his work." We all know the power of the body over the mind, and we all know, I trust, the power of the mind over the body; how any animating theme can kindle the mind until the wearied body will be stirred to new activities; until the man will forget that he was tired, because of that in which he is interested. But it must be something that does deeply interest the mind. And so there is suggested to us the thought that we ought to learn to love spiritual work.

If we love spiritual work it will kindle our souls; it will even give health and vigor to our bodies. There are some well-meaning, but good-for-nothing, professed Christians in our time, who would have better health of mind and even better health of body, if they would do more religious work and be good for something in their day and generation.

How shall we learn to love religious work so that it may kindle and refresh us? Old Daniel Sharp, who was a famous Baptist minister in Boston years ago, used to be very fond of repeating, "The only way to learn to preach is to -preach." Certainly, the only way to learn to do anything is to do the thing. The only way to learn to do spiritual work is to do spiritual work, the only way to learn to love spiritual work is to keep doing it until we gain pleasure from the doing; until we discern

rewards in connection with the doing; and to cherish all the sentiments which will awaken in us that “enthusiasm of humanity” which it was Jesus that introduced among men; and to love the souls of our fellow-men, to love the wandering, misguided lives, to love the suffering and sinning all around us with such an impassioned love that it shall be a delight to us to do them good and to try to save them from death. Then that will refresh both mind and body.

II. There are seasons in the spiritual sphere sowing seasons and reaping seasons, just as there are in farming.

“Say not ye,” said Jesus, “there are yet four months and then cometh the harvest?” that is to say, it was four months from that time till the harvest. They sowed their wheat in December; they began to reap it in April. “Say not ye, there are four months, and then cometh the harvest? behold, I say unto you, lift up your eyes and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest.” In the spiritual sphere it was a harvest time then, and they were bidden to go forth and reap the harvest that waved white and perishing. We can see, as we look back, that the ends of all the ages had now come to that time; that the long course of providential preparation, dimly outlined in the Old Testament, had led to the state of things that then prevailed; that the fulness of the times had come, when God sent forth his Son to teach men and to atone for men, and to rise again and come forth as their Saviour, and that his servants should go forth in his name. And the like has been true in many other seasons of Christianity; there have been great reaping times, when men have harvested the fruits which come from the seed scattered by others long before.

I persuade myself that such a time will be seen ere long in the world again. I think that the young who are here present to-day though they may forget the preacher and his prediction will live to see the time when there will be a great season of harvest that will astonish mankind. In the great heathen world I think it will be true that the labors of our missionaries are preparing the way, and that in the course of divine providence the same providence that overruled the history of Egypt and Assyria and Greece and Rome the greatest nations of Asia are now becoming rapidly prepared to receive a new faith. They say, who live there and ought to know, that there is a wonderful breaking up of religious opinion in all Hindostan, with its two hundred and fifty millions of people five times as many, almost, as in our great country that they are learning to let go their old faiths, and that the time must soon come when, in sheer bewilderment and blindness, as it were, men will search round for something else to look upon, something else to lay hold upon. It is a sad thing to see great nations of mankind surrendered to utter unbelief, but it has often proven the preparation for their accepting a true and mighty and blessed faith. I think one can see, in the marvellous changes which are going on in Japan, a preparation for like effects there; and as Japan is, for the civilized world, the gateway into China, and our missionaries are already at work there and great changes are taking place there, so it is quite possible that even in one or two generations there will be a wide spread of Christianity in that wonderful nation of mankind. God grant that it may be so!

I think the same thing is going to happen in our own country. We have been living in a time of eclipse, so to speak, of late years, but I think another reaction will come. Some of us can remember that thirty or forty years ago there was almost no avowed infidelity in this country. There was not a publisher in New York, who had any respect for himself and any large hope of success, that would have had a book with one page of avowed unbelief in it on his shelves. How different it is now!

We have been passing, as I said, through a reaction. In the early part of this century our whole country was honeycombed with infidelity. It was ten times worse than it is to-day. But in 1825, 1830, 1840, 1850, there were wide spread changes, revivals; and a great many men were brought into our churches who had not the root of the matter in them, and a lax discipline and a low state of religious living became, alas! too common, and we have been reaping the bitter fruits. Alas! how often it has happened that some man has become notorious in the newspapers as a defaulter, or a criminal in some other way, and we have been compelled to read the added statement, that he was a member of such and such a church, was a Sunday-school superintendent, teacher, or what not. How often it has happened! This has been one of many causes I cannot stop now to analyze and point out, but they can be analyzed and pointed out of such widespread unbelief of late years. But it cannot last. There never was such activity in the Christian world; and if our earnest Christian people stand firm, if they practice in all directions that earnestness of Christian purpose, if they try to maintain the truth of the gospel and live up to it in their own lives, and lift up their prayer to God for his blessing, there will come another great sweeping reaction. It is as sure to come as there is logic in history or in human nature.

It is as sure to come as there is truth in the promises of God's word. O, may many of you live to see that day and rejoice at its coming! The same thing is true in individual churches, that there are seasons of sowing and reaping. It has to be so. We sometimes say we do not believe in the revival idea; we think there ought to be revival in the church all the time. If you mean that we ought always to be seeking for spiritual fruits, always aiming at spiritual advancement, it is true. But if you mean that you expect that piety will go on with even current in the church, that there will be just as much sowing and reaping at any one time as at any other, then you will certainly be disappointed. That is not the law of human nature. That is not possible in the world. Periodicity pervades the universe. Periodicity controls the life of all individuals, shows itself in the operations of our minds. Periodicity necessarily appears in the spiritual sphere also. People have their ups and downs. They ought to strive against falling low. They ought not to be content with growing cold. They ought to seek to maintain good health of body all the while, but it will not be always equally good; and good health of mind and soul all the time, but it will not be always equally good. They ought to be seeking to reap a harvest of spiritual good among those around them all the while; but they will have seasons which are rather of sowing, and other seasons which will be rather of reaping. O! do you want to see a great season of harvest among your own congregation? And do you not know, brethren, as well as the preacher can tell you, what is necessary in order that you may see it? What are the conditions but deepened spiritual life in your own individual souls, stronger spiritual examples set forth in your lives, more earnest spirituality in your homes, a truer standard in your business and social relations to mankind, more of heartfelt prayer for God's blessing, and more untiring and patient and persevering effort, in season and out of season, to bring others to seek their salvation?

III. Spiritual work links the workers in unity.

"Herein is the saying true," said Jesus; "one soweth, and another reapeth. Other men have labored, and ye are entered into their labors." The prophets, centuries before, had been preparing for that day, and the forerunner had been preparing for that day, and the labors of Jesus himself in his early ministry 'had been preparing the way, and now the disciples could look around them upon fields where, from the sowing of others, there were opportunities for them to reap.

“ Other men have labored, and ye are entered into their labors. One soweth, and another reapeth.” That is the law everywhere; it is true of all the higher work of humanity, “One soweth, and another reapeth;” and our labors link us into unity. It is true of human knowledge. How little has any one individual of mankind been able to find out beyond what the world has known before! Even the great minds that stand like mountain peaks as we look back over the history of human thought, when we come to look into it, do really but uplift the thought that is all around them; else they themselves could not have risen. It is true in practical inventions. We pride ourselves on the fact that ours is an age of such wonderful practical inventions; we sometimes persuade ourselves that we must be the most intelligent generation of mankind that ever lived, past all comparison; that no other race, no other century, has such wonderful things to boast of. How much of it do we owe to the men of the past! Every practical invention of to-day has been rendered possible by what seemed to us the feeble attainments of other centuries, by the patient investigation of the men who, in many cases, have passed away and been forgotten.

We stand upon the shoulders of the past, and rejoice in our possessions, and boast; and when we grow conceited and proud of it, we are like a little boy lifted by his father’s supporting arms, and standing on his father’s shoulders, and clapping his hands above his father’s head, and saying, in childish glee, “ I am taller than pana!” A childish conclusion, to be sure. We stand upon the shoulders of the past, and thereby we are lifted up in all the higher work of mankind; and we ought to be grateful to the past, and mindful of our duty to the future; for the time will come when men will look back upon our inventions, our slow travel, our wonderful ignorance of the power of physical forces and the adaptations of them to physical advancement, and smile at the childishness with which, in the fag end of the nineteenth century, we boasted of ourselves and our time. And now it is not strange that this same thing should be true of spiritual work. When you undertake to do some good in a great city like this, you might sit down and say, “ What can I do with all this mass of vice and sin?” But you do not have to work alone. You can associate yourselves with other workers, in a church, with various organizations of workers, and thereby re-enforce your own exertions; you can feel that you are a working force, and you can feel that you are a part of a mighty force of workers, of your own name and other Christian names. Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, and are trying to do good in his name! And it will cheer our hearts to remember that wide over the land and over the world are unnumbered millions of workers of the army to which we belong.

They tell us that the International Sunday-school lessons which most of us study every Sunday, are actually studied now every Lord’s day by at least ten millions of people, all studying on the same day the same portion of the Bible. That is but one fact to remind us that we are members of a great spiritual host, doing a great work in the world. And not merely are there many cotemporaries with whom we are linked in unity, but we are in unity with the past; other men have labored and we have entered into their labors. All the good that all the devout women and all the zealous men of past ages have been doing has come down to us, opening the way for us to do good. And not merely with the past, but we are linked with the laborers of the future. They may hear our names or they may hear them not. We may perish from all memory of mankind, but our work will not perish, for he that doeth the will of God abideth forever, and if we are engaged in his work, we link ourselves to his permanency and his almightiness, and our work will go down to help the men who are to come after. The same thing is true here, also, in the individual church; one

soweth and another reapeth. A pastor seldom gathers half as much fruit from the seed of his own sowing as he gathers from the seed that others have sown. And there will come some man here God grant, it may be soon, and wisely, and well who will gather seed from the sowing of the venerable pastor so well and worthily beloved in years ago, seed from the sowing of the energetic pastor of recent years, and O my soul, he may gather some harvest, even from the seed scattered in the brief fleeting interim of this summer. We put all our work together. We sink our work in the one great common work. We scatter seed for God and for souls, and we leave it to God's own care and blessing. One soweth, and another reapeth. My brethren, there is nothing like Christianity to individualize mankind. It was Christianity that taught us to appreciate the individuality of men, "Every man must give account of himself unto God." Men were no longer to lose themselves in the state, as classical antiquity taught them to do, but to stand out in their separate personality and individual responsibility and individual rights and duties. But at the same time much of what we can do that is best in the world we must do by close connection and interaction one with another. Let us rejoice to act through others. Priscilla and Aquila! what a power they were for early Christianity when they took that eloquent young Alexandrian Apollos and taught him in private the way of God more perfectly! Priscilla, that devout woman, stood, in fact, before delighted assemblies in Corinth and spoke to them the perfect way of God through the eloquent man whom she had taught. And how often does the Sunday-school teacher, who labored long and, as the world might have thought, fruitlessly, with her little naughty boys and girls, become in future times a great power for good in the world through one or other of them! The teacher has to sink himself in his pupils: never mind if he sinks all out of the world's sight, provided he can make his mark upon them and prepare them for greater usefulness, can put into them some good spirit, and send them forth to do the work which to him personally is denied. Here lies the great power of Christian women. There is much they can do personally, with their own voice and their own action, but there is more they can do by that wondrous influence which men vainly strive to depict, that influence over son and brother and husband and friend whereby all the strength and power of the man is softened and guided and sobered and made wiser through the blessed influence of the woman. God be thanked that we can not only do good in our individual efforts, but we can do good through others! Let us cultivate this, let us delight in this, that we can labor through others. Whenever your pastor may stand before the gathered assembly he can speak with more power because of you, if you do your duty to him and through him. May I mention some of the ways in which we may help our pastor? I speak as one who at home sits for the most part, a private member of the church in the pew, toiling all the week, and often unable to preach on Sunday, and yet as one whose heart is all in sympathy with the pastor's heart, and perhaps a little better able than common to sympathize with both sides. We can help him to draw a congregation. You know we always say now-a-days, that it is very important to get a man who can draw a congregation. So it is, though it is very important to consider what he draws them there for, and what he does with them after he gets them there; and sometimes it does seem to me that it would be better for some people to remain not drawn than to be drawn merely to hear and to witness that which does them harm rather than good. But we do want a man who can draw a congregation; and we can help our pastor to draw a congregation. How? "Well, by taking care that we are always drawn ourselves, by occupying our own place, sometimes when we do not feel like it, on Sunday evening; because it is our duty to our pastor, our duty to the congregation, and our duty to the world. And we can do something to bring others. I recall a story, that a few years after the war (which is the great chronological epoch in a

large part of our country), at the White Sulphur Springs, in Virginia, was a venerable man at whom all the people looked with profound admiration, whose name was Robert E. Lee. He was a devout Episcopalian. One day a Presbyterian minister came to preach in the ball-room, according to custom, and he told me this story. He noticed that General Lee, who was a very particular man about all the proprieties of life, came in late, and he thought it was rather strange. He learned afterwards that the General had waited until all the people who were likely to attend the service had entered the room, and then he walked very quietly around in the corridors and parlors, and out under the trees, and wherever he saw a man or two standing he would go up and say gently: "We are going to have divine service this morning in the ball-room; won't you come?" And they all went. To me it was very touching that that grand old man, whose name was known all over the world and before whom all the people wanted to bow, should so quietly go around, and for a minister of another denomination also, and persuade them to go. Should not we take means to help our pastor to draw a congregation? And when he begins to preach, cannot we help him to preach? Demosthenes is reported to have said (and he ought to have known something about it), that eloquence lies as much in the ear as in the tongue. Everybody who can speak effectively knows that the power of speaking depends very largely upon the way it is heard, upon the sympathy which one succeeds in gaining from those he addresses. If I were asked what is the first thing in effective preaching, I should say, sympathy; and what is the second thing, I should say, sympathy; and what is the third thing, sympathy. We should give our pastor sympathy when he preaches. Sometimes one good listener can make a good sermon; but ah! sometimes one listener who does not care much about the gospel can put the sermon all out of harmony. The soul of a man who can speak effectively is a very sensitive soul, easily repelled and chilled by what is unfavorable, and easily helped by the manifestation of simple and unpretentious sympathy.

How can we help our pastor? We can help him by talking about what he says; not talking about the performance and about the performer, and all that, which, if it is appropriate anywhere, is surely all inappropriate when we turn away from the solemn worship of God, and from listening to sermons intended to do us good but talking about the thoughts that he has given us, recalling them sometimes to one who has heard them like ourselves, repeating them sometimes to some one who has not had the opportunity of hearing them. Thus may we multiply whatever good thoughts the preacher is able to present, and keep them alive in our own minds and the minds of fellow-Christians. Will you pardon an illustration here, even if it be a personal one?

Last year in a city in Texas, I was told of the desire on the part of a lady for conversation, and when we met by arrangement she came in widow's weeds, with a little boy of ten or twelve years old, and began to tell this story: Her husband was once a student at the University of Virginia, when the person she was talking to was the chaplain there, more than twenty-five years ago.

He was of a Presbyterian family from Alabama, and said he never got acquainted with the chaplain, for the students were numerous, but that he heard the preaching a great deal, and in consequence of it, by God's blessing upon it, he was led to take hold as a Christian, and went home and joined the church of his parents.

After the war he married this lady, and a few years ago he passed away. She said he was in the habit, before she knew him, she learned, of talking often in the family about things he used to hear the preacher say; the preacher's words had gotten to be household words in the family. And then

when they were married he taught some of them to her, and was often repeating things he used to hear the preacher say. Since he died she had been teaching them to the little boy the preacher's words. The heart of the preacher might well melt in his bosom at the story. To think -that your poor words, which you yourself had wholly forgotten, which you could never have imagined had vitality enough for that, had been repeated among strangers, had been repeated by the young man to his mother, repeated by the young widow to the child your poor words, thus mighty because they were God's truth you were trying to speak and because you had humbly sought God's blessing! And through all the years it went on, and the man knew not, for more than a quarter of a century, of all that story. Ah, we never know when we are doing good. Sometimes we may think we are going to do great things, and so far as can ever be ascertained, we do nothing; and sometimes when we think we have done nothing, yet, by the blessing of God, some truth has been lodged in a mind here and there, to bear fruit after many days.

How can we help our pastor? We can furnish him illustrations. Mr. Spurgeon tells us that he requests his teachers, and his wife, and various other friends to hunt up illustrations for him. He asks them, whenever they have come across anything in reading or in conversation that strikes them as good, to write it down and let him have it, and whenever he sees a fit opportunity he makes a point of it. We can all furnish our pastors with illustrations. In that very way, perhaps, we might give a preacher many things that would be useful to him. In other ways we can all do so. Ah, when the preacher tells how it ought to be, if you can sometimes humbly testify, in the next meeting on Tuesday or Friday evening, how it has been in your experience, you are illustrating for the preacher. When the preacher tells what Christianity can do for people, if your life illustrates it for all around, there is a power that no speech can ever have. There remains a fourth law of spiritual work.

IV. Spiritual work has rich rewards: "And he that reapeth receiveth wages," saith Jesus, " and gathereth fruit unto life eternal." Spiritual work has rich rewards. It has the reward of success. It is not in vain to try to do good to the souls of men through the truth of God and seeking his grace. Sometimes you may feel as if you were standing at the foot of a precipice a thousand feet high and trying to spring to its summit, and were all powerless. Sometimes you may feel as if you had flung your words against a stone wall and made no impression at all. Sometimes you may go away all ashamed of what you have said in public or in private. But there was never a word spoken that uttered God's truth and sought God's blessing, that was spoken in vain. Somehow it does good to somebody, it does good at some time or other; it shall be known in earth or in heaven that it did do good. Comfort your hearts with these words: It is not in vain to try to do good. You may say, " I have not the lips of the eloquent, the tongue of the learned, how can I talk?" There is many a minister who is eloquent and has preached to gathered congregations, who could tell you that he knows of many more instances in which his private words have been blest to individuals than he knows of in his public discourses. I knew of a girl who had been so afflicted that she could not leave her couch for years, who had to be lifted constantly poor, helpless creature! but who would talk to those who came into her room about her joy in God, and would persuade them to seek the consolations of the gospel, and many were benefited and would bring their friends to her, till after a while they brought them from adjoining counties, that she, the poor, helpless girl, might influence them; at length she even began to write letters to people far away, and that girl's sick-bed became a centre of blessing to people throughout a whole region. We talk about doing nothing in the world.

Ah, if our hearts were in it! we do not know what we can do. That tiger in the cage has been there since he was a baby tiger, and does not know that he could burst those bars if he were but to exert his strength. O the untried strength in all our churches, and the good that the people could do if we would only try, and keep trying, and pray for God's blessing. t My friends, you cannot save your soul as a solitary, and you ought not to be content to go alone into the paradise of God. We shall best promote our own piety when we are trying to save others. We shall be most helpful to ourselves when we are most helpful to those around us. Many of you have found it so; and all of you may find it so, again and again, with repetitions that shall pass all human telling. " For he that watereth shall be watered also again."

Spiritual work shall also be rewarded in the Lord of the harvest's commendation and welcome. Ah, he will know which was the sowing and which was the reaping. The world may not know; we may never hear; but 4& will know which was the sowing and which was the reaping, and who jaded to do good and thought he had not done it, and who was sad and bowed down with the thought of being utterly unable to be useful, and yet was useful.

He will know, he will reward even the desire of the heart, which there was no opportunity to carry out. He will reward the emotion that trembled on the lip and could find no utterance. He will reward David for wanting to build the temple as we" as Solomon for building it. He will reward all that we do, and all that we try to do, and all that we wish to do. O blessed God! he will be your reward and mine, forever and forever.

S. The Atonement Of Christ

THE ATONEMENT OF CHRIST

1. What was Christ's chief work as Saviour? Christ died and rose again for his people. 2 Corinthians 5:15; Romans 4:25.
2. Did Christ voluntarily allow himself to be slain? Yes, Christ laid down his life of himself. John 10:17; John 10:18.
3. Was this Christ's design in coming into the world? Our Lord says that he came "to give his life a ransom for many." Mark 10:45.
4. For what purpose did the loving God give His only Son? God gave His only Son "that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life." John 3:16.
5. How could Christ's dying give us life? Christ took our place and died like a sinner, that we might take his place and be righteous in him. 2 Corinthians 5:21.
6. Was it right that the just should die for the unjust? The Saviour was not compelled, but chose, to die for the benefit of others.
7. Is it right for God to pardon men because the Saviour died? God declares it to be right for Him to pardon men if they seek salvation only through Christ. Romans 3:26.
8. May a man go on in sin, and expect to be saved through Christ's atoning death? No, we must live for Him who died for us. 2 Corinthians 5:15.
9. Is salvation offered to all men through the atonement of Christ? Yes, salvation is offered to all, and all are saved who really take Christ for their Saviour. Ezekiel 18:23; 2 Peter 3:9.
10. What is Christ now doing for men's salvation? Christ is interceding for all those who trust in his atonement. Hebrews 7:25; Romans 8:34

S. The American Baptist Ministry A.D. 1774

The American Baptist Ministry of A.D. 1774

There are few things so advantageous, in the detailed study of history, as to establish ourselves at some definite point of the past, and look carefully around, until all that lies within the horizon of that time is thoroughly known. The period just named for this purpose is of peculiar interest to American citizens, as lying at the threshold of American independence, and also to Baptists, for then our brethren were just drawing near the end of their struggles and sufferings, and preparing the way for more joyous and prosperous work in a new and blessed day of freedom. The limits of a lecture will of course not allow any general study of that grand epoch. Even confining ourselves to the one theme of the Baptist ministry at that time, we shall be able only to glance rapidly along the outlines of this single department in the wide field of view.

It requires a great effort of imagination to go back one hundred years. In 1774 there was nothing of our present magnificent country but the thirteen colonies along the Atlantic coast, from New Hampshire to Georgia. In many of these, as we look back, we see that only the eastern part of the territory is settled, even in Public lecture in opening the session of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, then at Greenville, S. C, September 1, 1874.

Pennsylvania and Virginia hardly one-half, and in New York and Georgia, only the southeastern corner. The first feeble settlements in Kentucky and Tennessee are but a few years old. There has been in the colonies great political discontent for some fourteen years, particularly manifested in Massachusetts and Virginia, which has grown into a widespread opposition to the home government. The " Boston tea party " occurred last winter, December, 1773. The first Continental Congress is to meet in Philadelphia three days hence, September 4, 1774. The colonists intend to maintain their rights by force if necessary; but very few are as yet looking forward to independence. The Virginians have been engaged all summer in a great Indian war, which will end a few weeks hence with the " bloodiest and most decisive " of all the Indian battles at the mouth of Kanawha.

Let us now survey the leading Baptist ministers of the several groups of colonies. Many able and useful men have long ere this passed- away. In the previous century Hansard Knollys and Roger Williams were Baptist preachers in New England within less than twenty years after the landing of the Pilgrims, and John Clark founded the church at Newport in 1644, only twenty-four years after the landing. Still others were coming over from England and Wales, and by the end of the seventeenth century there were seventeen American Baptist churches in existence, situated chiefly in Rhode Island and Massachusetts, but several of them in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and one in Charleston, S. C.

Passing to the eighteenth century, we find that Elisha Callender, a graduate of Harvard College and a pastor beloved by all denominations in Boston, died in 1738, which is thirty-six years ago. A few years afterwards died Valentine Wightman, a man of marked ability and extensive

attainments, who founded many churches in Connecticut. And still earlier in the century was Abel Morgan, who came over from Wales to Philadelphia in 1711, and was greatly respected for his ministerial knowledge, zeal and usefulness, until his death in 1722.

These three Morgan, Callender and Wightman are all that we have time to glance at of the departed worthies, though various other good ministers of the time are known to history.

Coming to those who are still alive in 1774, we must look first at leading ministers who are by this time growing old, or already widely known those who belong mainly or largely to the past. A number of these are found in New England. Timothy Wightman succeeded his father, Valentine Wightman, in Groton, Conn, and though a man of less power than his father, has been very devout and useful, and has brought his church into a very healthy condition, with repeated revivals. He is now fifty-five years old, and is greatly beloved and full of pastoral work. Gardiner Thurston, of Rhode Island, is a little younger, and has spent all his life at Newport. He was not educated at college, but has always had a great thirst for knowledge, and been very diligent both in general and in theological studies. At first assistant to an aged pastor for eleven years, and giving part of his time to business for a support, he afterward succeeded him and has for fifteen years been full pastor and entirely supported by the church.

He is a charming man in private intercourse, and in preaching is not only interesting and instructive, but pathetic and solemn, and plainly depends much on the special support and blessing of the Holy Spirit. In Massachusetts is the famous Isaac Backus, now fifty years old, and in the fulness of his powers. Reared a Congregationalist in Connecticut, and converted during the "Great Awakening," produced by the preaching of Whitefield and others, he presently went off with the Separatists or New Light Congregationalists, who contended for a converted membership and strict discipline, and for an internal call to the ministry. After preaching some years in this connection he became a Baptist, and at length pastor of a new Baptist church in Middleborough, Mass, in which position he has now remained for eighteen years. Two years ago he was chosen agent for the Baptist churches in Massachusetts, to labor for securing religious liberty, and has done the work with great zeal and ability, corresponding with the English Baptists on the subject, and also corresponding with the patriotic Samuel Adams, as the Virginia Baptists are doing with Jefferson and Madison. He will shortly be in like manner appointed agent to attend the Continental Congress, which is about to meet in Philadelphia. Mr. Backus has already published several sermons and a number of pamphlets on questions of Scripture doctrine or of religious liberty. And he has been busily collecting materials for a history of the Baptists in New England, the first volume of which will be ready in two or three years. Very diligent and painstaking in the collection of materials and laborious in general, his writings are full of reliable information and vigorous argument, though somewhat deficient in literary finish. He is a man of powerful physique, strengthened by early work on a farm and by much travelling on horseback. His commanding appearance, deep-toned voice, grave argumentative style, earnest and masterful nature and fervent piety make him, though not exactly an attractive, yet a highly impressive preacher. And, altogether, he is at this time probably the most influential Baptist minister in New England. Fifteen years later he will spend six months in Virginia and North Carolina, strengthening the churches. While passing over various others, we must not fail to notice Noah Alden, of Massachusetts, now forty-nine years old, who was originally a Congregationalist, but has been for nineteen years a Baptist minister, greatly respected for his wisdom in regard to politics as well as religion, and very

useful in his pastoral work.

These are the older men among the leading Baptist ministers of New England at the time of which we speak, Wightman, Thurston, Backus, Alden. Several others are younger, though already well known and influential. Foremost among them are Manning and Stillman.

James Manning was born in New Jersey thirty-six years ago, attended the famous Baptist School at Hopewell, N. J, conducted by Rev. Isaac Eaton especially “ for the education of youth for the ministry,” and graduated with the highest honors at Princeton College.

He speedily grew very popular as a preacher, and before long became pastor at Warren, Rhode Island. Here he was the most active person in founding, just ten years ago, Rhode Island College, which in a few years was removed to Providence, and is destined at a later period to be known as Brown University. Of this first Baptist College in America Mr. Manning was made President and Professor of Languages, and he and the college have already gained a warm place in the affections of the people of Providence and of the Baptists of all the colonies.

Samuel Stillman, a native of Philadelphia, was brought by his parents to Charleston, S. C, when eleven years old, and converted under the ministry of Rev.

Oliver Hart, of whom we shall hereafter speak. He received a classical education from Mr. Rind, “ a teacher of some celebrity “ in Charleston, and then spent a year in studying theology with the assistance of his pastor, Mr. Hart. He began to preach in Charleston sixteen years ago, and settled first on James Island; but his lungs becoming diseased, he went to New Jersey as a better climate. After preaching there two years he visited Boston, where he was at first assistant in the Second Church, and soon afterwards, nine years ago, was made pastor of the First Baptist Church. Here he rapidly sprang into great popularity and influence. His preaching is attended for the sake of its eloquence by men having little sympathy with his thoroughly evangelical doctrines, including prominent lawyers and politicians.

Highly cultivated and careful in preparation, he yet often indulges in “ sudden bursts “ of unpremeditated, impassioned eloquence, and constantly makes free use of anecdote and other illustration. His religious visits are valued and solicited by persons of all denominations.

He is also taking an active part in the support and management of Rhode Island College, and in all the work of the Baptists of New England, and has already published quite a number of excellent sermons. He is now thirty-seven years old. Universally admired and beloved, full of ministerial work in public and in private, in his own church and elsewhere, deeply devout and richly blessed, we shall find in all this survey no Baptist pastorate so truly brilliant as that of Samuel Stillman in Boston. Indeed, it is doubtful whether the age in question presents a more popular preacher of any denomination in America.

Hezekiah Smith, by birth a New Yorker, was educated, like Manning, at Hopewell School and Princeton College. After graduating, he traveled South for his health, and was ordained in Charleston, S. C. After preaching a while in the Pedee country, with great acceptance, he returned northward, went to New England, and finally built up a new and strong Baptist Church at Haverhill, Mass, of which for the last eight or nine years he has been the beloved pastor. He has also made numerous preaching tours as far north as Maine, and his dignified, solemn, truly eloquent

preaching everywhere makes a great impression. He maintains an affectionate correspondence with Oliver Hart and other brethren in South Carolina. He is now thirty-seven years old, about the same age as Manning and Stillman.

There is little time to speak of Samuel Shepard, who was a young Congregationalist physician in New Hampshire, but was converted to Baptist views by reading a tract found at the house of one of his patients; and soon beginning to preach, founded three new churches in New Hampshire, and three years ago became their pastor. Nor of John Davis, the younger of that name, a native of Delaware, prepared at Hopewell School, and graduated at the College of Philadelphia, and after some years made pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Boston a man remarkable for learning, abilities and usefulness, cut down by death two years ago, when but thirty-five years old.

Leaving New England, we come to the Middle Colonies. Of the older men who are still living three or four must be mentioned.

Ebenezer Kinnersley, an Englishman by birth, and brought to this country in childhood by his father (himself also a Baptist minister), is now sixty-seven years old, and has spent his life in and about Philadelphia.

Never engaging much in preaching, he has been otherwise a very distinguished man, both as a zealous coworker with Franklin in discovering the properties of what they call the Electric Fire, and as the highly popular professor of English and Oratory in the University of Pennsylvania. He has delivered scientific lectures in the chief cities, which attracted great attention. In 1772, two years ago, he resigned his chair in the college, and retired to the country in feeble health. Abel Morgan, Jr, nephew to the older minister of that name, whom we mentioned, was born in a Welsh settlement in Delaware. After his ordination he came with a company of Baptists to South Carolina, and "was a constituent member of a church called Welsh Neck, in 1736."

Returning, he became pastor in Middletown, New Jersey, and has now been there for thirty-five years. He never married, giving as a reason the wish that "none of his attention and attendance might be taken off" from his mother, who lived with him more than thirty years, and died only three years ago. His learning is really extensive, and he is especially skillful in disputation.

Years ago he had a public debate on Infant Baptism with Rev. Samuel Finley, afterwards President of Princeton College. It was Mr. Finley that proposed the discussion, and as he afterwards printed a pamphlet, Mr. Morgan replied, and each of them replied again.

These were probably the first works issued in the New World in vindication of the baptism of believers only, and they are said to show decided ability and good learning. Though now sixty-one years old, Mr. Morgan is still a very laborious and useful minister. John Gano, born in New Jersey forty-seven years ago of a Huguenot family, after determining to preach, spent two or three years in studies preparatory to that work, meantime frequently preaching, even before he was licensed. In response to earnest requests from the South for ministerial help he was induced, twenty years ago, to come southward, and traveled extensively. In Charleston he preached in Mr. Hart's pulpit in the presence of a brilliant audience, including twelve ministers, one of them being George Whitefield, and for a moment (as he has recorded) felt the fear of man, but soon remembered that he "had none to fear and obey but the Lord." Two years later he made another tour to the South, and settled for two years in North Carolina, but being driven out by the Cherokee Indians, returned

North, and for a while preached alternately in Philadelphia and New York. Twelve years ago a church was at last organized in New York, and Mr. Gano became its pastor, in which position his labors have been greatly blessed. A small man, yet of manly presence and commanding voice, of good mind, respectable attainments and deep feeling, he is a highly popular and effective preacher.

It is worth while to notice how late the Baptists were in establishing themselves in New York City. They organized a church in Boston in 1664; in Charleston, S. C, 1683; in Philadelphia, 1698; in New York no permanent church was formed till 1762.*

Somewhat older than Gano is Morgan Edwards, a native of Wales, a preacher from his sixteenth year, and educated in the Baptist Seminary at Bristol, England. After preaching a number of years in England and Ireland, he was sent to America thirteen years ago by the famous Dr. Gill, in response to a request from the Baptist Church at Philadelphia that he would send them a pastor. The story is that in writing to Dr. Gill the church "required so many accomplishments" in a pastor, that the old gentleman told them he did not know that he "could find a man in England who would answer their description," but that Mr. Morgan Edwards "came the nearest of any that could be obtained."

After remaining eleven years in Philadelphia, he removed, two years since, to Newark, N. J. Mr. Edwards is a man of genius and scholarship. His Greek Testament is "his favorite companion" and he has also a good knowledge of the Hebrew Bible, being accustomed to say that the Greek and Hebrew are "the two eyes of a minister," while his extensive travels and wide general reading have contributed to make him a very interesting man, both in public and private. He has thus far published three sermons and a History of the Baptists in Pennsylvania, besides collecting much material for other works; and he is very careful and critical in respect to English style.

Besides these four older men in the Middle Colonies Kinnersley, Morgan, Gano and Edwards we must notice two who are somewhat younger, but prominent and promising both of them named Jones.

Samuel Jones is a native of Wales, but was brought to this country in infancy. His father, himself a pastor in Pennsylvania, and a man of wealth, was determined to give his son a thorough education, and accordingly Samuel was graduated A.M. of the College of Philadelphia in 1762. For the last eleven years he has been pastor of a church near Philadelphia, and also occupied in teaching, being very successful and highly honored in both vocations. By his excellent judgment and remarkable self-control he is particularly useful in meetings of the Philadelphia Association, and other ecclesiastical assemblies. This is noteworthy, for successful preachers much oftener possess fervor and fire than sound judgment and equanimity. David Jones was born and reared in Delaware, and educated at Mr. Eaton's Hopewell School in New Jersey, where he says he "learned Latin and Greek." Having determined to become a minister, he went, thirteen years ago, to Middletown to study divinity with his kinsman, Abel Morgan. For the last eight years he has been pastor in Monmouth County, N. J, but two or three years ago made three different journeys to the distant country about and beyond the Ohio River, preaching to the Indians, though without much effect. At the time of which we speak he is full of zeal for the political rights of the Colonies, as are the Baptist preachers everywhere, with rare exceptions. Some years ago he made a visit to New York City, and had an amusing experience which may help to show how scarce were our brethren

in that place, When I first came to New York [so he is said to have told the story] I landed in the morning, and thought I would try if I could find any Baptists. I wandered up and down, looking at the place and the people, and wondering who of all the people I met might be Baptists. At length I saw an old man, with a red cap on his head, sitting on the porch of a respectable-looking house. Ah, thought I, now this is one of the old residents, who knows all about the city; this is the man to inquire of. I approached him, and said: " Good afternoon, sir. Can you tell me where any Baptists live in this city.?"

"Hey?" said the deaf old Gothamite, with his hand to his ear.

Raising my voice, I shouted: " Can you tell me, sir, where I can find any Baptists in this place?" "Baptists, Baptists," said the old man musing, as if ransacking all the corners of his memory; " Baptists! I really don't know as I ever heard of anybody of that occupation in these parts!"

We now leave the Middle Colonies, and come to speak of some leading ministers in the Southern Colonies, from Maryland to Georgia. In Charleston, S. C, we find, as already several times mentioned, Oliver Hart, who is now fifty-one years of age. He was born and reared in Pennsylvania, and when a young man often listened with great profit to Whitefield. Ordained at the age of twenty-six, he heard " the loud call for ministers in the Southern Colonies," and coming South, found the church at Charleston vacant, and becoming their pastor twenty-four years ago, has, in that position, been highly respected and widely useful. He takes an active part as a citizen in the movements for the maintenance of colonial rights and liberties, but does not "mix politics with the gospel, nor desert the duties of his station to pursue them."

We are to think of him as a man of tall and graceful figure, with a pleasing countenance and voice, and while not exactly eloquent, yet an exceedingly instructive and impressive preacher. Though not bred in college, he has been a diligent student of the classics and of physical science, and has been the instructor in general learning and in theology of several other ministers, among them Samuel Stillman. Of these, Stillman and some others were furnished with the means of support by the "Religious Society" which Mr. Hart organized in Charleston nineteen years ago (1755) for this purpose.

Shubael Stearns and Daniel Marshall were intimately associated in North Carolina, and are naturally spoken of together, though the former died three years ago.

Shubael Stearns was born in Boston in 1706, and under the influence of the Great Awakening, attached himself, in 1745, to the Congregationalist Separates, or New Lights, and began to preach. In 1751 he became a Baptist, in Connecticut, and after two or three years more, longing to carry the gospel to more destitute regions, he came, with a small colony of brethren, to Berkeley County, Va. Here he was joined by Daniel Marshall, who was of the same age with him, and had also been a Congregationalist and a Separate in Connecticut. Believing that the second coming of Christ was certainly at hand, Marshall and others sold or abandoned their property, and hastening with destitute families to the head-waters of the Susquehanna, began to labor for the conversion of the Mohawk Indians.

After eighteen months he was driven away by an Indian war, and went to Berkeley Co, Va, where, finding a Baptist Church, he examined and adopted their views about 1754. He had married, while in Connecticut, the sister of Shubael Stearns, and the two became associated in Virginia, and

soon sought together a still more destitute region in North Carolina, not far from Greensboro. Here they and their little colony taught the necessity of the new birth and the consciousness of conversion, with all the excited manner and holy whine, and the nervous trembling and wild screams among their hearers, which characterized the Congregationalist Separates in Connecticut. Though at first much ridiculed, they soon had great success, building up two churches of five hundred and six hundred members.

Retaining their New England name of Separates, they called themselves " Separate Baptists," and these spread rapidly into Virginia and into Georgia, though destined, when their enthusiastic excesses should have been cooled down, to be absorbed, before the end of the eighteenth century, into the body of regular Baptists. Stearns died in North Carolina; but Marshall, ever looking out for new fields, came, after a few years, to Lexington District, in South Carolina, where he built up a church, and finally, three years before the time of which we speak, removed to Georgia, not far from Augusta, where he has already formed a considerable church.

Among the unusual customs of the Separates, both Congregationalist and Baptist, was the practice of public prayer and exhortation by women; and in these exercises Marshall's wife is said to have been wonderfully impressive. In one of his preaching tours, from North Carolina back into Southern Virginia, sixteen years ago, Daniel Marshall baptized Colonel Samuel Harriss, of Pittsylvania. This gentleman had a good social position, holding numerous civil and ecclesiastical offices, and possessing some wealth. He at once threw himself earnestly, with serious pecuniary sacrifices, into the work of preaching, and in the course of these sixteen years has made preaching journeys through a great part of Virginia as well as portions of North Carolina. His overwhelming earnestness and wonderful pathos produced so great an effect that highly judicious men declared that even Whitefield did not surpass him in addressing the heart. He has also taken an active part in Baptist efforts to secure religious freedom, none the less that he himself has been shamefully persecuted for preaching in Culpeper and Orange. He is a favorite presiding officer in the associations and other business meetings of the Separate Baptists, and in this very year, 1774, these enthusiasts having concluded that the office of apostle ought to be perpetual, Samuel Harriss and two others have been elected and solemnly set apart as apostles, an office which will be silently abandoned by all concerned the following year. Such a transient notion is but a spot on the sun of his noble Christian character and life. He is now fifty years old.

There are other well-known men in Virginia at the time in question of whom it would be pleasant to speak, such as David Thomas, forty-two years old, a Pennsylvanian, educated at Hopewell School, and removing when still young to Virginia, where he has been very useful; but we must pass them by, as we have passed by many good men in other colonies. In Maryland we find John Davis, the older of that name, fifty-three years old, another Pennsylvanian, who removed eighteen years ago to Maryland, and has built up a strong country church. There is as yet no Baptist Church in Baltimore.

It must have been noticed that with the single exception of Samuel Harriss, all the older ministers we have mentioned as particularly distinguished in the Southern colonies came originally from the North. When the early Baptist settlers came over from England and Wales, the English went chiefly, for reasons not hard to discern, to New England, and the Welsh chiefly to Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware. Next to these the colony to which Baptists earliest came, in

considerable number was South Carolina, and here the number was small compared with New England and the Middle Colonies. Thus the Baptists were at first far more numerous at the North than at the South, and naturally produced a larger number of ministers. Besides, there were already more general opportunities for education in the Northern Colonies, so that ministers from that region were more likely to become distinguished. And furthermore, the work of Whitefield and others awoke the slumbering Congregationalists of New England, and brought out the enthusiastic Separates, many of whom became Baptists, and traveled southward, in a missionary spirit, to supply the destitution. These considerations will help to account for the fact mentioned. And already, in 1774, if we look at the younger men just coming forward and giving especial promise of usefulness, we shall see a very large number in the Southern Colonies. Some of these young men we must briefly notice.

William Fristoe, hardly thirty years old, is already famous in Virginia, with many seals to his ministry, and in this year is chosen moderator of the great Kettocton Association. "Swearing Jack Waller," thirty-three years old, once a dissipated young man of good family, and a persecutor of the Baptists, was converted and baptized seven years ago, and some time after was long imprisoned for preaching. He blazes with unquenchable zeal, and turns many to righteousness in his native State, and has doubtless little idea that he will be buried in Abbeville District, South Carolina. James Ireland, aged twenty-six, a Scotch school-master in Northern Virginia, and very wicked, was in a singular manner convicted and converted, and five years ago was baptized by Samuel Harriss, and beginning to preach, with great zeal and effect, was soon after seized and imprisoned at Culpeper Court-House, where his enemies tried to blow up his room in the jail with gunpowder, and to suffocate him with fumes of sulphur, all for preaching the gospel; and he retaliated simply by preaching through the jail window to the people who would gather around. He is now at liberty and zealously at work. William Marshall, of Fauquier, now thirty-nine years old, was converted six years ago. Being of an influential family, and having been a conspicuous man of fashion, it made a great noise when he became a Baptist preacher, and the crowds who came to hear him have always been deeply impressed, and great numbers of them converted. He has a young nephew, John Marshall, who will in coming years be Chief Justice of a new nation. Lewis Lunsford, near Fredericksburg, is only twenty-two years old, but began to preach five years ago, being called "the wonderful boy," and his preaching attended by great crowds. With all this, and while he must have been conscious of possessing extraordinary talents, he has not been spoiled, but is full of humility and devotion. But the time would fail to tell of Picket, Conner, Williams, Taylor, the brothers Craig, Courtenay, Koontz, Garnett, Webber, and many more of these promising young men, who have, in 1774, recently entered upon the ministry in Virginia.

