

THE BIBLICAL WORLD

VOLUME XLIII

APRIL 1914

NUMBER 4

“OF ALL MEN THE MOST MISERABLE”

So Paul described Christians who had no risen Christ. To have believed and lost belief was worse than never to have believed at all. They had not only been disappointed—they had proclaimed a false religion.

And the sin of that false religion was optimism! Because of the gospel men had believed in something which had given them joy, and had brought joy to others; and that belief had been a deception.

Of course, Paul did not believe that the good news was false. He was sure he had not believed cunningly devised fables. Back of his enthusiasm there was the thrust of a great conviction.



The misery of which Paul speaks was not confined to the first century. There is many a preacher of the gospel whose confidence in his message has been honeycombed by unwarranted doubt.

Sometimes these doubts are the outgrowth of reaction from impossible beliefs. Any man acquainted with the hyperorthodox knows how many men drop from the ministry because they have claimed to believe more than they had any right to believe. Along with the gospel they have carried over the figures of speech, the very intellectual clothing, in which the gospel was expressed. And when they have come to see that such intellectual habiliment really does not belong to the heart of the gospel they have thought that the gospel itself was lost.

Overtrained in dogma, they are incapable of meeting the pressure of the religious need of a modern world.



There are other men who have lost their old-time convictions for quite other reasons. They think themselves liberal because they

believe less than they once believed. Overemphasizing investigation, they have come to question everything.

For a few months or years, it may be, they have enjoyed the enthusiasm of men liberated from unnecessary beliefs, only at last to find themselves dispossessed of their spiritual ambitions.

Thereupon their spiritual engine has "gone dead."

In caring for the headlight they have forgotten the fire-box.



Both of these classes of men are to be profoundly pitied, not alone because of their own spiritual bankruptcy, but because their bankruptcy was unnecessary. Our Christian religion with its faith in a God of Law who is also a God of Love; in a Jesus who is his historical revelation; in an immortality which he has brought to light; in the gospel of salvation which he preached and which he demonstrated is not something to be cast to one side with impunity. It is too vital for life not to avenge its disappearance.

Intellectual sophistication is no substitute for spiritual certainty. There is an everlasting Yea, but there is no everlasting Perhaps.

To preach the gospel of Jesus with enthusiasm does not require one to train oneself in credulity or to qualify one's intellectual honesty by obscurantism. Today, even more than in Paul's day, we know that the gospel of the resurrection has a place in the new world which science is revealing to us.

The preacher with no message beyond the call to investigation will be the shepherd of skeptics. A preacher of convictions, even though those convictions may be too large to be cast in terms of the past, too precious to be subjected to the discipline of authority, possesses a contagious faith which will make faith epidemic among those to whom he ministers.

The progress of the church is not marked by abandoned convictions, but by the growth of faith.

The only miserable preacher of the gospel is the man caught by an intellectual panic, as unnecessary as it is foolish.

“BITTERNESS”—A SERMON

“Let all bitterness be put away from ye, with all malice.”—Eph. 4:31; Heb. 12:15; Jas. 3:14.

G. A. JOHNSTON ROSS, D.D.
Professor of Homiletics, Union Theological Seminary

A theology that cannot be preached is a piece of intellectual bric-à-brac. One of the most hopeful facts in the present situation of the church is that theology is making men more religious. It is for that reason that we plan to publish every now and then in the BIBLICAL WORLD a sermon by one of the great preachers of our modern world. No man could more suitably inaugurate this new policy than Dr. Ross. We particularly commend this to every man who grows impatient over the failure of the world to accept some truth that has moved his own soul. It sometimes happens that a new truth becomes a source of heat rather than of light. To keep sweet and patient, to endure misinterpretation and misrepresentation are the elementary duties of every man who would help his world.

It will not be pleasant work to preach this sermon: nor, I imagine, will it be pleasant to hear. For the word “bitterness” needs only to be spoken to involve most of us in a common condemnation: to recall us to the most dismaying weakness in our personal character; to smite us into a sudden shame. I am going to speak of that which many of us who have professed Christ’s name know has spoiled our Christian testimony and effectiveness as *nothing* else has done: that which has been the occasion of our sharpest remorse, and our most desolating self-disgust.