We know of similar men in South Carolina and Georgia. Edmund Botsford, a young English soldier, came to Charleston some years ago, was converted under the ministry of Oliver Hart, and for the last three years has been preaching with great acceptance in the south western part of the State, until in May, 1774, he moved across into Georgia, whence we know that he will, after some years, return to spend his useful life in South Carolina. Richard Furman, clarum et venerabile nomen, is now nineteen years old. His father, a surveyor at the High Hills of Santee, has carefully taught him mathematics and the Bible. Uncommonly mature in intellect and piety, he began to preach at the age of sixteen.

Some youths of the same age tried all the arts of insulting ridicule, but without seeming to move him at all; his father earnestly strove to dissuade him, being anxious that he should become a lawyer, and fearful that he was carried away by temporary excitement; but he respectfully urged an irresistible feeling of duty. Soon invitations came to visit destitute places in the country around, and he has been preaching far and near. Tall and handsome, serious and dignified even in youth, his grave and impressive eloquence commands the attention of young and old, and men can see that he will be a prince and a great man in Israel. Abraham Marshall, son of the Daniel Marshall we spoke of, is living with his father in Georgia, aged twenty-six, and has been preaching several years. His educational advantages were confined to forty days at an "old field school;" but his native gifts of mind, his athletic frame and noble voice, his knowledge of the Bible and of the human heart, make him a highly effective and promising young preacher. In Philadelphia we find William Rogers, a native of Newport and graduate of Rhode Island College, who began to preach three years ago, and for two years has been pastor of the Philadelphia Church a young man of fine gifts and culture, and refined manners, very useful as a preacher, and destined to distinction as a professor. Burgess Allison, of New Jersey, has been preaching, in fact, though not formally, since the age of sixteen, and now, at twenty-one, is studying classics and theology with Dr. Samuel Jones, near Philadelphia.

He is fond of music and painting, and has great mechanical ingenuity, and with his singular good sense is likely to turn out a useful preacher and teacher, and a distinguished man of science. Thomas Ustick, a native of New York, is also twenty-one years old, was baptized at thirteen, and graduated at Rhode Island College, has been teaching school in New York and studying for the ministry, and in this year has begun to preach. Modest, gentle, devoted and diligent, he promises to be very useful. In New England, likewise, we hear of several very promising young men. Silas Burrows, of Connecticut, has been preaching nine years. Without much education, he is a man of good sense and the deepest feeling, and is wonderfully gifted in prayer and exhortation.

Charles Thompson, a native of New Jersey, belonged to the first graduating class of Rhode Island College, five years ago, and for the past four years has been pastor at Warren, R. I. Vigorous in intellect, and very diligent in study, with a fine figure and magnificent voice, full of tender pathos and of lofty passion, and devoted to his work, he is a young man of mark. His classmate at college, William Williams, of Welsh descent, was baptized three years ago by Thompson, at Warren, and licensed to preach, and in connection with the ministry will become famous in Massachusetts as a teacher.

It has seemed a long list, of older and middle-aged and young Baptist ministers, who were living in 1774.

Yet it has been made short by reluctantly omitting names well worthy to be known and honored. And there are youths who have not yet entered the ministry, but will one day be heard of. John Leland, twenty-one years old, was baptized in June, in Massachusetts. Thomas Baldwin, of the same age, is living in Connecticut, a diligent student, but not yet a Christian. Silas Mercer, in Georgia, is twenty-nine years old; originally an Episcopalian, he has become a Baptist in sentiment, but will not be baptized until next year.

Henry Holcombe is a boy of twelve years, and his father has recently removed with him from Virginia to South Carolina. Jonathan Maxcy is six years old, in Massachusetts, a very precocious

child, who will not die early. Robert B. Semple is five years old, in King and Queen. Andrew Broaddus is four years old, in Caroline County, Va, and his father, a zealous member of the Establishment, designs that his son shall be a clergyman.

Glance a moment, too, across the water. Whitefield died four years ago. Wesley, though over seventy, has many years of work in him still. Of the English Baptists, Dr. Gill, the great Talmudical scholar, author of a giant commentary on the whole Bible, an elaborate Systematic Theology and many other works, and yet all his life a hard-working pastor, died three years since in London. Robert Robinson, at the age of twenty-nine, is already a well-known author, an omnivorous reader, and a highly popular preacher under the shadow of the University of Cambridge. Stennett and Beddorne, authors of so many excellent hymns, are in their prime.

Andrew Fuller is twenty years old, having been baptized at sixteen, and after several years of providential leading towards the ministry, has just begun to preach regularly. Robert Hall, son of an able and honored minister of the same name, is ten years old, and loves, when out of school, to read over and over again such books as Edwards on the Will and Butler's Analogy.

Let us now single out for brief observation some points in the opinions and practices of American Baptist ministers in 1774.

1. These men felt themselves inwardly called to the ministry. Some of them indulged wildly enthusiastic notions as to the nature and evidences of this call, but at bottom it was a thoroughly correct conception which prevailed among them. And on this account it is not well to speak of the ministry as a profession. One ought not to choose the ministry at all as he might choose to be a lawyer, physician, teacher or editor, but it ought to be entered upon from a sense of duty to God and man. We are not claiming any special sanctity for the pursuit itself as compared with the professions, but only urging the importance of carefully avoiding the notion that to enter upon the ministry is merely "making choice of a profession."

2. They endured great hardships in the prosecution of their work. Frequent and immensely long journeys on horseback, through thinly-settled districts, devoid of comforts, were taken by almost all the pastors in their evangelizing labors, and burning zeal often impelled them to severer toils than they were able to bear. Besides, there was not seldom persecution, involving indignities, discomforts and sometimes positive sufferings. Many of us are familiar with the story of such persecutions in Virginia; but they began far earlier in Massachusetts, and were violent there at the time of which we speak, the Cavalier and the Puritan establishments being equally harsh and cruel. The Baptists are one of the few religious denominations that have never persecuted.

We cannot say they have been personally too good, seeing that some of them have shown great bitterness towards other religionists and even towards their own brethren who differed from them; but their immemorial principle of opposition to all union of church and state has always made it impossible that they should persecute. In so doing they would at once cease to be Baptists.

These hardships, from persecution and from ministerial labor, often told upon health. Many suppose that the frequent deaths from paralysis, for instance, are a peculiarity of our times. But among the men we have been speaking of it is mentioned that Backus, Alden, Gano, Harriss, Stillman and Manning all died of paralytic affections. True, these had all passed through the long agony of the Revolution.

3. Many of our brethren of that day erred about ministerial support. What they called the “hireling ministry “ of the establishments was an abomination to them, and they frequently went to the opposite extreme, some of them even proclaiming that they wished no contributions for their support; and not being wise enough to see and explain, like the apostle Paul, the difference between the course which for temporary reasons they pursued, and the general right of ministers to be supported. Their indiscriminating teachings were but too acceptable to human selfishness, and left deep-rooted errors which we are still toiling to eradicate.

4. Our ministers, in 1774, were in general heartily in favor of ministerial education, and many of them were themselves highly educated men. This last had been true from the beginning. Hansard Knollys and Roger Williams had both been clergymen of the Church of England, and educated at the English universities, and John Clarke was a diligent student of the original Scriptures. In the eighteenth century Elisha Callender was a graduate of Harvard, Samuel Jones and the younger John Davis of the College of Philadelphia, President Manning and Hezekiah Smith, of Princeton, and Charles Thompson, William Williams, Thomas Ustick and William Rogers, of Rhode Island College. A number of others, though not college graduates, were diligent students and really well educated; for example, Valentine Wightman, Thurston, Kinnersley, Gano, Abel Morgan (senior and junior), Morgan Edwards, David Jones, David Thomas, Oliver Hart, Stillman and Furman, several of whom were eminent for their general and theological attainments and teachers of others. The only men we have spoken of who became leading ministers without being what we might fairly call educated, were Isaac Backus and Silas Barrows, Shubael Stearns, Daniel Marshall and his son Abraham, Samuel Harriss and some of the younger men in Virginia, and Edmund Botsford; and some of these were highly intelligent and well-informed. Great interest was also shown in institutions for higher education. An English Baptist merchant, Thomas Hollis, gave a large donation to Harvard College to found a professorship, about 1720. Besides the famous Hopewell School in New Jersey, established by Isaac Eaton with express reference to the preparation of young men for the ministry, and which we have had occasion to mention so often, several high schools, conducted by Baptists, are known to us as in existence at the time. Rhode Island College (Brown University), established in 1764, awakened the liveliest interest among the Baptists everywhere. The Pennsylvanians, in fact, claimed to have originated the movement. The college was located in Rhode Island because there only was there absolute religious liberty. It received contributions of money, soon after its establishment, from Virginia and South Carolina, as well as from New England and the Middle Colonies. We find the associations also early expressing interest in ministerial education. At the Philadelphia Association, in 1722, “it was proposed by the churches to make inquiry among themselves if they have any young persons hopeful for the ministry and inclinable for learning, and if they have to give notice of it to Mr. Abel Morgan, that he might recommend such to the academy, on Mr. Hollis his account.” Mr. Hollis, besides endowing the professorship in Harvard, had apparently authorized Abel Morgan to send young men preparing for the ministry to the academy in Philadelphia, and look to him for the money. The association wished to co-operate in this, and the rather quaint phrase of their minutes is worth remembering, “ Any young persons hopeful for the ministry and inclinable for learning.” In 1756 the Charleston Association, South Carolina, recommended that the churches raise “ a fund to furnish suitable candidates for the ministry with a competent share of learning.” And we have seen that in the previous year, 1755, a society had been formed for that purpose by the church in Charleston, which aided Stillman, Botsford and others in pursuing studies for the ministry, Oliver Hart being

their instructor in theology. But while in so many ways showing that they valued, and striving to promote, the education of the ministry, our brethren were never disposed to confine the office to those who had passed through any specified course of study. They believed that God calls men to become preachers who have not had, cannot obtain, opportunities of regular preparatory education; and that the only test which the churches ought to apply is the practical one suggested by the apostle's expression, "apt to teach." At the same time, they generally maintained that every minister ought to gain all the knowledge he can. But a hundred years ago there was among the Baptists in some quarters a disposition to underrate general education in ministers, arising principally from two causes. First, the Congregational and Episcopal establishments had both shown a strong tendency to treat a course of education as not only an indispensable, but the only requisite preparation for preaching, many of their ministers making no pretension to an inward call, and some of them not even to personal piety. The Congregationalist Separates and the Baptists, opposing themselves strongly to this, naturally tended toward the opposite extreme, making piety and the inward call everything, and caring little for the general and theological education which was associated in their minds with so many unspiritual, and not a few immoral, clergymen. Secondly, the country was new; the people themselves were in general quite uneducated, sympathizing most strongly with preachers who were but little superior to themselves in general culture; and many of those among them who were efficient in other intellectual callings were self-taught men.

These last considerations, to some extent, still hold good in large portions of our country. The masses are still comparatively ignorant, and men who are even partially educated must take great care or they will fail to have the complete sympathy of this important class of their hearers. Alas! for the education, of ministers of Jesus if it ceases to be true that the common people hear them gladly. And in a country where so many of the ablest and most successful statesmen, lawyers, physicians, teachers, journalists have had no regular education, there is a great want of propriety in requiring that no one shall be a preacher who has not gone through a certain fixed course of study. But it is proper to insist that every minister, as well as every other who aspires to instruct his fellow- men, must in youth and in age be a learner, a diligent student.

One thing our brethren have always expected and required, that the minister, whatever else he knows or does not know, shall study the Bible. To explain and impress the teachings of the Bible is his great business.

It is very desirable for the lawyer to know classics and history, but necessary that he know law. It is highly useful for the physician to know psychology, but indispensable to know medicine. The teacher of mathematics is much profited by classical training; but he can do nothing unless he is acquainted with mathematics. And so the minister of the gospel will find all knowledge useful, and general training of mind eminently desirable; but the Bible he must know. And how much it means to know the Bible!

Let us add that a large proportion of these ministers were highly educated in another sense: they had the spirit, habits and manners of gentlemen. If it is not important for a preacher and pastor to be a gentleman, for whom is it important? It is, in this respect, a great privilege to have been reared in refined homes. But as Henry Clay and others of our American statesmen, so have many of our ministers shown that a man may come up from very inferior advantages, and by force of

native delicacy and generosity of feeling, and by diligent use of the best social opportunities, may become a noble gentleman.

5. Finally, notice the character of their preaching.

It was eminently Biblical. Whether learned in other things or not, they all, as we have said, tried to know the Bible. Those ignorant of Hebrew and Greek were yet most diligent, loving and life-long students of the English Bible. And some who had read few other books were yet “mighty in the Scriptures,” often teaching opposers the truth of the old adage: “Beware of the man of one book.” They were familiar with the text of Scripture, able to turn to any passage they wanted without a concordance, committing to memory long passages, and some of them whole books of the Bible. It is an abuse of our multiplied helps if we fail to gain like loving familiarity with the sacred < text. There is point in the words of an Elizabethan poet, I would I were an excellent divine, That had the Bible at my fingers’ ends; That men might hear out of this mouth of mine How God doth make his enemies his friends. And the preachers of whom we speak used their ready knowledge of Scripture in this way, both publicly and privately, whether men would hear or whether they would forbear. “May it please your worship,” said an irate lawyer in Virginia, “these men are great disturbers of the peace; they cannot meet a man on the road but what they ram a text of Scripture down his throat.” Their preaching was also eminently doctrinal. The great Scripture doctrines of depravity, atonement and regeneration were almost unknown to many of their hearers, and disputed by many others. And so the preacher felt called continually to preach these and the related doctrines, proving and enforcing them by liberal quotations from the text of Scripture. Whenever men cease to preach these great doctrines of the Bible, drawing them directly from the fountain head, believing something definite, knowing what they believe and why they believe it, and how to prove it from the Inspired Word, then the pulpit soon loses its power. Their preaching was, at the same time, eminently experimental. It was very common for the preacher to tell the exercises of his mind at the time of his conversion. When modestly and wisely done, as it has been done by Bunyan, Augustine, Paul, this can never fail to be full of interest and impressiveness. The Washingtonian temperance speakers carried too far their narratives of a drunkard’s experience, and so may our old preachers have sometimes gone too far with their experience-telling; but the thing is natural and lawful, and is mighty, if fitly managed. As to their manner of preaching, but little need be said. They had all the methods of preparation and delivery which we have, and differed about them as we do. Some of them, particularly of those who traveled widely and preached much in the open air and chiefly, it would appear, among the Separates acquired certain offensive mannerisms of delivery, the most striking of which was a peculiarity of tone, commonly called the “holy whine,” which may still be heard in some very ignorant preachers in certain parts of the country. This unpleasing and, to some persons, very ridiculous practice had a natural origin. When men spoke to crowds in the open air, on a high key, with great excitement for a long time, the over-strained voice would relieve itself by rising and falling, as a person tired of standing will frequently change position. This soon became a habit with such men, and then would be imitated by others, being regarded as the appropriate expression of excited feeling. The same causes produce the same sing-song tone in the loud cries of street-vendors in our cities. But the whine of the preacher, associated for many ignorant hearers with seasons of impassioned appeal from the pulpit, and of deep feeling on their own part, has become a musical accompaniment which gratifies and impresses them, and, like a tune we

remember from childhood, revives “ the memory of joys that are past, pleasant and mournful.” Why should we wonder at all this? Extremes meet. What is the intoning, which modern ritualists in this country so much admire, but just another species of holy whine, originating long centuries ago in very similar natural causes to those just stated, and impressive to some people now by reason of its association with what is old and venerable in devotion? If any one doubts that it is the same thing, let him hear the intoning in the Armenian Convent Church at Jerusalem.

It suffices to add that the preachers of that day depended much on the aid of the Holy Spirit to give them liberty in speaking, and the hearts of their hearers.

Some of them carried this to an enthusiastic extreme. But every truth is perverted by somebody. And it is a great fundamental truth, to which we must cling, that God will help us in preaching and himself “ giveth the increase.” The American Baptist ministers of one hundred years ago labored not in vain. The denomination was growing rapidly in the years before the Revolution, and it has continued to grow. In 1774 the total membership of Baptist churches throughout the colonies is estimated to have been not more than (30, 000) thirty thousand, and many think this estimate too high. Thus the membership was less than one per cent, of the population. In 1884 we had in the United States of regular Baptists, exclusive of cognate outlying bodies, at least (2, 500, 000) two million five hundred thousand members, which is nearly five per cent, of the population. More than onehalf of our present population is of German, Irish, French, Italian or Spanish descent, and thus originally altogether averse to any such opinions as ours; there has been no Baptist immigration except from England and Wales, and to a small extent from Scotland; yet in the face of all this we have an increase in our membership from one per cent, to five per cent, of the population, and the persons more attached to the Baptists than any other persuasion must be from one-fifth to one-fourth of the entire population. This shows that the work of our fathers’ hands has been blessed. And yet how many of these church members are comparatively useless. And throughout the country what growing masses of noisy infidelity what a spread of irreligion and corrupted Christianity, of immorality and vice, of political corruption and social pollution! Not only the example of the past age, but the pressing needs of our own age, call us to diligent, self-denying, devoted labor. And are we ambitious? Do we ask whether a hundred years to come men will be searching our history, repeating our names, rejoicing in our work? It matters little, for “ they that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.” Nay, it matters not at all, if only we can hear at last that thrilling word, “ Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.”

S. The Apostle Paul as a Preacher

The Apostle Paul as a Preacher*

Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ. Ephesians 3:8.

“NUMEROUS as were the functions of the Apostle Paul, he was, most of all things, a preacher of the gospel. The fact is prominent in his history, and was deeply felt by himself. Everything, with him, was made subordinate to this vocation. His whole life was wrapped up in it. Though often sad and weary, and not unfrequently (it would seem) desponding, he never turned aside from this great work. When difficulties and dangers gathered around, when foes were threatening and timid friends entreating, he could say, “ But none of these things move me; neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God.” And Paul was the greatest of all preachers. Of course, we omit from the comparison him who spake “ as never man spake.” There was in his preaching such a continual self-assertion, such a sublime and holy egotism, that in this, as in every other respect, his character is unique and peculiar, and we never think of comparing him with any mere man.

There have been many gifted men, gifted by nature and grace, who have devoted themselves to the work of the ministry; God be thanked for them all, and God grant that there may be many more hereafter! but in the estimation of every one who diligently studies his character and history, Paul must stand, among all preachers, unrivalled and alone. Thoroughly to analyze his great powers is a task for which I have no talent, and my hearers, under present circumstances, would perhaps have little inclination. I mean only to present some points in connection with Paul as a preacher, the consideration of which I trust may be blessed to our benefit.

1. The first of these points is 'mentioned mainly because of its relation to what will follow. It is the remarkable adaptation of his preaching to the particular audience. He has himself stated the principle upon which he acted in seeking this adaptation: “ I am made all things to all men.” This saying has come to be grossly perverted, being constantly applied as a reproach to the fickle and time-serving. The apostle has just before said what perfectly explains it: “To the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews;... to them that are without law, as without law... that I might gain them that are without law. To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.” He elsewhere declares the same principle regulating his general conduct: “ Even as I please all men in all things, that they might be saved.”

We have striking illustrations of this, in some of his recorded discourses. At Antioch, in Pisidia, he preached first in the synagogue, to Jews and proselytes. Here he conformed, as did Stephen in his address before the Sanhedrin, to the Jewish custom of commencing with a sketch of the national history. This would conciliate his audience, by bringing to mind facts of which they were all proud,

and in which he and they had a common interest; and from one point or another of that history the speaker could easily and gracefully turn, as did Paul on this occasion, to the subject on which he wished to dwell. The promised seed of David he declared was come in the person of Jesus. He pointed out the fact that the condemnation, death and resurrection of Jesus were in fulfilment of prophecies which they all believed. He proclaimed to them through Jesus the forgiveness of sins, and that complete justification, to the believer, which could not be obtained through the law of Moses.

He warned them not to neglect this proclamation, in language quoted from a prophet. All is from the Jewish point of view, and after the Jewish method; to the Jews he became as a Jew, that he might gain the Jews; and thus regarded, nothing could be more felicitous than the conduct of this address. At Lystra, when he had wrought a miracle of healing, and the astonished and ignorant pagans were about to offer sacrifice to him and Barnabas, as being "the gods come down in the likeness of men," he spoke, to restrain them, a few words which contained the simplest truths of natural religion: "Sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein: who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways: nevertheless, he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness." These truths were obviously appropriate to the occasion, and we learn that they sufficed to accomplish the apostle's object. But it is stated, concerning the same visit to Lystra, that "there they preached the Gospel," and that when he had been stoned, "the disciples stood round about him." We see then that his general preaching at that place was by no means confined to natural religion. At Athens, every one has been struck by the skill with which he sought to avoid offending the prejudices or violating the laws of his hearers. He began by complimenting them as in all respects an uncommonly religious people. He availed himself of an altar "to the unknown god," to speak of the true God without incurring the penalty denounced against the introduction of new deities. In a few brief sentences, he assailed, pointedly but courteously, several leading errors which prevailed among the Athenians, particularly their idolatry and their proud conceit of distinct national origin.

He quoted, not inspired Hebrew prophets, but a sentiment found in the writings of two Greek poets, one of them from his native Cilicia. And he carefully delayed to the close his declaration of the fact, so important, yet so likely to be rejected, that Christ had been raised from the dead. Was ever any discourse more skilfully adapted?

So, when standing before Felix, he did not directly denounce the tyrant's vices, for of course he would not have been heard for a moment, but he dwelt upon the opposite virtues. To a wicked man he spoke of righteousness; to an incontinent man, of self-control; to an unjust earthly judge, of the judgment to come. A similar skill in adaptation, and care to conciliate, is observable in the Apostle's letters. You can form a tolerably complete idea of the history and present condition of a Church, or of the character and circumstances of an individual, from his letters to such an individual or Church. And you see everywhere how observant he is of all courtesies and charities, how careful first to commend what he can in those who must on other accounts be censured, how anxious to win and save even amid his severest rebukes. The limit to this desire to please, the Apostle has clearly defined; as when he reminds the Thessalonians that he had not practiced any trickery in preaching, nor used flattering words, nor sought glory of men; "but as we were allowed

of God to be put in trust with the gospel, even so we speak; not as pleasing men, but God, which trieth our hearts.” However great his disposition to conciliate, he would not sacrifice principle would never offend God, to please men.

Now, with all this variety of adaptation to particular hearers, connect 2. His adhering constantly to the great central truths of the gospel. That cross, in which alone he “gloried,” which alone he “determined to know,” is always before his mind. Widely as he ranges over the fields of truth and duty, he never loses sight of that grand central object; never ceases to feel himself in its presence.

Every doctrine, and every precept, is presented in such a way that we feel it to have relation to the atoning work of our Saviour. For instance, servants are urged to be honest and obedient, “that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things.” Husbands are exhorted to “love their wives, even as Christ also loved the Church;” and wives to “submit themselves unto their own husbands, as unto the Lord; for the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church.” When pressing upon the Corinthians the duty of giving for the relief of their poor brethren, he adds, “Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift.” The example of Paul in this respect is not always followed. In seeking for adaptation, how often do men fail to adhere to these same great truths? Very anxious to make the sermon appropriate to the occasion, accommodated to the prejudices, or suited to the taste of the audience, they neglect to have it present the essence of the gospel to have it full of those truths which relate to sin and salvation. How much preaching, by able and earnest men, is thus comparatively lost, as to all the most important ends of preaching the gospel! Those men, and classes of men, who have been eminently useful as ministers, in actually converting sinners and building up believers, have been remarkable for constantly reiterating, in however various connections, and with whatever freshness of illustration, the same fundamental, saving truths. A glance at the history of the most successful preachers would show this to be true.

It is true now of all the really useful among “revival preachers;” and of many a plain man, whose extraordinary success it is difficult to account for, until we observe the constant recurrence in his discourses of the truths which belong to salvation. Surely the most gifted and cultivated ought to imitate this excellent peculiarity; surely right-minded hearers ought to prefer and encourage it. Let the preacher, like Paul, adapt, conciliate, please; but let him, also like Paul, bring everything into relation to our Lord and Saviour, for otherwise he is not preaching the gospel at all.

3. Observe, again, the Apostle’s simplicity and directness in presenting the truth. Every one is familiar with his defence, in the beginning of the first letter to the Corinthians, of his course in this particular. We know how he was complained of for the plainness of his mode of preaching, and how he resisted all the pressure, and would not practice the artificial rhetoric which was then fashionable.

Indeed, we are unwilling to think of him as acting otherwise. Whether we consider Paul’s personal character, or the fact of his inspiration, it is felt to be inappropriate and unworthy that he should be searching after mere prettinesses, should be seeking to heighten the simple loveliness of heavenly truth, by the meretricious adornments of a would-be eloquence. And there is significance in this strong, instinctive feeling. If it would have been wrong for Paul, how is it right for others, who, though humble and uninspired, are yet proclaiming the same divinely-given truths, and should be keeping in view the same sublime object, to save men’s souls? At the same time, all know that the

Apostle's speaking and writing possess much of real beauty. It need not be misunderstood if we say that Paul is an eminent example of the right use of imagination. Among his remarkable combination of mental qualities, it is clear that he possessed imagination of a high order. It is not shown by elaborate and multiplied figures for mere ornament. Occasionally we meet with an unobtrusive image of exquisite beauty; as when, in the address at Athens, he represents men as groping in their blindness after an object that is near: "That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us." But his power of imagination is seen mainly in the shaping of his thoughts in general; in the clear and delicate outline given to each particular thought, whether argument or precept, as it came moulded from his mind. It is in the same way that we find the finest imagination employed by all the men who have been most truly eloquent, by Demosthenes and Daniel Webster, by Chrysostom and Robert Hall. They could not have been eloquent without possessing this faculty in an eminent degree; but they have used it, not to send off mere fireworks of fancy, but to heat into a glow the solid body of their thought. The beautiful is thus by no means abjured, but subordinated. The gratification of our aesthetic sensibilities may render great service, as auxiliary to the instruction, conviction, persuasion, which are the great objects of preaching the gospel; but it must always be held auxiliary. The poet and the novelist aim to please, and incidentally to instruct; the preacher to do men good, and to please only as contributing to this higher end.

I have a practical object in saying all this, which may justify what would else be perhaps out of place. Not a little of the preaching done by good men is weighed down by rhetoric, falsely so-called. The evil is widespread and well known. Its existence and continuance are not wholly due directly to those who preach, but result in some measure from the wrong taste of the people. The preacher is very naturally led astray by this.

He sees that the people for a time flock to hear, and loudly praise, those who speak in this fashion. He cannot do them good by his preaching unless they will hear him. It seems necessary to yield to what appears to be the popular taste, though known to be false. Especially where one possesses more imagination than sober judgment, such a process of reasoning is very likely to convince him. Some little allowance, therefore, may commonly "be made for those who show this ambitiousness of style, this effort after eloquence. The evil must be corrected, partly by preachers themselves; but those among them who perceive and deplore it, are able to accomplish comparatively little except in their own case. It is so easy to break the force of the most unanswerable argument, coming from them, by a sarcasm, as that they only oppose that style of preaching of which they do not happen to be masters. The cure must come mainly from intelligent men who are not preachers. They can powerfully influence public sentiment, and they ought to speak their mind. There can be no question as to what all such men think on the subject, but they are often restrained from strongly expressing their opinion by a false delicacy, a mistaken respect for the ministerial office. In our age and country the relation of preacher and hearers must be freely discussed, like everything else. And the half-cultivated are everywhere doing this. The merits, not so much of different modes of preaching as of different preachers, form a prominent topic of conversation in many circles. That bad taste which forms the most erroneous opinions on the subject is also boldest in expressing them. Thus the evil is greatly augmented by loud voices of praise or blame. Cultivated men must exert themselves to correct it, though the task should sometimes painfully conflict with their reverence for the sacred office. They must freely commend

or condemn, not only general methods, but individual examples. I call upon those who have, and those who soon will have, influence over public opinion, as they value God's great appointed means of converting the world, to do what they can towards correcting the popular taste; to take every opportunity and means of showing the people what good taste requires, what alone is appropriate to the most solemn of all earthly positions, that of the man who stands up to preach the gospel.

4. Observe, in the next place, the Apostle's tenderness as a preacher. Hear him speaking of false professors: "For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ." Hear his farewell words to the elders of the Church at Ephesus: "And remember, that by the space of three years, I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears" What a scene was that this great and inspired man, speaking to the people both "publicly and from house to house," warning them with tears; telling them of God's amazing love, and his tremendous wrath; of their guilt, their helpless condemnation, and the one way of salvation. Christians, too, he warned of the false teachers that should enter from without, like grievous wolves into the fold, and that should rise up among themselves; and he would weep as he entreated them to hold fast the truth as it is in Jesus, to adorn their profession, to live for the salvation of men and the glory of God.

Thus, night and day for three years, he ceased not to warn every one with tears. And why should not Paul weep? and every preacher and every Christian weep? See the condition of our fellow-men, our friends, our kindred, as depicted, not by our wild fancy or morbid fears, but by the calm teachings of the Word of God. They are "condemned already," "the wrath of God abideth on them," their "steps take hold on hell." Can we half realize what is meant by these fearful sayings, and not weep? But worse. We tell them of the Saviour, who died that we might live, and who ever lives to save; we tell them of free pardon, of full salvation, to every penitent believer in him; of his redeeming love, his gracious invitations and precious promises. We tell of eternal bliss and eternal woe, of their own imminent and increasing danger.

We urge all that is terrible in God's wrath, all that is moving in his mercy. And they listen as calmly, they turn away as unconcerned, as though it were all a trifle or a dream. O, where is our pity, where our love, that we do not weep tears of blood? that we do not say with the Psalmist, "Rivers of waters run down mine eyes, because they keep not thy law?"

It is well that the gospel induces tenderness, since the preacher has to speak such awful truths. It is no light thing to look into the eyes of one you know, and respect, and love, and charge him with being a vile sinner charge selfishness, and pride, and pervading ungodliness, upon what he accounts his best actions; to warn him of the wrath to come; to bid him tremble lest he receive deserved damnation, and reflect now what will be his unavailing remorse if "in hell he should lift up his eyes, being in torment." It is well that the gospel, which, along with its promise of salvation to the believer, requires us to say, "He that believeth not shall be damned," should also inspire that feeling of tenderness with which the painful duty ought to be performed. But let us look again at the Apostle's tears. Why should Paul weep as he warned? He feared that his warning might be in vain; and often it was in vain. With all his abilities and inspiration, men often heard without heeding; and all his exhortations in many cases failed to restrain even professed believers from shameful sin, from utter apostasy. Need we be surprised that the same thing happens now?

5. The remaining point of which I would speak is, the disadvantages under which Paul labored. This greatest of all preachers appears to have had some serious physical disqualification. Let us consider the evidence of this fact, and the lesson it teaches. In the second letter to the Corinthians, he quotes the disparaging language of his enemies: "For his letters (say they) are weighty and powerful; but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible." Making allowance for the exaggerations of a hostile spirit, it is yet plain, even from this, that his presence was not commanding, not impressive, but rather the opposite. In the course of his letter to the Galatians, he seeks to revive their personal affection for himself (which the Judaizing teachers had endeavored to destroy), by reminding them of the time when he commenced his labors among them. Notice his language: "Ye know how, through infirmity of the flesh, I preached the gospel unto you at the first." The word through must be here taken to mean on account of the original naturally conveys this sense, and will hardly bear another so that we understand him to say: "Ye know how, on account of bodily infirmity, I preached the gospel to you at the first." When he first arrived in Galatia, he did not propose to tarry there; but some bodily infirmity making it necessary to remain, he began to preach the gospel to them. He adds: "And my temptation (trial) which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus." The physical affection before mentioned, he here calls his trial.

He had evidently feared that on account of this physical trial they would contemptuously reject him and his message; and he sets in strong contrast with that expectation the fact that they had received him with the greatest possible respect and reverence. In Second Corinthians, again, he speaks of certain remarkable visions with which he had been favored, above fourteen years before, which would be soon after his conversion, adding: "And lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure."

Nothing could be better calculated to humble a preacher, in danger of being elated on account of his extraordinary privileges, than to suffer from some grievous bodily affection some marked distortion, it may be, of form or feature which destroyed all impressiveness of appearance, which made him continually fear lest men should "despise" and "reject" him. If it were a mental defect, or a fault of character, he might hope in some measure to correct it. But this physical disqualification, which he is utterly unable to remedy, must be a constant source of distress and humiliation. The apostle deeply felt it, and prayed earnestly for the removal of the affection. "For this cause I besought the Lord thrice that it might depart from me. And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness." The distressing disadvantage was not removed. He was taught that under all disadvantages Divine grace would be sufficient to uphold and prosper him, for the strength of the Lord attains its perfect manifestation when exercised through feeble instruments. And he had learned by this time to endure patiently his infirmity, as useful for his own humbling; yea, he had learned to exult in it, as conclusively showing that his great successes were due to no human influence, but to Divine power. "Most gladly, therefore, will I rather glory in mine infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me. Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake; for when I am weak, then am I strong."

All men appreciate the great advantage, to a preacher as to any other public speaker, of a commanding and engaging appearance. We feel the effect of it, as soon as such a man arises to

address us. And if the speaker's presence be not merely unattractive, but painfully and ridiculously peculiar, it inevitably diminishes the impressiveness of what he may say. Yet, be it well observed, and forever remembered, that the most useful preacher that ever lived, was in this respect signally lacking. God's strength is indeed made perfect in weakness. Let the man who truly desires to preach the gospel, and who mourns that he does not possess those physical gifts which seem almost indispensable to eloquence, take to himself with humble joy that blessed assurance, "My grace is sufficient for thee." My hearers, one word more. The same glorious gospel which Paul preached has been handed down to us.

However feebly presented, it is "the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth." Paul felt himself but a vessel of clay, bearing the precious treasure of the gospel. That same precious treasure is offered to you. O, reject it not I beseech you I warn you. O, believe on that Saviour, whose ministers labor awhile, and one after another pass away, but who is himself "the same, yesterday, and to-day, and forever."

S. The Duty Baptists Teach Distinctive

The Duty of Baptists to Teach Their Distinctive Views

John A. Broadus "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Matthew 28:20. The things he had commanded include the internal and the eternal elements of Christian piety. Of the latter, they include ethical instruction and directions as to the conduct of Christian societies. These directions were afterward supplemented by inspired apostles giving instructions as to the constitution and government of the Christian societies, or churches, and the characteristic ceremonies they were to observe. These matters taming to the Christian societies are certainly not so import as the internal and spiritual elements of piety or as ethical principles and precepts, but still they are important. We may sure they are, from the fact that Christ and his apostles gave correction concerning them; and we can see why they must important.

It is impossible to maintain mental health if the body be abused or neglected, for bodily conditions react upon those of the and the externals of piety are the natural expression of its spiritual essence, which cannot be healthy if they are disregarded, exaggerated, or perverted. The tendency of human nature is usually not to neglect religious externals, but to exaggerate or pervert them. The New Testament gives us a very simple pattern in these respects; simple organization, simple government, simple ceremonies. But men early began to magnify their importance and to change their character and application.

EARLY JUDAIZERS AND THEIR SUCCESSORS Did you ever consider what became of the Judaizers who gave Paul so much trouble? When we last observe them in the history, in connection with Paul's latest recorded visit to Jerusalem, they are really beaten, but still numerous and active. When, in the second century, we again get a clear view of the early Christians, the Judaizers seem reduced to a mere handful. But has the tendency really disappeared? Nay; it is beginning to strike through and through the Christianity of the day, and from that time onward a painfully large portion of Christendom has had only a Judaized Christianity. When men began to exaggerate the importance of externals, they would soon begin to change their character. Coming to believe that baptism brings regeneration and is indispensable to salvation, they would of course wish to baptize as early in life as possible, and to make baptism practicable for the sick and the dying. Beginning to fancy that the bread and wine really became the glorified body and blood of the ascended Saviour, they not unnaturally took to withholding the cup from the laity, lest their awkward handling should spill some drops of the sacred fluid, which would have been profanation. And, in addition to these tendencies, the institutions of imperial Rome and the Roman genius for centralized government led the Christians to think it necessary that their societies should have a stronger government . **THE BAPTISTS OPPOSED TO JUDAIZING INFLUENCES** In opposition to all this, Baptists insist on holding to the primitive constitution, government, and ceremonies of the Christian societies, or churches; and this on the principle of recognizing religious authority but the Scriptures themselves, and of strict observing all that the Saviour has commanded. Now, the Saviour says in our text that we must teach them to observe all things whatsoever he commanded.

These commandments include matters just mentioned, concerning which the people who allow themselves to be called Baptists differ widely from large portions of the Christian world, and are persuaded that their own views are more scriptural, more in accordance with the Saviour's commands. They must therefore feel themselves required to teach these things as well as others. Hence, the text lays upon us the duty of which I have been requested to speak, the duty of Baptists to teach their distinctive views.

DISTINCTIVE VIEWS OF BAPTIST CHURCHES

It may be well to state briefly what I understand to be the leading distinctive views of the Baptist churches. The fact that certain of these are more or less shared by others will be remarked upon afterward.

1. We hold that the Bible alone is a religious authority; and in regard to Christian institutions the direct authority is of course the New Testament.

2. We hold that a Christian Church ought to consist only of persons making a credible profession of conversion, of faith in Christ. These may include children, even comparatively young children, for God be thanked that these do often give credible evidence of faith in Christ! But in the very nature of the case they cannot include infants. The notion that infants may be church members because their parents are seems to us utterly alien to the genius of Christianity not only unsupported by the New Testament, but in conflict with its essential principles; and we are not surprised to observe that our Christian brethren among whom that theory obtains are unable to carry it out consistently; unable to decide in what sense the so-called "children of the church" are really members of the church and subject to its discipline. The other notion, that infants may be church members because so-called "sponsors" make professions and promises for them, seems to us a mere legal fiction, devised to give some basis for a practice which rose on quite other grounds. Maintaining that none should be received as church members unless they give credible evidence of conversion, we also hold in theory that none should be retained in membership who do not lead a godly life; that if a man fails to show his faith by works, he should cease to make profession of faith. Some of our own people appear at times to forget that strict church discipline is a necessary part of the Baptist view as to church membership.

3. We hold that the officers, government, and ceremonies of a Christian society, or church, ought to be such, and such only, as the New Testament directs. As to ceremonies, it enjoins the very minimum of ceremony; for there are but two, and both are very simple in nature and in meaning. We insist that baptism ought to be simply what Christ practiced and commanded. We care nothing for the mode of baptism, the manner of baptizing, if only there is a real baptism according to the plain indications of Scripture. As to the significance of the ceremony, we understand it to involve three things: The element employed represents purification; the action performed represents burial and resurrection, picturing the burial and resurrection of Christ, and symbolizing the believer's death to sin through faith in Christ and his resurrection to walk in newness of life; and performing the ceremony in the name of the Lord Jesus, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, makes it like an oath of allegiance, a vow of devotion, to Jesus Christ, to the Triune God. The early Roman Christians had a good word for this idea if only the word could have remained unchanged in use: they called it a sacramentum, a military oath. As the Roman soldier in his oath bound himself to obey his general absolutely, so in baptism we solemnly vow devotion

and obedience. But, alas! the word "sacrament," like many another word in Christian history has come to be employed in senses quite foreign to its original use. As to the second Christian ceremony, we hold that not the bread, but the cup also should be given, urging, as all Protestants do, and Baptists are Protestants in one sense, though in another sense distinct from Protestants, that our Lord commanded us to do both, and no one has a right to modify commands. And the significance of the bread and wine is understood by us to be, not transubstantiation, nor consubstantiation, nor real presence in any sense, nor even according to Calvinian view that a special spiritual blessing is by divine pointment attached to the believing reception of these element but simply according to the Zwinglian view that these are mementoes, remembrancers of Christ, and that, taking them in remembrances of him, we may hope to have the natural effects such remembrance blessed to our spiritual good. As to the order of the two ceremonies, we believe the New Testament to indicate that the second should be observed by those who have previously observed the first and are walking orderly. This is in itself not a distinctive view of the Baptists for they share it with almost the entire Christian world in ages. The combination of this general Christian opinion, the New Testament requires baptism to precede the Lord's Supper, with our Baptist opinion as to what constitutes baptism leads to a practical restriction which many regard as the marked of all our distinctive views; while for us it is only incidental, though logically inevitable, result of that principle which we share with nearly all of those from whom it ceremonially separates us.

4. We hold that these societies called churches were design as shown in the New Testament, to be independent. They no right to control one another. Ample warrant there is for operation in benevolence and for consultations as to questions truth and duty, but without assuming to legislate or in any sense to rule one another. And they must be independent of what we call the State as to their organization, faith, worship, and discipline, while, of course, amenable to the State if they violate those moralities which are essential to public welfare; nor must they suffer themselves to be dependent on the State in the sense of receiving from it pecuniary support.

Now, I repeat that we do not consider these externals to be intrinsically so important as the spiritual, or even the ethical, elements of Christianity. But they are important, because they express the spiritual and react upon it healthily or hurtfully, and because the Author of Christianity, in person or through his inspired apostles, appointed and commanded them. And we think it a matter of great importance that they should be practiced in accordance with, and not contrary to, his appointment, that, in the language of his text, his disciples should observe and conserve (for the word includes both ideas) all things whatsoever he commanded them. We are glad that as to one or another of these distinctive views some of our fellow Christians of other persuasions agree with us more or less. We welcome all such concurrence, and it is not now necessary to inquire whether they hold those opinions with logical consistency. For ourselves, we do not claim to be fully acting upon these views, but we aim to do so, acknowledge ourselves blameworthy in so far as we fail; and we desire, notwithstanding our shortcoming in practice, to hold them up in due prominence before ourselves and others. I wish now, first, to present reasons why Baptists ought to teach their distinctive views, and then to remark upon means and methods of performing this duty.

I. REASONS WHY BAPTISTS OUGHT TO TEACH THEIR DISTINCTIVE VIEWS

1. It is a duty we owe to ourselves. We must teach these views in order to be consistent in holding them. Because of these we Stand apart from other Christians, in separate organizations, from Christians whom we warmly love and delight to work with. We have no right thus to stand apart unless the matters of difference have real importance; and if they are really important, we certainly ought to teach them.

We sometimes venture to say to our brethren of some other persuasions that if points of denominational difference evangelical Christians were so utterly trifling as they continually tell us, then they have no excuse for standing apart from each other, and no right to require us to stand apart from them unless we will abjure, or practically disregard, our distinctive views. But all this will apply to us likewise unless we regard the points of difference as having a substantial value and practical importance as a part of what Christ commanded, and in this case are a part of what he requires us to teach. And this teaching is the only way of correcting excesses among ourselves. Do some of our Baptist brethren seem to you ultra in their denominationalism, violent, bitter? And do you expect correct such a tendency by going to the opposite extreme? You are so pained, shocked, disgusted at what you consider an unlovely treatment of controverted matters that you shrink from treating them at all. Well, the persons you have in view, if there be such persons, would defend and fortify themselves by pointing at you.

They would say, "I am complained of as extreme and bigoted Look at those people yonder, who scarcely ever make the slightest allusion to characteristic Baptist principles, who are weak kneed, afraid of offending the Paedobaptists, or dreadfully anxious to court their favor by smooth silence: do you want me be such a Baptist as that?" Thus one extreme fosters another. The greatest complaint I have against what are called "sensational" preachers is not for the harm they directly do, but because they drive such a multitude of other preachers to the other extreme, make them so afraid of appearing sensational in their own eyes, or in those of some fastidious hearers, that they shrink from saying the bold and striking things they might say, at ought to say, and become commonplace and tame. And so it a great evil if a few ultraists in controversy drive many go men to avoid sensitively those controverted topics which we all under obligation to discuss. The only cure, my brethren, for denominational ultraism is a healthy denominationalism.

2. To teach our distinctive views is a duty we owe to our fellow Christians. Take the Roman Catholics. We are often told very earnestly that Baptists must make common cause with other Protestants against the aggressions of Romanism. It is urged, especially in some localities, that we ought to push all our denominational differences into the background and stand shoulder to shoulder against Popery.

Very well; but all the time it seems to us that the best way to meet and withstand Romanism is to take Baptist ground; and if, in making common cause against it, we abandon or slight our Baptist principles, have a care lest we do harm in both directions. Besides, ours is the best position, we think, for winning Romanists to evangelical truth. Our brethren of the great Protestant persuasions are all holding some "developed" form of Christianity, not so far developed as Popery, and some of them much less developed than others, but all having added something, in faith or government or ordinances, to the primitive simplicity. The Roman Catholics know this, and habitually taunt them with accepting changes which the church has made while denying the church's authority, and sometime tell them that the Baptists alone are consistent in opposing the Church. We may say that

there are but two sorts of Christianity; church Christianity and Bible Christianity. If well-meaning Roman Catholics become dissatisfied with resting everything on the authority of the church and begin to look toward the Bible as authority, they are not likely, if thoughtful and earnest, to stop at any halfway house, but to go forward to the position of those who really build on the Bible alone. Or take the Protestants themselves. Our esteemed brethren are often wonderfully ignorant of our views. A distinguished minister, author of elaborate works on church history and the creeds of Christendom, and of commentaries, etc., and brought in many ways into association with men of all denominations, is reported to have recently asked whether the Baptists practice trine immersion. A senator of the United States from one of the southern states, and alumnus of a celebrated university, was visiting, about twenty years ago, a friend in another state, who casually remarked that he was a Baptist.

"By the way," said the senator, "what kind of Baptists are Paedobaptists?" Not many years ago a New York gentleman who had been United States minister to a foreign country published in the New York Tribune a review of a work, in which he said (substantially), "The author states that he is a Baptist pastor. We do not know whether he is a Paedobaptist or belongs to the straiter of Baptists." Now, of course these are exceptional cases; but exemplify what is really a widespread and very great ignorance as to Baptists. And our friends of other denominations often us great injustice because they do not understand our tenets and judge us by their own. As to "restricted communion," for example, Protestants ally hold the Calvinian view of the Lord's Supper, and so think that we are selfishly denying them a share in the spiritual blessing attached to its observance; while, with our Zwinglian view, we have no such thought or feeling. These things certainly show it to be very desirable that we should bring our Christian brethren around us to know our distinctive opinions, in order that may at least restrain them from wronging us through ignorance.

If there were any who did not care to know, who were willing to be deprived of a peculiar accusation against us, then our efforts would be vain. But most of those we encounter are truly good people, however prejudiced, and do not wish be unjust; and if they will not take the trouble to seek information about our real views, they will not be unwilling to receive it when fitly presented. Christian charity may thus be promoted by correcting ignorance. And besides, we may hope that so at least will be led to investigate the matters about which differ. Oh, that our honored brethren would investigate! A highly educated Episcopal lady some years ago in one of our great cities, by a long and patient examination of her with no help but an Episcopal work in favor of infant baptism at length reached the firm conviction that it is without warrant in the Scripture, and became a Baptist. She afterward said, "I am satisfied that thousands would inevitably do likewise if they would only examine." But why should we wish to make Baptists of our Protestant brethren? Are not many of them noble Christians, not a few of them among the excellent of the earth? If with their opinions they are so devout and useful, why wish them to adopt other opinions? Yes, there are among them many who command our high admiration for their beautiful Christian character and life; but have a care about your inferences from this fact. The same is true even of many Roman Catholics, in the past and in the present; yet who doubts that the Romanist system as a whole is unfavorable to the production of the best types of piety? And it is not necessarily an arrogant and presumptuous thing in us if we strive to bring honored fellow Christians to views which we honestly believe to be more scriptural, and therefore more wholesome. Apollos was an eloquent man and mighty in the

Scriptures, and Aquila and Priscilla were lowly people who doubtless admired him; yet they taught him the way of the Lord more perfectly, and no doubt greatly rejoiced that he was willing to learn. He who tries to win people from other denominations to his own distinctive views may be a sectarian bigot; but he may also be a humble and loving Christian.

3. To teach our distinctive views is a duty we owe to the unbelieving world. We want unbelievers to accept Christianity; and it seems to us they are more likely to accept it when presented in its primitive simplicity, as the apostles themselves offered it to the men of their time. For meeting the assaults of infidels, we think our position is best.

Those who insist that Christianity is unfriendly to scientific investigations almost always point to the Romanists; they could not with the least plausibility say this of Baptists. And when an honest and earnest-minded skeptic is asked to examine with us this which claims to be a revelation from God, we do not have to lay beside it another book as determining beforehand what we must find in the Bible. Confessions of faith we have, some Older and some more recent, which we respect and find useful; but save through some exceptional and voluntary agreement we are not bound by them.

We can say to the skeptical inquirer, "Come and bring all the really ascertained light that has been derived from studying the material world, the history of man, or the highest philosophy, and we will gladly use it in helping to interpret this which we believe to be God's word"; and we can change our views of its meaning if real light from any other sources requires us to do so.

There is, surely, in this freedom no small advantage for being the truly rational inquirer. But, while thus free to search the Scriptures, Baptists are eminently conservative in their whole tone and spirit; and for a reason. Their recognition of the Scriptures alone as religious authority, and the stress they lay on exact conformity to the requirements of Scriptures foster an instinctive feeling that they must stand or fall with the real truth and the real authority of the Bible. The union of freedom and conservatism is something most healthy and hopeful.

4. There is yet another reason, one full of solemn sweetness: To teach our distinctive views is not only a duty to ourselves to our fellow Christians, and to the unbelieving world, but it is a duty we owe to Christ; it is a matter of simple loyalty to him.

Under the most solemn circumstances he uttered the express injunction. He met the eleven disciples by appointment on a mountain in Galilee; probably the more than five hundred whom Paul speaks were present also: "And Jesus came and sp unto them, saying, All authority is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and disciple all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." The things of which we have been speaking are not, we grant, the most important of religious truths and duties, but are a part of all the things which Jesus commanded; what shall hinder us, what could excuse us, from observing them ourselves and teaching them to others? The Roman soldier who had taken the sacramentum did not then go to picking and choosing among the orders of his general: shall the baptized believer pick and choose which commands of Christ he will obey and which neglect and which alter? And, observe, I did not quote it all:

Go, disciple, baptizing them, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Shall we neglect to teach as he

required, and then claim the promise of his presence and help and blessing?

II. MEANS AND METHODS OF PERFORMING THIS DUTY

1. One of the best means of teaching our distinctive views to others is the thorough instruction of our own people. Brethren of other persuasions need not be repelled or offended if they find us taking suitable occasion in pulpit discourses to teach our young members what Baptists believe, and why. If they perceive we are not striking at them through our members, but in simplicity and sincerity feeding our flock, they may even listen with interest. And then, if they choose to take these things to themselves of their own accord and on their own responsibility, why, all the better, of course. But our young members greatly need such instruction for their own sakes, and it is often grievously neglected. On a recent occasion a cultivated young lady stated that she had never in her life heard a word from the pulpit as to the relation between baptism and the Lord's Supper, and yet she was the daughter of a well-known Baptist minister, and her pastors had been men of marked ability and earnest Baptists. Do you think it a rare case? You can find such by thousands. And we ought to teach these things, in their measure, not only to our Young members, but at home to the youth of our families.

Suffer another fact for illustration: I once knew a lad of sixteen, well educated for his years, whose father was a zealous and quite influential Baptist layman and his pastor an able and eloquent minister. The boy had been baptized, and with great joy and trembling had sat by his father's side and taken bread and Wine in remembrance of Jesus. Some weeks later a Methodist preacher came through the country, a rare thing in that neighborhood, and after preaching he very tenderly invited all Christians to come to the Table of the Lord. The boy wanted to and knew of no reason why he should not, but thought he would wait till his older brother and sisters went forward; and, as they did not, he inquired on the way home why it was, and on reaching home asked his father about it. The argument was made plain enough, but it was all new to him. Pastors, parents, and had never thought it necessary to explain that matter to anybody.

I mention these homely incidents with the hope of arousing such Baptists as my voice can reach to consider how it may in their homes and their churches. Nor should this instruction neglected in our Sunday schools. The current lesson system can of course, make no immediate provision for such instruction, but it leaves ample room for it by giving lessons that embrace controverted matters, and it calculates that every denomination its lesson-helps will explain these matters according to its vies

It is clear, then, that Sunday schools connected with Baptist churches ought to use Baptist helps for the study of the lessons. If some undenominational publications are so valuable for teachers as to be desired also, they ought to be used only in addition to those which explain according to Baptist beliefs. We do not withhold instruction in our Lord's other teachings till the pupil has become a believer, and why should we withhold it as to commands regarding church membership and ordinances?

Three benefits ought to follow from thus teaching our youth:

First, it will restrain them from hereafter going to other nominations through ignorance. Some reasons for such change cannot be touched by instruction. But not a few take such step because they were never taught the scriptural grounds Baptist usage, and so they readily fall in with the

plausible idea that "one church is good as another if the heart is right." There can be no doubt that well-meaning persons have in this way been lost to us whom early instruction might have retained.

Secondly, we may thus render them better Christians. I agree with an eminent Presbyterian minister who recently said "We make people better Christians by making them better Presbyterians, better Methodists, Baptists, Episcopalians." There are some very excellent people in our time who think it a merit to be entirely undenominational, and who proclaim that they "love one church as well as another." But, were not deluded, such persons are few and quite exceptional; in general, the truest, most devoted, and most useful Christians are strong in their denominational convictions and attachments. I repeat, then, that by proper instruction in our distinctive views we shall really make our young people better Christians.

And, thirdly, we thus prepare them to explain and advocate these views in conversation, a thing which is often called for, and when properly managed may be very useful.

2. If actions speak louder than words, we may practically teach our distinctive views by everything that builds up our churches in Christian character and promotes their legitimate influence. Baptists are in some respects placed at serious disadvantage in consequence of trying to do their duty. They have not restricted their ministry to men who had a certain fixed grade of education, but have encouraged all to preach who felt moved to do so, and whom the churches were willing to hear. In this way they have greatly helped to meet the vast demand in our country, and have gained a powerful hold upon the masses.

What would have become of the scattered millions in this new country had it not been for the Methodists, the Baptists, and some others who have pursued a like course? But the result is, that we have a great mass of comparatively uneducated ministers and members. Moreover, our Episcopal and Presbyterian brethren brought over the sea the social influence derived from an established church; and this social superiority they have easily maintained in many of our cities, particularly as their ministry was at the same time restricted to men having considerable education. The result is that, while Baptists have many families of excellent social position and influence, and many ministers of high cultivation, yet, in virtue of having a great number who are in these respects comparatively wanting, they have to bear, as a denomination, the odium of social and educational inferiority.

I do not regret this as regards our past. I think our principle as to the ministry is right, and I rejoice that we have been able to take hold of the multitude. But we must strive earnestly to better this situation in the future by steadily lifting up this great body of people as fast as we can. Whatever elevates the educational condition of our denomination or gives more of social influence, provided this be not gained by worldly conformity, will help in securing respect and attention for our distinctive tenets. And a like effect will be produced by the increasing development of benevolence among our churches, and by a completer report of what is actually done.

3. If we wish to teach our distinctive views to others, it is necessary to understand those whom we propose to reach. I remember a teacher of modern languages who would often elaborately explain some French or German or other idiom with which had no difficulty at all, and then pass over as not needing explanation many a phrase we could not understand. He knew the language he was teaching, but was not well acquainted with the language of his pupils.

If we would in any way teach effectively, we must know things look to the persons addressed; we must get their point of view. Now, Baptists are not, on the whole, so ignorant of denominational opinions of other Christians as they are of ours, because our circumstances have compelled us to give some attention to that matter. Yet we need a much better acquaintance with them if we would speak to any purpose in public or private. I respectfully urge upon all ministers and upon intelligent private members of both sexes that they shall study, by reading and personal inquiry, each of the leading religious bodies with they have to do, shall study them in three respects:

(a) Inquire what are the characteristic peculiarities of this body of Christians differencing them from others, and if possible at the fundamental opinions which account for these peculiarities. (b) Consider in what respects they particularly deserve our admiration and, with the necessary changes, our imitation. denomination emphasizes certain aspects of truth or departments of duty, and will in regard to these present a very instructive and inspiring model. (c) Strive to ascertain how they regard tenets, practices, and spirit. What things in us they especially dislike, and with what they might easily feel sympathy.

Such inquiries will help us in several ways. They may restrain the tendency to react from what we regard as the errors of others into an opposite extreme, as Protestants have done with reference to some errors of Popery, and many Baptists with reference to prelatical or pastoral domination, to clerical support, etc. They may check the unconscious adoption or imitation of opinions, sentiments, or phrases which are inconsistent, or at least incongruous, in us.

We rejoice in that "progress of Baptist principles" among Paedobaptists which Dr. Curtis's book so well describes, and perhaps fail to inquire whether there be not a counter-influence which deserves attention, and which may not be wholly beneficial. And then this study of other denominations will enable us better to adapt ourselves to those whom we would influence. When you address to Methodists an article suited to High Churchmen or vice versa, what in the world are you thinking about?

4. We should study the wise treatment of controverted topics. Upon this point I venture to offer several practical suggestions for what they are worth.

(a) Years ago I asked the now lamented Dr. Jeter how he managed about matters in dispute between us and other denominations. His reply was, in substance, "I never go out of my way to avoid such topics, and never go out of my way to find them. When naturally suggested by my subject or the circumstances, I speak of them, and I try to speak without timid fear of giving offense, and without fierce vehemence, as if taking hostility for granted, but just treating these matters, so far as I can, in the same tone with which I speak of other things." This seemed to me then, and still seems, an admirable statement of the course it is generally best to pursue. Some are constantly going out of their way to find such topics through a bred-and-born love of controversy or a mistaken judgment as to its necessity and benefits. Others go out of their way to avoid all disputed questions, and want nothing to do with controversy of any kind. This latter class might be advised to study the history and recorded writings of a man named Paul. He did not shrink from controversy. Yea, and his Master and ours is polemical on every page of his recorded discourses, always striking some error or evil practice of the people around him.

(b) Dr. Jeter's plan may further suggest, what I think is true, that it is commonly better to treat these topics as they occur our ordinary discourses. Set sermons have certain advantage even public debates may still be useful in some few quart though most of us think their day of usefulness in this is passed. But set sermons forewarn our hearers holding different opinions to come with armor buckled and visor close watching that no shaft shall reach them; while some excellent people take them as an invitation to stay away. They are doubt sometimes appropriate and helpful, but in general the other course can scarcely fail to prove best.

(c) I think it very undesirable to connect sharp polemics w the actual administration of ordinances. Do not go into a defense of our restriction of the Lord's Supper when about to take the bread and wine. Whatever you can say will repel some hearers and deeply pain some others, while such a discussion scarcely prove the best preparation for partaking. Try to out the sweet and blessed meaning of the ordinance and to serve it with unpretending reverence and solemnity, and it will itself teach all concerned.

I think Baptists often mar the wholesome solemnity of ordinance through the persuasion that they ought then and there to defend their restricted invitation. And when about to baptize, it is usually best simply to read the New Testament sages which give the history and significance of the ordinary and then with solemn prayer and a carefully prepared and reverent administration of the rite to leave it and the Scripture make their own impression. If an address or sermon be given present the practical lessons of baptism, especially that we should walk in newness of life, that will be more seemly, and often convincing, than to argue the proper subjects and proper action of baptism. Of course, any such suggestion as this must be subject to exception, but I am persuaded it will generally hold good.

(d) We should use mainly arguments drawn from the English Scriptures and from common experience or reflection; only occasionally those which depend on learning. Scholarship is greatly to be desired in ministers, and may we have much more of it!, but the highest function of scholarship in preaching is to take assured results and make them plain to the general understanding, and certain thorough evidence which the unlearned can appreciate. If you pour a flood of learning about your hearer, and he remembers that two Sundays ago there was a torrent of learning from Dr. Somebody on the other side, then, as he does not understand and cannot judge, he is apt to conclude that he will not believe either of you. And do let us beware of using doubtful arguments as if they were conclusive.

(e) We may treat these subjects by other means as well as by preaching. Many opportunities will occur in conversation, for one who has a cultivated social tact and conversational skill, to relieve some prejudice, parry some thrust, or suggest some point for research or reflection, far more effectively than it can be done in the pulpit, and this without unpleasantly obtruding such subjects or in any wise violating the delicate proponents of life. And carefully chosen tracts, books, or periodicals will often reinforce the sermon or conversation, or even reach some who would not listen to any public or private spoken words. We have already a great wealth of good literature of this kind, with which preachers and intelligent private members should make themselves as thoroughly acquainted as possible, so that they may know how to select precisely the most suitable for every case? a matter of the very highest importance.

(f) We must always speak of controverted subjects in a loving spirit. Baptists occupy, of necessity, a polemical position; let us earnestly strive to show that it is possible to maintain a polemical position in the spirit of true Christian love. This is really good policy; and, what is ten thousand times more, it is right.

5. Let us gladly cooperate with our fellow Christians of other Persuasions in general Christian work as far as we can without sacrificing our Convictions. Men who think ill of us are sometimes sorely perplexed. They say, "Look at these narrow-minded, bigoted 'close-communication' Baptists! How zealously they work in our union enterprise! how loving they seem to be! I don't understand it.?"

It is well to increase this perplexity. At the same time, we must not allow our conscientious differences to be belittled. Sometimes in a union service you will hear a well-meaning and warm-hearted man begin to gush, till at length he speaks scornfully of the trifles that divide us. In such a case one might find some means of diverting the dear brothers mind to another topic, and either publicly or privately inform him that such talk will not quite do.

Indeed, this is coming to be better understood than was the case a few years ago. In Young Men's Christian Association for example, one seldom encounters now the unwise speeches this respect that were once somewhat common. We must learn how to distinguish between abandonment of principles and mere practical concessions in order to conciliate, a distinction well illustrated for us in Acts 15:1-41 and in Paul's action as to Titus and Timothy. In the case of Titus the apostle would not yield an inch, would not give place for an hour, because a distinct principle was made; and shortly after he voluntarily did, the case of Timothy, what he had before refused, there being now no issue of principle.

It may sometimes be difficult to make the distinction, but that is a difficulty we may not shirk. One of the great practical problems of the Christian life, especially in our times, is to square for truth and squarely against error, and yet to hearty charity toward Christians who differ with us. This assuredly can be done. The very truest and sweetest Christian charity is actually shown by some of those who stand most firmly by their distinctive opinions.

6. Finally, let us cultivate unity among ourselves. The Baptists of this vast country are, in fact, united. Dr. Barnas Sears, who had exceptional opportunities of observing, spoke to me long before his death of the fact that our theological seminaries are all teaching the same doctrines without any central authority to keep them united. And the fact is more general. Apart from mere excrescences, American Baptists are wonderfully agreed, wonderfully, if you remember it as an agreement reached and maintained in perfect freedom. This unity becomes more manifest to any one in proportion as he gains a wider acquaintance. For example, pardon my taking local names to illustrate, there is many a brother in Mississippi with no knowledge of New England who, if he should spend a few weeks in Boston, would be astonished to find himself surrounded by real, right-down Baptists. And if some brethren in New England should go among those dreadful Landmarkers, whom they have seen so severely censured by newspapers that do not seem to know even the meaning of the term, they would conclude that most of the said Landmarkers are really very much like themselves, and not dreadful at all.

Dr. Fuller was fond of giving a story told by William Jay. Mr. Jay walked out one day in a dense English fog. Presently he saw approaching him a huge and monstrous object that made him start.

As they drew nearer together it assumed the shape of a gigantic man; and when they met, it was his own brother John. And American Baptists are becoming more united just now. A few years ago there was in some quarters a movement toward the propagation of "open communion" which at a distance awakened concern. But the estimable brethren engaged in that movement have gone in peace or have peacefully subsided into quiet. And in some other quarters ultraists are losing influence, and brethren who once followed them seem now disposed not at all to abandon any principle, but to avoid pushing differences among ourselves into an occasion of denominational disruption. So the general outlook is now very encouraging.

Let us cultivate, I say, this unity among ourselves. In order to do so, our watchwords must be freedom, forbearance, patience. There can be no constrained unity among us. The genius of our ideas and institutions quite forbids it. That newspaper, seminary, or society which undertakes to coerce American Baptists into unity will soon weary of the task.

We must be forbearing and patient, and not discouraged by many things which under the circumstances are to be looked for. Competing journals and other institutions may get up an occasional breeze; each great city may show a too exclusive interest in societies there located: that is natural, if not wise; personal rivalries may sometimes curiously complicate themselves with questions of principle and of general expediency: it may cause regret, but need not cause wonder; East and West may pull apart in some respects, and North and South; even the "celestial minds" of our noble women may not always perfectly agree about organizations; we cooperate fully in some matters, partially in some, perhaps work separately in others, yet with hearty fraternal kindness, but let us cultivate freedom, forbearance, patience, and we shall be substantially united more and more. This growing unity among ourselves gives us increasing power to impress our denominational opinions upon others; and the more zealously we strive to teach our distinctive views to others, the more we shall become united among ourselves.

S. The Duty of Baptists to Teach

The Duty of Baptists to Teach Their Distinctive Views By John A. Broadus, D. D., 1880 Professor in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary Louisville, Kentucky "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." -- Matthew 28:20. The things he had commanded include the internal and the external elements of Christian piety. Of the latter, they include ethical instruction and directions as to the conduct of Christian societies. These directions were afterward supplemented by the inspired apostles giving instructions as to the constitution and government of the Christian societies, or churches, and the characteristic ceremonies they were to observe. These matters pertaining to the Christian societies are certainly not so important as the internal and spiritual elements of piety or as ethical principles and precepts, but still they are important. We may be sure they are, from the fact that Christ and his apostles gave direction concerning them; and we can see why they must be important. It is impossible to maintain mental health if the body be abused or neglected, for bodily conditions react upon those of the mind. And the externals of piety are the natural expression of its spiritual essence, which cannot be healthy if they are disregarded, exaggerated, or perverted. The tendency of human nature is usually not to neglect religious externals, but to exaggerate or pervert them. The New Testament gives us a very simple pattern in these respects -- simple organization, simple government, simple ceremonies. But men early began to magnify their importance and to change their character and application.

Early Judaizers and Their Successors Did you ever consider what became of the Judaizers who gave Paul so much trouble? When we last observe them in the history, in connection with Paul' latest recorded visit to Jerusalem, they are really beaten, but still numerous and active. When, in the second century, we again get a clear view of the early Christians, the Judaizers seem reduced to a mere handful. But has the tendency really disappeared? Nay; it is beginning to strike through and through the Christianity of the day, and from that time onward a painfully large portion of Christendom has had only a Judaized Christianity. When men began to exaggerate the importance of externals, they would soon begin to change their character.

Coming to believe that baptism brings regeneration and is indispensable to salvation, they would of course wish to baptize as early in life as possible, and to make baptism practicable for the sick and the dying. Beginning to fancy that the bread and wine really became the glorified body and blood of the ascended Saviour, they not unnaturally took to withholding the cup from the laity, lest their awkward handling should spill some drops of the sacred fluid, which would have been profanation. And, in addition to these tendencies, the institutions of imperial Rome and the Roman genius for centralized government led the Christians to think it necessary that their societies should have a stronger government. The Baptists Opposed to Judaizing Influences In opposition to all this, Baptists insist on holding to the primitive constitution, government, and ceremonies of the Christian societies, or churches; and this on the principle of recognizing no religious authority but the Scriptures themselves, and of strictly observing all that the Saviour has commanded. Now, the Saviour says in our text that we must teach them to observe all things whatsoever he commanded. These commandments include the matters just mentioned, concerning which the

people who allow themselves to be called Baptists differ widely from large portions of the Christian world, and are persuaded that their own views are more scriptural, more in accordance with the Saviour's commands. They must therefore feel themselves required to teach these things as well as others. Hence, the text lays upon us the duty of which I have been requested to speak -- the duty of Baptists to teach their distinctive views.

Distinctive Views of Baptist Churches

It may be well to state briefly what I understand to be the leading distinctive views of the Baptist churches. The fact that certain of these are more or less shared by others will be remarked upon afterward.

(1) We hold that the Bible alone is a religious authority; and in regard to Christian institutions the direct authority is of course the New Testament.

(2) We hold that a Christian Church ought to consist only of persons making a credible profession of conversion, of faith in Christ. These may include children, even comparatively young children, for God be thanked that these do often give credible evidence of faith in Christ! But in the very nature of the case they cannot include infants. The notion that infants may be church-members because their parents are seems to us utterly alien to the genius of Christianity, not only unsupported by the New Testament, but in conflict with its essential principles; and we are not surprised to observe that our Christian brethren among whom that theory obtains are unable to carry it out consistently -- unable to decide in what sense the so-called "children of the church" are really members of the church and subject to its discipline. The other notion, that infants may be church-members because so-called "sponsors" make professions and promises for them, seems to us a mere legal fiction, devised to give some basis for a practice which rose on quite other grounds. Maintaining that none should be received as church-members unless they give credible evidence of conversion, we also hold in theory that none should be retained in membership who do not lead a godly life; that if a man fails to show his faith by works, he should cease to make profession of faith. Some of our own people appear at times to forget that strict church discipline is a necessary part of the Baptist view as to church-membership.

(3) We hold that the officers, government, and ceremonies of a Christian society, or church, ought to be such, and such only, as the New Testament directs. As to ceremonies, it enjoins the very minimum of ceremony; for there are but two, and both are very simple in nature and in meaning. We insist that baptism ought to be simply what Christ practised and commanded. We care nothing for the mode of baptism, the manner of baptizing, if only there is a real baptism according to the plain indications of Scripture. As to the significance of the ceremony, we understand it to involve three things: The element employed represents purification; the action performed represents burial and resurrection, picturing the burial and resurrection of Christ, and symbolizing the believer's death to sin through faith in Christ and his resurrection to walk in newness of life; and performing the ceremony in the name of the Lord Jesus -- in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost -- makes it like an oath of allegiance, a vow of devotion, to Jesus Christ, to the Triune God. The early Roman Christians had a good word for this idea if only the word could have remained unchanged in use: they called it a sacramentum, a military oath. As the Roman soldier in his oath bound himself to obey his general absolutely so in baptism we solemnly vow devotion and obedience. But, alas! the word "sacrament," like many another word in Christian history, has come

to be employed in senses quite foreign to its original use. As to the second Christian ceremony, we hold that not only the bread, but the cup also should be given, urging, as all Protestants do -- and Baptists are Protestants in one sense, though in another sense distinct from Protestants -- that our Lord commanded us to do both, and no one has a right to modify his commands. And the significance of the bread and wine is understood by us to be, not transubstantiation, nor consubstantiation, nor real presence in any sense, nor even according to the Calvinian view that a special spiritual blessing is by divine appointment attached to the believing reception of these elements, but simply according to the Zwinglian view that these are mementoes, remembrancers of Christ, and that, taking them in remembrance of him, we may hope to have the natural effects of such remembrance blessed to our spiritual good. As to the order of the two ceremonies, we believe the New Testament to indicate that the second should be observed only by those who have previously observed the first and are walking orderly. This is in itself not a distinctive view of the Baptists, for they share it with almost the entire Christian world in all ages. The combination of this general Christian opinion, that the New Testament requires baptism to precede the Lord's Supper, with our Baptist opinion as to what constitutes baptism, leads to a practical restriction which many regard as the most marked of all our distinctive views; while for us it is only an incidental, though logically inevitable, result of that principle which we share with nearly all of those from whom it ceremonially separates us.

(4) We hold that these societies called churches were designed as shown in the New Testament, to be independent. They have no right to control one another. Ample warrant there is for cooperation in benevolence and for consultations as to questions of truth and duty, but without assuming to legislate or in any sense to rule one another. And they must be independent of what we call the State as to their organization, faith, worship, and discipline, while, of course, amenable to the State if they violate those moralities which are essential to public welfare; nor must they suffer themselves, to be dependent on the State in the sense of receiving from it pecuniary support.

Now, I repeat that we do not consider these externals to be intrinsically so important as the spiritual, or even the ethical, elements of Christianity. But they are important, because they express the spiritual and react upon it healthily or hurtfully, and because the Author of Christianity, in person or through his inspired apostles, appointed and commanded them. And we think it a matter of great importance that they should be practised in accordance with, and not contrary to, his appointment -- that, in the language of his text, his disciples should observe and conserve (for the word includes both ideas) all things whatsoever he commanded them.

We are glad that as to one or another of these distinctive views some of our fellow-Christians of other persuasions agree with us more or less. We welcome all such concurrence, and it is not now necessary to inquire whether they hold those opinions with logical consistency. For ourselves, we do not claim to be fully acting upon these views, but we aim to do so, acknowledge ourselves blameworthy in so far as we fail; and we desire, notwithstanding our shortcoming in practice, to hold them up in due prominence before ourselves and others.

I wish now, first, to present reasons why Baptists ought to teach their distinctive views, and then to remark upon means and methods of performing this duty.

I. Reasons Why Baptists Ought to Teach Their Distinctive Views

1. It is a duty we owe to ourselves. We must teach these views in order to be consistent in holding them. Because of these we stand apart from other Christians, in separate organizations - from Christians whom we warmly love and delight to work with. We have no right thus to stand apart unless the matters of difference have real importance; and if they are really important, we certainly ought to teach them. We sometimes venture to say to our brethren of some other persuasions that if points of denominational difference among evangelical Christians were so utterly trifling as they continually tell us, then they have no excuse for standing apart from each other, and no right to require us to stand apart from them unless we will abjure, or practically disregard, our distinctive views. But all this will apply to us likewise unless we regard the points of difference as having a substantial value and practical importance as a part of what Christ commanded, and in this case they are a part of what he requires us to teach. And this teaching is the only way of correcting excesses among ourselves. Do some of our Baptist brethren seem to you ultra in their denominationalism, violent, bitter? And do you expect to correct such a tendency by going to the opposite extreme? You are so pained, shocked, disgusted, at what you consider an unlovely treatment of controverted matters that you shrink from treating them at all. Well, the persons you have in view, if there be such persons, would defend and fortify themselves by pointing at you. They would say, "I am complained of as extreme and bigoted. Look at those people yonder, who scarcely ever make the slightest allusion to characteristic Baptist principles, who are weak-kneed, afraid of offending the Paedobaptists, or dreadfully anxious to court their favor by smooth silence: do you want me to be such a Baptist as that?" Thus one extreme fosters another. The greatest complaint I have against what are called "sensational" preachers is not for the harm they directly do, but because they drive such a multitude of other preachers to the other extreme -- make them so afraid of appearing sensational in their own eyes, or in those of some fastidious hearers, that they shrink from saying the bold and striking things they might say, and ought say, and become commonplace and tame. And so it is a great evil if a few ultraists in controversy drive many good men to avoid sensitively those controverted topics which we are all under obligation to discuss. The only cure, my brethren, for denominational ultraism is a healthy denominationalism.

2. To teach our distinctive views is a duty we owe to other fellow-Christians. Take the Roman Catholics. We are often told very earnestly that Baptists must make common cause with other Protestants against the aggressions of Romanism. It is urged, especially in some localities, that we ought to push all our denominational differences into the background and stand shoulder to shoulder against Popery. Very well; but all the time it seems to us that the best way to meet and withstand Romanism is to take Baptist ground; and if, in making common cause against it, we abandon or slight our Baptist principles, have a care lest we do harm in both directions. Besides, ours is the best position, we think, for winning Romanists to evangelical truth. Our brethren of the great Protestant persuasions are all holding some "developed" form of Christianity -- not so far developed as Popery, and some of them much less developed than others, but all having added something, in faith or government or ordinances, to the primitive simplicity. The Roman Catholics know this, and habitually taunt them with accepting changes which the church has made while denying the church' authority, and sometimes tell them that the Baptists alone are consistent in opposing the church. We may say that there are but two sorts of Christianity --church Christianity and Bible Christianity. If well-meaning Roman Catholics become dissatisfied with resting everything on the authority of the church and begin to look toward the Bible as authority, they are not likely, if thoughtful and earnest, to stop at any halfway-house, but to go forward to the position

of those who really build on the Bible alone. Or take the Protestants themselves. Our esteemed brethren are often wonderfully ignorant of our views. A distinguished minister, author of elaborate works on church history and the creeds of Christendom, and of commentaries, etc., and brought in many ways into association with men of all denominations, is reported to have recently asked whether the Baptists practise trine immersion. A senator of the United States from one of the Southern States, and alumnus of a celebrated university, was visiting, about twenty years ago, a friend in another State, who casually remarked that he was a Baptist. "By the way," said the senator, "what kind of Baptists are the Paedobaptists?" Not many years ago a New York gentleman who had been United States minister to a foreign country published in the New York Tribune a review of a work, in which he said (substantially), "The author states that he is a Baptist pastor. We do not know whether he is a Paedobaptist or belongs to the straiter sect of Baptists." Now, of course these are exceptional cases; but they exemplify what is really a widespread and very great ignorance as to Baptists. And our friends of other denominations often do us great injustice because they do not understand our tenets and judge us by their own. As to "restricted communion," for example, Protestants usually hold the Calvinian view of the Lord's Supper, and so think that we are selfishly denying them a share in the spiritual blessing attached to its observance; while, with our Zwinglian view, we have no such thought or feeling. These things certainly show it to be very desirable that we should bring our Christian brethren around us to know our distinctive opinions, in order that we may at least restrain them from wronging us through ignorance. If there were any who did not care to know, who were unwilling to be deprived of a peculiar accusation against us, with them our efforts would be vain. But most of those we encounter are truly good people, however prejudiced, and do not wish to be unjust; and if they will not take the trouble to seek information about our real views, they will not be unwilling to receive it when fitly presented. Christian charity may thus be promoted by correcting ignorance. And besides, we may hope that some at least will be led to investigate the matters about which we differ. Oh that our honored brethren would investigate! A highly-educated Episcopal lady some years ago, in one of our great cities, by a long and patient examination of her Bible, with no help but an Episcopal work in favor of infant baptism, at length reached the firm conviction that it is without warrant in the Scripture, and became a Baptist. She afterward said, "I am satisfied that thousands would inevitably do likewise if they would only examine." But why should we wish to make Baptists of our Protestant brethren? Are not many of them noble Christians -- not a few of them among the excellent of the earth? If with their opinions they are so devout and useful, why wish them to adopt other opinions? Yes, there are among them many who command our high admiration for their beautiful Christian character and life; but have a care about your inferences from this fact. The same is true even of many Roman Catholics, in the past and in the present; yet who doubts that the Romanist system as a whole is unfavorable to the production of the best types of piety? And it is not necessarily an arrogant and presumptuous thing in us if we strive to bring honored fellow-Christians to views which we honestly believe to be more scriptural, and therefore more wholesome. Apollos was an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures, and Aquila and Priscilla were lowly people who doubtless admired him; yet they taught him the way of the Lord more perfectly, and no doubt greatly rejoiced that he was willing to learn. He who tries to win people from other denominations to his own distinctive views may be a sectarian bigot; but he may also be a humble and loving Christian.

3. To teach our distinctive views is a duty we owe to the unbelieving world. We want unbelievers to accept Christianity; and it seems to us they are more likely to accept it when presented in its primitive simplicity, as the apostles themselves offered it to the men of their time. For meeting the assaults of infidels, we think our position is best. Those who insist that Christianity is unfriendly to scientific investigations almost always point to the Romanists; they could not with the least plausibility say this of Baptists. And when an honest and earnest-minded sceptic is asked to examine with us this which claims to be a revelation from God, we do not have to lay beside it another book as determining beforehand what we must find in the Bible. Confessions of faith we have, some older and some more recent, which we respect and find useful; but save through some exceptional and voluntary agreement we are not bound by them. We can say to the sceptical inquirer, "Come and bring all the really ascertained light that has been derived from studying the material world, the history of man, or the highest philosophy, and we will gladly use it in helping to interpret this which we believe to be God's word;" and we can change our views of its meaning if real light from any other sources requires us to do so. There is, surely, in this freedom no small advantage for attracting the truly rational inquirer. But, while thus free to search the Scriptures, Baptists are eminently conservative in their whole tone and spirit; and for a reason. Their recognition of the Scriptures alone as religious authority, and the stress they lay on exact conformity to the requirements of Scripture, foster an instinctive feeling that they must stand or fall with the real truth and the real authority of the Bible. The union of freedom and conservatism is something most healthy and hopeful.

4. There is yet another reason—one full of solemn sweetness: To teach our distinctive views is not only a duty to ourselves, to our fellow-Christians, and to the unbelieving world, but it is a duty we owe to Christ; it is a matter of simple loyalty to him. Under the most solemn circumstances he uttered the express injunction. He met the eleven disciples by appointment on a mountain in Galilee; probably the more than five hundred of whom Paul speaks were present also: "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All authority is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and disciple all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." The things of which we have been speaking are not, we freely grant, the most important of religious truths and duties, but they are a part of the all things which Jesus commanded; what shall hinder us, what could excuse us, from observing them ourselves and teaching them to others? The Roman soldier who had taken the sacramentum did not then go to picking and choosing among the orders of his general: shall the baptized believer pick and choose which commands of Christ he will obey and which neglect and which alter? And, observe, I did not quote it all: Go, disciple, baptizing them, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Shall we neglect to teach as he required, and then claim the promise of his presence and help and blessing?

II. Means and Methods of Performing this Duty

1. One of the best means of teaching our distinctive views to others is the thorough instruction of our own people. Brethren of other persuasions need not be repelled or offended if they find us taking suitable occasion in pulpit discourses to teach our young members what Baptists believe, and why. If they perceive we are not striking at them through our members, but in simplicity and sincerity are feeding our flock, they may even listen with interest. And then, if they choose to take

these things to themselves of their own accord and on their own responsibility, why, all the better, of course. But our young members greatly need such instruction for their own sakes, and it is often grievously neglected. On a recent occasion a cultivated young lady stated that she had never in her life heard a word from the pulpit as to the relation between baptism and the Lord's Supper, and yet she was the daughter of a well-known Baptist minister, and her pastors had been men of marked ability and earnest Baptists. Do you think it a rare case? You can find such by thousands. And we ought to teach these things, in their measure, not only to our young members, but at home to the youth of our families. Suffer another fact for illustration: I once knew a lad of sixteen, well educated for his years, whose father was a zealous and quite influential Baptist layman and his pastor an able and eloquent minister. The boy had been baptized, and with great joy and trembling had sat by his father's side and taken bread and wine in remembrance of Jesus. Some weeks later a Methodist preacher came through the country -- a rare thing in that neighborhood -- and after preaching he very tenderly invited all Christians to come to the Table of the Lord. The boy wanted to go, and knew of no reason why he should not, but thought he would wait till his older brother and sisters went forward; and, as they did not, he inquired on the way home why it was, and on reaching home asked his father about it. The argument was made plain enough, but it was all new to him. Pastors, parents, and all had never thought it necessary to explain that matter to anybody. I mention these homely incidents with the hope of arousing such Baptists as my voice can reach to consider how it may be in their homes and their churches. Nor should this instruction be neglected in our Sunday-schools. The current lesson-system can, of course, make no immediate provision for such instruction, but it leaves ample room for it by giving lessons that embrace controverted matters, and it calculates that every denomination in its lesson-helps will explain these matters according to its views. It is clear, then, that Sunday-schools connected with Baptist churches ought to use Baptist helps for the study of the lesson. If some undenominational publications are so valuable for teachers as to be desired also, they ought to be used only in addition to those which explain according to Baptist beliefs. We do not withhold instruction in our Lord's other teachings till the pupil has become a believer, and why should we withhold it as to his commands regarding church-membership and ordinances?

Three benefits ought to follow from thus teaching our youth: First, it will restrain them from hereafter going to other denominations through ignorance. Some reasons for such change cannot be touched by instruction. But not a few take such a step because they were never taught the scriptural grounds for Baptist usage, and so they readily fall in with the plausible idea that "one church is good as another if the heart is right." There can be no doubt that well-meaning persons have in this way been lost to us whom early instruction might have retained. Secondly, we may thus render them better Christians. I fully agree with an eminent Presbyterian minister who recently said, "We make people better Christians by making them better Presbyterians, better Methodists, Baptists, Episcopalians." There are some very excellent people in our time who think it a merit to be entirely undenominational, and who proclaim that they "love one church as well as another." But, where not deluded, such persons are few and quite exceptional; in general, the truest, most devoted, and most useful Christians are strong in their denominational convictions and attachments. I repeat, then, that by proper instruction in our distinctive views we shall really make our young people better Christians. And, thirdly, we thus prepare them to explain and advocate these views in conversation -- a thing which is often called for, and when properly managed may be very useful.

2. If actions speak louder than words, we may practically teach our distinctive views by everything that builds up our churches in Christian character and promotes their legitimate influence. Baptists are in some respects placed at serious disadvantage in consequence of trying to do their duty.