My brethren, I should be an arrogant Pharisee if I excluded myself from this condemnation. I know the bitterness of bitterness; the sharp, grinding shame and chagrin when one has betrayed, by unkind interpretations of other people’s conduct, the acid spirit of cynicism, and bartered one’s Christian name and force for a moment’s taste of the pungent liquor of denunciation. I speak out of a

sore heart and—this is not a sermon for children—only men and women who have known this same soreness of heart will care about or so much as understand what I am saying.

For I want to speak of bitterness in *Christian* people’s hearts. That in human hearts unmoved by religion and unvisited by the gentleness of Christ, a harsh mistrust of others and quick suspicion and sensitive self-love should rule is not to be greatly wondered at. We should look for it, and perhaps should not be greatly astonished were it avowed and gloried in. But the diabolic miracle is that it should be found in hearts whom Christ has touched, who have been moved by his beauty and his love, and made some honest, not to say fluent and exuberant, response to that love. That contact with Christ has not driven the pettiness of self-love out of us, has not shamed out of us the smallness, the alertness to catch the hurt of insult, the suspicion of a slight, the suggestion of

hostility; that Christ's magnanimity has not made impossible a contemptible ingenuity in misinterpretation and misconstruction of motive, and has not flooded the nature with its own sunny radiance, and made it move and have its being in love—that is the astonishment, the dismay, and the sorrow of many a man and woman trying to be good.

We *must* get rid of this thing, brethren, or our Christian force and influence will absolutely disappear. It is hardly too much to say that men believe in us as Christians *only so long as they believe that we are kind*: only so long as they do not know that we are bitter, and retaliative, and alert to take offense, and cruel in misjudgment. When the veil is lifted and they know the facts, they have finished with us, and our profession of religion is but the minister of bitterness in them. Kindness is a beautiful thing in *any* man: it is an imperative necessity in a Christian. A Christian cynic is a contradiction in terms. You know what I mean: if I add that of course a Christian man is to have his opinion of unworthy conduct like other people, and that he also has the right to entertain righteous indignation against evil—you know that in saying that I am but echoing words that rise within you as self-defense against the sword of self-accusation. For you and I in practice, brethren, know quite well the difference between indignation against evil and bitterness against persons we dislike.

I

First, let us try to measure the strength of this accursed thing. Surely we were once unstained and breathed the air of more generous interpretations than

we do now! Why? Is it because we were ignorant of the world and in happy unconsciousness of the hypocrisies of men? Then if that is so, this thing which we have now to crush and kill has on its side the *gruesome facts of human depravity*. Let us calculate on that. If today I set myself to try to be generous in my assumptions regarding my fellows, let me expect tomorrow to receive a rude shock, and let me nerve myself to resist the temptation to be ashamed of my naïve confidence in humanity. Someone, some Christian possibly, will grossly disappoint me this week, and forthwith the bitterness within me will be on its self-defense and justifying itself within me. Let me, I say, calculate on that.

But again, why once so frankly charitable and now so snappishly cynical? Was it because I was *freer, and didn't care about others' conduct*? It is a ghastly thing to see a young cynic: to see a young face, that should have been unwrinkled by suspicion, furrowed like a dried fig by its own withering superiority. No: we weren't like that. We simply didn't care: we took people as we found them and did not concern ourselves with quarrelings. Then has bitterness some unholy alliance with the entanglements of association in which we tend with the passing years to become more and more imbedded? As we go on in life we certainly tend to settle down in groups, classes, sets, cliques, clubs, coteries. We find our level, as men say; we begin to move among our equals, who are part and parcel of our life. It would appear, then, that this is part of the strength of this business of bitterness; that it finds its material (more's the pity) among our equals, among the people who

ought to be our loved comrades, who should reflect us, who should help us, and whom we should help. It is just these people upon whom our venom is spent. It is the old Aristotelian principle: “Potter envies potter.” We are not bitter against those high above us in station; we rather please ourselves in our compassion for the very poor: it is these others, our equals, our possible rivals, who misunderstand us, who hide their real selves from us, who do the things we do but do them with irritating differences in opinion and manner—it is against these we are envenomed. Well, so be it: we know at least where the battle has to be fought, where self-repression will have to be most sternly practiced.