They have not restricted their ministry to men who had a certain fixed grade of education, but have encouraged all to preach who felt moved to do so, and whom the churches were willing to hear. In this way they have greatly helped to meet the vast demand in our country, and have gained a powerful hold upon the masses. What would have become of the scattered millions in this new country had it not been for the Methodists, the Baptists, and some others who have pursued a like course? But the result is, that we have a great mass of comparatively uneducated ministers and members. Moreover, our Episcopal and Presbyterian brethren brought over the sea the social influence derived from an established church; and this social superiority they have easily maintained in many of our cities, particularly as their ministry was at the same time restricted to men having considerable education. The result is that, while Baptists have many families of excellent social position and influence, and many ministers of high cultivation, yet, in virtue of having a great number who are in these respects comparatively wanting, they have to bear, as a denomination, the odium of social and educational inferiority. I do not regret this as regards our past. I think our principle as to the ministry is right, and I rejoice that we have been able to take hold of the multitude. But we must strive earnestly to better this situation in the future by steadily lifting up this great body of people as fast as we can. Whatever elevates the educational condition of our denomination or gives more of social influence, provided this be not gained by worldly conformity, will help in securing respect and attention for our distinctive tenets. And a like effect will be produced by the increasing development of benevolence among our churches, and by a completer report of what is actually done.

3. If we wish to teach our distinctive views to others, it is necessary to understand those whom we propose to reach. I remember a teacher of modern languages who would often elaborately explain some French or German or other idiom with which we had no difficulty at all, and then pass over as not needing explanation many a phrase we could not understand. He knew the language he was teaching, but was not well acquainted with the language of his pupils. If we would in any way teach effectively, we must know how things look to the persons addressed; we must get their point of view. Now, Baptists are not, on the whole, so ignorant of the denominational opinions of other Christians as they are of ours, because our circumstances have compelled us to give some attention to that matter. Yet we need a much better acquaintance with them if we would speak to any purpose in public or private. I respectfully urge upon all ministers and upon intelligent private members of both sexes that they shall study, by reading and personal inquiry, each of the leading religious bodies with which they have to do -- shall study them in three respects: (a) Inquire what are the characteristic peculiarities of this body of Christians differencing them from others, and if possible get at the fundamental opinions which account for these peculiarities. (b) Consider in what respects they particularly deserve our admiration and, with the necessary changes, our imitation. Each denomination emphasizes certain aspects of truth or departments of duty, and will in regard to these present us a very instructive and inspiring model. (c) Strive to ascertain how they regard our tenets, practices, and spirit —what things in us they especially dislike, and with what they might easily feel sympathy.

Such inquiries will help us in several ways. They may restrain the tendency to react from what we regard as the errors of others into an opposite extreme, as Protestants have done with reference to some errors of Popery, and many Baptists with reference to prelatical or pastoral domination, to clerical support, etc. They may check the unconscious adoption or imitation of opinions, sentiments, or phrases which are inconsistent, or at least incongruous, in us. We rejoice in that "progress of Baptist principles" among Paedobaptists which Dr. Curtis's book so well describes, and perhaps fail to inquire whether there be not a counter-influence which deserves attention, and which may not be wholly beneficial. And then this study of other denominations will enable us better to adapt ourselves to those whom we would influence. When you address to Methodists an article suited to High Churchmen, or vice versa, what in the world are you thinking about?

4. We should study the wise treatment of controverted topics. Upon this point I venture to offer several practical suggestions for what they are worth.

(a) Years ago I asked the now lamented Dr. Jeter how he managed about matters in dispute between us and other denominations. His reply was, in substance, "I never go out of my way to avoid such topics, and never go out of my way to find them. When naturally suggested by my subject or the circumstances, I speak of them, and I try to speak without timid fear of giving offence, and without fierce vehemence, as if taking hostility for granted, but just treating these matters, so far as I can, in the same tone with which I speak of other things." This seemed to me then, and still seems, an admirable statement of the course it is generally best to pursue. Some are constantly going out of their way to find such topics through a bred-and-born love of controversy or a mistaken judgment as to its necessity and benefits. Others go out of their way to avoid all disputed questions, and want nothing to do with controversy of any kind. This latter class might be advised to study the history and recorded writings of a man named Paul. He did not shrink from controversy. Yea, and his Master and ours is polemical on every page of his recorded discourses, always striking at some error or evil practice of the people around him.

(b) Dr. Jeter's plan may further suggest -- what I think is true -- that it is commonly better to treat these topics as they occur in our ordinary discourses. Set sermons have certain advantages; even public debates may still be useful in some few quarters, though most of us think their day of usefulness in this country is passed. But set sermons forewarn our hearers holding different opinions to come with armor buckled and visor closed, watching that no shaft shall reach them; while some excellent people take them as an invitation to stay away. They are no doubt sometimes appropriate and helpful, but in general the other course can scarcely fail to prove best.

(c) I think it very undesirable to connect sharp polemics with the actual administration of ordinances. Do not go into a defence of our restriction of the Lord's Supper when about to take the bread and wine. Whatever you can say will repel some hearers and deeply pain some others, while such a discussion can scarcely prove the best preparation for partaking. Try to bring out the sweet and blessed meaning of the ordinance and to observe it with unpretending reverence and solemnity, and it will itself teach all concerned. I think Baptists often mar the wholesome solemnity of this ordinance through the persuasion that they ought then and there to defend their restricted invitation. And when about to baptize, it is usually best simply to read the New Testament passages which give the history and significance of the ordinance, and then with solemn prayer and a carefully-prepared and reverent administration of the rite to leave it and the Scripture to

make their own impression. If an address or sermon be given to present the practical lessons of baptism, especially that we should walk in newness of life, that will be more seemly, and often more convincing, than to argue the proper subjects and proper action of baptism. Of course, any such suggestion as this must be subject to exception, but I am persuaded it will generally hold good.

(d) We should use mainly arguments drawn from the English Scriptures and from common experience or reflection; only occasionally those which depend on learning. Scholarship is greatly to be desired in ministers -- and may we have much more of it! -- but the highest function of scholarship in preaching is to take assured results and make them plain to the general understanding, and certain thorough evidence which the unlearned can appreciate. If you pour a flood of learning about your hearer, and he remembers that two Sundays ago there was a torrent of learning from Dr. Somebody on the other side, then, as he does not understand and cannot judge, he is apt to conclude that he will not believe either of you. And do let us beware of using doubtful arguments as if they were conclusive.

(e) We may treat these subjects by other means as well as by preaching. Many opportunities will occur in conversation, for one who has a cultivated social tact and conversational skill, to relieve some prejudice, parry some thrust, or suggest some point for research or reflection, far more effectively than it can be done in the pulpit, and this without unpleasantly obtruding such subjects or in any wise violating the delicate proprieties of life. And carefully chosen tracts, books, or periodicals will often reinforce the sermon or conversation, or even reach some who would not listen to any public or private spoken words. We have already a great wealth of good literature of this kind, with which preachers and intelligent private members should make themselves as thoroughly acquainted as possible, so that they may know how to select precisely the most suitable for every case -- a matter of the very highest importance.

(f) We must always speak of controverted subjects in a loving spirit. Baptists occupy, of necessity, a polemical position; let us earnestly strive to show that it is possible to maintain a polemical position in the spirit of true Christian love. This is really good policy; and, what is ten thousand times more, it is right.

5. Let us gladly co-operate with our fellow-Christians of other persuasions in general Christian work as far as we can without sacrificing our convictions. Men who think ill of us are sometimes sorely perplexed. They say, "Look at these narrow-minded, bigoted 'close-communication' Baptists! How zealously they work in our union enterprise! how loving they seem to be! I don't understand it." It is well to increase this perplexity. At the same time, we must not allow our conscientious differences to be belittled. Sometimes in a union service you will hear a well-meaning and warm-hearted man begin to gush, till at length he speaks quite scornfully of the trifles that divide us. In such a case one must find some means of diverting the dear brother's mind to another topic, and either publicly or privately inform him that such talk will not quite do. Indeed, this is coming to be better understood than was the case a few years ago. In Young Men's Christian Associations, for example, one seldom encounters now the unwise speeches in this respect that were once somewhat common. We must learn how to distinguish between abandonment of principles and mere practical concessions in order to conciliate -- a distinction well illustrated for us in Acts xv. and in Paul's action as to Titus and Timothy. In the case of Titus the apostle would not yield an inch,

would not give place for an hour, because a distinct issue of principle was made; and shortly after he voluntarily did, in the case of Timothy, what he had before refused, there being now no issue of principle. It may sometimes be difficult to make the distinction, but that is a difficulty we may not shirk. One of the great practical problems of the Christian life, especially in our times, is to stand squarely for truth and squarely against error, and yet to maintain hearty charity toward Christians who differ with us. This assuredly can be done. The very truest and sweetest Christian charity is actually shown by some of those who stand most firmly by their distinctive opinions.

6. Finally, let us cultivate unity among ourselves. The Baptists of this vast country are, in fact, united. Dr. Barnas Sears, who had exceptional opportunities of observing, spoke to me not long before his death of the fact that our theological seminaries are all teaching the same doctrines without any central authority to keep them united. And the fact is more general. Apart from mere excrescences, American Baptists are wonderfully agreed -- wonderfully, if you remember it as an agreement reached and maintained in perfect freedom. This unity becomes more manifest to any one in proportion as he gains a wider acquaintance. For example -- pardon my taking local names to illustrate -- there is many a brother in Mississippi with no knowledge of New England who, if he should spend a few weeks in Boston, would be astonished to find himself surrounded by real, right-down Baptists. And if some brethren in New England should go among those dreadful Landmarkers, whom they have seen so severely censured by newspapers that do not seem to know even the meaning of the term, they would conclude that most of the said Landmarkers are really very much like themselves, and not dreadful at all. Dr. Fuller was fond of giving a story told by William Jay. Mr. Jay walked out one day in a dense English fog. Presently he saw approaching him a huge and monstrous object that made him start. As they drew nearer together it assumed the shape of a gigantic man; and when they met, it was his own brother John. And American Baptists are becoming more united just now. A few years ago there was in some quarters a movement toward the propagation of "open communion" which at a distance awakened concern. But the estimable brethren engaged in that movement have gone in peace or have peacefully subsided into quiet. And in some other quarters ultraists are losing influence, and brethren who once followed them seem now disposed not at all to abandon any principle, but to avoid pushing differences among ourselves into an occasion of denominational disruption. So the general outlook is now very encouraging.

Let us cultivate, I say, this unity among ourselves. In order to do so, our watchwords must be freedom, forbearance, patience. There can be no constrained unity among us. The genius of our ideas and institutions quite forbids it. That newspaper, seminary, or society which undertakes to coerce American Baptists into unity will soon weary of the task. We must be forbearing and patient, and not discouraged by many things which under the circumstances are to be looked for. Competing journals and other institutions may get up an occasional breeze; each great city may show a too exclusive interest in societies there located: that is natural, if not wise; personal rivalries may sometimes curiously complicate themselves with questions of principle and of general expediency: it may cause regret, but need not cause wonder; East and West may pull apart in some respects, and North and South; even the "celestial minds" of our noble women may not always perfectly agree about organizations; we co-operate fully in some matters, partially in some, perhaps work separately in others, yet with hearty fraternal kindness, -- but let us cultivate freedom, forbearance, patience, and we shall be substantially united more and more. This growing

unity among ourselves gives us increasing power to impress our denominational Opinions upon others; and the more zealously we strive to teach our distinctive views to others, the more we shall become united among ourselves.

===== [John A. Broadus, The Duty of Baptists to Teach their Distinctive Views, a booklet by the ABPS, 1880. - jrd]

S. The Future Life

THE FUTURE LIFE

1. Do men everywhere believe in a future life? In all nations and races men have generally believed in a future and endless life.
2. Does the Bible confirm this belief? The Bible leaves no room to doubt that every human being will always continue to exist.
3. What becomes of the soul at death? The soul is undying, and passes at once into blessedness or suffering. 2 Corinthians 5:8; Luke 16:23; Luke 16:28.
4. What becomes of the body after death? The body returns to dust, but it will rise again. Genesis 3:19; Ecclesiastes 12:7; Acts 24:15.
5. Will the same body live again? Yes, the very same body will live again, but greatly changed as to its condition and mode of life. 1 Corinthians 15:42-44.
6. What is meant by the day of judgment? The day of judgment means a great and awful day, on which the living and the dead will stand before Christ to be judged. Acts 17:31; Matthew 25:31; 2 Corinthians 5:10.
7. To what will Christ condemn the wicked? Christ will send the wicked away to everlasting punishment in hell. Matthew 25:41; Matthew 25:46.
8. To what will Christ welcome the righteous? Christ will welcome the righteous to everlasting blessedness with him in heaven. Matthew 25:34; Matthew 25:46.
9. Will there be different degrees of punishment? The future punishment will be greater according to the degrees of sin, and the knowledge men had of God's will and of the way of salvation through Christ. Luke 12:47; Luke 12:48; Mark 12:40.
10. How is hell described in the Bible? Hell is a place of darkness and torment, of endless sin and endless suffering.
11. How is heaven described? Heaven is a place of light and holiness, of freedom from all sorrow and temptation, of blessed society and thankful praise to God. Revelation 7:9; Revelation 7:10; Revelation 21:4.

S. The Good Shepherd

The Good Shepherd

John A. Broadus I am the good shepherd. John 10:11

Pastoral life, always more common in East than West, early became associated in men's minds and in literature with ideas of peace and tranquil enjoyment. Likewise, pastoral life has yielded many beautiful images to the inspired writers. But they used figures to teach spiritual truths. Many of the most famous men connected with the history of Israel were themselves shepherds.

Isaiah, looking forward to the Messiah, amid the more splendid imagery with which he represents him, touches our tenderest feeling when saying (40:11), "He shall feed his flock," etc. So when Jesus came, he frequently availed himself of this same image. He does not scrupulously adhere to the figure of a shepherd, nor need we. Consider him.

I. As giving his life for the sheep.

1. He came, not as the thief [false teachers], but that they might have life. John 10:10.

Imagine a flock, scattered, panic-struck because a furious lion has assailed them. But the shepherd comes and soon lies dead in their defense; but the lion lies dead beside him, and the flock is safe. Heroic man, how he would be honored among the rustic people—his remains, his name. You see the parallel—so may angels honor our shepherd. But here the parallel ends—he died, yet he lives, to move among those he has died to save, to be loved and followed with new affection. He laid down his life that he might take it again.

2. He died voluntarily, John 10:15; John 10:18.

(a) Disciples were likely to think, When so often told in advance, and when his hour came, that men were compelling his death. In one sense this is true, in another it is purely voluntary. They could not, except he had chosen.

(b) The Father did not compel him to do it. Objection is sometimes made to atonement here—yet innocent not forced to suffer for guilty, it was voluntary.

(c) But was it right that he should suffer, even voluntarily? He felt he had the right. See John 10:18.

We could never have asked him to die for us. If it were now to be decided, that he should be humiliated, suffer, die, to save us from destruction, every just and generous feeling would prompt us to say, "No. Let me bear what I have merited—let him not suffer for me." Nonetheless, without our knowledge he did suffer and suffered out of love. Shall we reject him? Now it is no longer a question, "Shall he die for us?" He did! "In his love and in his pity he redeemed us." Shall we accept the benefits secured by his dying love—shall we be grateful—love him—be his? Consider II. His tender care of his flock.

1. He knows them by name, John 10:14. No danger that in the multitude anyone will be overlooked or forgotten. He knows every individual, and intimately.

2. He pursues the straying-"goeth into the mountains." This applied primarily to his coming into our world to seek and save the lost. Same thing is true of his gracious dealing with wanderers from his fold, backsliders. Such wanderers should return to the shepherd and bishop of our souls.

3. He deals gently with recent and feeble believers. Passage in Isaiah 40:1; Isaiah 40:1 -"he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and bear them in his bosom." This does not refer to children particularly, as context would place beyond question, but to those who have recently become believers, and are feeble. He will take care, shelter, bear along, strengthen. May your faith "grow exceedingly." Now babes in Christ, you shall become perfect (full-grown) men in Christ Jesus.

4. He supports in danger and difficulty. The shadow of death is a highly poetical expression for the profoundest darkness. Conceive a flock led by the shepherd through a valley, deep, overshadowed, dark, where savage wild beasts abound, and yet they are fearless because the shepherd is with them. So we in seasons when, figuratively, our path lies through a dark valley, we will not fear because the Shepherd will be present. In affliction, when apt to feel deserted and desolate, he will be near, will uphold and comfort. How beautiful, how delightful to a flock which has been passing through a dark valley, will be the green pastures and quiet waters. And often when you have been afflicted, the subsequent seasons of health, prosperity, tranquil happiness, have been more delightful by reason of the shivering terror with which you had passed through that dark valley.

5. He guards in temptation. The flock, in a deep and dark valley, is especially exposed to wild beasts. So we have dreadful foes-"our adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour" (1 Peter 5:8). The apostle here referred especially to persecution. The great enemy commonly comes against us. The Scripture has an expression more beautiful, and not less impressive-"Satan transformed into an angel of light" (2 Corinthians 11:14). Temptation has a dreadful power. In the way a thousand snares Lie to take us unawares;

Satan, with malicious art, Watches each unguarded part; But from Satan's malice free, Saints shall soon victorious be;

Soon the joyful news will come, "Child, your Father calls; come home."

6. He will continue to preserve them to the end, John 10:27-29. This great truth is repeatedly and strongly taught in Scripture. If we become really his, he will not forsake us, we shall never cease to be his. The ground of this is in his power and unchangeableness-assurance of it is in his promises.

Some are afraid to undertake a life of piety, lest they should not hold out. Will the Saviour hold out? He will give unto us eternal life-we shall never perish.

Now how should the flock feel and act toward such a shepherd? Only time for these things:

(a) Confide in his protecting care.

(b) Cherish toward him a tender affection. The love of the flock for their shepherd here a rebuke and a stimulation to us.

(c) Follow him with unhesitating obedience.

S. The Great Invitation

The Great Invitation

John A. Broadus And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come, and let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely. Revelation 22:17 The book of Revelation sets forth the progress of Christianity-its struggles, its reverses, its traits, its final triumph. Now at the close of the book, and of all God's teaching to men, is given this final invitation. With full knowledge of what awaits them, men are invited to come. Jesus, in his own person, as in the beginning of the book, here speaks. Often, when on earth, Jesus had said, "Come." So now, the revelation from on high closes with the same invitation.

It might seem that men would need only an intimation that they may come and would joyfully accept. But they are slow to come, and in infinite condescension and compassion, the invitations are multiplied.

I. Consider those who offer the invitations.

1. The Spirit of God invites men to come.

(a) The Scriptures, which he has inspired, abound in invitations.

(b) The Spirit by his own special influence leads men. Led by his spirit he does draw men so that they shall come. He draws them in a thousand ways-everything calculated to impress the heart, to arouse the conscience, to convince the judgment-is a part of that divine drawing. For observe, "I drew them with cords of a man with bonds of love." He draws us with influences suited to our nature-not as inanimate matter-not as irrational animals-but as men, with cords of a man. Oh, how often do men resist his drawings, withstand all his influences, and perish, complaining all the while, that men did not come, because not drawn.

2. The Bride. The church, including all true Christians of every age, offers an invitation.

(a) All efforts of Christians to do good form a continual invitation.

(b) The example of all earnest consistent Christians offers a silent invitation. The fact is that many become Christian, and truly live as such, whom we might have supposed beyond the reach of the gospel whether too bad or too good.

(c) Very many devote themselves to the work of urging this invitation.

3. And let him that heareth say, come. How forcibly does this exhibit the freeness of the invitation. The Saviour desires it to be spread among all men.

II. Who are invited?

1. Let him that is athirst come. Is a man convinced, whether for brief or protracted experiment, that polluted fountains of sinful good cannot satisfy the thirstings of the immortal soul? Not sensuality,

not fame, not even knowledge? Does he believe that there is a good, for this life and that which is to come, that can satisfy and endure? Does he thirst for this? We ought to desire it-more than anything else, all things else. Many do desire it-at times, for a season, feebly, with distracted desires. Young man who came to Christ, "What shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" He was not thoroughly in earnest, or he would have partaken. Whosoever then thirsts, let him take. But this might be misunderstood, as limiting the freeness of the offer. And it is added.

2. Whosoever will. As if carefully guarding against all misunderstanding, anyone who will is invited to come.

(a) Nothing else which man needs or desires, is promised as sure to be obtained. With other things there is still uncertainty. But here, here only, whosoever will may take, whosoever will shall surely receive.

(b) "If I only had become a Christian." "Whosoever will." "I do want to be a Christian"-"whosoever will." "I am so unworthy"-"whosoever will." "I have done my best"-this may be an excuse, "whosoever will." "I am not fit to come"-"come freely."

Many things call you away-but oh, heed the invitation of the text. And make up your mind that you will come to Christ.

S. The Habit of Thankfulness

The Habit of Thankfulness. In everything give thanks. 1 Thessalonians 5:18.

WE hear a great deal said about habits. But it nearly always means bad habits. Why should we not think and speak much about good habits? They are as real, and almost as great, a power for good as bad habits are for evil. We do our work largely by the aid of habit. How much this helps one in playing on an instrument, or writing on a type-writer. Through many a familiar conjunction of notes or of letters the fingers fly with the very smallest amount of attention and exertion. Many a man who is growing old will every day get through an amount of work that surprises his friends, and it is possible because he works in the lines of lifelong habit. Besides, the only possible way to keep out bad habits is to form good habits. By a necessity of our nature, whatever is frequently and at all regularly done becomes habitual. If a man has been the slave of evil habits, and wishes to be permanently free, he must proceed by systematic and persevering effort to establish corresponding good habits. The education of our children, both at school and at home, the self-education of our own early life, consists mainly in the formation of intellectual and moral habits. I think we ought to talk more upon this subject, in public and in private upon the power and blessing of good habits. And the theme of this discourse will be, the habit of thankfulness to God.

I. Consider the value of the habit of thankfulness.

It tends to quell repining. We are all prone, especially in certain moods, to complain of our lot. Every one of us has at some time or other imagined, and perhaps declared, that he has a particularly hard time in this world. It is to be hoped that in other moods we are heartily ashamed of ourselves for such repining. But how prevent its recurrence? A most valuable help will be the habit of thankfulness to God. Then if a fretful, repining spirit begins to arise, just in the middle, perhaps, of some complaining sentence, we shall suddenly change to an expression of thankfulness and perhaps end with laughing at ourselves for the folly of such repining.

It tends to enhance enjoyment. We all know that when we receive a gift, with any true sentiment and any suitable expression of thankfulness, the reaction of gratitude augments our gratification.

It serves to soothe distress. Persons who are greatly afflicted, and not wont to be thankful, sometimes find the memory of past joys only an aggravation of present sorrow. Far otherwise with one who has learned to be habitually thankful. For him the recollection of happier hours is still a comfort.

It helps to allay anxiety. Did you ever notice what the apostle says to the Philippians? "In nothing be anxious; but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God. And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall guard your hearts and your thoughts in Christ Jesus." Notice carefully that we are to prevent anxiety by prayer as to the future with thanksgiving for the past.

It cannot fail to deepen penitence. “The goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance.” When we are fully in the habit of thankfully observing and recalling the loving kindnesses and tender mercies of our heavenly Father, this will make us perceive more clearly, and lament more earnestly, the evil of sin against him; and what is more, this will strengthen us to turn from our sins to his blessed service.

It has as one necessary effect to brighten hope. “I love to think on mercies past, And future good implore,” is a very natural conjunction of ideas. If we have been wont to set up Ebenezers upon our path of life, then every glance backward along these mile-stones of God’s mercy will help us to look forward with more of humble hope.

It serves to strengthen for endurance and exertion.

We all know how much more easily and effectively they work who work cheerfully; and the very nutriment of cheerfulness is found in thankfulness as to the past and hope as to the future.

If this habit of thankfulness to God is so valuable, it is certainly worth our while to consider, II. Occasions of habitual thankfulness. It is obvious that these are numerous and various beyond description. But we may find profit in summing them all up under two heads.

1. We should be thankful to God for everything that is pleasant. No one will dispute that proposition in theory, whatever may be our practice. The apostle James tells us that “every good gift and every perfect boon is from above, coming down from the Father of lights.” We have so much occasion to speak about the religious benefits of affliction, to dwell on the blessed consolations of Christian piety amid the sorrows of life, that we are in danger of overlooking the other side.

It is a religious duty to enjoy to the utmost every rightful pleasure of earthly existence. He who gave us these bodies, so “fearfully and wonderfully made,” who created us in his own image, with spirits of such keen appetency and longing aspiration, desires that we should find life a pleasure. As already intimated, we work best at what we enjoy. It is highly important that the young should enjoy what they are studying; and while this may, to some extent, be accomplished by giving them studies they fancy, it is also possible that by well guided efforts they should learn to relish studies to which they were at first disinclined. I sometimes hear young married people say, “We are going to housekeeping, and then we can have what we like.”

I sometimes feel at liberty to reply, “Yes, to a certain extent you may; but what is far more important and interesting, you will be apt to like what you have.” To have what we like is for the most part an impossible dream of human life; to like what we have is a possibility, and not only a duty, but a high privilege.

2. We should be thankful to God for everything that is painful. Well, that may seem to be stating the matter too strongly. We can help ourselves by noticing that whatever may be possible in that direction, the apostle has not in the text enjoined quite so much as the phrase just used would propose. He does not say, “for everything give thanks,” though that might be enjoined; he says, “in everything give thanks.” Now that, surely, need not seem impossible.

We may always be thankful that the situation is no worse. The old negro’s philosophy was wise and good, “Bress de Lord, ’taint no wuss.” We always deserve that it should be worse, no matter

how sorrowful may be the actual situation. We can never allow ourselves to question that with some persons it has been worse.

Let us always bless the Lord, that but for his special mercies it would be worse with us to-day. I recall an unpublished anecdote of President Madison, told to me in the region where he lived and died. It may be mentioned, by the way, that Mr. Madison was a v rarely excellent and blameless man. His biographer told me that, notwithstanding all the political conflicts of a life so long and so distinguished, he found no indication that Mr. Madison's private character had ever been in the slightest degree assailed an example which it would perhaps be difficult to parallel. In his old age the venerable ex-President suffered from many diseases, took a variety of medicines and contrived to live notwithstanding. An old friend from the adjoining county of Albemarle sent him a box of vegetable pills of his own production, and begged to be informed whether they did not help him. In due time came back one of those carefully-written and often felicitous notes for which Mr. Madison and Mr. Jefferson were both famous, to somewhat the following effect: " My dear friend. I thank you very much for the box of pills.

I have taken them all; and while I cannot say that I am better since taking them, it is quite possible that I might have been worse if I had not taken them, and so I beg you to accept my sincere acknowledgments."

Really, my friends, this is not a mere pleasantry.

There is always something, known or unknown, but for which our condition might have been worse, and at the very least, that something constitutes an occasion for gratitude. Whatever we may have lost, there is always something left. As already observed, our present sufferings may well set in brighter relief the remembered happiness of other days. And though men are prone to make this an occasion of repining, yet it ought to be an occasion of thankfulness. Not long ago a young husband spoke to me, with bitter sorrow, about the death of his wife. I suggested that he might well be thankful for having lived several happy years in the most intimate companionship with one so lovely; and that in coming years, when the blessed alchemy of memory should make her character seem all-perfect in his eyes, he might well find pathetic and ineffable pleasure in the memory of that early time. We all know how to repeat, amid sorrowful recollections, those words of Tennyson, " O, death in life, the days that are no more! " But it is surely possible so to cherish blessed and inspiring memories as to invert the line, and say, " O, life in death, the days that are no more! "There is a still more important view of this matter.

It has become a blessed commonplace of Christian philosophy that our sufferings may, through the grace of God, be the means of improving our character. Such a result is by no means a matter of course. Sufferings may be so borne, with such bitter repining and selfish brooding, as greatly to damage character. But the Scriptures assure us that devout souls may regard affliction as but a loving Father's chastisement, meant for their highest good. In all the ages there has never been a pious life that did not share this experience. To be exempt from it would, as the Bible expressly declares, give clear proof that we are not children of God at all. Many of us could testify to-day, if it were appropriate, that the sorrows of life have by God's blessing done us good. All of us have occasion to lay more thoroughly to heart the lessons of affliction. And oh! if we do ever climb the shining hills of glory, and look back with clearer vision upon the strangely mingled joys and sorrows of this earthly life, then how deeply grateful we shall be for those very afflictions, which at

the time we find it so hard to endure. If we believe this to be true, and it is a belief clearly founded on Scripture, then can we not contrive, even amid the severest sufferings, to be thankful for the lessons of sorrow, for the benefits of affliction?

Remember, too, how our seasons of affliction make real to us the blessed thought of Divine compassion and sympathy. When you look with parental anguish upon your own suffering child, then you know, as never before, the meaning of those words, " Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." When you find the trials of life hard to bear, then it becomes unspeakably sweet to remember that our high priest can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, having been " in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Thus affliction brings to the devout mind blessed views of the Divine character which otherwise we should never fully gain.

" Then sorrow, touched by thee, grows bright With more than rapture's ray; As darkness shows us worlds of light We never saw by day."

Besides all this, remember that the sufferings of this present life will but enhance, by their contrast, the blessed exemptions of the life to come. A thousand times have I remembered the text of my first funeral sermon, " And there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying; neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away." These are the present things now all around us and within us; but the time is coming when they will be the former things, quite passed away. You know the use which skilful composers make of discords in music. The free use of them is among the characteristics of Wagner; but they are often found in our simplest tunes for public worship. The jarring discord is solved, and makes more sweet the harmony into which it passes. And oh! the time is coming when all the pains and pangs of this present life will seem to have been only " a brief discordant prelude to an everlasting harmony." My friends, are you optimists or pessimists? Let me explain to the children what those words mean. The Latin word *optimus* means best, and *pessimus* means Avorst. So an Optimist is one who maintains that this is the best possible world; and a Pessimist, that it is the worst possible world. Now which are you, an optimist or a pessimist? For my part, I am neither. Surely no man can really imagine that this is the best possible world, save in some brief moment of dreamy forgetfulness. And as to thinking it the worst possible world, well, a person would have to be uncommonly well off who could afford to think that. I read, some time ago, a biography of Arthur Schopenhauer, the celebrated German pessimist. I was not surprised to find that his father left him an independent fortune, and he had no painful bodily diseases. He could afford to spend his time in trying to persuade everybody to be miserable, in building pessimistic theories. But most of us have so many real toils and troubles that we are instinctively driven to search for the bright side of life, to seek all possible consolation and cheer. Agassiz had " no time to make money;" and few of us will ever have time to be pessimists.. No, we cannot begin to say with Pope, " Whatever is, is right;" nor yet to reverse it, " Whatever is, is wrong." But whether poetical or not, it will be a very true and valuable saying if we read, " Whatever is, you must make the best of it." And just in proportion as we strive to make the best of everything, we shall find it practicable to carry out the apostle's injunction, " In everything give thanks." The greatest of early Christian preachers, perhaps the greatest in all Christian history, was Chrysostom. His motto was, " Glory to God for all things." He probably derived it from the story of Job, which was his favorite subject of devout meditation, and is mentioned in a large proportion of his eloquent sermons. You might fancy that it was easy for the young man to say, "

Glory to God for all things," when he was growing up in Antioch, the idol of his widowed mother, with ample means, and the finest instructors of the age* You might think it easy to say this when he was a famous preacher, in Antioch, and afterwards in Constantinople, when ten thousand people crowded the great churches to hear him; though such a preacher could not fail to suffer profoundly through compassion for the perishing, and anxious effort to reclaim the wandering, and sympathy for all the distressed, as well as with many a pang of grief and shame that he did not preach better. But Chrysostom continued to say this, when the Court at Constantinople turned against him, when the wicked Empress became his enemy, and compassed his banishment again and again. When his friends would go to far Armenia and visit him in exile, he would say to them, "Glory to God for all things." When he was sent to more distant and inhospitable regions, so as to be out of reach of such pious sitting, his letters were apt to end, "Glory to God for all things." And when the soldiers were dragging him through winter snows, and, utterly worn out, he begged to be taken into a little way-side church that he might die, his last words, as he lay on the cold stone floor, were, "Glory to God for all things."

III. How may the habit of thankfulness be formed and maintained? Well, how do we form other habits?

If you wish to establish the habit of doing a certain thing you take pains to do that thing, upon every possible occasion, and to avoid everything inconsistent therewith.

Now, then, if you wish to form the habit of thankfulness, just begin by being thankful not next year, but to-night; not for some great event or experience, but for whatever has just occurred, whatever has been pleasant, yes, and we did say, for whatever has been painful. You certainly can find some special occasion for thanksgiving this very night. And then go on searching for matter of gratitude, and just continuing to be thankful, hour by hour, day by day. Thus the habit will be formed, by a very law of our nature. But remember that good habits cannot be maintained without attention. They require a certain self-control, a studious self-constraint. Is not the habit of thankfulness worth taking pains to maintain? The older persons present remember Ole Bull, the celebrated violinist.

I once dined in company with him, and in an hour's conversation across the table found him a man of generous soul, full of noble impulses and beautiful enthusiasms, and rich with the experience of wide travel. And I was greatly interested in a remark of his which is recorded in the recent biography: "When I stop practicing one day, I see the difference; when I stop two days, my friends see the difference; when I stop a week, everybody sees the difference." Here was a man who had cultivated a wonderful natural gift, by lifelong labor, until, as a performer upon the finest of instruments, he was probably the foremost man of his time ~'T and yet he could not afford to stop practicing for a single week, or even for a single day. "They do it for an earthly crown; but we for a heavenly." Christian brethren, shall we shrink from incessant vigilance and perpetual effort to keep up the habit of thankfulness to God?

I see many young persons present this evening. Will not some of you at once begin the thoughtful exercise of continual thankfulness? Will you not think over it, pray over it, labor to establish and maintain so beautiful and blessed a habit? Ah, what a help it will be to you amid all the struggles of youth and all the sorrows of age! And in far-coming years, when you are gray, when the preacher of this hour has long been forgotten, let us hope that you will still be gladly recommending to the

young around you the Habit of Thankfulness.

S. The Habit of Thankfulness

The Habit of Thankfulness

John A. Broadus In everything give thanks. 1 Thessalonians 5:18

We hear a great deal said about habits. But it nearly always means bad habits. Why should we not think and speak much about good habits? They are as real, and almost as great, a power for good as bad habits are for evil. We do our work largely by the aid of habit. How much this helps one in playing on an instrument, or writing on a typewriter. Through many a familiar conjunction of notes or of letters the fingers fly with the very smallest amount of attention and exertion. Many a man who is growing old will every day get through an amount of work that surprises his friends, and it is possible because he works in the lines of lifelong habit. Besides, the only possible way to keep out bad habits is to form good habits. By a necessity of our nature, whatever is frequently and at all regularly done becomes habitual. If a man has been the slave of evil habits, and wishes to be permanently free, he must proceed by systematic and persevering effort to establish corresponding good habits. The education of our children, both at school and at home, the self-education of our own early life, consists mainly in the formation of intellectual and moral habits. I think we ought to talk more upon this Subject, in public and in private upon the power and blessing of good habits. And the theme of this discourse will be, the habit of thankfulness to God.

I. Consider the value of the habit of thankfulness.

It tends to quell repining. We are all prone, especially in certain moods, to complain of our lot. Every one of us has at some time or other imagined, and perhaps declared, that he has a particularly hard time in this world. It is to be hoped that in other moods we are heartily ashamed of ourselves for such repining. But how to prevent its recurrence? A most valuable help will be the habit of thankfulness to God. Then if a fretful, repining spirit begins to arise, just in the middle, perhaps, of some complaining sentence, we shall suddenly change to an expression of thankfulness-and perhaps end with laughing at ourselves for the folly of such repining.

It tends to enhance enjoyment. We all know that when we receive a gift, with any true sentiment and any suitable expression of thankfulness, the reaction of gratitude augments our gratification.

It serves to soothe distress. Persons who are greatly afflicted, and not wont to be thankful, sometimes find the memory of past joys only an aggravation of present sorrow. Far otherwise with one who has learned to be habitually thankful. For him the recollection of happier hours is still a comfort.

It helps to allay anxiety. Did you ever notice what the apostle says to the Philippians? "In nothing be anxious; but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God. And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall guard your hearts and your thoughts in Christ Jesus." Notice carefully that we are to prevent anxiety by prayer as to the future with thanksgiving for the past.

It cannot fail to deepen penitence. "The goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance." When we are fully in the habit of thankfully observing and recalling the loving-kindnesses and tender mercies of our heavenly Father, this will make us perceive more clearly, and lament more earnestly, the evil of sin against him; and what is more, this will strengthen us to turn from our sins to his blessed service.

It has as one necessary effect to brighten hope. "I love to think on mercies past, And future good implore" is a very natural conjunction of ideas. If we have been wont to set up Ebenezers upon our path of life, then every glance backward along these milestones of God's mercy will help us to look forward with more of humble hope.

It serves to strengthen for endurance and exertion. We all know how much more easily and effectively they work who work cheerfully; and the very nutriment of cheerfulness is found in thankfulness as to the past and hope as to the future.

If this habit of thankfulness to God is so valuable, it is certainly worth our while to consider,

II. Occasions of habitual thankfulness. It is obvious that these are numerous and various beyond description. But we may find profit in summing them all up under two heads.

1. We should be thankful to God for everything that is pleasant. No one will dispute that proposition in theory, whatever may be our practice. The apostle James tells us that "every good gift and every perfect boon is from above, coming down from the Father of lights." We have so much occasion to speak about the religious benefits of affliction, to dwell on the blessed consolations of Christian piety amid the sorrows of life, that we are in danger of overlooking the other side. It is a religious duty to enjoy to the utmost every rightful pleasure of earthly existence. He who gave us these bodies, so "fearfully and wonderfully made," who created us in his own image, with spirits of such keen appetency and longing aspiration, desires that we should find life a pleasure. As already intimated, we work best at what we enjoy. It is highly important that the young should enjoy what they are studying; and while this may, to some extent, be accomplished by giving them studies they fancy, it is also possible that by well-guided efforts they should learn to relish studies to which they were at first disinclined. I sometimes hear young married people say, "We are going to housekeeping, and then we can have what we like." I sometimes feel at liberty to reply, "Yes, to a certain extent you may; but what is far more important and interesting, you will be apt to like what you have." To have what we like is for the most part an impossible dream of human life; to like what we have is a possibility, and not only a duty, but a high privilege.

2. We should be thankful to God for everything that is painful. Well, that may seem to be stating the matter too strongly. We can help ourselves by noticing that whatever may be possible in that direction, the apostle has not in the text enjoined quite so much as the phrase just used would propose. He does not say, "for everything give thanks," though that might be enjoined; he says, "in everything give thanks." Now that, surely, need not seem impossible.

We may always be thankful that the situation is no worse. The old Negro's philosophy was wise and good: "Bress de Lord, 'taint no wuss." We always deserve that it should be worse, no matter how sorrowful may be the actual situation. We can never allow ourselves to question that with some persons it has been worse. Let us always bless the Lord, that but for his special mercies it would be worse with us today.

I recall an unpublished anecdote of President Madison, told to me in the region where he lived and died. It may be mentioned, by the way, that Mr. Madison was a rarely excellent and blameless man. His biographer told me that, notwithstanding all the political conflicts of a life so long and so distinguished, he found no indication that Mr. Madison's private character had ever been in the slightest degree assailed -an example which it would perhaps be difficult to parallel. In his old age the venerable ex-President suffered from many diseases, took a variety of medicines and contrived to live notwithstanding. An old friend from the adjoining county of Albemarle sent him a box of vegetable pills of his own production, and begged to be informed whether they did not help him. In due time came back one of those carefully written and often felicitous notes for which Mr. Madison and Mr. Jefferson were both famous, to somewhat the following effect: "My dear friend. I thank you very much for the box of pills. I have taken them all; and while I cannot say that I am better since taking them, it is quite possible that I might have been worse if I had not taken them, and so I beg you to accept my sincere acknowledgments." Really, my friends, this is not a mere pleasantry. There is always something, known or unknown, but for which our condition might have been worse, and at the very least, that something constitutes an occasion for gratitude. Whatever we may have lost, there is always something left. As already observed, our present sufferings may well set in brighter relief the remembered happiness of other days. And though men are prone to make this an occasion of repining, yet it ought to be an occasion of thankfulness. Not long ago a young husband spoke to me, with bitter sorrow, about the death of his wife. I suggested that he might well be thankful for having lived several happy years in the most intimate companionship with one so lovely; and that in coming years, when the blessed alchemy of memory should make her character seem all-perfect in his eyes, he might well find pathetic and ineffable pleasure in the memory of that early time. We all know how to repeat, amid sorrowful recollections, those words of Tennyson, "Oh, death in life, the days that are no more!" But it is surely possible so to cherish blessed and inspiring memories as to invert the line, and say, "Oh, life in death, the days that are no more!"

There is a still more important view of this matter. It has become a blessed commonplace of Christian philosophy that our sufferings may, through the grace of God, be the means of improving our character. Such a result is by no means a matter of course. Sufferings may be so borne, with such bitter repining and selfish brooding, as greatly to damage character. But the Scriptures assure us that devout souls may regard affliction as but a loving Father's chastisement, meant for their highest good. In all the ages there has never been a pious life that did not share this experience. To be exempt from it would, as the Bible expressly declares, give clear proof that we are not children of God at all. Many of us could testify today, if it were appropriate, that the sorrows of life have by God's blessing done us good. All of us have occasion to lay more thoroughly to heart the lessons of affliction. And oh! if we do ever climb the shining hills of glory, and look back with clearer vision upon the strangely mingled joys and sorrows of this earthly life, then how deeply grateful we shall be for those very afflictions, which at the time we find it so hard to endure. If we believe this to be true, and it is a belief clearly founded on Scripture, then can we not contrive, even amid the severest sufferings, to be thankful for the lessons of sorrow, for the benefits of affliction?

Remember, too, how our seasons of affliction make real to us the blessed thought of divine compassion and sympathy. When you look with parental anguish upon your own suffering child,

then you know, as never before, the meaning of those words, "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." When you find the trials of life hard to bear, then it becomes unspeakably sweet to remember that our High Priest can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, having been "in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Thus affliction brings to the devout mind blessed views of the divine character, which otherwise we should never fully gain.

Then sorrow, touched by thee, grows bright
With more than rapture's ray;
As darkness shows us
worlds of light
We never saw by day.

Besides all this, remember that the sufferings of this present life will but enhance, by their contrast, the blessed exemptions of the life to come. A thousand times have I remembered the text of my first funeral sermon, "And there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying; neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away." These are the present things now-all around us and within us; but the time is coming when they will be the former things, quite passed away. You know the use which skillful composers make of discords in music. The free use of them is among the characteristics of Wagner; but they are often found in our simplest tunes for public worship. The jarring discord is solved, and makes more sweet the harmony into which it passes. And oh! the time is coming when all the pains and pangs of this present life will seem to have been only "a brief discordant prelude to an everlasting harmony." My friends, are you optimists or pessimists? Let me explain to the children what those words mean. The Latin word *optimus* means "best," and *pessimus* means "worst." So an Optimist is one who maintains that this is the best possible world; and a Pessimist, that it is the worst possible world. Now which are you, an optimist or a pessimist? For my part, I am neither. Surely no man can really imagine that this is the best possible world, save in some brief moment of dreamy forgetfulness. And as to thinking it the worst possible world-well, a person would have to be uncommonly well off who could afford to think that.

I read, some time ago, a biography of Arthur Schopenhauer, the celebrated German pessimist. I was not surprised to find that his father left him an independent fortune, and he had no painful bodily diseases. He could afford to spend his time in trying to persuade everybody to be miserable, in building pessimistic theories. But most of us have so many real toils and troubles that we are instinctively driven to search for the bright side of life, to seek all possible consolation and cheer. Louis Agassiz had "no time to make money"; and few of us will ever have time to be pessimists. No, we cannot begin to say with Pope, "Whatever is, is right"; nor yet to reverse it, "Whatever is, is wrong." But whether poetical or not, it will be a very true and valuable saying if we read, "Whatever is, you must make the best of it." And just in proportion as we strive to make the best of everything, we shall find it practicable to carry out the apostle's injunction, "In everything give thanks." The greatest of early Christian preachers, perhaps the greatest in all Christian history, was Chrysostom. His motto was, "Glory to God for all things." He probably derived it from the story of Job, which was his favorite subject of devout meditation, and is mentioned in a large proportion of his eloquent sermons. You might fancy that it was easy for the young man to say, "Glory to God for all things," when he was growing up in Antioch, the idol of his widowed mother, with ample means, and the finest instructors of the age. You might think it easy to say this when he was a famous preacher, in Antioch, and afterwards in Constantinople, when ten thousand people crowded the great churches to hear him; though such a preacher could not fall to suffer profoundly

through compassion for the perishing, and anxious effort to reclaim the wandering, and sympathy for all the distressed, as well as with many a pang of grief and shame that he did not preach better. But Chrysostom continued to say this, when the Court at Constantinople turned against him, when the wicked Empress became his enemy, and compassed his banishment again and again. When his friends would go to far Armenia and visit him in exile, he would say to them, "Glory to God for all things." When he was sent to more distant and inhospitable regions, so as to be out of reach of such pious visiting, his letters were apt to end, "Glory to God for all things." And when the soldiers were dragging him through winter snows, and, utterly worn out, he begged to be taken into a little wayside church that he might die, his last words, as he lay on the cold stone floor, were, "Glory to God for all things."

III. How may the habit of thankfulness be formed and maintained?

Well, how do we form other habits? If you wish to establish the habit of doing a certain thing, you take pains to do that thing, upon every possible occasion, and to avoid everything inconsistent therewith. Now, then, if you wish to form the habit of thankfulness, just begin by being thankful-not next year, but tonight; not for some great event or experience, but for whatever has just occurred, whatever has been pleasant, yes, and we did say, for whatever has been painful. You certainly can find some special occasion for thanksgiving this very night. And then go on searching for matter of gratitude, and just continuing to be thankful, hour by hour, day by day. Thus the habit will be formed, by a very law of our nature. But remember that good habits cannot be maintained without attention. They require a certain self-control, a studious self-constraint. Is not the habit of thankfulness worth taking pains to maintain? The older persons present remember Ole Bull, the celebrated violinist. I once dined in company with him, and in an hour's conversation across the table found him a man of generous soul, full of noble impulses and beautiful enthusiasms, and rich with the experience of wide travel. And I was so much interested in a remark of his which is recorded in the recent biography: "When I stop practicing one day, I see the difference; when I stop two days, my friends see the difference; when I stop a week, everybody sees the difference." Here was a man who had cultivated a wonderful natural gift, by lifelong labor, until, as a performer upon the finest of instruments, he was probably the foremost man of his time; and yet he could not afford to stop practicing for a single week, or even for a single day. "They do it for an earthly crown; but we for a heavenly." Christian brethren, shall we shrink from incessant vigilance and perpetual effort to keep up the habit of thankfulness to God?

I see many young persons present this evening. Will not some of you at once begin the thoughtful exercise of continual thankfulness? Will you not think over it, pray over it, labor to establish and maintain so beautiful and blessed a habit? Ah, what a help it will be to you amid all the struggles of youth and all the sorrows of age! And in far-coming years, when you are gray, when the preacher of this hour has long been forgotten, let us hope that you will still be gladly recommending to the young around you the Habit of Thankfulness.

S. The Holy Scriptures

The Holy Scriptures. And that from a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. 1 Timothy 3:15.

WHATEVER we may say, it is to be admitted that there are wide and potent differences among the races of mankind. The Galatians who received Paul so joyfully, with such impulsive affection, and a few years afterward had turned away from him, were the same Gauls whom Caesar described not long before, the same as the Gallic races of mankind to-day, impulsive and changeable: and no small part of what we prize most in our civilization is to be discerned in our German forefathers, as Tacitus describes them in a beautiful little treatise he wrote about the manners, customs and character of the Germans. Many other elements of our civilization, the things that contribute most to make our life desirable, come to us from the great classic nations of antiquity. Grecian philosophy, Grecian art, Grecian poetry and eloquence, have made their mark on all that we delight in; Roman law and the Roman genius for government have much to do with what is best in our law and government. And yet, when you have made allowance for all these, ample and cordial allowance for race characteristics, and for the effect of all that is Grecian and all that is Roman, who can deny that a large part of what we prize most and enjoy most in our life of to-day has not been explained from any of those sources that it comes from the Bible, that it comes from Christianity? There are many men who think they are now so refined that they have gotten above Christianity, and yet it is Christianity that gave them the said refinement. Now, if all this is true, it ought never to be out of place nor beyond our sympathies to speak of the Bible the Bible that has done so much for all that we like best in our homes, our social life, our public institutions the Bible that has been the comfort and joy of many of those we have loved best in other days the Bible that is the brightest hope of many of us for time and for eternity the Bible that gives the only well-founded hope for mortal, and yet immortal man, in regard to the great future.

“Thou hast known the holy Scriptures.” That did not mean the same thing for Timothy, exactly, as for us. It meant our Old Testament; for of course when Timothy was a child the New Testament was not yet in existence. How do I know that it meant our Old Testament? How do I know that our Old Testament is a book of Divine origin? Is there any way to prove that, which is not dependent upon scholarship, which can be easily stated? apart, I mean, from its internal evidence of its own inspiration through its wisdom, power, and blessing. I know it in this way. The term “Scripture” or “Scriptures” was in our Lord’s time a technical term, just as it is among us. When a man among the Jews spoke of the “Scripture,” when Jesus said, “The Scripture cannot be broken,” everybody understood that it meant a certain well-known and well-defined collection of sacred writings known to all his hearers. Jesus and His Apostles have testified that the “Scriptures” are divine. Now do I know what writings they were?

Yes; I know from outside sources, very varied and ample. I know from the great Jewish historian and scholar, Josephus, who expressed himself very distinctly as to the sacred books of the Jews, and declares that no man would venture to add to the number or to take away from them. I know

from the Jewish writings of a later period, embodying their traditions of the New Testament time and of earlier times, the Talmud, in which the collection of sacred writings described is precisely our Hebrew Old Testament, neither more nor less. I know from Christian writers of the second century and of the third century, who made it a specialty in Palestine itself to ascertain what were the sacred books of the Jews in the time of Christ, and who definitely stated the result to be our Old Testament. Now I am not pinning my faith to the Jews and saying that these books were divine because the Jews thought so.

I am trying to ascertain what books they were which Jesus and the Apostles declared to be divine, and I learn beyond a doubt that the Jews who heard them understood, without fail and without exception, that it meant precisely what we call the Old Testament. That is a clear statement of the matter, which cannot be gainsaid and which leaves no occasion for doubt. A man may say, "Well, I find a good many things in the Old Testament that I don't see any use in, that I don't see the good of, some things that I object to." But hold! The founder of Christianity and his inspired Apostles have spoken about them, and whether you understand everything in the Old Testament or not, they have declared that the Scripture cannot be broken; that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable; that the holy Scriptures (the Old Testament) are "able to make wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus."

There is a great deal of wisdom in this world. It is wonderful that mankind, considering how foolish they are, should be so wise; and oh! it is wonderful that mankind, considering how wise they are, should be so foolish. There is a great deal of wisdom in the world; wisdom that commands the admiration of all who are fitted to appreciate it. Men are so wise about their business affairs! Just look at the great business schemes, the grand business combinations! How easily men discern the new openings for business which new inventions and discoveries offer to them! How clearly we ordinary people see, after a while, what some extraordinary man saw years before, and seized upon it and made himself one of the great business men of the time by his wisdom! I was reading, only yesterday, the life of Sir Moses Montefiore, embracing something of the life of the first great English Rothschild, and was reminded how wise those men were in understanding their times at the beginning of the century, during the Napoleonic wars, in seeing deeper into the probabilities than even great statesmen saw. There is a great deal of wisdom in the world; and this makes it all the sadder to think how few, comparatively, seem to be wise unto salvation. Nay, these wonderful human endowments and energies of ours seem often to be directed toward wisdom unto sin. Men take their splendid powers and prostitute them in the service of wickedness. The longing to know evil is so intense in human nature! What is that early story in the dim light of the first history of mankind? We do not know much about it. We can ask a thousand questions about it that no one can answer. But this much we see clearly, A fair woman in a beautiful garden, gazing upon a tree and its fruit, and the thought suggested that it is a tree to be desired to make one wise; eat of that, and they will be independent of God, they will be themselves as God, knowing good and evil for themselves good and evil and not having to ask Him for guidance. She takes and eats, and gives to her husband, and he eats in flat, bold defiance of the great Father's prohibition.

Then their eyes were opened opened unto sin, opened unto shame. And ever since why, it is just wonderful to watch your own children and see how early they show a keen relish for knowing about wrong things; how they will get off with some villainous servant or off with some bad schoolmate, and get themselves told a lot of things that it would be so much better for them never

to hear of. They do so want to know the bad things! The growing boys are so curious about places that are characteristically places of evil. Wise unto sin! There are a great many things it is better never ' to know.

There are things about which ignorance is bliss; yea, and ignorance is wisdom. There are things of which those who know least are the wisest people, and those who know most are the most foolish people. It is a matter to be thankful for, and in a good sense proud of, if a man can say, that as to the popular forms of outbreaking vice he never knew anything about them; that he never entered a place of debauchery; that he does not know the names of the instruments of gaming; that he does not know the taste of intoxicating liquors.

Happy the man who can humbly declare to a friend such blessed ignorance, such wise ignorance as that.

While men are so busy in being wise unto sin, how desirable, surely, that we should be wise unto salvation! My friends, let us wake up a little. We sleep, we dream along through life. We say, " O yes, yes, I believe that there is another life, a future." You believe it is eternal? u Yes, I believe it is an eternal life." And you believe in God? " Yes, I believe in God." And you believe in Jesus Christ? " Well, yes; I suppose that is all so." And yet, living in this brief, fleeting, uncertain life, in this strange world, and admitting all these things to be true, and not wise unto salvation, and not praying to be wise unto salvation!

" The holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." That is the way in which they do it through faith which is in Christ Jesus: for the holy Scriptures of the Old Testament are never half understood except as they are seen in the light of Christ Jesus. They all pointed forward to Christ Jesus; they all found their fulfillment, the key of their interpretation, in Christ Jesus. The Old Testament history is not merely a history of some wandering patriarchs and of a strange, wayward people of wonderful powers and wonderful propensities to evil. It is not merely a history of Israel. The Old Testament is a history of redemption/of God's mightiness and mercies, and of a chosen nation, all along toward the promised, long-looked-for time when God's Son should come to be the Saviour of mankind.

We cannot understand the Old Testament, except we read it in its bearing upon Christ, as fulfilled in him.

I remember once a neighboring professor sent us invitations to his house for a summer evening, saying that he had a century plant which seemed about to bloom, and asking us to come and watch with them till it blossomed. It was a delightful occasion, you may fancy. With music and conversation we passed on through the pleasant summer evening hours, on till past midnight.

Then we gathered around and gazed upon the plain, wonderful thing that had lived longer than any of us had lived, and now, for the first time, was about to blossom for the admiration of beholders. And oh! I think sometimes that Jesus Christ was the blossoming Century Plant, the beautiful Millennium Flower. All the long story of Israel meant him; and if you do find many things in the Old Testament that you do not see the meaning of, remember that they all pointed forward toward him.

Then, besides, the Scriptures not only have to be understood through him, but they make us wise unto Psalms 11:1-7 vation only through faith in him; because if we do not believe what the Scriptures say concerning him, how can they have their full power over us? They have a certain power. Just as the moon, when it is eclipsed, yet has some light shining upon it, reflected from the atmosphere of the earth, so the people, who do not themselves believe in the Scriptures, and do not believe in Christ Jesus with living faith, get much benefit reflected from the Christian people around them, and the Christian homes in which they grew up, and the Christian atmosphere they breathe; but they never get the full benefit which the Bible is able to give, except through personal faith in Christ Jesus. Ah! that dark lie in the garden would never have brought its baneful results for our race of mortals, if our first mother had not believed it. A lie rejected is powerless; a lie believed is ruin. And so truth rejected cannot have its full effect upon us.

How can we get the benefit of Scripture if we do not believe in Him who is the centre and the heart and the essence and the life of Scripture, even Christ Jesus?

There is another line of thought here: "And that from a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." Happy Timothy! His mother and his grandmother had shown an unfeigned faith, to which the Apostle himself testified. From a child they had trained him to know the holy Scriptures; and in his early youth he had met the blessed Apostle and learned from him the faith which is in Christ Jesus, and thus had become wise unto salvation. Happy Timothy! Happy, every growing child that has devout people around to point it toward the knowledge of God's Word. My friends, we who are growing old, what do we live for in this world, but for the young who are growing up around us? What would be the use of life to us, if it were not in the hope of making the life of those whom God hath given us, and those who spring up under our view, brighter and better and purer, and worthier? We ought not to think it a small matter to train the growing children in our homes, in the Sunday-school, as we meet them in society, wherever we can reach them by our influence to know the holy Scriptures. You are not doing enough if you merely tell your children sometimes, "You ought to read the Bible," and perhaps scold a little because the child does not read the Bible; that is not half enough. Ah! we ought to set the child an example of reading the Bible, as some of us neglect to do. We ought to make the children see, by our own daily assiduity, our own living interest, that we believe in reading the Bible and get good out of it.

We ought to talk about what is in the Bible; we ought to point out to the child this or the other-portion that is suited to his age and character and wants. We ought to talk to the child about what he is reading, to show him the application of this or that text to his daily life.

Out of the abundance of a heart that is full of the knowledge of God's Word, our mouth ought to speak often in the conversation of the family, so as to make the child feel that the Bible has gone into our soul, and that it shows itself in the glance of our eye and in the tone of our voice and in the tenor of our life. Are there many of us that do that? Dear children! there come times when our hearts grow soft and tender toward them, and we feel that we could die for them if that would do them any good; and yet here is something by which we could promote their highest, noblest, eternal welfare, and we do not have the time! Happy Timothy, who, ere he became grown, learned the faith which is in Christ'

Jesus. Happy every one who from a child has known the holy Scriptures, has learned early and God be thanked! the earlier the better to give the young heart to Christ Jesus and dedicate the young life to His blessed service, and now is going on, trying to persuade others to love and serve Him too. But ah! there are many who from a child have known the holy Scriptures, and now are passing on into mature life, wise about a great many earthly things; and some of them are gray-headed and wrinkled, and some of them tottering towards the end not yet, oh, not yet wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus! There are many peculiar circumstances about growing old: the parents gone, long ago; maybe the brothers and sisters all gone, and one stands alone, like some pine smitten of the lightning in the field alone of what was once the family circle; and the friends of youth most of them gone, alas! and some of them estranged, and others so far away; new things growing up, like the bushes growing around an old pine tree, that are not akin to it; new features, new interests, new pursuits; and he who grows old finds it hard to interest himself in these things and feel the spring and buoyancy and the sweetness of life as he felt it in other days.

Alas for a man who from a child has known the holy Scriptures, and now is growing old, and has not become wise unto salvation! Alas for a man who can bear, like Atlas, the burdens of the world's affairs in the maturity of his strength and his wisdom, and who is neglecting to be wise unto salvation! Ah! if I speak to any one such person in middle life, or growing old, might I persuade him to say this day, out of an honest and humble heart, " O Jesus, of whom my mother taught me in my childhood, take me now to be Thine! "And alas! that there are so many, even in our own country, which delights to call itself Christian, who from childhood have not known the holy Scriptures; that in this, which is in some respects the brightest land of earth, and in some respects the foremost nation of earth, there are some children who do not know the looks of the outside of a Bible! They are growing up in homes where no Bible was ever seen; and there are plenty of such homes. Ought it not to be a pleasure to us to try to spread the Bible among our fellow-men? One will say, many copies are destroyed and many copies are slighted. Certainly: not every venture in business pays. There has to be a head in the books of every establishment for loss as well as for profits. There are many blossoms on the tree that bring no fruit, and many seeds fall into the ground that spring not up; but that does not prevent us from planting nor hinder us from gathering. Grant that some copies will perish, and many copies will be slighted: yet scatter the Bible, and many will read it, and not a few, by the blessing of God's grace, will thereby become wise unto salvation. It is hard sometimes to tell what is the greatest privilege of earthly life, but it does seem that just the greatest privilege of earthly life is to give to some fellow-creature the blessed Word of God, and then to try, by loving speech and living example, to bring home to the heart and conscience of those whom we can reach, the truths it contains. If we do love the Bible ourselves (and many of us do), then ought not such to delight in scattering the Bible among others? If some of us know too well that we are but poor sticks of Christians at best, and that we do not love the Bible as we ought, and do not live by it as we ought, yet shall we not at least feel, " Now here is something that I can do; here is something that I will do. I do not treat the Bible rightly myself, but I will gladly give the Bible to every one, high and low, rich and poor, in all the land, in all the world, whom I can help." O that it may be true of your children and mine, of your acquaintance and mine, that we have done them some good in bringing them to a knowledge of the holy Scriptures, and that they have all been brought, by God's grace, to the blessedness of being wise unto salvation.

S. The Holy Spirit And The Trynity

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE TRINITY 1. Who is the Holy Spirit? The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God, and is called the third person in the Trinity.

2. What did the Holy Spirit do for the prophets and apostles? The Holy Spirit inspired the prophets and apostles to teach men their duty to God and to each other.

3. What did the Holy Spirit do for all the writers of the Bible? The Holy Spirit inspired them to write just what God wished to be written.

4. Did the Holy Spirit dwell also in Jesus Christ? Yes, the Holy Spirit was given to Jesus without measure. Luke 4:1; John 3:34.

5. When Jesus ascended to heaven, what did he send the Holy Spirit to do? Jesus sent the Holy Spirit to take his place and carry on his work among men. John 14:16; John 14:17.

6. What does the Holy Spirit do as to the world? The Holy Spirit convicts the world of its sin and its need of Christ's salvation. John 16:8.

7. What work does the Holy Spirit perform in making men Christians? The Holy Spirit gives men a new heart, to turn from sin and trust in Christ. John 3:5; Ezekiel 36:26.

8. How does the Holy Spirit continue this work? The Holy Spirit helps those who trust in Christ to become holy in heart and life. Galatians 5:22; 1 Corinthians 3:16.

9. Is the Holy Spirit himself divine? Yes, the Holy Spirit is God. Acts 5:3; Acts 5:4.

10. If the Father is God, and the Saviour is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, are there three Gods? No, there are not three Gods; God is one. Deuteronomy 6:4; Mark 12:29.

11. What then do we mean by the doctrine of the Trinity? The Bible teaches that the Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, and yet God is one.

12. Are we able to explain the Trinity? We cannot explain the Trinity, and need not expect to understand fully the nature of God; we cannot fully understand even our own nature.

13. How is the Trinity recognized in connection with baptism? We are told to baptize "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Matthew 28:19.

14. How is the Trinity named in a benediction? "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all." 2 Corinthians 13:14.

S. The Light of Life

The Light of Life

John A. Broadus In him was life: and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not. John 1:4; John 1:5

Every attentive reader must have been struck with the introduction to the Gospel of John. It is calculated and designed to give more correct and exalted conceptions of the dignity of him who became our Redeemer-that we may recognize his claims upon our love and obedience. Who can fail to take interest in the inspired account of such a subject! From the very nature of the subject, the passage contains much that is difficult-but without going beyond our depth, without wild and vain speculation, we may find our profit in dwelling upon the various parts of this introduction, which will come up in the process of explaining and commenting upon the verses read.

I. In him. Whom? The Word. Consider

1. The allusions to his pre-existence and divinity. We may suppose (with reverence) that sacred writers often had great difficulty in finding suitable terms-never more than here. The term "Word" (logos) had come to be much used to denote an exalted being, sup-posed to have a very intimate relation to the Deity. Later Jewish writers identify or at least connect this logos with the word of God-especially Philo, who is said to have employed the term frequently, and to have referred to a peculiar use of it made by Plato. In the speculations which were already becoming rife in Asia Minor, the term was largely employed to express various ideas of a divine being which were absurd and even blasphemous. Now the apostle adopted the term as coming nearest, not sanctioning these erroneous notions, but making such statements as were calculated to correct them-setting forth the real and true Word, in opposition to all false and fantastical notions.

(a) This exalted Being existed in the beginning.

(b) He was with God-intimate communion, enjoyment of glory and blessedness.

(c) He was God. Plain, explicit, unambiguous. Numerous other statements like it.

(d) Repeated statement that he was with God, seems to refer to the distinction of persons-the Word was God, and the Word was with God. How much the Scriptures explicitly declare concerning the divinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and yet that God is one. Terms "person" and "Trinity" are of human choosing, but the best perhaps that we can find.

(e) He was the Creator of all things.

2. His incarnation-"The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth-and we beheld his glory," etc. A real incarnation-"forasmuch as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he also" etc.

II. "In him was life." Various terms employed in this introduction, Which require and would repay a careful study, comparing especially the apostle's own use of them elsewhere. Besides Word, we have life, light, darkness, grace and truth, the world, etc.

Life-Cf. John 5:26. "As the Father hath life in himself, even so," etc. 1 John 1:1; 1 John 2:1-29 :-"Of the Word of Life; for the Life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." Thus he is represented as the self-subsisting source of Life, the fountain of life.

Again, as appointed to impart spiritual life. John 14:6. "I am the way, and the truth, and the life." 1 John 5:11. God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. In him is life then, in the most extensive sense.

III. "And the life was the light of men." The vitalizing, fructifying principle. Light used in Scripture is expressive of knowledge and happiness.

1. Knowledge. As sight is the chief means of gaining knowledge of external world, so very naturally light is the emblem of knowledge in general. He has given knowledge.

(a) Of immortality. So much more certainly and distinctly known.

(b) Of the attributes of God, and our relations to him.

(c) Of the way in which guilty man may be justified and saved. Notice this especially.

2. Happiness. What a world of darkness is ours-not simply mental, but spiritual darkness! He the Sun of Righteousness. Think of the happiness derivable from knowledge of the coming life. Still more happiness comes from knowledge and personal experience of the way of salvation. The true Light, which coming into the world, lighteth every man. Not Jews alone, but "a light to lighten the Gentiles"-his mission is not restricted in its design, whatever may be true of its actual application.

IV. "And the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not." (Received it not.) Men are in the spiritual ignorance and misery which belong to sin.

1. These received not the light. The world, made by him, yet knew him not. His own received him not. Often they who seem specially favored, do most utterly reject the Saviour. They loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.

2. We may rejoice that the statement could not be made without exception-there have always been some to receive him. To them he gave the right, privilege, to become the sons of God-to as many as received him, and not Jews alone. And these were not such by virtue of any natural birth, but by spiritual birth-born of God. Cf. "born of water and of the Spirit," the pure birth of the Spirit. And now, my friends, do not wonder that I have failed to give any very clear and complete conceptions of these great truths; these are things the angels desire to look into-they shall be our study through eternity. Who can grasp the vast ideas here shadowed forth-who comprehend the mystery of the Trinity, the Incarnation-or appreciate all that is meant here by life, by darkness and light? A full comprehension and appreciation is reserved for the coming state. But we know enough for all the ends of life, all the wants of our spiritual being, if we will receive the light, and act upon it. To which class shall we belong, those who receive, or those who reject, the Light of the

World, the only Saviour?

S. The Lord's Day

THE LORD'S DAY 1. What does the word Sabbath mean? The word Sabbath means rest.

2. Why was the Sabbath at first appointed? The Sabbath was at first appointed to represent the rest of God after finishing the creation. Genesis 2:3.

3. What says the fourth commandment given through Moses at Mount Sinai? Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Exodus 20:8; Exodus 20:11.

4. What does this show? The fourth commandment shows that the children of Israel knew about the Sabbath, but were apt to neglect it.

5. When the Saviour was charged with breaking the Sabbath, what did he teach about it? The Saviour taught that it was not breaking the Sabbath to heal the sick, to provide food for the hungry, or to do any work of necessity or mercy. Matthew 12:3; Mark 3:4; Luke 13:15; Luke 13:16.

6. What change was gradually made under the direction of the apostles as to the day to be observed? The day to be observed was changed from the seventh day to the first day of the week, the day on which the Lord Jesus rose from the dead. John 20:1; John 20:19; John 20:26.

7. What is this day called? The first day of the week is called the Lord's day. Revelation 1:10.

8. What do we find the first Christians doing on the Lord's day? They met for public worship, heard preaching, took the Lord's Supper, and gave money for religious objects. 1 Corinthians 16:2; Acts 20:7.

9. Ought we to keep the Lord's day as the Sabbath? Yes, we ought to keep the Lord's day as a day of rest and holy employments.

10. Ought we to keep the Lord's day as the first Christians did? Yes, we ought to keep the Lord's day as a day for public worship, with Bible study and preaching, for religious gifts and ordinances, and for doing good in every way.

S. The Lord's Prayer

The Lord's Prayer

John A. Broadus Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Matthew 6:9 The prayer which thus begins, which for many ages has been called among Christians "the Lord's Prayer," is above all eulogium for its sweetness. No wonder this is so! For our Lord presents it as a specimen, as a model of prayer. He said, "When ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking," saying over the same thing a thousand times. "Be ye not therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him." Thus then do ye pray-this way and not with vain repetitions, not with much speaking, thus do ye pray! He gives it as a sample, as a model. So on a later occasion, recorded in Luke 11:1-54 -probably a long time after this, most likely in quite another part of the country, certainly on a later occasion-our Lord was praying himself, and when he ceased, the disciples asked him "Teach us to pray" and he said "When ye pray, say:" and then he gave them substantially the same prayer as the one here before us.

Now it very naturally occurs to many persons that our Lord has given this as a form of prayer; that when we pray we ought always to say these words. I do not object to using these words whenever anyone thinks them appropriate, that they express his sentiments; but it is very certain that our Lord did not give this as a form of prayer. If you will notice a moment I shall prove it. On the second occasion the prayer is very different from that which we here read. Even in the common text, it is different in several expressions; but if you will take any revised text as furnished by any competent scholar of the day, you will find that the prayer on that occasion is quite different. Allow me to repeat it as it is there. You all know the words as they occur here but on that second occasion this is what he said: "Father, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And bring us not into temptation."

Now you observe that I have omitted several phrases of the familiar prayer given here in the Sermon on the Mount. If you look a little closely you notice that nothing of essential importance, no distinctive idea, has been omitted here. Instead of "Our Father which art in heaven," you have simply "Father." You have lost some pleasing words, but you have really lost no part of the essential thought. When after the petition "Thy kingdom come," you find wanting the words "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," you observe in a moment that although a pleasing expression has been expunged, it is involved in the preceding petition, "Thy kingdom come;" for when God's reign on earth is fully come, his will must of necessity be done on earth as in heaven. And so, when after the prayer "Bring us not into temptation," you miss the words "But deliver us from evil," you observe that they do, at most, but express the other side of the same truth; something that is implied in the words that remain. On that second occasion then, our Lord has omitted no idea that belongs to the prayer. It is substantially the very same, but in form it is exceedingly different. Is not there the proof at once that he did not intend this as a form of prayer?

If he did so intend, why in the world should he not have repeated his form correctly on the second occasion? No: he intended it not as a form of prayer, that precisely these words should be used, but as an example, "Thus do ye pray." Avoid the vain repetitions and much speaking of the heathen: Thus: thus comprehensively; thus simply. Oh, how much is included in these few, brief, simply expressed petitions! "Thus then do ye pray." And my brethren, I venture to ask your special attention to this model in one respect. We have two good classes of petitions here, as is obvious at once, petitions with reference to God's glory, and petitions with reference to our own good. And my point is, that the petitions with reference to God's glory come first. Now you have noticed, and indeed it seems natural to us that when we pray, we pray first about ourselves, and a great deal about ourselves, and then if we do not forget, if there seems to be time left before we close the prayer, we may introduce some petitions as to God's glory. But here the class of petitions which refer to God's glory come first. That is their rightful place. I do not feel they should always come first in order, that there ought to be any formality or stiffness in it, but that they should often be put in the place of priority, and regularly in the place of pre-eminence. Much more important is it that God's name should be hallowed, and God's kingdom come in the world, than that you and I, as individuals, should gain the blessings we desire. And now I propose to you, that while of course we cannot bring out many of the thoughts involved in this comprehensive prayer, we shall try to get some practical lessons from it.

I. Observe first, the petitions which relate to God's glory.

1. "Hallowed be thy name." The words are so simple, we have known them so well from our childhood, that it is really difficult to stop and ask what they mean. Let thy name be made holy. God's name represents himself. It is a prayer that his name, and himself as represented by his name, may be regarded as holy-spoken of as holy-treated as holy. We have a model here in the picture given by Isaiah, the adoring Seraphs covering their faces in awe before the throne. What do they cry? Not, as often we do; great, majestic, glorious-not a word about his power, nor even about his wisdom-"Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts." That is the central thought, that ought to be our deepest desire, that God may be regarded, and spoken of, and treated, as holy.

Oh, what a contrast between that scene of the vision, and the sights and the souls of this world in which we live. Walk the streets anywhere; listen to the talk wherever you find it, especially when men grow excited. Hear them! Hear how that high and holy name is bandied as a jest and polluted with profanity. It is enough to make a man shiver to hear the profanity that abounds everywhere. I have shivered, literally, sometimes as I listened. But my brethren, have we nothing to do but to look with horror at other men's profanity? There are some things important to our own life here. Have a care that while you may not use in vain the sacred name of God itself, you shall not fall into the practice of using other sacred expressions lightly and irreverently. I have heard even refined ladies use phrases in a light way, that were appropriate only in solemn prayer; and to a certain extent that was irreverence, that was profanity. Have a care about indulging wit that comes from profaning the language of Scripture, and allusions to God. Bluff old Dr. Johnson once said that "a man that has any respect for himself ought to be above that kind of wit, it is so cheap: any one can do that." Yes, anyone that has any respect for himself ought to be above that kind of wit, and a man that has any reverence for God ought to shrink from it. Have a care how you repeat the profanity of other men. You want to tell a good story and the point of it perhaps lies in a profane expression. Now is it that you should repeat that expression? Is it good for yourself to repeat it? Is

it healthy? Especially is it good for that boy there that is hearing, and may not make the nice distinction that you make, when you repeat other men's profanity? I would not inculcate scrupulosity about trifles, but perchance this is not a trifle, and it seems to me that we who pray this prayer, ought to lay such things to our hearts, and shrink with horror, and cultivate ourselves into shrinking with shuddering, from anything like profanity. Oh, that God's name might always be spoken with deepest reverence. Oh, that God himself might come to be everywhere thought of, and talked about, and obeyed, as holy. Anyhow, let us try to have it so in our hearts, on our lips, in our lives.

2. And the second petition, "Thy reign come." I am not going to explain all these simple words of course, but here is one that wants explaining. The Greek word which is rendered "kingdom" in the text requires three English words to convey its meaning. Primarily the word means "kingship," the condition of being a king, the possession of royal power. Then secondarily it means "reign," the exercise of royal power. As a final derivation it means what we call "kingdom," subjects or territory over whom or in which this royal power is exercised. Kingship, and reign, and kingdom. There are many cases of that kind in translation, where several terms have to be used in one language to convey the meaning of a single word in another. Now the leading thought here is evidently that which we express by the word "reign." And the reference is to the Messianic reign which the prophets had long foretold; that Messianic reign of which David had sung; that Messianic reign which John the Baptist had declared was now near at hand, and Jesus at the beginning of his ministry in Galilee took up the same cry, "The kingdom of heaven is near at hand; repent therefore and believe the good tidings." Men had long prayed that that reign might come, and now there was all the more propriety in such a prayer, for it was near at hand. Do you think there is no need of that prayer still? Do you think the reign, the Messianic reign of God in the world, has come? It has but begun. It was beginning when Jesus taught these teachings. It began still more when he rose triumphant from the grave and ascended glorious into the sky. It began still further, on the day of Pentecost. It began in another sense at the destruction of Jerusalem, which he spoke of beforehand as the time when he should come in his kingdom. It has begun on the earth, ah! it has not come yet. Alas, for the wide portions of the world where the very name of the King Messiah has not come. Alas, in the metropolis of one of the great Christian nations of today, the great mass of the men that surge around us, are utterly unsanctified by the gospel, utterly heedless of the reign of God. Stop any moment and think, between two heartbeats, of this great world you live in, of this great city you live in, and then you shall address yourself with new fervor to the prayer: "Thy reign come, O God! thy reign!" Anyhow, let it come in us; let it pervade our whole being; let it control our whole life; let it sanctify our home life; let it elevate our social life; let it purify our business life; let men feel, as they note our conduct, that we are subjects of the Lord God.

3. I shall not dwell, for lack of time, upon the third petition here, which is but an expansion of the preceding. For, as I have said, whenever God's reign has fully come, then his will must be done on earth. Many things occur now that are not according to God's will. The prayer is that God's will may take place; that everything may happen on earth in accordance with God's will, as in heaven everything does happen. Many times for us, I know it is hard even to consent that this shall be so. When it is plainly God's will that something should happen, which to us is painful, we shrink and with difficulty we say, "Thy will be done." No wonder: it has been so with better persons than we are. Certain disciples, when they besought Paul not to go up to Jerusalem and he would not be

persuaded, ceased and said: "The will of the Lord be done." The struggling Saviour in Gethsemane as he strove in agony and prayer to nerve himself up for what he had to bear, said again and again-for it would not stay said: "nevertheless, not my will, but thine he done." No wonder we find it hard sometimes to say that. The prayer teaches us not merely to submit to God's will, but to desire that God's will may take place in the world; that everything concerning us and concerning all around us may happen according to his will. And if he takes away our property, our health, our usefulness, our life, or some one we love better than our life, still we would say and we should rejoice when we say, "Thy will be done." Oh, if it could be so; if in the world, whether gaining or losing, in success or failure, it could be so, in us and about us, that God's will were done in all things-what a joy in the thought; what a springing gladness it puts into the heart, the very idea!

II. But perhaps we shall find, not more important but more practical lessons if we turn to the second part of the prayer, which contains petitions relating to ourselves.

1. First: "Give us this day our daily bread." Now I entreat you, don't listen to the commentaries, so many of which tell you that this means spiritual bread. I am weary of that everlasting spiritualizing. Spiritual things are far above temporal things, but there are many references in the Scriptures to our temporal and material wants, and why should we lose their meaning, and sustaining power, because we go on allegorizing everything. It is plainly a prayer for temporal good, as represented by that which is most essential, and thus stated in the simplest possible form; and a prayer with reference simply to day after day. A little child sees its meaning and feels its sweetness, and the wisest man can find no higher wisdom than to cry still: "Give us this day our daily bread." My brethren, I should be inclined to think that above all the petitions of the prayer this needs to be enforced in our time. I have known some Christians who were very unwilling to realize that there was any human exertion in obtaining spiritual good. They say, if that be true, how is it the gift of God? And if it be the gift of God, how can it be the effort of our own labor? Yet if spiritual good is the gift of God, so is temporal good the gift of God, though it is obtained only by human effort. The truth is, we see, that both are the gift of God, and both are the result of our own exertions.

Especially with reference to one of the great tendencies of thought in our time is it important that we should cherish this petition for our daily bread. "Pshaw!" men say, "that depends upon physical forces and laws; upon material things; upon your own exertion, man; upon the climate and the weather." Now in the face of these notions it becomes all the more appropriate that we should pray to God to give us daily bread. Yes, and I tell you plainly and boldly, though I have not time to develop the thought, if it is not right and wise to ask God for daily bread, if as they tell you in the newspapers so often, there is no efficacy in prayer, there is no use in praying for rain, then there is no God at all. You are driven straight to it by absolute logical necessity. If it is not proper to pray for daily bread and to pray for rain, there is no God; there is nothing in existence but matter, with its organization and its results. You cannot help it; there is no standing room, for the life of you, between those two positions. Alas, alas, how many in our time, one-sided or superficial, have gone into utter materialism. Never was there a time when it was more needful that the Christian world should realize in their experience the sentiment of this prayer. We work for daily bread, and we plan for years to come, but none the less are we to seek it as the daily gift of the daily goodness of our Father in heaven.

2. "And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors." The simple prayer for temporal things all embraced in that one petition for what is most indispensable, and now in addition, a twofold prayer-forgiveness for past sin, and deliverance from sin in the future. That our God may be glorified; that our earthly wants may be supplied, and that we may be forgiven our sin, and delivered from evil-that is all there is to pray for.

You know that the term "debt" is used here as an Aramaic expression to denote sin-sin regarded as a debt, which we must pay to God, or in the kindred phrase of other languages, "pay the penalty." You notice that when our Lord repeats the thought a moment later he says trespasses, or transgressions. You remember that when he gives the prayer on a subsequent occasion it is: "Forgive us our sins; for we also forgive everyone that is indebted to us." "Forgive us our debts" means, forgive us our sins. My friends, does it ever occur to you that you are more anxious about the "give" than the "forgive"? Does it ever happen in your experience that you pray that God would give and forget to ask that God would forgive? And yet, is not this last as deep a need? Yea, a deeper need than the other? Ah! that a man should have all earthly things given him, and his sins not forgiven, would be a poor gift. Yet a man who should be deprived of all earthly things and go starving into the other world, yet with his sins forgiven, would be rich and might rejoice. Let us not forget as we go on praying for what God has to give, to ask still more earnestly that he would forgive us our sins.

I must beg you in connection with the prayer to dwell upon the condition which our Lord here presents. It is a matter of the utmost practical importance to all of us. "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors." You have noticed surely, that after completing this simple prayer, Jesus before going on to speak of other things, takes up again one of the thoughts of the prayer; and which one is it? Something about God's name being hallowed, or his reign coming? Something about daily bread? Something about temptation, or evil? Nay: it is this one; this one thought he repeats, repeats it positively and negatively. For if you forgive men their trespasses, your Heavenly Father will also forgive you, and if you forgive not, neither will your Heavenly Father forgive you. You know why-you know yourself but little if you do not well know why he dwells upon this. The disposition to be revengeful, or at any rate to be unforgiving, is one of the deepest rooted, one of the hardest to correct, one of the most hurtful and ruinous in its influence, of all the evil dispositions that belong to our sinful human nature. So our Lord presents forgiving as the condition of being forgiven, the condition sine qua non-if we do not forgive men we cannot be forgiven. He does not mean that our forgiving in the meritorious ground of our being forgiven. It is an indispensable condition. Only if we do forgive men can we be forgiven, but then we are forgiven on the ground which the gospel provides-the merit which is not our own.

Now let us make a practical distinction. We use that word "forgive" in a somewhat ambiguous fashion. In the strict and proper sense it is not our duty to forgive a man unless he repents. God forgives in that sense no man but the penitent, and Jesus said, you remember: "If thy brother sin against thee seven times in the day and seven times in the day turn saying, 'I repent,' thou shalt forgive him." It is not right that you should restore a man to the confidence he has forfeited, unless he shows himself worthy of it. It is not right that you should forgive a man, in the full sense of the term, unless he repents; not only is it not your duty, but it is not right. "Love your enemies, that ye may be sons of your Father in heaven." God forgives only the penitent, and loves them as his friends, but even the impenitent God loves. "He makes his sun to rise on the evil and the good,

and sends rain on the just and the unjust." He wishes his enemies no harm, but does them good. We need not, and really should not, forgive a man in the full sense while he remains impenitent, but we must in the other sense forgive him. We must bear him no malice. We must do him no harm. We must be glad to do him good, in anything that will not promote his evil designs against us. Thus shall we be the sons of our Father in heaven.

I think this distinction is practically important. The idea of forgiving a man who is impenitent does seem to be impracticable, and that is not what the Scriptures teach; but that we should bear no malice and yield to no revenge, that is what the Scriptures teach. Ah me, even this is hard enough for poor human nature! Let us strive to do that; let us lay it to heart. Who is there here today among us who has not sometimes thought himself to have been cruelly wronged? Who? We all have need then to exercise this forgiveness.

3. And finally, "bring us not into temptation." For it is not simply lead it is bring. Human agency is, for the moment, here left out of account. The thought is, of God's providence as bearing us on, and bringing us into certain situations, and the prayer is that God will not bring us into circumstances of temptation of trial. Why? Because we are afraid we cannot stand temptation. Ah, every man that knows himself will most certainly feel an echo in his heart, "I am weak, O Lord bring me not into temptation." A man advertised for a coachman, and when the applicants came, he asked each one, "How near would you undertake to run my carriage wheel to the edge of a precipice?" The first one said he would run within a foot of it. The second said he would run within six inches. The third was an Irishman, who said, "I would kape away as far as I could,"-and he got the place. Maybe you will remember that, if you forget my solemn injunction. O my Christian friends, pray that you may be kept away from temptation, for you are weak, and let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall.

"Bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil." My brethren, this simple prayer ought as a model to control all our praying. Its spirit ought to strike into our blood, shaping our whole character, regulating our whole life. And as we pray it, oh, ought not our life's endeavor to accord with it? What folly to pray, "Thy reign come," and never a finger lifted to urge forward the progress of that reign; never a sacrifice made, never deed done, nor word spoken, nought but idle prayer. What folly to pray for forgiveness of sin, and pray for deliverance from evil, if along with the prayer there be not the cherished desire after holiness, and the perpetual effort to abhor-to abhor-that which is evil, and cleave to that which is good.