Once more, why were we once so happily free from the acerbity that curses us now? Well, we hadn’t arrived at the vivid self-consciousness of today. We hadn’t estimated ourselves, nor much cared about self-inspection; rather, we laughed at that sort of thing as morbid. We were glad to be praised, though; and we reveled in the kind appreciation of our friends. And—yes, there did come a rude awakening; our ambition soared high and we fell; and someone cut home into our hearts with a startling version of what men really thought of us. There are some men whose words are like hot irons: “There is,” says the Book of Proverbs, “there is that speaketh like the piercing of a sword.” So it came to us; perhaps it was some unjust accusation or undeserved neglect, perhaps it was some rough awakening to unwelcome truth; but anyway, we were disillusioned, and we have been cynics since and worse.

Well, then, again we have measured the strength of the thing we have to crush. It is allied to, it is rooted in, self-love; and its handmaid is pride, and we shall have to attack these things, too, if this bitterness is to come to an end.

But, again, hadn’t we better health when we were younger? Isn’t that the simple explanation of our sunnier view of men and things? Hasn’t this unfortunate bitterness, irritable quickness to define what we dislike, hasn’t all this, to be plain, a dyspeptic origin? Is it not largely a matter of overdriven energies and overstrung nerves? Well, it need not be denied; if we gain a momentary relief from the pressure of self-accusation by such thoughts, let us have the relief by all means: *but* what it means is this: this thing which we have to fight is in alliance with variations in our physical condition, and we have to count on that, to reckon with it in the fight, not to excuse ourselves from the fight on the ground of it.

The allies of this enemy are becoming formidable; yet still we have not told the tale of them. There is one specially we must not overlook. I spoke a moment ago of its alliance with *pride*. Yes: but when we look back on things, that pride has taken a specific form: it has been pride in the cleverness of our speech. We cannot remember perhaps when people praised our first precocious epigram, but we do know that somehow we came to have a taste for the intoxicating stimulant of the pleased admiration of our friends when we said smart, sharp things about our neighbors. The thumb-nail sketches were diverting and clever and, of course, caricatures; to have been truthful would have been dull.

And when we were really roused by genuine irritation this talent for delineation became invaluable, and we rejoiced in it. Is this what the apostle James refers to when he says, "If ye have bitter envyings and strife in your hearts, glory not and lie not against the truth"? That is precisely what we did: we gloried most for at least one vivid intoxicated moment when our epigrams on other people were farthest from the truth.

How contemptible it all is now, as we look back on it! Yes, but how often have we seen it to be contemptible; yet under the excitement, or for excitement's sake, have gone back to the old sin! Aye, even in solitude we have drunk this heating wine: we have gone over fancied insults, and carved out words to define the hidden motives of conduct we could not understand, we have summed up the characters of our associates, we have practiced denunciation and nursed the fire of resentment; and that is why today this habit of judging is so inveterate and the bias to uncharitable judgment is so heavy.

This is the worst of all the allies of bitterness: its alliance with the processes of thought and the charm and power of speech. Let us calculate on that; let us move cautiously against the enemy; his weapon, the cruelest of all, is the very speech that comes so suddenly to our tongue in the excitement of passion or of praise.

Such is our foe, twining itself round what should be the dearest and pleasantest of our associations, manipulating our most useful gifts and trading on our most pardonable weaknesses, mercilessly ready to condemn us by a slip in speech—such is this spirit of bitterness which is

eating the heart out of our Christian influence and destroying our Christian character.