S. The Mother of Jesus

The Mother of Jesus.

Mary, the mother of Jesus. Acts 1:14.

THERE is a well-known tendency of human thought to oscillate from one extreme to another. I think this tendency was exhibited in several points of what we call the Protestant Reformation. In certain important respects, we are all agreed that there was a real and thorough reformation. In certain other respects most of us think it was a very partial reformation. And there are yet several other respects in which it was a violent reaction from one extreme to the opposite extreme. It appears to me that this has been the case as regards the position of Protestants toward the mother of Jesus. The Romanists, we may say without uncharitableness, have come very near making her an object of worship. Their theologians make nice distinctions on the subject, but practically, for the ignorant mass, she is really an object of worship, a sort of goddess. The Protestant mind, starting back in horror from that terrible idolatry, has seemed to shrink sensitively away from ever saying a word or ever thinking for a moment about the mother of Jesus.

It is all natural enough, the growth of what we consider to be the grave Romanist error about Mary. The association connected with all those who followed Jesus would naturally have caused the early Christians to feel a peculiar interest in her, as they ought to have done. And then the feeling which rapidly grew up, of a desire for human mediation between us and God between us*, and the Saviour himself and which led, in the course of the centuries, to praying to the saints for their mediation, would naturally cause the mother of Jesus to be regarded as the most influential of all these interceding saints. Moreover, the Roman Church, with that talent for governing which has characterized the Roman people through all their history, readily adapted itself to the tastes of mankind, to the tendencies of human nature in general, and to the special usages of the old Pagan Romans, introducing, for example, a number of festivals, so that there would be something corresponding to the ancient festivals to please the people. And as all Pagan nations had their female deities, there naturally arose a feeling which made the mother of Jesus a sort of female divinity. Then, when art came into use in the churches, when they introduced image worship, there was nothing more natural than that the mother and the babe in her arms should be the chosen subject of artistic representation in places of worship; that the great artists of Italy should not only find this most popular and remunerative for their pencil, but most pleasing for themselves. So galleries were filled with many charming delineations of the Virgin and child. I suppose, also, that the spirit of chivalry in the Middle Ages may have had something to do with this. There was then a high, romantic sentiment towards woman as such, and this may have caused Mary to be regarded as the representative woman, so that romance added itself to devotion. For these and other causes it has come to pass that not only in the Roman Church, but in the Greek and Armenian and Coptic Churches, and all through the East, they talk a great deal more about Mary than about her son. I have at home a great collection of Latin hymns of the Middle Ages, made by a German scholar, in which there are three times as many about Mary as about Jesus and the apostles all

put together.

Now, I say the Protestant mind has violently reacted from all this, and it is not strange that we should shrink shuddering from what is practical idolatry, no matter how skillfully explained away. But isn't it a pity that we should go to the opposite extreme as regards the mother of our Lord? Let us look, then, at what the Scriptures teach. It was said to her by the angel, "Blessed art thou among women," and she said, "Henceforth all generations shall call me blessed."

There is no ground there for worship. "Blessed among women," Elizabeth was called, and Jael, who killed Sisera. The meaning of Mary's own saying is, all generations shall call me happy, shall felicitate me, shall recognize that my position is a happy one. There is no foundation for calling her "the Blessed Virgin Mary," as an act of worship, but there is a foundation for taking peculiar interest in what the Scriptures teach concerning her. It is not much that they do teach, and doubtless that is well, for otherwise it would have been perverted in the interest of that semi-idolatry we have been speaking about; but from what they do teach we may draw some useful lessons, and may, at the same time, get some interesting views of her son, who is, O wonder of wonders! our Divine Redeemer.

1. First recall Mary's early life. Now, I could bring you some so-called manuals about the Blessed Virgin Mary, which would give you a great mass of detail about her early life, but unfortunately they are all late tradition; in fact, they are all pure fiction, and without the advantage of being well invented. They are commonly dull and stupid. But when we look to the Scriptures themselves, some things we do know about her early life. We know that instead of being at a convent at Jerusalem, as the silly traditions say, she lived at the little town of Nazareth. This village, nestling down in its deep and retired valley, is never mentioned in the Old Testament, and even Josephus, who writes about a dozen places within a few miles of it, never speaks of Nazareth. It was an insignificant and quite out of the way place, far from the bustling, noisy world. Yet here Mary was to rear the appointed Saviour of men. Out of silence and obscurity was to come in the appointed time the Saviour of mankind. Nor must you suppose it was a desirable community to live in. Those who wrestle with the giant vices that gather in great cities often dream that in a quiet little retired village it would be easy to do right but Arcadian, (simplicity and purity is seldom anything more than a dream.) Those people of Nazareth were singularly bad.'

They showed towards Jesus himself a rudeness and ferocity to which we know of no parallel in his ministry. They rejected him rudely. They tried to take his life. And one of whom Jesus said that he was an Israelite in whom there was no guile, and who lived in a neighboring village, asked in astonishment, "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" It was a bad place. And Mary lived among those rude people of Nazareth.

Besides knowing the place of her abode, we know of Mary that she was familiar with Scripture. For when the great time in her life came, and, inspired, she burst out into praise, almost every expression she uses is from the Old Testament. Her whole mind and heart were full of the sacred writings, so that their language came spontaneously to her lips. That is an important point; she was familiar with the Scriptures.

2. In the next place, think of Mary's belief and rejoicing. There came to her the most wonderful promise that ever was made on earth, and the most incredible.

It seemed at first blush to be impossible, and the question she asked concerning it touched that very point.

She said: "How can these things be?" "It is in that respect we see an instructive difference between Mary and Zachariah. Zachariah said: "How shall I know this, seeing I am an old man and my wife is old?" He speaks as a man not disposed to believe and who insists upon having better proof. But Mary speaks as one who is disposed to believe, and asks only to have an apparent impossibility removed, that she may believe.

You see here two types of character, two states of mind, such as often exist with us in relation to the Scriptures.

There are people that present their difficulties in such a way as to show plainly that they are like Zachariah; they don't much want to believe, and they insist on their difficulties and cherish them, and are not anxious you should remove them. There are others who have sore difficulty in the way of believing, so that we owe them our tender respect and sympathy, who are asking only that they may get rid of what seems to them to stand in the way, so that they may believe. God be gracious to all such! God help them out of their trouble! Mary believed, not "because it was impossible," as a Latin Father once rhetorically said; she believed notwithstanding it seemed impossible, because it was expressly ascribed to the power of God. "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee." And Mary said: "Behold the hand-maid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word." We do not want to believe a thing that is impossible, but, like Mary, we have to believe what includes many elements that are incomprehensible. In the nature of things it must be so. There was much that Mary could not understand, and as the years came and went she did not understand them still. When the shepherds came after the babe had been actually born, and reported what the angels had said, we are told that Mary "kept all these things and pondered them in her heart." She could not know the meaning. When Simeon, in the Temple, said such wonderful things about the child, we read that Mary and Joseph wondered about all these things that were told concerning him; and when the child showed such extraordinary knowledge at twelve years of age, we are told that Mary and Joseph were amazed. It was necessary that they should not understand it. If the reality as to what it was had forced itself upon them, it would have been impossible that they should have lived under the same roof. So Mrs. Browning makes her say, "Bright angels, move not! lest ye stir the cloud Betwixt my soul and his futurity | I must not die, with mother's work to do, And could not live and see." In the very idea of an incarnation there are necessarily many things incomprehensible. My friends, if you take this Bible, which comes so strangely home to all our spiritual wants, which, in all seasons of conscious spiritual weakness, offers the very strength we need, which affords us that help against sin which is not found anywhere else in this world this Bible, which the more progress we make in trying to do right, seems the more sweetly adapted to all our spiritual wants if you take this Bible, you find that it reveals an incarnation, and that this, from the necessity of the case, involves many things that seem almost impossible. There must be ever so many allusions to things in which we can make no progress at all, as to comprehending their nature. We are in Mary's position. "We are not expected to believe an impossibility, but warranted and bound to believe an assured fact, notwithstanding there be many things about it whose nature we cannot possibly comprehend.

It seems that this distinction might have value to any one troubled about these problems, and anxious to receive the truth.

Notice, further, that Mary, in believing, rejoices. She said: "My soul doth magnify the Lord; from henceforth all generations shall call me happy." It was a wonderful thing, that young girl, the child of poverty, in that little out of the way village, daring to say that all coming generations should know of her and call her happy; but she said it, because God had promised. She said it with no idea of personal merit, with no thought of personal pride, but because God had promised. If one of you should stand here by my side, and we two should, with the most genuine humility in our power, say we think we are children of God, we hope we shall be blessed forever in Heaven, we are confident we shall dwell amid the purity and glory of the better world, there are some people ready enough I know not that there are such here present, but you find cases of that sort everywhere there are some people ready enough to say: "You think a great deal of yourselves; you count yourselves favorites of heaven," and all that.

Yet, in fact, the profession would be made not in self complacency, but in simple, humble reliance on a divine promise. And why should not a human heart trust a divine promise, as then, so now and henceforward and for ever more, and trusting a divine promise, rejoice in a divine hope?

3. In the third place, think of Mary training her child.

We know something of the nature of that training. We have read of young Timothy, that from a child he knew the Holy Scripture that his mother and grandmother had taught him, and had learned to share the faith that was in them. That is a picture we may transfer to the humble home of the carpenter in Nazareth. That child needed to be trained. Do we not read that he grew in wisdom and stature? If he increased in wisdom, there was need of education. We find that the mother trusted him almost without bound. And we know that he was really what children so often imagine themselves to be, wiser than his parents. Yet, he went down with them and was subject to them. The human mind has to grow. If there was a real incarnation, the human mind had to grow. It needed to be developed. There was room for education. There was demand for it. Yea, and he himself, toward the close of his ministry, must have meant the same thing as to the capacity of the human mind to contain knowledge, when he said: "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, not even the angels in heaven, nor even the Son, but the Father only." The human mind cannot know all things. And our Lord's human mind could not hold all knowledge. Such is the declaration of the record, that his mind grew in wisdom as his body grew in stature, and Mary was the mother that trained him. It seems idle sometimes for a poor toiling mother to indulge in the romantic ideas which poets and novelists write about a mother's high mission; and yet it is good for such a one, amid trial and sacrifice and suffering and struggles, to remember, and comfort herself in remembering, that hers is a high mission. After all, the noblest thing that is done in this world is when a mother does in truth and wisdom and fear of God train up a child. Let us all stand back in her presence. Let us call upon all men whose aspirations are the highest, whose work is the noblest, to stand aside and acknowledge cheerfully, "Hers is the best work, hers is the noblest work done in the world." And if that be the case, it must be a work of sacrifice and suffering, for there is nothing good ever done on earth save with sacrifice. Let the toiling mother solace herself with the thought that all motherhood has been dignified and made sublime by the young mother in the little town of Galilee, who was training in an humble home that child that was to be the Saviour

of the world and the glory of the universe.

It was a unique task no doubt, and yet I say it has ennobled all motherhood, and any struggling, sorrowing mother may take comfort in the thought that she is engaged in a like good work. Blessed be God! what mother here knows of the high possibilities that are before her child? What Christian mother can fail to know of that supreme possibility, that blessed certainty, that she trains up a spirit immortal when she brings up a child in the fear of the Lord.

But, now, please observe that Mary must have trained this child in the knowledge of God's word. My friends who are parents, we abuse everything; and so we abuse the benefits of the Sunday-school. There is grievous danger that we parents shall turn over to the Sunday-school our parental duty of training our children in God's word. It is one of the perils of our time. Though we have those in the Sunday-school to help us in the task, and ought to be heartily thankful for their help, yet the work is ours nonetheless, and the work will, for the most part, remain undone unless we do it the work of training our children in the knowledge of God's word.

Let us train them to look at God's word as the guide of their life. I read somewhere of a mother whose husband was a grossly wicked man, who used to cry out against all things religious, and declared that he believed not in God; yet she reared up a number of children by his side, and they all became Christians. Some friend asked if she would tell how she managed this. She said, " I never set my word against their father's, but when he says anything against God's service, I hunt up a passage and say, ' Your father says so and so, but here is what your heavenly Father says/ and then I read it to them." That was all the secret she had, but what a blessed secret!

Parents, learn to have the Scriptures on your tongue's end for the benefit of your children. Good old John Wesley was a trifle superstitious, after the fashion of his time, when he used to open the Bible at random and make use of whatever text he happened first to light upon. Far better than that is it for us to have the mind so full of the Scriptures, their teachings so familiar to our thought, that whenever we need one of them it will come by natural association of ideas. And so Mr. Moody has taught all of us that if we can get some happy quotation of Scripture, it will be worth more than all our wisdom in explaining a difficulty to an inquirer.

4. I pass on to say a word as to a later point in Mary's history. She seems to have unwarrantably interfered in the ministry of her son. At the wedding at Cana she suggested for him a course of action, and he said: " Woman, what have I to do with thee," or rather "What have we to do with each other?" There was nothing harsh in this, but there was an intimation that they had entered into new relations, that he who had been to her as a child to its mother could not be controlled by her in his public action, and she must draw back. A year or two later, when Jesus was teaching all the morning in a crowded house, and there were so many questions to be answered that they had not time for the mid-day meal, we read that "his friends" went forth to seize him, for they said, " he is beside himself." Now, put the Gospel histories together, and it appears that those friends were his mother and his brothers; and when they sent him a message over the heads of the crowd in the house, that his mother and brothers were without and wanted to see him, the answer, too, is very remarkable. He said: " Who is my mother, and who are my brothers? " And he looked around in a circle upon those that sat about him and said: " Behold my mother and my brothers; for whosoever shall do the will of God, he is my brother, and sister, and mother." His kindred were seeking to interfere with his work, and said he was beside himself. No wonder men call Christian

earnestness fanaticism. Jesus himself, the founder of it all they said he was crazy. His own mother and his brothers said this because he was in earnest. What a comfort there is for all of us in the application he made of their request: "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father in Heaven, he is my brother, and sister, and mother." How does a man love his brother?

Think of the warm affection with which a man cherishes his brother. Then think of the tenderness with which a manly nature loves a sister. Then add to these, yea, compass them all around with the love that a real man has for his mother a love that will ever grow as he grows older and now consider. Jesus has said it may include you and me, with all our unworthiness "Whosoever shall do the will of God is as dear to me as brother, and sister, and mother." The Scriptures contain many wonderful things, but what more wonderful than those words?

5. There is one other theme, of which I know not how to speak Mary at the cross. Description is here dumb. Imagination stands in mute wonder. There are many points of view from which to look at the cross, and one not the least instructive, no doubt, would be to try to place yourself in imagination beside that sorrowing mother, through whose heart now according to old Simeon's prediction long before a sword was passing, a sword of cruel suffering and death. You would remember how suffering is the inevitable consequence of sin in this world, how suffering was the necessary condition of human salvation, even that poor mother's suffering as she looked upon her atoning son. Then remember how out of his death came life again, and out of that sorrow came springing joy. I cannot speak of that; who can? But you might sit down sometime and think it all over. Try to stand beside the mother at the cross, try to imagine how she felt, and try, also, to imagine how he felt towards her; for amid all the strange sorrow of that dark hour, he that was dying thought of his widowed mother, and felt, as every true man feels, that he must make some provision for her future. Yea, amid that great event of the universe, with that darkness settling down upon all his soul as the sin-bearer, he made provision for his widowed mother. Yet, what a simple provision it was! He had a loving friend, and to him he said: "Take her; do you be her son and she will be your mother," and that was all.

6. And now, finally, think a moment of Mary in heaven. If ever there comes a pang to the glorified ones, methinks Mary must look down with unutterable grief upon the thousands and millions that almost worship her instead of worshiping her son, the Saviour.

"centuries That roll, in vision, your futurities My future grave athwart, Whose murmurs seem to reach me while I keep Watch o'er this sleep, Say of me as the Heavenly said 'Thou art The blessedest of women! 'blessedest, Not holiest, not noblest no high name, Whose height misplaced may pierce me like a shame, When I sit meek in heaven! "

MRS. BROWNING, The True Mary.

It is not unnatural, it is because they have forgotten that he, the divine one, is himself human. The human heart longs after human sympathy, and the consciences of guilty men make them wish for a human mediator between themselves and the God they shrink from. Luther tells us that in youth, with his Romish education, he was afraid of Christ. He never heard a word said about Christ, save as the babe in the mother's arms, or the sacrifice on the cross, or the Judge in the last day. His idea was that he must call upon the saints, and especially upon the Virgin Mary, to pity him and intercede for him with Christ. When people have such views of Christ, no wonder they seek some

human mediator. The only cure for it all is to know that Christ the divine was truly human, that Mary was no more truly human than was Jesus, the Son of Mary. Truly divine and also truly human, he is able to sympathize with us in our infirmities, to lay a hand of love and pity upon our poor sinful heads, and yet, with the other hand, to lay hold upon the very pillars of God's throne, and to be our Advocate with the Father, our one Mediator, all the Mediator we need or should desire. O Jesus, son of Mary, and yet Son of God, before the mystery of thine Incarnation we bow, and trusting in the mystery of thine intercession, we pray thee make us, make us, wholly thine!

S. The Pleasures of Piety

The Pleasures of Piety

John A. Broadus Her ways are ways of pleasantness, And all her paths are peace. Proverbs 3:17

Some have thought it wrong that Christianity should appeal so much to the desire of happiness-most men, on the contrary, dislike its requirement of self-denial. As objections, a French preacher has well said, we might leave them to refute each other. But then both statements are true-and religion herein corresponds with human nature as we find it. Men in general have a conflict between feeling of interest and of duty-desiring gratification, yet feeling that they ought to deny themselves. Religion proposes to reunite and harmonize these so that the desire for happiness may be satisfied with holiness; that not only interest in fact, but men's feeling of interest, may coincide with duty-and while denying themselves all unlawful gratification, they may have new desires, whose gratification shall afford real happiness. Religion should make us happy, for love is the fulfilling of the law, and love is happiness. Religion may properly appeal to our desire for happiness, because we cannot exercise love to others without self-love. Selfishness, the perversion, the caricature of this, is wrong, but self-love is a necessary part of our nature, indispensable to our loving others, and thus indispensable to religion.

Condescending to our infirmities, and seeing that men have lost the relish for holiness, God appeals to their relish for happiness. If attracted by this, they may then be less averse to holiness. But observe, there is no compromise-it is not by the offer of sensual pleasures, here or hereafter, that we would attract men to religion. We do not say that you can be religious, and still enjoy the pleasures of sin. We do insist that you can be religious, and still have pleasure. It would not do if happiness were the sole object in seeking religion-but it may attract, and other elements enter in afterward.

Take this, then, as the subject of the sermon, "Religion affords Happiness," or, "The Pleasures of Piety."

I. The influence of piety upon those objects and relations which are commonly thought to contribute most to happiness.

1. Influence upon length of days. How religion contributes to this. Even conscientious care, even strong religious principle, fails to save many persons from neglect of health; but what would become of them without such principles?

2. Influence upon reputation. Consistent piety secures respect and confidence. Those who are religious should refuse to compromise with others. They may be annoyed, even vexed, at your refusal, yet in their hearts they will honor you. A firm, decided stand is easiest to maintain, and at the same time most reputable.

3. Influence on riches. I cannot speak of this, any more than the former topics, at length. Riches do not of themselves make a man pious-they often, though not always, have a contrary effect. Piety

does not necessarily promote wealth-but it must always have that tendency. It deters from vices, and vice is commonly expensive. It enjoins and encourages those virtues, which are promotive of wealth, as frugality.

4. Influence upon our social relations. Affection for kindred and friends is enhanced by piety and mutual duties are performed better where there is piety. Piety gives a greater disposition to forgiveness and to self-sacrifice. It sheds a new luster over the brightest home, bestows an added joy upon the most loving hearts. With reference to all these, observe the disposition religion produces, as regards both prosperity and adversity. Piety gives contentment, the disposition to make the best of everything. How great the value of this to happiness!

II. The new sources of happiness which piety opens up within us.

Piety opens up many new sources of happiness.

1. Trust in providence. Rather than "trusting to luck," or trusting merely to the uniformity of the laws of nature, we place our trust in a personal God who governs all things by his powerful Word. How immense the importance to our happiness of regarding the doings of providence as the work of our Father.

2. Peace of spirit. This grows out of reconciliation with God. How often the happiness of the impenitent is marred by thoughts of his danger as the enemy of God. But reconciliation with God, what a ground for peace of spirit-appropriating all the gracious promises, resting upon them, delighting in them. Then we may be able, by God's grace helping, to attain peace of conscience.

3.The enjoyment of religious exercises. Piety makes our worship, both public and private, pleasant. In seasons of private prayer and in Scripture reading, truth comes with unwonted clearness and preciousness.

4. Self-sacrifice for the good of others.

5. The hope of eternal blessedness.

Let it not be objected then to religion, that it would destroy happiness. It confers the highest happiness in life, the only happiness in death and in eternity.

S. The Prayer of the Woman of Canaan

The Prayer of the Woman of Canaan

John A. Broadus Matthew 15:21-28

Never, save on this occasion, did our Lord go beyond the border of Palestine. He was a "minister of the circumcision" - "not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." He did not absolutely restrict his benefits to the Jews, for centurions as well as this woman knew his healing power. But the Gentile restriction, and the hesitation here, may seem strange in view of the fact that the peculiar glory of the gospel was that its benefits should extend to the Gentiles, that the exclusiveness of the Jewish system was to be broken down. It seems to be a part of that obvious plan in God's moral government that great changes are not made suddenly, but gradually, as man was to be prepared to receive. The Messiah was the son of David - his dispensation was to be an enlargement and consummation of the Jewish system, and so the foundations of his kingdom must be laid in Israel.

Now the best of the Jews could not be prepared at once for fraternizing with the Gentiles; therefore, had Jesus gone out among the Gentiles in the beginning, and placed them on the same footing, he would have shocked prejudices so as to gain no Jewish disciples. Even after his ascension, it required providential scattering and special vision to convince Peter that this was proper. Accordingly, he confined himself to his own nation and so did the seventy. But when his own work was finished, when the Holy Spirit came with his teachings, when the great principles of the Messiah's reign were more fully understood, then the apostles went preaching "repentance and remission of sins unto all nations." But as Jesus went into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, he met a woman whose daughter was "grievously vexed with the devil." This woman's concern for her daughter expressed itself in a prayer which deserves our study and imitation in both its matter and its spirit. Let us notice them.

I. The subject of her prayer.

She prayed for blessings on her child. Many of us would pray thus too, if a child were so possessed. Some who neglect religion have at such a time made agonized petitions to God and made promises to him. But are not your children and those of your friends diseased? Are they not, in a most important sense, affected with the disease of sin and under the power of Satan. I do not doubt you pray for them, often and earnestly, much more than they suppose. Sometimes you long to speak to them, yet you are afraid to do so. Therefore, you go away and pour it out before the Lord. But do you pray as you should? With such earnestness as this woman manifested? Making each case your own? Christian parent, think often of your son, your daughter, living as they do. Pray for them; live rightly before them; and seek in every way to win them to Christ. It will be better for you, though not lessening their guilt, if they die before you, or are left behind you, impenitent; it will be a comfort if you can ere long be joined with them in Christian hope, and when you depart to be with Christ, can know that they are pressing toward the mark. In view of death, and eternity,

pray, Christian hearers, for your dear kindred, and for your children.

II. The character of her prayer.

1. It was a believing prayer.

She believed that Jesus was Messiah, the "Son of David," and that he was able and willing to heal her child. How great was her faith! Has he not the power and willingness to save us, to bless us with spiritual blessings?

2. It was an humble prayer.

She was willing to take the position Jesus gave her. So should it be with us. We should stand where God's Word places us. But many are not willing to do this. When God's Word declares them depraved, they defend themselves against the charge. When God's Word calls them guilty, they deny or seek to extenuate. When God offers them salvation as a free gift, they are unwilling to accept. This, for the unconverted, is a matter of great importance, to stand where God places you, and accept what God offers you.

Many beautiful instances of humility might be found in Scripture, such as the centurion, publican, and Paul, but none is more worthy of imitation than the humble plea of the woman of Phoenicia.

3. It was persevering prayer.

The object of our Lord's seeming repulse was probably to test the perseverance of her faith. She persevered because she really desired what she sought. Her perseverance won her desire.

Here is a prayer which is worthy of imitation. Here is a spirit which We could well imitate.

S. The Resurrection of Our Lord

The Resurrection of Our Lord

John A. Broadus "The Lord is risen indeed." Luke 24:34

Very near the place of the crucifixion there was a garden belonging to Joseph, of Arimathaea, this being the name of a little country town from which he had come. He was a man of wealth, as no other could have owned a garden just outside the walls of a great city. He, too, was a man of elevated social position: for excepting the high priest there was no higher position possible for a Jew than to be a member of the Sanhedrin. He was a disciple of Jesus, but "secretly, for fear of the Jews." It is difficult to interpret that expression with certainty, but it gives us a rather painful view of the powerful influence exerted upon the religion of many men by social considerations. This gentleman was afraid of losing social caste, and afraid of losing a distinguished position, and so he had not been able to declare himself a disciple of Jesus before the world. In the Sanhedrin Joseph appears to have opposed the vote by which Jesus was condemned, and we may suppose that from this garden of his, near to the place, he had looked out with mournful interest upon the scene of the crucifixion. Perhaps as his eye wandered, it fell upon the new tomb which he had caused to be cut out from the solid rock in the garden, preparing it for the entombment of himself and his household, but in which no one had yet been laid. It occurred to him that he would honor the prophet, the crucified, by making him the first to be buried in his new tomb. It is one of the contradictions that are perpetually occurring in our Lord's life; that he died as a despised malefactor, and yet he was buried like a man of the greatest distinction. There was need of haste after his death occurred, for that was three o'clock, and if they waited until the sun went down and the Sabbath began it would be impossible, so Joseph hurried to the Roman governor and asked permission to bury the prophet in his tomb. Pilate thought it unusual that he should have died so soon, since those crucified usually lingered for a day or two, sometimes for several days. But all the sleepless suffering of the night before and the dark mysterious agony of the day had told rapidly upon him; thus in six hours he had died. Pilate sent an officer to ascertain the fact, and upon his report, he gave the permission required. Joseph hurried to buy costly ointment to embalm the body. Another member of the Sanhedrin, Nicodemus, who three years before had visited Jesus by night, also went to Golgotha. No expense was spared by those distinguished and wealthy men in expressing love and admiration for the body of the prophet. I wonder if Nicodemus did not remember, as he and the attendants took down the body of Christ, how he had said to him at that night interview: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so shall the Son of Man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have everlasting life." This interment was witnessed, we are told, by two women-Mary Magdalene, and another Mary, the mother of Joseph. They stood at a distance and so did not see that Nicodemus had brought those spices. Now as the sun was going down, and the stone was rolled to the mouth of the sepulcher, the women went to the city planning what they would do when the Sabbath was passed. So the night came and the morning. Those were very weary hours of that Sabbath day for the disciples of Jesus; there never was amid all the crushed hopes of human hearts on earth an experience so

bitter as theirs. They had "trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel," they climbed up to the hope that he was the promised Messiah, and now it was all gone. His enemies, to be sure, had heard a whisper from some source that he had predicted that he would be crucified, and that he would rise again on the third day. They seized upon that idea, and went to work to make sure that nothing should be done by his friends to simulate a resurrection. And make sure they did! They got a guard of Roman soldiers to watch the tomb, whose lives would be the forfeit if they neglected their duty. They put upon the stone before the door the seal of the Roman government which it was death for any man to break. They made their work sure.

They remembered the prediction, and why did not the disciples remember it, too? Well, I suppose they had never looked upon the prediction as representing a reality. When Peter and James and John came down with him from the mount of transfiguration and he told them they must tell no man what they had seen on the mount, until the Son of Man was risen from the dead, we are told that they used to question and reason with one another as to what the rising from the dead meant. Why, it could not mean a literal rising from the dead. King Messiah was not going to be crucified, and come to life-of course, it could not mean that. It was contrary to all their ideas. And as it could not mean a literal rising from the dead, what could it mean? I suppose the idea of a real death and a real resurrection never entered their minds; therefore they did not remember it, because it had never been reality to their thought. The hours went on, and when the sun set on the Jewish Sabbath, which was Saturday evening, the women went to the shops, which were opened at sunset, to buy their spices. Some of these women had been accustomed to contribute of their substance for the support of Jesus and his followers, and they were going now to make their last contribution to do some honor to his dead body. When the early morning came, they went to the tomb. On their way there occurred to their minds a difficulty. The two women had observed that it was a very large stone that was rolled against the tomb, and it occurred to them that they would not be able to remove it. But they pressed on, and when they arrived at the sepulcher-the stone was rolled away. Immediately the thought came, not that he was risen, but that the body had been removed by some friend or some enemy. So one of them, Mary Magdalene, rushed back to the city to the residence of John, where Peter also was, to tell them about it. The other woman remained. And presently looking into the sepulcher they saw two angels, who spoke to them and said: "Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, he is risen. Go tell his disciples that he is leading the way to Galilee and they shall see him there." So they departed to carry this message. I fancy they went to Bethany. Most likely the nine disciples, who were accustomed to go to Bethany every night with the Master, had gone there now.

Soon after the women left, here came Peter and John, eagerly hastening at the news which Mary had brought that the sepulcher was opened. John came first, and stopped and looked in, but in his deeply reverential way did not enter. Then Peter came, and, bold as he always was, rushed right in and John followed him. They saw the linen cloths that had wrapped the body lying, and the napkin which had been wrapped about the head was folded and laid apart. John telling the story afterward, says that he "saw, and believed." Those accustomed to dealing with evidence know that among matters of importance, very slight circumstances will sometimes clinch the whole thing and leave no doubt about it. Here was such a slight circumstance. It could not be that friends had borne that body away, for they would have carried it away with the cloths; and enemies would not have left the cloths folded and neatly laid away. Their presence there and the tokens of order and

loving care satisfied John that the Master was risen indeed. No doubt there came back upon him a recollection of those forgotten sayings of the Master, and he now saw what he could not understand when he came down from the mount of transfiguration, what the rising from the dead did mean. It meant reality. He saw and believed. But Jesus was not there, and they knew not what to do nor to think, and so they went soon away. However, Mary Magdalene had followed them to the tomb, and was now standing without and weeping. After a little she stooped timidly and looked into the tomb, and again the angels appeared and said. "Woman, why weepest thou?" Still she had no thought that he was risen. She said, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him." Then she turned around and through her tears saw a man standing by, who she took it for granted was in charge of the garden, and she said, "Sir, if thou has borne him away, please tell me where thou hast laid him?" Do you remember what followed? Ah! she heard a voice, a voice that years before had spoken and the dread demons that possessed her fled away; a voice from which she had heard so often such wise and loving words as thrilled her soul and would linger forever in her memory. She heard that voice as he said, "Mary." And she turned and said, "My teacher!" I do not know exactly what is meant by the words our Lord then spoke. They are obscure, but I think they mean this; that with the superstition which was common to the Jews-and these disciples had a great many such erroneous notions and retained them for a great while-they were likely to say among themselves, "Ah: but it is just his ghost, he has gone to the Father." The disciples thought the same thing when he appeared to them that evening. The brethren at Mary's house thought that when Peter appeared for whom they were praying in prison; they said it was his spirit. It seems that Mary feared he had ascended and this was only a phantom, and so she was about to lay hold of him to settle that point, when he said, "Touch me not: for I have not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." So she turned away to fulfill the mission.

Sometime after, Jesus appeared to the other women and gave them commissions with his own lips likewise. As the morning went on these women told their story, and the disciples would not hear a word of it. They seemed to be strangely incredulous. They said it was all idle tales. With that magnificent, supercilious superiority with which men often speak as regards women, they said it was all women's idle tales. Does it seem strange and sad that they were incredulous? I am glad of it, for as an old writer has said, "They doubted, that we might not doubt." You can see that these men were not credulous enthusiasts, seizing without solid evidence upon something they wanted to believe. They had forgotten the whole idea of a resurrection of Jesus, though their enemies believed it. Moreover, when the story was now told them, it was idle tales. And so there came more evidence that broke down all their unbelief, and left no doubt for them, and leaves no doubt for us. As the day went on, our Lord appeared to Simon Peter, not to condemn him, but as a condescension to poor fallen Simon, because he had fallen so low. The loving Lord would not allow him to go away in despair, he appeared to him. Then in the afternoon, he came to two men walking toward Emmaus, talking sorrowfully together. They had believed that this Jesus of Nazareth was the Redeemer of Israel and now that belief was all gone. Then they had heard tales that some women had seen visions of angels and said he was alive, and men had been there and the tomb was empty. They did not know what to think of it, but they talked it over very sadly and confusedly.

What a scene it was when suddenly there stepped in a quiet man and addressed them. He asked them what they were talking about, and they spoke with sad faces and then went on the colloquy with which you are familiar. What a scene it was when he began to open to them the predictions! He was not only conqueror and king, but sufferer and sacrifice, and the very words burned within them as they received new light about the Messiah and began to see that possibly he might be crucified. Perhaps then the story of the women that he was risen was not an idle tale. What a scene it was when breaking bread their eyes were opened and they knew him, but for one brief moment, and he vanished from their sight. Then as they came back to Jerusalem, they said the Lord had risen indeed and had appeared to Simon and they told their story. As they talked about it with the doors shut for fear of the Jews, suddenly he stood in their room and in his old loving way he said, "Peace be unto you." But they had that same Jewish superstition. They could not believe it was reality. They thought he was dead and this was his ghost, and felt the thrill that men feel at the very idea of seeing something supernatural. And he said "Why are ye troubled? See, it is not a spirit! Look at the wounds in the hands and in the side? Give me food. They gave him food, and he ate it before them." Their incredulity broke down. It had to break down, then and there. They had been told that the Messiah was to be despised and rejected and to die and to rise again. There was nothing hard to believe about it if they understood the Scriptures, but the fact came first and they were obliged to believe the fact. Then their hearts were opened to see that the fact had been predicted long before by the prophets.

We have reached the Lord's day evening. You remember how a week later he overcame the incredibility of Thomas, how he appeared in Galilee and then back in Jerusalem and at length in the presence of the disciples ascended into heaven. Without following those appearances I wish to make certain observations respecting the resurrection of the Son of Man, even the resurrection of Jesus Christ as an unquestionable reality. My friends, if I do not know that Jesus Christ rose from the dead then this world has no history. I do not know anything in the past if I do not know that. If a man will look carefully and thoughtfully over all these evidences, will note the slowness of belief of these men, their intelligence, will see that they were not prejudiced enthusiasts, will see how when they had fairly been convinced of this they gave their lives for it, if a man will put all circumstances together including the traditions and discrepancies of the experience, I am satisfied that he will see, if he is willing to see, that the fact shines out clearly. I will not say a man is obliged to believe it. If a man is determined to doubt he can always find some loophole for doubt, but a man who is desirous of believing will see that it is reality: that there is no excuse for question. The second observation is that the resurrection of the Lord Jesus establishes the truth of Christianity. The apostle Paul says he is declared to be the Son of God by the resurrection from the dead. Now Lazarus was raised from the dead and that did not prove such a thing concerning him; but Jesus of Nazareth had claimed to be the Son of God, had claimed it before the Sanhedrin when he had been denounced as a blasphemer, and after all his high claims and predictions if he had not been all that he claimed there never would have been such a high destiny accomplished for him. It was the sign manual of the Deity, it was the seal of the Sovereign of the Universe affixed to his claim, it declared him to be all that he had ever professed to be, and so it establishes the truth of all his teachings and the truth of the whole Christian society. The great fact that Jesus Christ rose from the dead is the central fact of the evidence of Christianity. The third observation is that the resurrection of Christ consummated his work of redemption. This is a view which I think does not appear to come often within the sight of Christian teachers at the present time, and yet was much

in the minds of the first disciples. The resurrection with them was not merely a great fact that established the truth of Christianity but also consummated the work of redemption. Paul says, "Who was delivered for our offenses and was raised again for our justification." He says to the Corinthians, "And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again." He says not merely "died for them" but that he "rose again." He laid down his life, and took it again for us. He rose triumphant over death and over sin and over Satan in our behalf. And thus you see how it is that in the Epistle to the Romans he makes this statement: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." That is the consummation of the Christian redemption, believe that God raised him from the dead and confess him with the mouth, and you shall be saved. The fourth observation is that the resurrection of Christ is the pledge of the resurrection of his people. "Now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept." The sheaf of barley that they weighed as the first fruits of the harvest was regarded as a pledge that the rest of the harvest would come in its time and Christ's resurrection is the first fruits, the pledge of our resurrection. And so the apostle wrote to the Thessalonians, "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope." A great poem before that time had expressed it, "When a man has once died there is no resurrection," but Paul says, "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." The resurrection of Christ is the pledge, I say, of the resurrection of his people.

Yet a fifth observation. The resurrection of Christ is celebrated by us on the Lord's day. I have no time to go into the argument which is here involved, but we believe from slight intimations in the Acts of the Apostles and in Revelation which show conclusively that the Christians of that time held religious meetings on the first day of the week, and from the light which is shed back upon it, and from known facts we learn that the apostles had authorized that the Sabbath should be transferred to the first day of the week; not that there were any minute directions, such as Moses had given to the Jews, that they should pick up sticks and make fires on the Sabbath day; not that there were any directions as to ceremonial but they were reminded the old primeval Sabbath which God had declared should be kept holy to him. Those directions stand without any specific qualifications as to how we shall do them and stand with new significance in that they represent the resurrection of Christ, a day concerning which we have no specific details as to how we are to observe it, but the general thought that it is the old day of God which is to be set apart from all other days and sanctified to him and also the day that represents the resurrection of Christ.

Finally, the resurrection of the Lord Jesus is a pledge to his people to live a risen life. You remember what the apostle says to the Romans: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus were baptized into his death; therefore we were buried with him by baptism into death, and, like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father even so we also should walk in the newness of life." Oh, ye Christian people, when you first set out in Christ's service, you did by a solemn ceremony declare that by faith in Jesus Christ you had died to sin and risen to a new life and were going to live always afterward a new life. Has it been so with you? Does your heart smite you with the painful thought that it has been but very partially so? O friends and brethren, then God has given you a time to set out afresh.

S. The Saviour

THE SAVIOUR 1. Who is the Saviour of men? Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is the Saviour of men.

2. Was Jesus himself really a man? Yes, Jesus Christ was really a man; he was the son of Mary.

3. Was Jesus the son of Joseph? No, people called Jesus the son of Joseph, but he was really the Son of God. Luke 1:35.

4. Can you give any express statement that Jesus was God? "The Word was God. . . . And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth." John 1:1; John 1:14.

5. What then is Jesus Christ? Jesus Christ is both God and man, the God-man.

6. How does this fit Jesus to be the Saviour of men? Jesus the God-man can stand between men and God as Mediator.

7. Can you tell the meaning of the two names, Jesus Christ? Jesus means Saviour, and Christ means Anointed, like the Hebrew word Messiah. Matthew 1:21; John 4:25.

8. What did Christ do on earth for us? Christ taught the highest truths, he lived as a perfect example, and he died and rose again to redeem us.

9. What is Christ doing now for us? Christ dwells in his people, intercedes for them, and controls all things for their good. John 14:23; Hebrews 7:25; Matthew 28:18.

10. What will Christ do hereafter for us? Christ will come a second time and receive us unto himself, to be with him for ever. John 14:3; Hebrews 9:28.

11. What must we do to be saved through Jesus Christ? We must believe in Christ, must turn from our sins to love and obey him, and must try to be like him.

S. The Saviour Praying for Us

The Saviour Praying for Us

John A. Broadus I pray for them. John 17:9

We are told in the text of something that Jesus does for us. Do I say rightly that he does for us? He said, "I pray for them," and he was speaking immediately of the little company of men who were right around him, the disciples. On the evening before the crucifixion, at the close of the farewell address, he said, "I pray for them," but you remember how a little later he said, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one." Through them and their word the circle would widen itself and continue to widen until it should embrace all that should ever become believers on him.

I invite you, dear Christian friends, to take this prayer in John 17:1-26, as giving you an idea of What sort of things the Lord Jesus Christ is asking for now in your behalf. Oh, that it may come home to us as downright reality that the Saviour who ever liveth, prays for you and me, knowing us better than we know our-selves, and that such things as these are the things for which he prays.

First then, notice this petition: "I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil." What a common mistake it is among men to think that the only object Jesus Christ has with reference to the human race is to gather a few of them out of this world's destruction and carry them to the better world. But he said, "I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil." He was going out of the world, and his heart longed after those who had been with him. They wondered why they could not go with him, and one even said, in self-confident fervor, "I am ready to go with thee to death." But he said, "I do not pray that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil." Many good people think hard of themselves because they do not want to die. I have heard such persons say, "Ah me! I am so unwilling to die, I think anyone that loves God ought to be willing to die." Well, that is against nature. It is impossible; it is wrong. The Lord Jesus Christ proposes not merely to rescue some souls from this world's ruin, but to rescue them in this world and make them live in this world as they were meant to live, by the help of his grace. This world belongs to him, and what he proposes is to take some of those-all that will come to him-that are thus oppressed by sin, and to help them here to live a life such as they should live. The idea that a person who is in health and young, with opportunities of usefulness, should want to die, is absurd. Yet many people misunderstand the matter, and think hard of themselves that they love to live and shrink from the idea of dying. When people should live a long time in the nature of things, and find nothing to live for, some-thing is wrong about them. They may be maddened by dissatisfaction with life, or by intolerable distresses in life:

Mad from Life's history Glad to Death's mystery Swift to be hurled;

Anywhere, anywhere, Out of the world.

I read that Elijah lay under a juniper tree in the desert and requested for himself that he might die; yet really I suppose there had been no time for many years when he was not better fit to die than at that moment. In answer to his prayer, an angel came with food that he might eat and lie down and sleep again, and getting up might go work in God's service. Often when people are whining that they do not want to live, what they really need is food and sleep and exercise that they may be ready to serve God.

Now is that your desire? You feel many anxieties about life, you talk about the perils of life; is it your great struggle to escape evil, to live without sin? I do not know how it is with you, but I know how it is with Him. He ever liveth to intercede for you; and He prays that you may be kept from evil.

Then the second prayer: "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth." You observe he does not merely pray that they may be kept from evil, but that they may be made holy. Here is a common error among men about the service of Jesus Christ, the idea that it is merely a negative thing, that he proposes merely to keep them from doing evil, to keep them from doing harm. Some people think all there is in religion is to try to avoid doing harm, when Jesus goes on praying that they may be made holy. Piety is not a mere negative thing. The ten commandments, I know, are all in negative form, "thou shalt not." Even so, Christianity reveals that this is but one side, and that the other side, the nobler and more glorious side of piety, is that we must not merely try to keep from doing wrong, but try to do right. Jesus prays not simply that they may be kept from evil but that they may be made holy. My Christian hearers, I should be reluctant to ask any of you whether you think that you are holy, because those whom God would regard as holiest would be most pained to have such a question asked them. So I ask you the question, "Do you want to be holy?" and that question you should face. O men and women, you should desire to be holy! Anyhow, Jesus wishes that for you, and he prays, "Make them holy-make them holy through thy truth: thy word is truth."

It is truth that makes men holy. Earth's unholiness began with a lie that man believed and so went headlong to ruin. Truth is the lifeblood of piety. Truth is the medicine for the soul's disease. Nobody is ever made holy except through truth. Blessed be God, it often works its healing work though sadly mingled with error. The truth though it be adulterated with error, may yet through God's blessing work its healing, saving, sanctifying work. But it is only the truth that does the work. "Make them holy through thy truth." Pilate asked the question, "What is truth?" He asked the question the next morning, and here was the answer the night before, "Thy word is truth." We know that word, and we may use it as the great means of becoming holy.

Here, my brethren, I wish to offer you a practical counsel. I offer it as the result of a good deal of observation among Christian people, and of my own efforts amid a thousand infirmities and shortcomings, to lead a better life. My counsel is this, regard the Bible more than you have been accustomed to do, as that which we are to use as the means of becoming holy. Regard the Bible as the great means of making you better, of making you good. Use the Bible for that purpose. I know how it is, and you will pardon me for telling you. Many times you do not love to read your Bible. The truth is, you take up your newspaper a second time and go on looking for something else in it when the Bible is lying neglected by your side. Then when you do take the Bible, you feel that it is rather dull reading. Now my counsel is, learn to regard the Bible more as the means of making you better, of making you holy. When you read it in private or hear it read in public,

educate yourselves to regard it as the great means of making you better, of strengthening you, of correcting your faults, of helping you to know your duty and helping you to do your duty. Fill your heart and mind full of the teachings of God's Word, hoping it will make you better, and this course will interest you in the Bible. You will take more interest in hearing the preacher read it from the pulpit and explain and impress upon you its teachings, if you listen with the idea, "How I hope this will help me!" So in private read the Bible with the thought, "How I pray that this may do me good." Please remember this suggestion and act upon it!

Now let us consider the third petition: "That they all may be one"- That they all may be one." Ah; I see Jesus Christ standing in that night hour with his little company of eleven. I see him sending his thoughts down the coming years to dwell upon those who through these should believe on him, and his heart went out toward them, praying "that they all may be one." I see Jesus Christ bending now from the mediator's throne with endless solicitude for every human heart that looks lovingly up to him, and knowing them all in all, the sheep of his flock on earth, and praying still "that they all may be one."

Now, my brethren, you expect me to turn round and say to you, it is not so; you expect me to contrast with this prayer the sad divisions of the Christian world. But I shall do no such thing. It is so; the prayer is answered. You say, "Very imperfectly answered"? Certainly; and so is that other prayer, "Sanctify them, make them holy," that is very imperfectly answered, and yet you would not deny that it is answered. You may deem it strange that Jesus prayed that his people might be holy, and they are so unholy, yet you do not say his prayer is not answered. In like manner or to this other prayer, Christ's true people are one, I rejoice in it and thank God. When my heart is sad at the outward divisions of the Christian world and sadder in contemplating the bitterness that so often attends these divisions, then I turn for consolation to the thought that all that truly trust in Jesus Christ, that all who love Jesus Christ in sincerity, are one. They are more one than they know, and in proportion as they are united to the Redeemer, they are united with each other. I have seen differences in families, and yet I knew they were one notwithstanding this temporary unkindness and alienation. So among Christ's children, all that are truly his, are one.

Moreover, this prayer is to be more fully answered only in the same way that the previous prayer was to be fulfilled. "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth," Yes, and "that they all may be one, ' through thy truth. The more gospel truth we know, and believe, and love, and live by, the more we shall be one. My friends, it seems to me that here is one of the great problems of the day in Which you and I are called to live, to know how to cling to gospel truth in a spirit of broad kindness toward those who differ from us as to what is gospel truth. Many people are so possessed with the idea that every-thing must be given up to the outward union of Christians that they shrink from maintaining their views as to what is gospel truth, from the notion that this would interfere with Christian union. Some have so liberalized the Christian faith that they say, "Do not blame a man for his belief; it does not make much difference what a man believes." That is, there is no assured truth; one thing is as true as another. On the other hand, there are people who set their heads upon certain views of truth-I did not say their hearts-until there is not any-thing in the whole horizon of their view but those particular tenets which distinguish them from their fellow Christians. Now it is a fact that men are made better only by truth, and that Christians will be made more thoroughly one only through truth, and it is folly to sacrifice truth for the sake of union-outward union. The practical problem we have to solve is, how to maintain supreme and

sovereign devotion to God's truth, and yet deal in all loving-kindness, and generous affection, and hearty co-operation, with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. You say it is hard to do both of these things! Of course, it is hard to do anything well, always hard to do right and to do good, with this poor human nature of ours.

I mention one more petition. Recall those we have had. "I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil. Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth. That they all may be one." And now finally, "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me." They had beheld his humiliation, those who accompanied him, and he longed that they might be with him to behold his glory. He offers the same prayer for all that should believe on him through their word.

There are two reasons why Jesus Christ made this petition. He asked it partly for his own sake. Did you never imagine that he was sad at leaving his disciples? You know that they were sad, but was not he? Did you never suppose that he longs to have those who love him more immediately with him? He said to his disciples, Let not your heart be troubled: believe in God and believe in me, and it will all be well. I go to prepare a place for you, and if I go I will come again, and receive you unto myself. As a father taking leave of his family in going to a foreign country might say, "Now it is very sad that we are to be parted, but I am going to get a home for you, and when I get a home I will come back to you and take you there with me." He says it not only to comfort them, but more than they know perhaps, he says it to comfort his own heart also. And so Jesus said, "That they may be with me where I am." He wants to have his people with him. But the other reason is more obvious to us; he made the prayer for their sake. He makes the prayer for our sake, "I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory." To be with him is to be delivered from all the infirmities, and imperfections, and conflicts of this earthly life. I do not suppose we could bear all this if it were not for the fact that it is to end-and to end in victory. I suppose we should give over the struggling effort to do right and to do good in this world were it not for the assurance that we shall at last be conquerors and more than conquerors through him that loved us. To be with him will be to be with all who have loved us and who have gone before us to him. To be with him is to be free from all sin, and safe. Safe! O my soul, safe from all temptation to sin. To be with him is to behold his glory. So the Saviour prays for us, and how grateful we are. Let us strive to fulfill his petitions that one day we may be with him.

S. The Sin of Unbelief

The Sin of Unbelief

John A. Broadus

... He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. John 3:18

Men are too apt to think of sin as residing only in outward actions, and not as well in desires and dispositions-or only of positive transgression, and not of negative sin also. The idea of sin in general is vague and unimpressive. Any particular sin will hardly be applicable to all, and some who are not wholly innocent will excuse themselves by thinking of others much more guilty. But the text presents a sin of which all who hear it are guilty, all without exception, all alike-the sin of unbelief.

I. Unbelief a great sin, because the source or the occasion of all other sins.

1. It is seen in the fall. "Ye shall not surely die"-and the woman began to doubt whether God would fulfill his threatenings-the tree was pleasant looking, the fruit inviting-the prospect of being as God awakened sinful pride-she ate. In unbelief it commenced. This led to disobedience.

2. The Israelites "could not enter in because of unbelief"-they had no sufficient confidence in the divine protection. So when unbelieving messengers made fearful report, the people refused to enter, and were condemned to wander, that generation to perish in the wilderness.

They did not believe the clear promise of God's blessing, so amply attested, but did believe the exaggerated report of difficulties. Men are ready to believe what falls in with their feelings or their carnal fears, while they are slow to believe what God hath spoken. Unbelief of the truth always connected with the belief of a lie-that earth is better than heaven, sin lovelier than holiness, time more important than eternity. These and a thousand such lies men are believing, and acting accordingly, while the pure light of divine truth shines all unheeded upon them.

3. Unbelief the occasion of other sins-perverted passions and depraved desires may be the inciting cause, yet but for unbelief these would not suffice. With a true faith we should appreciate the evil of all sins, and be impressed with the beauty of holiness-and faith working by love would purify, etc. Unbelief is to the life as a bitter fountain to the stream. An evil heart of unbelief is like a great marsh sending up noxious vapors. Men often see and deplore the evil effects, and try to correct, but in vain.

II. Unbelief a grievous sin in itself.

We are in God's world-we are bound to receive his teachings as truth, to rest upon his promises, and obey his precepts. But it is unbelief with respect to the Son of God, which is denounced in the text and elsewhere as a flagrant sin. In the text, dignity of Christ's character seems presented as magnifying guilt of unbelief-"the only begotten Son of God." Consider Jesus as the mediator, the

offered object of faith, in condescension to our infirmity-consider too his love, sympathy, invitations-and then estimate the sin of rejecting Christ. This removes all possibility of question as to one's being a sinner-"but now they have no cloak for their sin." Men often seek to cover up their sin beneath the cloak of various pretences and shadowy, vain excuses. But no question about this sin, whether they realize its guilt or not. This of itself is sufficient to condemn! Would you know your standing before God? There is no need to argue concerning your various excellencies and faults, comparing with others, extenuating and excusing-the text settles the question. Suppose the catalogue of your sins were read to decide your character before God. Whenever this sin is reached, "he hath not believed," etc., then and there the examination will cease, the question is decided. Already, without examining further, the man is condemned. This is true, dear friends who are unconverted, of you all. As Peter on the day of Pentecost spoke to the people, so would I to you. He did not stop to accuse them of particular sins, nor to consider how much merit there might be in particular excellencies, he did not speak of all that terrible wickedness which then so much abounded, nor of Pharisaic pride nor of Sadducean skepticism-he dwelt upon their rejection of Jesus, the Son of God, both Lord and Christ. It was the consciousness of this crowning sin that pricked them to the heart, and made them cry, etc. And so now. I do not stop to speak of vices, nor even of general alienation of heart-I solemnly say, what God's Word declares, you are condemned as unbelievers in Christ. We may recognize your personal worth in many respects, but you have been rejecting Christ. Often his salvation has been offered, and you have refused to accept it. Do not say you are not an avowed infidel-without that, one may be guilty of unbelief-without that, the Scriptures declare you are guilty. But some one may say, how can unbelief be a sin (though this Scripture declares it), when I cannot help it? I am unable to believe. The Saviour said, "No man can come unto me," etc. Ah, my friend, do not deceive yourself by that specious excuse. The Scripture also said, "Ye will not come," etc.-are not willing. If a man is unable to believe, it is only because he is unwilling. Inability is not like that to fly to the stars, nor to know the future-not to lack capacity, but unwillingness. And does this diminish guilt? The more opposed a man is to doing his duty, the more he is blameworthy. If a servant neglects a plain duty, does his lack of inclination exculpate him? The more averse is one's heart to Christ, the more unwilling he is to believe, so much the greater must be the guiltiness of unbelief. No, no, you are verily guilty. But why this argument and appeal? Why, might someone say, does a man who wishes others to be happy, labor to convince them that they are very sinful, condemned to destruction? Why should it be said of the Comforter, that he would convince the world of sin? Is there any comfort in such a conviction? Is it not more pleasant, is it not wiser, to forget sin and judgment, than to be reminded of it? No, for this conviction may lead to Him who forgives sin. The man who feels it true of himself that he is condemned already, may know that other gracious truth that "there is no condemnation," etc. "He that believeth on Jesus is not condemned." That very sin of unbelief, which seals your condemnation, may suggest the way of pardon. Cease to reject Jesus, receive him as your Saviour. Acknowledging guilt, pray for mercy, through him. Jesus is able to save you! Will you ask him to save you, and continue to ask? Oh, that you would!

S. The Two Roads of Life

The Two Roads of Life

John A. Broadus

Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it. Matthew 7:13; Matthew 7:14 This is an appalling generalization when we find that all the countless diversities of human character, conduct, destiny, can be reduced to two classes. Men are diverse-as leaves of the cut-paper mulberry, no two precisely alike. Moreover, they pride themselves so on certain of their diversities and distinctions. Yet they all belong to one or other of two classes. There are but two ways, and two ends they reach. Our Saviour has contrasted these ways in several most important and interesting particulars.

I. Two ways: wide-strait, broad-narrow.

1. The one gate is wide-the entrance upon a wicked life is easy, almost spontaneous-all men begin it in early life. Terrible indeed is the depravity of man, when prone "as the sparks to fly upward," so man easily follows a particular evil course. But the other is difficult of entrance. For man as he is, and unaided, it is not easy to be converted-he may change some points of outward conduct, may modify disposition, etc-but to effect a radical change is for him impossible. Man forgets the need of divine influence. It is hard to give up self-reliance, as well as to renounce the world.

2. The one way is broad, spacious. As was said before, it is but to yield to natural inclinations. It requires little effort, and no constraint. This broad way "admits of many subdivisions"-may be profligate, or outwardly moral-coarse or refined-a reviler of religion, or a hypocritical pretender to religion. Among a thousand courses, one may take his choice, and yet be still in the broad way. But the other way is narrow. The Christian life on earth is surpassingly difficult-viewed with carnal eye seems surprisingly disagreeable.

(a) Sometimes the Christian faces opposition, both open or secret-the days of persecution not wholly past.

(b) Many temptations come from wicked acquaintance-for there are human tempters, sometimes through little more than thoughtless folly.

(c) However, worse than either, is one's own inclinations. It costs painful and sustained effort to deny ourselves all sinful gratification, and steadfastly resist the world's allurements. One thoroughly in earnest, striving to climb the heights of holiness, must know that it is difficult.

(d) In addition, one of the chief sources of difficulty and distress in the Christian course, is our own disposition to despondency-we grow fainthearted. Sometimes such despondency is the natural reaction from excessive confidence, or rather from self-confidence. The remedy is prayer-the

afflicted pray and sing cheerful psalms.

I would mention many other courses of difficulty, they are legion-and our only help is in the name of the Lord. "Be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might."

II. Those who travel their ways.

1. One group-and a majority, takes the broad way. Many are taking the wrong road. It is not self-righteous pride to say this, for Jesus said it.

2. A second group-and a small group, only a few, takes the right way. It seems impossible that only a few will see. But this is the clear teaching of the text.

III. The end of the two ways.

1. The one, though broad and crowded, leadeth to destruction. Not the destruction of existence, but of happy existence-not of being, but of well-being. Scriptures speak of death in the strongest terms, to describe the ruin and wretchedness of the world of woe. Jesus himself, so gentle and sympathizing, has often spoken strongly of hell: certainly something as bad as "fire."

2. But the narrow way, though found by few, and difficult, leads to life, [the kind of life given by Jesus]. This will make amends for sacrifice and suffering And is not the end of any earthly course most important? We are immortal beings. Do you believe indeed that you are to live forever? And shall not this outweigh [all else]?

Hear then the Saviour's injunction-"Enter ye in at the strait gate." Be not deterred by its difficulties-it may seem at first almost impossible, certainly disagreeable. We know this is so-count the cost-but is it not better to bear this than hell? To forsake fleeting and imperfect pleasure and ease, rather than turn from the way to heaven? And he who does this will soon find pleasure in so doing-as one who by an effort leaves the beaten, crowded way along a mountain's base, and climbs a narrow path well-nigh alone. Pleasure is not only in the prospect, but fresh air and the very effort of climbing the rugged path make one vigorous and buoyant. So, with changed desires and tastes, the narrow way may become a delight.

Enter in quickly-no need, no reason, for delay. You may become a Christian speedily-why not today resolve, in the fear of God, to "deny yourself" and to receive Christ.

S. The Word Of God

THE WORD OF GOD Part I. The Books of the Bible

1. How many separate books are there in the Bible? There are thirty-nine books in the Old Testament, and twenty-seven in the New Testament.
2. What are the five books of Moses? The five books of Moses are Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy.
3. What are the other historical books in the Old Testament? The twelve other historical books in the Old Testament are Joshua, Judges, Ruth, I and II Samuel, I and II Kings, I and II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther.
4. What are the five poetical books? The five poetical books are Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon.
5. Which are the four greater prophets? The four greater prophets are Isaiah, Jeremiah (with Lamentations), Ezekiel, Daniel.
6. Which are the twelve lesser prophets? The twelve lesser prophets are Hosea, Joel, Amos; Obadiah, Jonah, Micah; Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah; Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi.
7. What are the five historical books of the New Testament? The five historical books of the New Testament are Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts.
8. What are the fourteen epistles of Paul? The fourteen epistles of Paul are Romans, I and II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, I and II Thessalonians, I and II Timothy, Titus; Philemon, Hebrews.
9. What are the seven other epistles? The seven general epistles are James, I and II Peter, I, II, and III John, Jude.
10. What is the last book in the Bible? The last book in the Bible is Revelation.

Part II. Inspiration and Authority of the Bible

11. Were the books of the Bible written by men? The books of the Bible were written by men, but these men were moved and guided by the Holy Spirit. 2 Peter 1:21; 1 Corinthians 14:37.
12. What special proof have we that the entire Old Testament is inspired? Christ and his apostles speak of "Scripture," or "the Scriptures," as inspired by God, and we know that they meant exactly what we call the Old Testament. John 10:35; 2 Timothy 3:16.
13. Does the Bible contain any errors? The Bible records some things said by uninspired men that were not true; but it is true and instructive that these men said them.

14. What authority has the Bible for us? The Bible is our only and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice.

15. What things does the Bible teach us? The Bible teaches all that we need to know about our relations to God, about sin and salvation.

16. How ought we to study the Bible history? We ought to study the Bible as a history of providence and a history of redemption.

17. Who is the central figure of the Bible history? The central figure of the Bible history is Jesus Christ, the Hope of Israel, the Saviour of mankind.

18. What does the Bible do for those who believe in Jesus Christ? The Bible makes those who believe in Jesus wise unto salvation. 2 Timothy 3:15.

19. What does the Bible contain besides history? The Bible contains doctrines, devotional portions, precepts, and promises; it teaches us how to live and how to die.

20. With that disposition ought we to study the Bible? We ought to study the Bible with a hearty willingness to believe what it says and to do what it requires. John 7:17.

21. What great help must we all seek in studying the Bible? We must pray that the Holy Spirit who inspired the Bible will help us to understand it. Psalms 119:18; Luke 24:45.

S. Worship

Worship God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. John 4:24.

JESUS was tired. The little that we know of the history just before, yet enables us to see cause why He should have been tired.

He had been, for long months, engaged in active efforts to save men's souls to lift men out of their sluggishness and worldliness toward God. That is hard work for mind and heart. And he had been at work among many who were hostile. The disciples of John were some of them envious that their master was decreasing and another was increasing, though John said it was right and good; and when the Pharisees heard that Jesus was now making and baptizing more disciples than John, they were jealous. They made it needful that he should withdraw from Judea, as so often during his brief ministry he had to withdraw from the jealousy of his enemies or the fanaticism of his friends, and seek a new field. Worn out and perhaps sad at heart, the Redeemer sat alone by Jacob's well. At the dedication of the Second Baptist Church in St. Louis, 1879. Our artists owe us yet two companion pictures, the one of Jesus, as the disciples saw him when they turned back to look, on their way to buy food, as he sat and rested, leaning with limbs relaxed, with face weary, yet gentle; and the other of Jesus as they found him when they came back, sitting up now with an animated look on his face, busily, eagerly talking.

Ah! there was an opening to do good, and he who "went about doing good" would give up even his needed rest, and often did, we know, to do good to the least and the lowest. The disciples wondered not that he was ready to do good; they had seen that often already. They wondered that he was talking with a woman, for that was contrary to the dignity of a man according to the ideas of that time and country, to be seen talking with a woman in public. They wondered; they knew not yet what manner of spirit they were of, that they had to deal with high saving truths that break through all weak conventionalities.

They would have wondered more if they had known what he knew full well, that it was a woman of bad character; and yet he saw in her potencies for good, and he did win her that day to faith in the Messiah who had come, and sent her forth to tell others to come and see "a man who had told her all things whatsoever she did." But she shrank in the process. Beautiful and wonderful it is to see how admirably our Lord led the casual conversation with a stranger so as to introduce the profoundest spiritual truths. My Christian friends, let me not fail to point your attention to this. I know no art of social life more needful to be cultivated in our time and country than the art of skilfully introducing religion into general conversation. It is a difficult task. It requires tact and skill to do this in such a way as to accomplish much good and no harm; but it is worth all your efforts. Old and young, men and women, yea shall I say it? especially young ladies, who are Christians, with that control which young ladies have in our American society, need to cultivate few things so much as just that power which the Saviour here showed. Oh! beautiful, blessed example of Jesus! How it shines more and more as we study and strive to imitate it! And not only did he lead on

toward religious truth, but he knew how, in a quiet, skilful way, to awaken her consciousness to a realization of her sinfulness, so that she might come near to spiritual truth. She shrank from it, I said, as people will often shrink from us when we try to bring truth home to their souls. She shrank, and while not wishing to turn the conversation entirely away from religious things, she would turn it away to something not so uncomfortably close, and so she asked him about a great question much discussed.

“ Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet. Our fathers did worship in this mountain,” and right up the steep slopes of Mount Gerizim she would point to the mount high above them, where were the ruins of the old temple of the Samaritans, destroyed a century and a half before. “ Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship. O prophet, which is it?” Again the Redeemer, while he answers her question, will turn it away from all matters of form and outward service, and strike deep by a blow into the spiritual heart of things.

“ Woman, believe me, the hour is coming, when neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father.” He will not fail to imply in passing that Jerusalem had been the right place. “ Ye worship that which ye know not. We worship that which we know, for salvation is from the Jews “ he only mentions that in passing “ but the hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth, for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers.”

Only spiritual worship will be acceptable to God; this is what he seeks, and, more than that, this is what the very nature of the case requires. “ For God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.”

I wish to speak of the worship of God, and I shall ask two very simple questions about it, and try to some little extent to answer each of them.

Why should we worship God? How should we worship God?.

I. A man might well draw back and fear to say one word as to reasons why we should worship God. Oh! how high, and wide, and deep, that theme! And yet it may be useful just to remind you of some things included in these expressions. Why ought we to worship God? Because it is due to him; and because it is good for us.

(1.) That we should render to God worship is due to him. My dear friends, if we were but unconcerned spectators of the glorious God and his wonderful works, it ought to draw out our hearts to admiration and adoration and loving worship. The German philosopher, Kant, probably the greatest philosopher of modern times, said: “ There are two things that always awaken in me, when I contemplate them, the sentiment of the sublime. They are the starry heavens and the moral nature of man.” Oh! God made them both, and all there is of the sublime in either or in both is but a dim, poor reflection of the glory of Him who made them.

Whatever there is in this world that is suited to lift up men’s souls at all ought to lift them towards God.

Robert Hall said that the idea of God subordinates to itself all that is great, borrows splendor from all that is fair, and sits enthroned on the riches of the universe.

More than that is true. I repeat, all that exalts our souls ought to lift them up toward God. Especially ought we to adore the holiness of God.

O sinful human beings, still you know that holiness is the crown of existence. There is not a human heart that does not somehow, sometimes love goodness. Find me the most wicked man in all your great city, and there are times when that man admires goodness.

Yea, I imagine there are times when he hopes that somehow or other he may yet be good himself. When a man we love has died, we are prone to exaggerate in our funeral discourse, in our inscriptions on tomb-stones and the like to exaggerate what? We seldom exaggerate much in speaking of a man's talents, or learning, or possessions, or influence, but we are always ready to exaggerate his goodness. We want to make the best of the man in that solemn hour. We feel that goodness is the great thing, for a human being when he has gone out of our view into the world unseen. And what is it that the Scriptures teach us is one of the great themes of the high worship of God, where worship is perfect? Long ago a prophet saw the Lord seated high on a throne in the temple, with flowing robes of majesty, and on either side adoring seraphs did bend and worship, and oh! what was it that was the theme of their worship? Was it God's power? Was it God's wisdom? You know what they said "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts. The whole earth is full of His glory." And there do come times, O my friends, to you and me, though we lift not holy hands, for we are sinful, though we dwell among a people of unclean lips, there come times to you and me when we want to adore the holiness of God. And then think of his love and mercy! If you were only unconcerned spectators I said think of his love and mercy!

He hates sin. We know not how to hate sin as the holy God must hate it. And yet how he loves the sinner! How he yearns over the sinful! How he longs to save him! Oh, heaven and earth, God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever will have it so, might through him be saved.

I know where that great provision, that mighty mercy is adored. I know from God's word that those high and glorious ones, who know far more than we do of the glorious attributes of the Creator and the wide wonders of his works, when they have sung their highest song of praise for God's character and for creation, will then strike a higher note as they sing the praises of redemption, for holiness and redemption are the great themes which the Scriptures make known to us of the worship in heaven. John saw in his vision how the four living creatures, representing the powers of nature, and the four and twenty elders, representing the saved of God, bowed in worship, and how a wide and encircling host of angels caught the sound, and how it spread wider still, till in all the universe it rolls, "Salvation and honor and glory and power be unto him that sitteth on the throne and unto the Lamb forever and ever."

Holiness and redemption! We ought to adore if we had nothing to do with it, for we have a moral nature to appreciate it. And oh! are we unconcerned spectators? That most wonderful manifestation of God's mercy and love has been made towards us. And, if the angels find their highest theme of praise in what the gracious God has done for us, how ought we to feel about it? Yea, there is a sense in which, amid the infirmities of earth, we can pay God a worship that the angels cannot themselves offer.

“ Earth has a joy unknown in heaven; The new-born bliss of sins forgiven.” And sinful beings here may strike, out of grateful hearts for sins forgiven, a note of praise to God that shall pierce through all the high anthems of the skies and enter into the ear of the Lord God of Hosts.

(2.) But I said we ought to worship God, not only because it is due to Him, but because it is good for us.

Only the worship of God can satisfy, O my friends, the highest and noblest aspirations of our natures. When anything lifts us up, then we want God as the climax of our exalted thought, and our thought itself is imperfect without it. If you will look, as I looked this morning, in the early light, upon the glory of the autumn woods, faded now, yet still bright, and so beautiful; if you gaze upon the splendor, as you will do when this service is ended, of the nightly skies; if you stand in awe before the great mountains, snow-clad and towering, before Hermon, before the wonderful mountains of our own wonderful West; if you go and gaze in the silence of night upon the rush of your own imperial river, or stand by the sea-shore, and hear the mighty waters rolling evermore, there swells in the breast something that wants God for its crown and for its completeness. There are aspirations in these strange natures of ours that only God can satisfy. Our thinking is a mutilated fragment without God, and our hearts can never rest unless they rest in God. And worship, oh, how it can soothe! Yea, sometimes worship alone can soothe our sorrows and our anxieties.

There come times with all of us when everything else does fail us; there come times when we go to speak with sorrowing friends and feel that all other themes are weak and vain. You, wicked man yonder you have gone sometimes to visit a friend that was in great distress, who had lost a dear child, it may be, or husband or wife; and as you have sat down by your friend and wanted to say something comforting, you have felt that everything else was vain but to point the poor sorrowing heart to God; and you felt ashamed of yourself that you did not dare to do that. How often have devout hearts found comfort in sorrow, found support in anxiety, by the worship of God; by the thought of submission to God and trust in God; a belief that God knows what he is doing; that God sees the end from the beginning; that God makes “ all things work together for good to those that love him!” And I add that the worship of God nourishes the deepest root of morality individual and social. Morality cannot live upon mere ideas of expediency and utility. We have some philosophers in our day (and they show abilities and earnestness that command our respect, though they may seem to us to go so sadly and so far astray) who have persuaded themselves, alas! that Christianity must be flung aside; that belief in God even must be abandoned; but they are beginning to recognize the necessity for trying to tell the world what they are going to put in place of that, for the conservation of individual and social morality; and so the great English philosopher of the present time tells us in a recent work, and the gifted author of “ Theophrastus Such,” who is one of his followers, has told us, that natural sympathy will lead us to recognize that we owe duties to others as well as ourselves. Natural sympathy is going to do that. Ah, I trow not. Sometimes it will, if there be something mightier that can help. Often natural sympathy will fail. The root of morality is the sentiment of moral obligation. What does it mean when your little child first begins to say “ I ought to do this “ and I ought not to do that?” What does it mean? “ I ought.” The beasts around us are some of them very intelligent.

They seem to think in a crude fashion. They seem to reason in a rudimentary way. Our intellect is not peculiar to us. They have something of it, but they show no sign of having the rudiments of the notion that "I ought" and "I ought not." It is the glory of man.

It marks him in the image of the spiritual one that made him. And what is to nourish and keep alive and make strong that sentiment of moral obligation in our souls, unless it be the recognition of the fact that there is a God who gave us this high, moral, spiritual being; who made us for himself; to whom we belong, because he made us, and because he made us to love him until the sentiment of obligation to him shall nourish in us the feeling of obligation to our fellow-men, who, like us, are made in his image. But we are told that there is going to be a moral interregnum shortly; that so many cultivated men in England and in some parts of our country are rejecting all religion; that now there is danger that society will suffer until the new ideas can work themselves into popular favor. Yes, indeed, society would suffer but for one thing, and that is that still there are and still there will be not a few among the cultivated, and many, thank God! among those who are not blessed with cultivation, who hold fast their faith in the only true God and in Jesus Christ whom he has sent, and that will conserve society and hold up the very men who fancy they can do without Christianity. For this reason, if there were no other, it would be worth while to build great and noble churches in our great cities, as we build monuments for other things to remind men of grand events and heroic deeds; so that if churches were never entered, they would be worth building as memorials, as reminders of God and eternity.

Amid the homes of wealth and luxury, amid the splendid centres of commerce, and amid, alas! the palaces of vice, our churches stand serene and still, pointing up, like the Christian's hope, toward heaven. The thoughtless, the wayward, worldly and wicked will sometimes look as they pass, and as from the monuments over some heroic dead man, they catch a moment's impression for good, so from the church edifice itself they will catch a momentary impression of higher things, and be at least a little restrained from what is wrong and a little incited towards what is right. And that is but the least of it. The great nourisher of morality in the individual and the community is not the mere outward symbol; it is the worship that is paid within. But I shall say no more on this theme. All that I can say is weak, poor and vain. How can a man tell the reasons why we should worship God? They are as high as heaven, as wide as the world, as vast as the universe'; all existence and all conception everything is a reason why we should worship God; and I turn to the other question, to which the text especially points.

II. How should we worship God? I wish here to speak only of that line of thought which the text presents, How shall we worship God with spiritual worship? The spiritual worship the text points out to us is essentially independent of localities. Time was when it was not so: when the best worship that was to be expected in the world depended upon holy places and impressive rites. In the childhood of the race these ideas were necessary, but Christianity came as the maturity of revealed religion, and declared that those ideas should prevail no longer; /that true Christian spiritual worship is essentially independent of localities.), My friends, under the Christian system you cannot make holy places; you cannot make a holy house. We speak very naturally and properly enough, if with due limitation, in the language of the Old Testament, about our places of worship, but we ought to remember constantly the limitations. You cannot consecrate a building in the light of Christianity. You can dedicate the building; you can set it apart to be used only for the worship of God; but you cannot make the house a holy house; it is an idea foreign to the intense

spirituality which Jesus has taught us belongs to the Christian idea of worship. Why, then, one might say, why should we have houses of worship? not merely because if there is to be the worship of assemblies at all, with all the strange power that sympathy gives to aggregated worship, then there must be places of assembly; but because these soon become associated with the solemn worship we hold in them and sacred by their associations, and if we do not disturb those associations, if from the places where we are wont to hold solemn worship, we keep carefully away all that tends to violate those associations, they grow in power upon us; they do not make the place holy, but they make it easier by force of association and of beneficent habit for us to have holy thoughts and to pay holy worship in the place where we have often paid it before. So we can see why it is fit to set apart places of worship, houses of worship for God, though they be not in themselves holy, though spiritual worship is independent of locality.

Let us rise to a broader view of the matter. Spiritual worship must subordinate' all these externals. Can you listen a few minutes while I offer a plain, unadorned, unimpassioned statement about this really practical matter, surely suitable to our circumstances, worthy to be discussed; for there are many extremes about it among men, and though you may not go with my thought, it may help you to think the matter through for yourself. I say, then, on the one hand, spiritual worship must have its externals. For while we are spiritual, like God, we are something else also.

We have a material nature, and we are all closely linked and inter-dependent and acting upon each other continually. It is idle, then, to think that our worship will be all that it is capable of becoming if we try to keep it exclusively spiritual and give it no outward expression at all. When you try to pray in private by your own bed-side, alone with your beating heart and your God, you mistake if you try to pray without couching your thought and feeling in words. We need the force of expression, though we utter not the words. We need to have the words in order to give clearness and form to our thought and our sentiment; and it is good, even when alone, in low, solemn tones to speak aloud one's private prayer, for that seems somehow, by a law of our nature, to make deeper the feeling which we thus outwardly express; and if we do so even in private prayer, how much more is it necessarily true in public worship!

We must have expression then for our worship, that there may be sympathy expression that shall awaken and command sympathy. We must use the language of imagination and passion as in the Scriptures. The Scriptures are full of the language of imagination and passion language that is meant to stir the souls of men. And when we sing, sing in the simplest and plainest way, if you please we are yet striving to use that as one of the externals of spiritual worship. We need it. We must have externals. Why, then a man might ask, and men often have asked why not have anything and everything that will contribute at all to help the expression and cherish the devout feeling?

Why not have everything in architecture, everything in painting and statuary, everything in special garments, in solemn processions, in significant posture? Why not anything and everything that may at all help as an external expression of devout feeling? Let us consider this, I pray you. I said spiritual worship must have its externals, and now I repeat that it must subordinate those externals; whatever externals it cannot subordinate it must discard, and the externals it does employ it must employ needfully. There are some things that awaken in some men a sort of fictitious, quasi-devout feeling, which you never would think of recommending as aids to devotion.

Some persons when they use opium have a dreamy sort of devoutness, and some persons, even when they become drunk, show a morbid sort of religion. Yet who would think of saying that these are acts that help to devotion? But there are feelings that are right in themselves and noble in their place that do in some cases help to promote devotional feeling. The husband and wife, when they bow down with their children by their sides to pray together, and then, rising up, look lovingly into each other's eyes, find their devout feeling towards God heightened by their love for each other and their children. I can fancy that the young man and maiden who both fear God and have learned to love each other may sometimes feel their devout sentiments truly heightened by this new, strange and beautiful affection which they have learned to feel for each other. That is so sometimes, and yet everybody sees that to recommend that as an avowed and systematic thing to be used as a help to devotion would be out of the question. Not everything, then, that may promote devotion is to be regularly used for this purpose.

There are some things that look as if they were necessary, are very often recommended as helpful, and often employed as helps, that turn out to be dangerous and erroneous. Why can't we use pictures and statuary as helps to devotion? Why can't we employ them as proper means of making the thought of our Saviour near and dear to us? Well, in all the ages of the world, the heathen have tried this. An educated young Hindoo, some years ago, educated in England, wrote an essay in which he complained bitterly that the Hindoos were accused of worshipping images, and quoted Cowper's beautiful poem entitled, "My Mother's Picture:"

"O, that those lips had language!

Years have passed since thee I saw." And he says, the picture of the poet's mother brought close and made real the thought of one long dead. That is the way, he said, that we use images. But that is not the way that the great mass of men use images in worship. They have often meant that at the outset; but how soon it degenerated and was degraded, and these things that were meant as helps to worship dragged down the aspirations of human hearts, instead of lifting them up! But, it seems to me, if I were to employ such helps in our time, persuading myself that they would be good, that I should feel it was wise to go back to the old ten commandments that we teach our children to repeat, and cut out the second commandment, that expressly forbids the use of graven images, because it necessarily leads to idolatry. I should cut that out. You can inquire, if you are curious to do so and I say it in no unkindness you can inquire whether those Christians in our own time and country who employ pictures and statuary to-day as helps to devotion have mutilated the ten commandments. They were obliged to leave out that which their little children would say was forbidding what they do.

Aye, the world has tried that experiment widely and in every way, and it is found that though you might think that pictures and statuary would be helps to devotion, they turn out to be hurtful. They may help a few; they harm many. They may do a little good; they do much evil. But there are some of these things which we must have to some extent, church buildings, architecture, music, cultivated eloquence. How about these? We are obliged to have these. We must have the rude and coarse, if we have not the refined and elegant; and just what we may have in this respect why, it depends, of course, upon what we have been accustomed to in our homes, our places of public assembly, our halls of justice. That which is natural, needful and good for some would utterly distract the attention of others. Take a man from the most ignorant rural region, utterly unused to

such things, and place him in this house next Sunday morning, and his attention would be utterly distracted by the architectural beauties of the place and the strange power of the music, and he would be scarcely able to have any other thought. These things would be hurtful to him; but to those who have been used to them and who, in their own houses, have been accustomed to elegance and beauty, or in the homes of others they sometimes enter, or in the great places of public assembly in the cities where they live, these things need not be hurtful to them. They may be helpful to them. Ah, my friends, they need to be used by us all with caution and with earnest efforts to make them helpful to devotion, or they will drag down our attention to themselves. Often it is so. You go home with your children, talking only about the beauty of your house of worship or the beauty of the music, and how soon your children will come to think and feel that that is all there is to come to church for, and how many there are who do thus think and feel. '

It is easy to talk nonsense on the subject of church music. It is very difficult to talk wisely. But I think we sometimes forget in our time that there is a distinction between secular and sacred music. I have seen places where they did not seem to know there was such a distinction. They seem to have obliterated it by using so much purely secular music in sacred worship.

It is a distinction not easy to define, I know, but easy enough to comprehend on the part of one who is cultivated and has an ear for music and a heart for devotion. It is a distinction that ought always to be needfully regarded. Our beautiful church music I delight in. I have sat here this afternoon and evening, and it has done me good to listen to it; but we must learn to use it as a help to devotion, or else we are using it wrong, and it will do us harm. We must not only cultivate the use and enjoyment of artistic music for the sake of enjoyment, but what is far more than enjoyment, we must cultivate the power of making it a help to religious worship. We must learn to do that, or we must refuse to have it. There is danger here. My friends, you should rejoice in the high privileges of cultivated society and refined homes, beautiful places of worship, glorious sounds of music and a lofty style of eloquence; but there is danger for you. I have heard people say sometimes: "I don't believe in the religion of the negroes. I go to the place of worship of the negroes, and I find they work themselves into a mere animal excitement. They sway their bodies, and parade around the room, and shake hands, and shout, and embrace each other; and work up mere animal excitement; but there is no religion in that." Oh, you child of culture! Go to your beautiful place of worship, with its dim, religious light, its pealing organ, its highly cultivated gentleman, trained in elegant literature to speak in a beautiful style, as he ought to do, and you may have excited in you a mere Eesthetic sentiment which may have no more real worship in it than the poor negro's animal excitement. But, thank God! they sometimes really have a genuine religion about it, as genuine as yours.

There is danger there, but my friends there is always danger, and we must learn to discard that which we cannot subordinate to spiritual worship, learn to use heedfully, with constant effort for ourselves and for our families and for our friends to use that which it is right to use, that it may help and not hinder. I pray you, then, do not go to asking people to come just to see your beautiful house of worship or to listen to your noble music. Some will come for that reason alone, and you cannot help it. But do not encourage such a thought.

Talk about worship. Talk about these externals as helps to the solemn worship of God. Try to take that view of it. Try to make other people take that view of it. Be afraid for yourselves, and try to

speak of it for its own sake and not for the sake of the Eesthetic gratification it may give. And now, my brethren, can you listen a few moments longer to some closing words? Worship: spiritual worship. I think that in most of our churches our churches that have no set ritual, no fixed form of worship there is a disposition to underrate the importance of public worship; to think only of the preaching.

I notice that in those churches, not only our own, but those like it that have no special form of worship, they always give notice for preaching and not for worship, they only talk about the preacher and not the worship.

They seem to think it makes little difference if they are too late for worship, provided they are there in time for the sermon. I notice that many preachers seem to give their whole thought to their sermon, and think nothing of preparing themselves for that high task, that solemn, responsible undertaking, to try to lift up the hearts of a great assembly in prayer to God. What I wish to say is, wherever that may be true, let us consider whether we ought not to take more interest in our worship, in the reading of God's word for devotional impression, in solemn, sacred song and in humble prayer to God, in which we wish the hearts of the whole assembly to rise and melt together. It is true that we must have a care how we cultivate variety here, for the hearts of men seem to take delight in something of routine in their worship; they are rested if they know what comes next; they are harassed often if they are frequently disappointed and something quite unexpected comes in.

We must keep our variety within limits, but within limits we must cultivate variety. I believe there should be more attention paid to making our worship varied in its interest than is usually the case; and then, oh, my brethren, something far more important for the preacher and people is this we must put heart into our worship.

We must not care merely to hear a man preach. I do not wish you to think less of preaching, but more of the other. We must put heart into our worship. Even the sermon is a two-sided thing one side of it is part of our worship so far as it causes devotional feeling and lifts up the heart towards God, though on its other side of instruction and exhortation it is distinct from worship.

Now, I say we must put heart in our worship. Do not venture to come to this beautiful place of worship, or whatever place of worship you attend, and just sit languidly down to see if the choir can stir you or to see if the preacher can stir you. Oh! stir up your own souls.