And what power bitterness has to infect a man's whole nature! Viscount Morley reminds us in his *Cromwell* that a man's opinions are linked together by many invisible strands. Bitterness takes advantage of that unity in our nature, and taking possession of only a segment of man's thought at first will spread itself over every opinion and sympathy he possesses. Especially is this the case when the first access of bitterness comes through a great disappointment with men.

I well remember when the blow came to me; when, the glow and glamor of my ordination past, I had settled down to acquiring some knowledge of my people, and had been stunned by the appalling realities regarding the men and women in the ranks of professing Christians in the village where my ministry lay. I cannot forget the desolating dreariness of my disillusionment; and how my bitter disgust found expression in acidulated speech, and in crude sarcasms which a maturer experience would fain have unspoken. "Is there not a cause?" I said to myself at the time; "do I not do well to be angry?" For my blood boiled at the systematic dishonor done to Christ, the desecration of his sacraments and the riot of inconsistency in the profession of his name. But the lurking enemy of bitterness recked nothing of the occasion he could use to issue forth, whether it were just or not; the point is the bitterness tended to invade segment after segment of my thought; it began in my hasty judgment of a few villagers. In a month or two I found it in my

theology and my interpretation of the Christian ethic, and its tendency was ever vigorously to spread farther afield.

And as it spreads from department to department of a man's interests (I dare say you have known extreme cases of sour-spirited men who can admire nothing, appreciate no one, and who grudge a tribute of praise to the most obviously beautiful things), so it spreads from member to member of any community. "Beware," said the apostle, "lest a root of bitterness springing up trouble you and *thereby many be defiled.*" What a true touch that is! Have we not seen this unholy infection at work: happy companionships turned into knots of malice, groups even of Christ's servants becoming nests and hotbeds of unholiest resentment, their mutual smiles veiling a deep mistrust, and confidence and freedom utterly destroyed by the sordid necessity of maintaining a perpetual watchfulness lest by a word the one should exasperate the explosive self-love of the other? Oh, have we not chafed against this thing and just then most earnestly cried out to be delivered when our own fall into bitterness had most its origin in disappointment with ourselves?

II

What is to be done? It is not an affair of manners, this. It is mockery to tell us that smallness of nature and ingenuity in misconstruing conduct and fertility in misunderstanding—that these things are simply the vulgarities of the plebeian and disappear on the advent of education and refinement. The simple fact is that they do not; that they flourish in the very centers of learning and organized religion, and perhaps are

least offensive just in the rough-and-tumble life of a great city, where men have less leisure for refinement of criticism and more readily condone, if not forgive. No; nothing external will remedy this thing. The effort must be directed from within.

And surely the first thing to do is to be clear that effort is necessary and worth while. Necessary, else we should not have the strenuous and urgent exhortations on this matter in the New Testament: "*Pursue peace with all men*"; "*looking out diligently*"; "*straining to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.*" That is the way the New Testament speaks of this matter. It is assumed that there is a difficult work to be done. And that effort is worth while is shown most clearly by the fact that the prevalence of this thing in Christian communities depends largely on the training of opinion regarding it. In some Christian communities its essential opposition to the spirit of Christ does not seem to have been realized; there it is rampant and flagrant; in others it is counted a shame and disgrace. Surely the producing of that feeling of shame—or as we should say the educating of public opinion—is the very motive of the third chapter of the Epistle of James, with the wistful simplicity revealing the saddened heart of the apostle: "My brethren, these things ought not so to be."

And, brethren, I don't know that anywhere in the church the education of the Christian sentiment on this matter has been adequate. For years Christian sentiment on the subject of our duty to the *poor*, to the *needy*, to the generally dependent and inferior has been urged and urged with great success: but, as

the late Canon Mozley pointed out, not nearly as much work has been done in the department of Christian ethics which concerns our relations with our *equals*. And as I have said, it is there that the crux of this problem of bitterness lies.

Well, but the question presses: In what direction are we to make our effort? We begin at the outmost edge of interior reforms, if I may so speak, when we speak of cultivating repression of *speech*. Yet we must do that and do it seriously, with some serious apprehension of the fruitfulness of speech in good or evil, and of its terrible reflex action on the mind of the speaker. If a man habitually utters low and unjust judgments of others, he will himself sink to the level of his judgments; and we may have seen collapses of this sort ourselves.

And specifically, we must declare war against the type of clever speech that hurts. "We may put down," Father Faber says, "clever speeches as the first and greatest difficulty in the way of kindness." Nothing will avail to cure us of a bitter spirit unless we be made ashamed of the cheap *banalité* of cutting speeches and of shabby misinterpretations clothed in funny words. The daintiness of the apothegm does not strip the act of its vulgarity. Assassination is the same brutal thing, whether the weapon be a bludgeon or a stiletto. We must learn that *it is mean to hurt*.

Have you ever heard Cardinal Newman's definition of a gentleman? "It is almost," he said, "a definition of a gentleman to say that he is one who never inflicts pain. . . . He carefully avoids whatever may cause a jar or a jolt in the minds of those with whom

he is cast—all clashing of opinion, or collision of feeling, all restraint, or suspicion or gloom or resentment; his great concern being to make everyone at his ease and at home. He has his eyes on all his company: he is tender toward the bashful, *gentle toward the distant*, and *merciful toward the absurd*. He guards against unseasonable allusions, or topics which may irritate. He has no ears for slander or gossip, is scrupulous in imputing motives to those who interfere with him, and interprets everything for the best." Would to God that this idea of gentlemanliness were incorporated into our Christian practice and ambitions.

But we must go deeper still. Release from bitterness is largely a matter of width of sympathetic outlook and of preoccupation in great causes. Paul's exhortations against bitterness are never far removed from his reminders to his people of the great sweep of the action of redemption, of the vast circumference of the kingdom of God. Bitterness and narrowness of view, or at least narrowness of interest, always go together. If the church were missionary (let it be said for the thousandth time), her intractable divisions at home would be manageable, aye, would disappear.

The world is waiting for the gospel of Christ, for the Book of God, for the knowledge of the way of life: Christendom and Christian churches are rent by internal strife and the most acrimonious antagonism. Is it possible to avoid connecting the two things causally? And as it is with the church that is jaded with her own exceeding dulness, so it is with idle and self-seeking Christian units. They must stir the dulness out of their

too leisurely lives by the excitement of strife and the pungent delights of unfavorable criticism and evil surmisings. I grant you that you will get bitterness out of overworked people, as you will out of the religious unemployed, because the overworking of some is the corollary of the idleness of the others. But what would heal the hurt of many a disordered life, aching with the distemper of its own suspiciousness, would simply be absorption in the work of Jesus Christ, response to the call of his needy ones, and devotion to his program of service for the world.

And lastly and chief of all, the effort to crush bitterness must be carried to the region of prayer, of faith, of religious communion if any progress is to be made. When I see a Christian man fall into bitterness, especially when I am myself that man, I know that it is due to a want of *freshness in devotion*, to falling behind in the exercise of personal religion. In Hebrews 12:15 this is the very expression used: “Lest any man fail of, i.e., fall behind, the grace of God.” When does a man fall behind the grace of God? When he is living not on the devotion of today, but on the emotions of yesterday; not on today’s spiritual sustenance but on the mildewed manna of yesterday. There is an air of out-of-dateness, a hint of atrophy or rusting of religious faculty, about the Christian whose affections are narrowing in, whose kindly charitableness is wrinkling up into mean suspicions,

and who has come out of the sunshine of love into the chilling fogs of cynicism.

It comes to this, brethren: your spirit and mine cannot be kept sweet for a day, not for a day, without direct contact with the spirit of Jesus. Do not tell me that that renowned Christian of the lancet-tongue and brilliant sarcasms is living a life of prayer. It is impossible. He could not be laying himself open to Christ’s rebuke, and yet persist in the diabolic spirit of the traducer and the slanderer.

Within thy tabernacle, Lord
Who shall abide with Thee?
And in thy high and holy hill
Who shall a dweller be?
Who doth not slander with his tongue
Nor to his friend doth hurt:
Nor yet against his neighbor doth
Take up an ill report.