It is your solemn duty when you go to engage with others in the worship of God it is your duty to yourself, it is your duty to others, it is your duty to the pastor who wishes to lead your worship, it is your duty to God, who wants the hearts of men, and who will have nothing but their hearts. I know how we feel. Worn by a week's toil, languid on the Lord's day through lack of our customary excitement, we go and take our places, jaded and dull, and we are tempted to think, " Now I will see whether the services can make any impression on me; whether the preacher can get hold of me I hope they may," and we sit passive to wait and see. Oh, let us not dare thus to deal with the solemnity of the worship of God. My brethren, if we learn to worship aright, there will be beautiful and blessed consequences. It will bring far more of good to our own souls. It will make worship far more impressive to our children. Haven't you observed that it is getting to be one of the questions of our day how the Sunday-school children are to be drawn to our public worship? We are often

told that the preacher must try to make his sermon more attractive to children, and so he must. But let us also make our worship more impressive, and make our children feel that it is their duty to worship God, and try to bring them under the influence of this worship. I heard last week in Washington one of the foremost Sunday-school laborers of this country, a Methodist minister, make this statement in private. He said: "Of late I have been telling the people everywhere, if your children cannot do both, cannot go to Sunday-school and go to the public worship also, keep them away from the Sunday-school, for they must go to the public worship." You may call that an extravagant statement. I am not sure that it is extravagant, but I am sure of this, that we need not merely to try to make our preaching attract children, but to try to make the worship so solemn, so real, so genuine, so earnest, that those strange little earnest hearts of our children will feel that there is something there that strikes to their souls. And if you have true, fervent worship of God, the stranger that comes into your place of worship will feel it too. Have you not noticed when you go into some houses how quickly you perceive that you are in an atmosphere of hospitality and genuine kindness? There may be no parade, no speech-making. Yet in some places you may feel it, you feel it in the atmosphere, you feel it at once in your soul; you see a place where they are kindly and loving. So it ought to be, that when a man comes into your place of worship he shall very soon feel a something that pervades the atmosphere he breathes, from the look of the people, from the solemn stillness, from the unaffected earnestness he shall feel that these people are genuine, solemn worshippers of God. When he feels that, he will conclude that God is with you of a truth and there will be power to move his soul in your solemn worship.

Now, my brethren, in this beautiful house which you have built for the worship of God, and are now dedicating to His worship, oh, may there be much of real spiritual worship. When your hearts are full sometimes and you come and try to throw your souls into God's worship, may you be moved and melted; when you are sorely tempted sometimes and, coming to the house of God, try to lift your heart to Him in prayer, may you get good from the wise and loving words of the man you love to see stand before you as your pastor. As your children grow up by your side and learn to delight with you in coming to the house of God in company, oh, may you be permitted to see more and more of them gladly coming to tell what great things God has done for their souls, and gladly coming to put on Christ by baptism. And not only the children of your households, but strangers within your gates. How soon they will be pouring into this great city from the far East and the wonderful West, from all the North and all the South, and from beyond the sea! How they will, in these coming years, pour into this imperial, central city, with its vast possibilities that swell the souls of your business men, and that ought to swell the souls of your religious men. May the stranger within your gates learn here to love your Saviour and rejoice here to proclaim that love, and rise from the liquid grave to walk in newness of life. And again and again, as you gather for that simplest of all ceremonies, as it is the most solemn, which Jesus himself appointed, in all simplicity taking bread and wine in remembrance of him, may he who sees men's hearts, see always that your hearts are towards him in godly sincerity. And when offerings are asked here may they be offerings given as a part of the worship of God, offerings that come from your hearts, offerings that are accepted by him who wants the heart, offerings that are worthy of this beautiful home of your church life, and worthy to follow the gifts wherewith you have erected it. And time and again may there go forth those who have learned to worship here like successive swarms from fruitful hives to carry the same spirit of worship elsewhere, here and there, in great and growing and needy cities.

Yes, and when the young of your households begin to link those households more closely than ever together, and on the bright bridal day the brilliant procession comes sweeping up the aisle and all men's hearts are glad; may they always come reverently in the fear of the God they have here learned to worship. And O, mortal men and women, who have united to build high and glorious piles that will stand when you are gone, when in the hour of your departure from the works of your hands, and from the worship that you have loved on earth, and slow and solemn up the aisle they bear the casket that holds all that is left to earth of you, and behind come sad-faced men and sobbing women, and while the solemn music sounds through all these vaults and your pastor rises, struggling to control his own sorrow for the death of one he loved so well O, may it be true, in that hour which is coming may you begin from this night so to live that it shall then be true, that the mourners of that hour may sorrow here, not as those who have no hope, and that the men and women who honor you, and have gathered to pay honor to your memory, may feel like saying in simple sincerity as they look upon your coffin, "the memory of the just is blessed; let me die the death of the righteous and let my last end be like his." O begin to-day, God help you to begin from this hour of entrance into your new place of worship so to live that all this may be true when you pass away. But one more thought. There will never be any perfect worship in this house. When was there ever any perfect worship? Once there was. There was a little obscure village; the military history of the country does not mention it; the older sacred writings do not. It was a despised village, and there was a lowly mechanic, who spent his early life in that village quietly, unpretending and unnoticed, and who used to go on the Sabbath day to the synagogue. He paid perfect worship.

Oh, glorious, beautiful spectacle! He paid perfect worship, but since his day there has never been any perfect worship in this world. Shall there be any perfect worship for us then, dear hearers, who sometimes aspire towards God and long to worship him in true spirituality, but never find the full attainment? God be thanked, we have hope of that higher and better life where we shall worship without effort and without imperfection. And God help us that we may strive to worship here with all our hearts, in the hope that at last we shall worship perfectly there.

S.The Inter-Biblical History

The Inter-Biblical History By John A. Broadus, 1887

Address by the Rev. Dr. John A. Broadus, of Kentucky — Value of a Neglected Field of Study — Four Periods: the Persian, the Greek, the Maccabaeian, and the Roman — Outlines and Characteristics of Each — Literature of the Jews — The Jewish Alexandrian Philosophy — Did the Jews Generally Expect a Messiah?

Christianity is an historical religion. Even the doctrinal and preceptive portions of the Bible are imbedded in history. Nothing can be understood unless it is studied historically. And this is strikingly true of Christianity. The inter-Biblical history is important for various reasons. It helps to understand the condition of the Jews in New Testament times — their political, social, and religious condition. It helps to understand the origin of Christianity. There are several erroneous views as to the origin of Christianity. Some have held that it is a mere creation of human thought. Tom Paine's vulgar notion, that the New Testament was a mere imposture, is now dead and buried. But occasionally some writer still tries to maintain that Christ is only a poetic ideal of a man and a teacher. Many hold that Christianity is a mere product of historical forces. This notion prevails among rationalistic Jews and rationalistic Christians. Devout people among us would usually call it an exclusively supernatural phenomenon. Now, it is the inter-Biblical history that must prepare us to judge among these different views. And we shall probably find that each is really true in some sense. Christianity is supernatural in origin, but it is also in a just sense a product of historical forces — both world-historical and Jewish-historical; and Christianity does meet and surpass the human craving for an ideal man and teacher. The inter-Biblical history also explains the connection between the Old and New Testaments. It shows that the history of Israel is one — from Abraham to the Promised Seed of Abraham — all one grand history of Providence and one grand history of Redemption. [Among the ancient sources the general reader only needs to have the Old Testament Apocrypha and Josephus. The former collection is found in many old family Bibles, or can be had separately in Bagster's edition for less than a dollar. Ask for the copy that contains Fourth Maccabees. Of recent works on the subject it is enough to mention Fisher's "Beginnings of Christianity," and Redford's "Four Centuries of Silence" — neither of them costly, and both very readable.] The inter-Biblical history must be divided into four periods, (1). The Persian period, which began in the Old Testament with Cyrus and the return from the captivity, extending up to B.C. 331. (2). The Greek period — B.C. 331-167. (3). The Maccabean period — B.C. 167-63. (4). The Roman period — B.C. 63 to A.D. 70.

1. The Persians were friendly to the Jews because the latter were monotheists like themselves, and their rule of the Jews was kindly. To this period refers the beautiful historical romance called Tobit, found in the Old Testament Apocrypha. Whether written during this period or later, it is a picture of Jewish life in the East during the Persian time. It shows the wealth of the Jews in Mesopotamia; gives beautiful pictures of their domestic life, their pious almsgiving and care of the dead; presents remarkable instances of answers to prayer; and shows the belief of the Jews as to

angels and demons.

2. The Greek period begins with Alexander — often called the Macedonian madman, but really a scientific and sagacious statesman. He is represented by Josephus as going to Jerusalem, and, when met by the high-priest in solemn procession, as bowing before him and declaring that this very person had appeared to him when he began the invasion of Asia and invited him to come. The story has great verisimilitude. Alexander might easily have had such a vision, or he might readily have pretended to have had it for effect. Either would suit exactly his character and diplomatic conduct. Alexander's relation to Christianity is highly important. He united Asia and Europe. When Jesus said, "Go, disciple all nations," this audacious command was humanly possible of fulfilment because of what Alexander had done. Greek civilization had broken up the fixedness of Western Asiatic civilization; very much like what is happening in Hindostan and Japan at the present day. The Greek language was widely diffused by Alexander and his successors — a language unrivalled in exactness, flexibility, and adaptation to all uses. As employed by the Jews it received a Hebrew tinge which appears in the Septuagint and the New Testament, which adapts it better to the expression of Christian ideas than the Attic dialect itself would have been. Among the successors of Alexander the Jews were interested only in the Ptolemies of Egypt, and the Seleucid kings of Assyria with their capital at Antioch. Under the Ptolemies the Old Testament was translated into Greek — a translation called Septuagint, from the Jewish story that it was made by seventy translators. This is the form in which the Old Testament has always been used among Greek Christians to the present day, and it is highly valued by recent Old Testament scholarship. During this period appeared in Palestine a remarkable Jewish book called "The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach," and commonly known in the Old Testament Apocrypha as "Ecclesiasticus" (abbrev. "Ecclus."). It was written between 198 and 167, and translated into Greek in Egypt. It is full of shrewd and suggestive sayings as to how a man may get on in life, and shows great enthusiasm for the history of Israel; but it contains no clear references to a future life, and nothing about the hope of a Messiah. This period ends with the great persecution of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes. The real design of this was not religious, but political. He wished to unify the numerous peoples in his dominion by inducing them to adopt his own religion, language, and customs — an attempt very much like that of Russia in Poland, or Austria in Hungary. When he began the persecution, he had recently been cruelly snubbed by a Roman consul, who met him in Egypt and turned back his conquering army from the approach to Alexandria.

3. The Maccabean period introduces to us the most charming historical narrative among the Old Testament Apocrypha, namely, First Maccabees. It is very curious to compare with this beautiful Hebrew work the rewriting of it by Josephus into an elaborate Greek style. Here also we meet Judas Maccabseus, one of the chief heroes of Hebrew history — a man of splendid military talents and noble piety. The conflict between the handful of Jews and the great Syrian-Greek kingdom seems insignificant in its numbers and the narrowness of its field; but it was really a conflict between the true and false religion, and the destinies of the world were in an important sense involved therein. The Jews were helped by many circumstances: especially by a disputed succession which arose after the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, and made their support important to the rival claimants. After thirty years of struggle their independence was established under John Hyrcanus. His rule as high-priest is looked back to by all Jews as a glorious period. But there were seeds of decay which we may now discern even in that glorious time. The government was

despotic, and supported by mercenaries. A people who cannot do their own fighting will not long maintain national greatness. There were fierce conflicts of unscrupulous parties, afterward called Pharisees and Sadducees, and which were much more thoroughly political parties than religious sects, the tendencies being combined. This period ends with the coming of Pompey to Jerusalem to settle the succession between two descendants of John Hyrcanus.

4. In the Roman period we find the Jews touched by the Roman civil wars. Crassus came to Jerusalem and robbed the Temple, it being so rich and he being greatly in want of money. Julius Csesar was in sore trouble at Alexandria, and helped by the Jewish forces. Afterward Cassius, Antony, and Octavius all came more or less into relation with the Jews. Here arose another great historical figure, namely, Herod. The conflicts between rival claimants made it possible that this Idumean should render himself important, and finally induce the Roman Senate to declare him king of the Jews. Herod was a man of prodigious talents, who managed Antony and the Senate, escaped the wiles of Cleopatra, won over Octavius, pleased the Greeks, and got on somehow with the Jews. In his domestic relations he was much sinning and much sinned against; and his trouble with the beautiful Mariamne, his wife, was augmented by the intrigues of her mother — an aggravated case of mother-in-law. [Read Josephus' account of Herod in the Antiquities, Book 15 to Book 17, chapter 8.] In conclusion, notice two related subjects. First, the Jewish Alexandrian philosophy. When the keen and powerful minds of the Jews gained the leisure which wealth gives, some of them took great interest in Greek literature, including philosophy, attaching themselves to one or another of the great Greek schools. Here belongs the so-called "Wisdom of Solomon," which must be carefully distinguished from the book previously mentioned — the "Wisdom of the Son of Sirach." That was written in Palestine; while the "Wisdom of Solomon" is an Alexandrian book, which combines Greek philosophy, especially that of Plato, with Jewish ideas, and is written in an over-wrought but really beautiful style. This is found among the Old Testament Apocrypha, and the first nine chapters are especially admirable. When speaking of the great Philo, the last and most important of these philosophical writers, we should mention the so-called "Fourth Maccabees" — a sort of sermon in which the writer glorifies Stoic philosophy, and at the same time the Old Testament, by showing how the law of Moses may enable a man to carry out the great Stoic saying that reason must be lord of the passions. It is a very curious and interesting little book. The other topic is, the Jewish expectations concerning the Messiah at the time He came. The best book on the subject is Drummond on "The Messianic Idea among the Jews" — London, 1877. The ancient sources are several Jewish writings of uncertain date, and most of them interpolated long after the Christian era. The genuine and clearly pre-Christian statements concerning the Messiah are merely a repetition or explanation of those in the Prophets. Some statements in the so-called "Book of Enoch" would seem a real advance toward the views of the New Testament; but those portions of "Enoch" are almost certainly post-Christian. A large proportion, and probably the great majority, of the Jews at this time cherished no Messianic expectations whatever, as was the case, for example, with Josephus, who pretended that the Messianic prophecies were fulfilled in Vespasian. Those who did cherish Messianic expectations had unclear and shifting conceptions; and the great characteristics of the actual teachings and life of Jesus Christ are utterly wanting in these Jewish writings — namely, spirituality, self-renunciation, Messiah's suffering and atoning death, and His resurrection and future spiritual reign.

=====

[From T. J. Shanks, editor, A College of Colleges, (A Collection of Lectures), 1887, pp. 67-73. This book was provided by Steve Lecrone, Burton, OH. — jrd]

The Epistle to the Hebrews

The Epistle to the Hebrews By John A. Broadus From the Preface: "The 'Summer School for College Students,' held at Northfield, Massachusetts, from June 30 to July, 12, 1887, was an occasion in many respects without precedent. During the twelve days of its continuance, at least four hours each day were spent in listening to addresses and discussions. . . ."

John A. Broadus was one of the speakers; three of his lectures were printed in a twenty-two chapter book entitled A College of Colleges. The sessions were led by D. L. Moody; T. J. Shanks was editor of the book.

Address by the Rev. Dr. Broadus — Key-Note of the Book — The Hebrew Christians Tempted to Relapse into Judaism — Reasons for Perseverance in the New Faith — Jewish Arguments Reversed — The Son of God Superior to Angels, to Moses, and to the Levitical Priesthood — Dignity of the Messiah.

I wish to speak of the Epistle to the Hebrews. My object is to come as near as I can to giving an off-hand specimen of the treatment of a Bible book as a whole. The Epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, from Italy, to the Christian Hebrews. You know there has long been a dispute as to whether it was written by Paul or not. I shall not go into that, except to say that I think the strong probability is, it was written by Paul. This Epistle is mentioned in the very earliest Christian writing in existence — the Epistles of Clement, in which it is repeatedly quoted. I don't think there would ever have been any doubt it was written by Paul, except for the fact that the Alexandrian critics, who were very particular about Greek, saw in it certain differences of style from the other of Paul's Epistles. But what if there are differences of style? That is exactly like Paul. I am inclined to think the most probable opinion is that which was advanced by Origen, the greatest of early scholars and critics, and which he derived from his teacher, Clement of Alexandria — that it was really a discourse which Paul delivered, and which was reported by some one else. Christ's discourses were reported. The discourses in the Book of Acts were reported by Luke. There is nothing incredible about the hypothesis, and it meets every point of the enigma, how the book could contain so much that was like Paul, and yet in a style so much unlike Paul. But I wish to speak of the contents of this wonderful Epistle. It is remarkable, probably, as no other for its absolute unity. One idea runs all through this Epistle. There are not more than two or three sentences in it that you can interpret without taking account of that one idea. Now, there are several Epistles in which there is a manifest key-note. If you study Philippians you will find that "joy" is the key-note; if you study Colossians, it is "complete in Christ"; and in Ephesians, "one in Christ"; and so in Galatians and Romans, "justification by faith"; etc. But here there is more than a key-note. One idea runs right through it, and that idea is to restrain the Hebrew Christians from abandoning Christianity. "Let us hold fast our profession." That is the object — to restrain the Hebrew Christians addressed from abandoning Christianity. "Let us hold fast our profession." "Let us hold fast the profession of our hope without wavering." "Let us hold on." "Let us hold on to our faith in Christianity." That is the practical lesson in everything in this Epistle, and its arguments are

brought to bear upon that design.

"Don't give up Christianity." The Hebrew Christians addressed had been much persecuted. They had not yet suffered bloodshed; but they had taken joyfully the spoiling of their goods. However, some of them had got into the way of forsaking the assembling of themselves together. It was the manner of some not to go to their religious meetings, because that might become an occasion of further persecution. But besides the persecutions, the Jews had brought to bear upon them very subtle and powerful lines of argument to persuade them to abandon Christianity. I shall state these very loosely at first, and then in a form in which you can understand their bearing. There were three lines of argument which the Jews were accustomed to employ to convince the Christians that they had better give up Christianity and go back to the religion of the Jews. They would say: "We used to suppose that this Nazarene religion of yours was only a new sect of Judaism, like the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, or what not. But it looks as if you were going to set it up for an independent religion. And now, if Christianity is to be set up for an independent religion apart from Judaism, just see how inferior it is to the religion of our fathers, in regard to (i) the angels on Mount Sinai; (2) Moses; and (3) the priesthood, the Temple, the law, and the sacrifices." They would say: "The religion of our fathers was given through holy angels on Mount Sinai." That isn't recorded in Exodus; but it was the belief of the Jews, as recorded in Stephen's speech in Acts 7:1-60. It appears here: "The religion of our fathers was given through holy angels. Are you going to turn away from that which came straight from the holy angels, and take up with the new-fangled religion of the Nazarene?" Then secondly: "Our religion was given through Moses." Moses was to the devout religionists of the time a sort of combination, I suppose, of all that we feel toward George Washington, and that we feel toward the Apostle Paul. It is very hard to realize how the Jews revered Moses. "Are you going to turn away from the religion of Moses, just to follow the religion of the Nazarene?" Thirdly: "The religion of our fathers is a religion. See its daily service, its smoking altar, its daily sacrifices, through which men may seek forgiveness. This religion of yours has no altar, no sanctuary, no sacrifices, no priest — nothing but a Nazarene. Why, it is nothing at all. It isn't a religion. It hasn't any of the marks of a religion. Are you going, to abandon the religion of our fathers — with the priesthood and the sacrifices — for a religion that has nothing, and is nothing?"

Now, I don't know a more remarkable example in all literature of a writer taking the arguments of his opponents and turning them right against them: as though soldiers charged up a hill against some battery, and seized the guns, and then turned them against the enemy. For every one of these arguments the writer turns exactly in the other direction; and from being a ground for rejecting Christianity, he finds in them a ground for holding on to Christianity. A large part of the Epistle consists of a comprehensive argument on this whole question, but with warnings and exhortations interspersed. See chapters 1 to 10:28. In this argumentative portion the writer takes up these three lines of argument. He replies, first: The Son of God is far superior to the angels. He is far superior to the angels, through whom the law was given on Mount Sinai. That is the topic of the first and the second chapter — the Son of God, through whom Christianity was given, is far superior to the angels, through whom the law was given. Now, open your Bibles and look, as I just point out rapidly how every time the argument is taken right out of the Bible — with applications, exhortations, and warnings, all red-hot. Recollect what that point was: "The religion of our fathers was given through holy angels on Mount Sinai. What have you got to equal that?" "Why, this,"

says the writer, "that Christianity is given through the Son of God, who is far above the angels." Notice how he begins. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners (God who in many parts and in many ways) spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son." In other words, "The old religion was given in many different parts, and in many different ways." Now, here is a new part which God has given — not through prophets any longer, but through His Son. "Through His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, through whom He made the worlds; who, being the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power, when He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high, being made so much better than the angels." There we touch the point. "Being made so much better than the angels, as He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." The rest of the chapter is taken up with proofs that the Son of God is superior to the angels. Then if the law was given through angels, Christianity has the authority of the Son of God, who is more than the angels. Please notice at the end of the first chapter an expression which is constantly misunderstood. "To which of the angels said He at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool"; — as He did say to Messiah, in the 110th Psalm. "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister " — not sent forth to reign, as the Messiah was, on the Father's right hand. The angels are ministering spirits, "sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." That "for" means "for the sake of " — "for the benefit of." "Sent forth to minister to God (not to reign with God) for — for the benefit of — the heirs of salvation." People have got a notion that the angels are sent forth to minister to them. They have got the idea that the angels minister to Christians. They minister to God for the benefit of Christians. The idea is the same in the last result.

Notice, now, that having set forth that statement, that the Son of God through whom Christianity is given, is far superior to the angels, and proved it by quotations, the writer immediately proceeds, without going any farther, to make a practical application of it. He can't wait to get through his argument. That is like Paul. He is going to begin his application; the argument may take care of itself after. "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest haply we drift away from them." What a striking Greek phrase that is. It suggests drifting in a boat along something important on the shore. "For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward, how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" Not "the great law"; but "so great salvation." And then he goes on to tell how great it is. "Which at the first began to be spoken through the Lord." Not "through angels"; but "through the Lord." He had this to start with, that it was spoken through the Lord Jesus Christ. "And was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him" — His own immediate followers. "God also bearing them witness (or uniting with them in bearing witness) both with signs and wonders, and with manifold miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to His own will." Now then: "Will it do to neglect the Gospel? You see what became of the men who slighted the law, that was given through angels on Mount Sinai — they received the just recompense of reward. How, then, shall we escape if we neglect the revelation that was given through the Son of God, confirmed by all that heard it, and ratified by all manner of miracles and gifts of the Holy Spirit?" Isn't that turning the argument the other way? Isn't that showing a reason why they should not neglect Christianity or abandon it? The rest of the second chapter goes on in a similar manner — showing that the Founder of Christianity is preferred to the angels.

Take the second argument — in regard to Moses. The Son of God is far superior to Moses. This extends from chapter 3:1 to 4:13. The Jews had the greatest veneration for Moses. And the sacred writer here in Hebrews 3:1, after introducing Christ Jesus, calls Him by two names, "Consider the Apostle" — that is, commissioner, or missionary; the term is taken in a literal, etymological sense. "Consider the Commissioner and High Priest of our profession" — that is, the one Son of God — "the Apostle of our profession, Christ Jesus." "Who was faithful to Him that appointed Him, as also Moses was faithful in all His house." This statement is repeated: "in all His house" — that is, in God's house. That is borrowed from Numbers, as you see in the margin (Numbers 12:7). The writer says, "Moses was faithful in all His house," and founds his argument upon that. "Moses was only a servant of God. He was a faithful servant, but he was only a servant in the house; and the Founder of Christianity is the Son of God, and a son is more than a servant. Well, then, if you say that the religion of our fathers has this dignity, that it was given through Moses, the servant of God, I grant it; but Christianity has this higher dignity, that it is given through Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and the Son is more than the servant." That is his argument. It is a very short argument. He builds it in Hebrews 3:5-6, and then he falls to application again. As Spurgeon says, "where the application begins the sermon begins"; and certainly the writer of this Epistle has not kept all the application to the last. His object is to restrain these people from abandoning Christianity and going back to Judaism. See the application he makes in Hebrews 3:1-19 and Hebrews 4:1-16. It is all founded upon the idea that we have a Leader and Apostle who is greater than Moses, and then greater than Joshua. "If our fathers were bound to follow Moses, the faithful servant of the Lord, and if our fathers wouldn't, and perished in the wilderness, although they had such a leader, what will become of us if we fail to follow our Leader, who is greater than Moses or Joshua? If our fathers wouldn't follow their leaders, and perished through their unbelief and disobedience, let us labor to enter into that rest, lest we fall after the same example of unbelief." I need not go into details. There is the argument: "The Founder of Christianity is greater than Moses." Then the application: "If our fathers were ruined by refusing to follow Moses in their unbelief, how much greater ruin will befall us if we refuse to follow a greater than Moses — that is, the Founder of Christianity."

Now we come to the third argument, and the principal one. It occupies the far greater portion of the book. His priesthood is far superior to the Levitical priesthood. This extends from chapter 4:13 to 10:18, inclusive — forming the bulk of the argumentative portion of the Epistle. It begins with an exhortation. The argument covers a great deal of ground, and so the writer begins with an exhortation. I pointed out how, in the first case, he broke into the middle of his argument with an exhortation. Now he actually begins with one. That is like Paul. He is going to talk about the fact that the Son of God, the Founder of Christianity, is a priest. He calls Him a priest: "Having, then, as we said a while ago, a great High Priest." He is going to elaborate that — the proof will come afterward. "Having, then, a great High Priest, that is passed through the heavens." That is a bad mistake in the translation — "passed into the heavens." The image of the heavens corresponds to the veil in the Temple. As the high priest passed through the veil and out of sight into the sanctuary beyond, so our High Priest passed through the visible heavens. "Passed through the heavens" makes a great difference there in comprehending the image. "Having, then, a great High Priest that is passed through the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession." That is the key-note of the Epistle. "Let us not neglect our salvation. Let us not fail to enter into that rest, as our fathers failed through unbelief. Let us hold fast our profession." "For," — you all know the

passage, but let me lose no opportunity to repeat it. O precious words — O sacred truth, that has come home unnumbered times to sin-burdened, struggling, troubled human hearts! "For we have not an high priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace." I used to hear some good men, when I was a boy, change that. They always prayed, "come with a holy boldness." They thought it would be too bold to say, "come boldly," and they wanted to come with a holy boldness — a humble boldness. Why that? Because they didn't understand the "therefore." "Therefore — because we have a great High Priest who has passed into the heavens, and is ever interceding, and can sympathize with our infirmities — let us therefore, and thinking of Him, and of His holiness, come boldly." I have a very dear friend who preached a whole sermon from this word "therefore." Let me say in regard to all of Paul's Epistles: if you can understand every "therefore," and every "for," you can understand any of his writings. Never mind about the rest. Take care of the pennies and the pounds will come out straight.

Having begun with this exhortation — to hold fast because we have such a High Priest — the sacred writer goes on to argue this matter out. He shows that the general characteristics of the high priest are to be found in Christ (Hebrews 4:1-9). Christ, the Founder of Christianity, has the general characteristics possessed by one who is what a high priest ought to be. That is the first point. Then he shows that Christ's priesthood is superior to the Levitical, because it is after the order of Melchisedec, and constituted with an oath (chapter 5:1- to 7:28). This is one of the most important parts of the Epistle, in which the writer proves that Christ's priesthood is superior to the Levitical because after the order of Melchisedec, and constituted with an oath. But having mentioned Melchisedec, he pauses. He is afraid they won't understand him — or at least, that a great many won't understand him. "Of whom we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered, seeing ye are dull of hearing. For when, for the time (considering the time, how long you have been professing Christians), ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one should teach you again, and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat." In other words: "Considering that you have been a long time professed Christians, you ought to be able to digest heavy food; yet here you are wanting milk still." "For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness." Oh, how full our churches are — churches away from here, for politeness requires that we should except ourselves — of such people, who are not feeding on the Scriptures. They want nothing but milk, and some of them want that sweetened. "But heavy food belongeth to them that are of full age (grown-up people — supposed to be), even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil." Gentlemen, the more you know of God's Word, the more you can know God's Word; and the more you are living by God's Word, the more you can understand God's Word. And if you keep it at arm's length, and dally with it, and play around it, then the years and years may come and go and we still may not know how to enter into its deeper meanings. The Apostle feels like a teacher who has put his pupils through a lesson, and wants to put them through an examination. "Are you not going on," he says, "into the difficult questions? Must I go back over the A, B, C of the business? No; I won't do any such thing. Therefore let us leave the principles of the doctrine of Christ, and go on unto perfection" — that perfection of which he spoke in Hebrews 5:14, namely, the maturity of Christian growth — the being grown-up people, and not mere babes. "Let us leave the principles of the doctrine of Christ and go on to perfection, not laying again the foundation" — the A, B, C. "I will go on to something else. There will be some of you that can't understand it, I know; but there is no use in staying with

them and bothering with them any longer." That is about the way the writer speaks. There are many pupils who remain away behind all the time, and you take a great deal of trouble with them, and finally you say to yourself: "I have fooled with them long enough. I'll give my attention to some of the rest." I am trying to illustrate the best way I can the idea of the sacred writer. He reproves those people who can't understand things, because they have so long been professed Christians and have made no progress, and want him to be forever repeating the A, B, C's of Christianity. He says: "Let us go on. As for those other people, there is no use doing anything. Some of you understand."

Q. Were those people renewed?

Dr. Broadus — In the first place, you don't know; and in the second place, I don't know; and in the third place, I don't know who does know; and I believe we won't stay — we will go on. Gentlemen, the solemn warnings that are given in this Epistle of what will happen if we give up Christianity, apply to us as they did to those people. Apart from Christianity we have got nothing to go upon — nothing to depend upon. Without stopping to decide the question whether your Christian experiences have been genuine or not — you haven't got to go into the rubbish of the past — if you give up Christianity you are gone. That was true of them; it is true of you and me. That is all there is to it, that I can see. Next, the writer goes on to apply consoling words to the better class of them. "But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak. For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labor of love which ye have showed toward His name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister." "Those there are among you that really have made progress in Christian truth and Christian living, and we don't mean to condemn you." And so he goes on to the end of that admonition. The admonition extends from chapter 5: 11, away to the end of chapter 6. Then at the end of chapter vi. he comes to the High Priest again — "Even Jesus, made an high priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." Now, observe — here is the point: Christ's priesthood is superior to the Levitical, because it is a priesthood after the order of Melchisedec, found mentioned in Psalms 110:1-7 : "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec." All the Jews understood this reference. His point now is that the Messiah is a priest, and a higher kind of a priest than the priests of the Levitical dispensation. Now, don't get befogged about Melchisedec. We don't know much about Melchisedec. There are two things shown to us: First, he is a priest continually — he "abideth a priest continually" (Hebrews 7:3). The priesthood of Melchisedec as it stands on the page of history is a continual priesthood. It is not a priesthood like the Levitical, that is derived from a father and handed down to a son, and is established on genealogy. There is no mention of any father or mother — no mention of any father or mother — no mention of any genealogy — no mention of the beginning of his days or the end of his life. There it stands, a priesthood all the time. That is a picture of the priesthood of Messiah, which is a priesthood not derived from ancestors and handed down to successors, but a perpetual and continual priesthood. Who is Melchisedec? — and what is Melchisedec? That about Melchisedec; and so far as I can see, only that and nothing more. You can write the rest of his life, perhaps, because you don't know. What a man doesn't know is an immense field for prospecting.

Then the second argument which he makes about this matter, is: The greatness of the Messianic priesthood, as proved by the fact that Abraham gives to Melchisedec a gift of a tenth part of the spoils. The Melchisedec priesthood was a very exalted kind of priesthood, you see. The argument,

then, regarding the priesthood of Christ is, first, it is a continual, permanent priesthood; second, it is a very exalted priesthood. This is proven in two ways: First, Abraham gave Melchisedec titles; and second, The Messiah was declared to be a priest with an oath. "The Lord swore, and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec" (Hebrews 7:21). The Founder of Christianity is a priest of a higher sort than the priests of the Levitical priesthood, as is proven by His being a priest after the order of Melchisedec, and a priest constituted with an oath. Now, I beg you before you leave that, to notice in Hebrews 7:25 a passage that everybody preaches about, but often, I think, failing to get the great and glorious meaning. In Hebrews 7:23 the passage begins: "And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death." There was a long succession of numerous priests, because they were not suffered to continue. " But this man," the Founder of Christianity, the Messiah, "because He continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood" — not a changeable one, a transmissible one, handed down to Him and then handed by Him to a successor. He is a priest forever, untransmitted; and stands always the same. "Wherefore," because His priesthood is untransmissible, "He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them." Why; a Pope of Rome has to build himself a tomb for fear his successor will not care enough about him to build him one at all. And if you put anything that takes hold upon eternity into the hands of a mortal man, he soon finds he has got to die, and has got to have a line of successors ; and how do you know they will remember you, and care anything about you, and put through what he has undertaken to do for you? But the Messiah holds His priesthood forever — untransmissible. He ever lives to make intercession for them who come to God through Him; and if you put your salvation in His hands, He does not have to turn it over to any one who may or may not carry it out. "He is able to save them unto completeness, because He ever lives to carry on the work He undertook to do for them." Some people understand this to mean:

"He is able to save unto the worst sinners." That is a great and glorious truth, but that is not the idea here at all. "He is able to save forever and forever, because He is the same unchangeable priest." "To save unto completeness" — not simply to begin it and keep at it awhile, but to completeness. Oh, the wrecks in human history of things that men began with noble intent and sustained with high endeavor, but they died, and their work fell through and passed away. Our Saviour "is able to complete the salvation of them that come to God through Him, seeing He ever liveth." Now, gentlemen, you can forget all the rest of what I have said, if you lay hold of that for yourself and for everybody else — for the troubled ones who try to live in this life of sin and sorrow. But let us go on. The next part of the argument covers the rest of the argumentative portion of the Epistle. Christ ministers in a higher sanctuary than the Levitical, and offers a better sacrifice. This the writer elaborates at considerable length in the next two chapters and a half. Please think about it. The Jews were saying that the Christian religion lacked the very elements of being a religion. It had no priesthood, no sanctuary, no altar, no sacrifice — it was no religion at all. The sacred writer proceeds to show that the Founder of Christianity — the Messiah, the High Priest — has a sanctuary, has an altar, has a sacrifice; and that these are all superior to those they had been telling him about and wanting to go back to. The Messiah has a better sanctuary, a better altar, and a better sacrifice than the Levitical. Now, see. Open to Hebrews 8:1-13.

(a.) He is "a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle" — not merely a man's tabernacle, but a tabernacle beyond the sky, of which the earthly tabernacle was a type. "By how

much also is He the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises." He ministers in the true tabernacle, under a better covenant.

(b.) Now, the sacrifice is His own blood. The sacrifice He offers is His own blood. Gentlemen, we are used to that; but there is a sense in which that is the most stupendous fact that ever came into our minds. The eternal heart of God was made flesh, and came to be a teacher, and a priest also — to offer a sacrifice consisting of His own blood. You never heard of that in your life in any other except the Christian religion. It is most amazing — the sacrifice is His own blood! Look at Hebrews 9:1-22. Notice in Hebrews 9:11, for instance: "Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building. Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood, He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption." That word is emphatic here, you see. His own blood wins eternal redemption. The writer will repeat these thoughts presently. "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and 'the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purify your conscience." That is the great central thought of the Atonement: the sacrifice of His own blood, not the blood of bulls and its, shall "purify your conscience from dead works to serve the living God."

(c.) This sanctuary and sacrifice are not typical, but heavenly and true. This is stated very briefly in Hebrews 9:23-24 : "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these" sacrifices of the blood of animals. The earthly copies made of the heavenly sanctuary had to be purified with the blood of animal sacrifices. "But the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." So then, the true sanctuary, of which the earthly place of worship was but a picture, had for its sacrifice the blood of Christ Himself.

(d.)The sacrifice is not repeated, but once for all — once for all, and all-sufficient. That is the rest of the argumentative portion — chapter 9:25 to 10:18. His sacrifice is not repeated, but once for all, and all-sufficient. "Not repeated" — that is the emphatic point. Now look at the text a moment there — see how it brings it out — Hebrews 9:25 : "Nor yet that He should offer Himself often, as the High Priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others: for then must He often have suffered from the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath He appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." See Hebrews 10:12 : "But this man, after He had offered one sacrifice of sins forever." Again, Hebrews 10:14 : "For by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." See how often this idea is repeated. The sacrifice was not every day — not every year; but His own blood was offered once for all, all-sufficient, forever. That completes the argumentative portion.

Now, the rest of the Epistle — 10:19 to the end — is a further exhortation of a nature akin to the previous exhortation — to hold on to Christianity; not to abandon it, and go back and be mere Jews. Because, "Haven't I proven that in all the points in which the religion of our fathers deserves reverence, Christianity deserves only a greater reverence?" The writer isn't content with the exhortations he has thrown in by the way; but now he expands "as the Lord gives light and liberty"

— as the old preacher used to say. He expands the argument.

1. He exhorts them to hold fast because of having such a High Priest. This comes immediately after the preceding section — Hebrews 10:19-25 : "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus . . . let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering." This is the same thing he said before, you know — "Let us hold fast the profession of our faith, because we have such a sacrifice. Let us hold fast the profession of our hope without wavering."

2. He states the terrible results of apostasy. He refers to them as a reason for not stopping to argue any more with those who have abandoned Christianity. "If you go back and have anything more to do with the Jews, just see what the end will be." Hebrews 10:26-39 : "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." He bears on again with the law: "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace." Now, don't stop to ask any of your theological questions. I believe in theology, but this is a matter of history. And then these were not the last people in this world who, having once been professing Christians, have been tempted to abandon their faith in the name of science, in the name of culture, or in the name of nonsense; and there will be temptations hereafter, and arguments to persuade men to abandon Christianity. Oh, many have been tempted and tested in that way many times. One good thing to think is: "If I abandon Christianity, what then? — what then? 'To whom shall we go?' If I abandon Christianity, I have got to believe something. What is there better worth believing than Christianity? I have got to believe something — what else is there to believe in?" It is useful to go to the very edge of a precipice and see how deep it is, if you turn and get away as fast as ever you can. If that doesn't suit your theology, so much the worse for your theology. But I am not talking theology.

3. He speaks of their former patient endurance — Hebrews 10:32-39. Just as before, when he spoke of the persons it was no use fooling over, and then turned to the better class; so now when speaking of the terrible results of apostasy, immediately after he says: "I don't mean this about you. You have done well." After a solemn warning concerning the fearful ruin resulting from apostasy, he puts in something encouraging — something comforting: "Call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated (or enlightened), ye endured a great fight of afflictions." "Let that encourage you." Then in Hebrews 10:35 : "Cast not away therefore your confidence, which hath great recompense of reward." "Hold on! — as you have been holding on; and don't give up, for you see the ruin that would follow." "For ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God ye might receive the promise. For yet a little while, and He that shall come will come, and will not tarry." Here he quotes from Habakkuk (Habakkuk 2:3-4). It is the same passage that Paul quotes in Romans and Galatians. "Now the just shall live by faith; but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." There is the warning. "But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition, but of them that believe to the saving of the soul." Oh, that chapter-maker — how he ruins the meaning sometimes. He was a good-natured, well-meaning old soul, who lived about six centuries ago. He used to divide tolerably well when he was at his best,

but sometimes he has broken things right in two, as in this case. "We are not of them who draw back unto perdition, but of them that believe to the saving of the soul. Now, believing is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." It goes right on. People begin there — at the opening of chapter xi. — as if it was a new being in. creation, a new universe almost. They never stop to look back and see what precedes it. "We are of them that believe to the saving of the soul. Now, believing is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." I have heard it said very often that that is a Divine definition of faith, and I have these things to remark about it: First, I should think it a matter of concern if a Divine definition of faith contained as many words that were hard to define as that passage does; and, second, I can't see that there is any need of a definition of faith, Divine or human. Faith is as easy a thing to understand as anything that comes before the human mind. It is as simple an idea as there is. How can you explain what cannot be analyzed and made any simpler at all? I heard a definition of faith by an old colored preacher in Virginia. "Uncle Ben," said one of his people, "can you explain what is faith in the Lord and faith in the devil?" Uncle Ben drew himself up and said: "Yes. Dere's in the first place faith in de Lawd, an' in de second place, faith in de devil. In de first place — firstly — dere's faith. Now, I'm goin' to 'splain faith. Now, faith — faith is just faith — an' nothin' mo', an' faith, an' nothin' less, an' nothin' but faith — an' I am done 'splainin'." When you get a better definition than that old negro preacher had, I wish you would write to me. Some people say they can't understand faith, when if they can't it is because they don't want to do it. If I want my child to love me, I don't go into metaphysics — I show myself lovely. Let me show myself lovely, and my child will love me; unless it is so constituted that it doesn't want to love me, and then no metaphysical definitions will help the matter at all. I think our definitions of faith only help objectors to find excuses for refusing to exercise it.

"We are not of them who draw back unto perdition, but of them that believe to the saving of the soul." "In the power of this faith we should bear present trials, and press on through present difficulties till we get through and are received." The whole burden of this chapter is to present glorious instances of men who had so much faith in the things to come that they held out, and triumphed at last. The writer says in effect: "See how they put up with the trials of the present life, as you ought to do. Have patience. Keep on believing, unto the saving of the soul." And after a long list is given (in Hebrews 11:1-40), he begins the application of it. In Hebrews 12:1, he says: "Wherefore, seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses" — namely, those heroes of faith that have been described, and in their day had trouble and conquered it. And these persons are not simply spectators, but persons who have borne witness. The Greek here is* ----- * Literally: "We have environing us so great a cloud, or throng of persons, witnessing." — Ed.

[104]

"Seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us. Looking unto" — and he doesn't say "looking unto Abel, Enoch, Abraham, Moses," because there came into his mind, just then and there in the midst of his exhortation, the thought that there is an example of faith and the power of faith in future good to sustain amid present trial and suffering that transcends all his roll of worthies, and so he says: "Looking away." That is what it is literally+ — "Looking away from ourselves, away from the heroes of past ages, to the one

example, unique and incomparable, of the power of faith in future good to sustain us in present trial." "Looking away unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, who for the joy that was set before Him" — and who believed in that joy that was set before Him. As Abraham believed in the promises set before him, and bore present trial; as Noah believed; so this higher One, for the joy that was set before Him, "endured the Cross, despising the shame"; and He has had the fulfilment of His faith — He has entered into that joy — He "hath set down at the right hand of the throne of God." So, then, let us not be of them that draw back unto perdition, but of them that believe unto the saving of the soul; for it is such belief in God's promises of future good that can enable us to bear all present trials, and triumph over all present -----

+ "Viewing with undivided attention by turning away from every other object; regarding fixedly and earnestly." — Ed. [105] difficulties, as did the heroes of faith in the past, and even Jesus our Lord and Redeemer.

Now there is more to say, but I must conclude. The rest of the Epistle is much to the same effect: further exhortations — and all based continually upon the superiority of the Christian priesthood and the Christian sacrifice to all the ideas of the past dispensation. There are only two or three sentences at the close that have no immediate connection with the burden of the whole argument.

=====

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
 - 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net