Yes, the kindness that beams from our faces on our brethren is the best evidence that we have been on the mount with God.

There is no place where earth’s sorrows
Are more felt than up in Heaven:
There is no place where earth’s failings
Have such kindly judgment given.

And our judgment will take after the kindness of heaven’s judgment, if we are often in humble self-prostration on the Mount of Communion, and suffer to blow about us the refreshing wind of the Spirit of God.

MODERN THEOLOGY AND THE PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL

IV. FROM WHAT AND TO WHAT ARE WE SAVED?

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, PH.D., D.D.

Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary

Author of "Christian Theology in Outline"

The subject which is next to engage our attention differs from those which we have been considering thus far in that it deals with a need of which everyone has direct and first-hand evidence. When we took up the Bible, we began by asking why we need a Bible, and it was necessary to do this, for there are people who do not seem to think we do. It is a fact—a lamentable fact—that for a great many people today the Bible is an all but unknown book. If they were in trouble, it would never occur to them to go to it for help. If they were in perplexity, it would never occur to them to go to it for guidance. They seldom read it. If you were to quote a familiar text they could not tell you from what book it came. It is more than likely that they would not even know that it came from the Bible at all. For all practical purposes the Bible has completely passed out of their lives.

It is so with the second great need of which we spoke—the need of God. Here, too, there are people who, so far as outward evidence is concerned, are unaware of their need. They are not conscious of God's presence in their lives. He is not a factor with which they feel they must reckon in the solution of their problems. They never pray. They do not go to church. They tell us that they believe in the religion of kindness and

that Nature is a good enough church for them.

If, then, we wish to commend our religion to people of this kind we must begin by showing why it is important to read the Bible and to believe in God. We must show that these fixed points in our Christian faith and practice are not arbitrary, but have found their place necessarily in answer to deep-seated human needs, needs that require only to be pointed out to be recognized.

But in the case of our present subject, no such preliminary explanation is necessary, for everybody who is old enough to know anything knows what it means to need salvation. Salvation means deliverance, help. It is the promise of relief from the evil of which life is full, the assurance of well-being and safety. To ask from what and to what we are saved is to ask from what evil we need to be delivered and what consequences we may expect to follow from the deliverance. This is a question of universal human interest. If you do not believe it, read the advertisement columns in the daily papers, or better still, the magazines, with their long list of remedies for the countless ills to which flesh is heir. Listen to the conversation of any group of men and women who know one another well enough to talk of the subjects that interest them most, and you

will find that they are talking about the need of salvation—either their own or somebody else's. They do not call it by that name, to be sure, but that is what they mean. There is no one, I repeat, old enough to know anything, who has not faced the fact of evil in his own experience and learned what it means to need deliverance. In every age, religion has made its most direct and persuasive appeal through its promise of help to people who were in trouble—in other words, because it has offered men salvation.

I have a friend, a man of singularly fine and unselfish feeling, who tells me that he thinks this matter of preaching salvation has been greatly overdone. Religion, he declares, is constantly presented as if it were a sort of medicine, a patent remedy, warranted to heal sickness and to cure sin, or, if not that, as a kind of life insurance policy, guaranteeing the insurer against the danger of loss and safeguarding him against the effects of his own misconduct and folly and that of others. But such a conception of religion, my friend holds, is altogether unworthy of its dignity. Religion is not something for the sick merely, but the well; not for the weak, but for the strong; not for the sinful, but for the righteous. Religion is the way by which we enter into the highest life possible and develop our capacities to the utmost. Religion is something for men at the height of their power and in the zenith of their prosperity, not simply for the hour of failure or the day of death. Religion is joy rather than comfort; fulness of life rather than safety; service rather than salvation.

¹ *Autobiography*, p. 214.

I have much sympathy with this point of view. In our desire to help men in their troubles, we often overlook the positive aspects of our religion. We greatly need the kind of preaching of which my friend speaks, preaching that will emphasize the virile and heroic aspects of Christianity; preaching that will present religion as a generous and satisfying life, the one adequate outlet for the energies that in most of us are but half used; preaching that will sound the note of adventure and enthusiasm, such as was struck by James Chalmers, Robert Louis Stevenson's friend, when he wrote:

We want "men and women who think preaching and living the gospel to the heathen the grandest work on earth. . . . We want men who will thoroughly enjoy all kinds of roughing it, who will be glad when ease and comfort can be had, but who will look upon all that comes as only the pepper and salt giving zest to work, and creating the appetite for more."²

But while this is true, and we cannot emphasize it too strongly, it is not all the truth. Whatever may be the case in the bright future to which we look forward by and by when the spirit of Christ shall be everywhere victorious and God's will be done on earth as it is done in heaven, certainly here and now men are the victims of sickness and sorrow and sin and death and failure in all its countless and heart-breaking forms. However much more there may be in religion than the word "salvation" expresses, it remains true that if we are to reach men at the point of their present need, here is where we must begin.

But though we should all agree as to the need of salvation, we should find it less easy to agree as to the particular evil from which men most need to be saved. For there are so many kinds of evil. There are evils which attack us from without, and evils which have their seat within. There are evils which affect us as individuals, and there are social evils. There are ills of the body, and ills of the mind. There is ignorance; there is sorrow; there is sickness; there are failure and misfortune; and there is the great family of evils which have their source in a perverted will. Clearly, if we are to help people intelligently, we must decide which need is greatest and where salvation is to begin.

Here the preachers of a generation ago had a great advantage, for they knew just what they were trying to do. With most of the evils of which we have been speaking, they were not concerned—at least, not primarily. Their special ministry was to the soul of man. It was their aim to set men right with God. The salvation they preached was from sin and the punishment which was its inevitable consequence.

Study the career of any one of the older revivalists, and you cannot help being impressed with the businesslike way in which he set about his work. The first thing which he attempted to do when he came to a new place was to make his hearers realize their absolute helplessness apart from God. He began by preaching the law. He warned men of the inevitable consequences of their sin, and only when he saw that they had been brought to a proper sense of the seriousness of their condition was he ready to follow up the first impression

with the message of forgiveness and peace.

And not only did the preacher know what he was trying to do, *but the people knew too*. We used to hear a great deal when I was a boy about the way of salvation. It was a way that had been trodden so many times that it was possible for anyone who wished to know just where he was going. People might not choose to go, but they knew where the way was, and they had no doubt that if they followed it, it would take them where they wanted to go.

If we look more closely at the salvation which the old revivalists preached, we find that it had two characteristics. In the first place, it was salvation from punishment; and in the second place, it was salvation from a punishment which was to be inflicted by and by.

This does not mean, of course, that deliverance from punishment was the whole of the preacher's message. He knew as well as we that the evil of evils was sin itself. Indeed the worst punishment which God could inflict upon a man was simply to let him continue in his sin. But to his thought punishment was something independent of sin and added to it, something from which a man needed to be delivered for its own sake, even after he had turned from his sin. It was not enough to repent in order to be forgiven, even if you were able to do so, which you were not. There was a necessity in the nature of God which required that past sin should be punished, and it was because it provided a way of escape from this punishment that the preaching of the atonement brought such relief to tortured spirits.

But it was not simply punishment

from which men needed to be delivered, but future punishment. The great day of reckoning to which the soul looked forward was not in this life but in the life to come. For a time, to be sure, the wicked might flourish like the green bay tree, but in the end his doom was sure. When death came he would be brought to the bar of divine judgment and face the great alternative of heaven or hell.

Here too we must be on our guard against exaggeration. Many descriptions of the older preaching of future punishment fail to do justice to its spiritual profundity. The older preachers realized as well as we that the true hell is not without, but within. It is separation from the comfortable presence of God here and hereafter. None the less it is true that in their thought of this separation they had the future rather than the present in mind. They were thinking not so much of present deliverance from sin as of escape from those torments of mind and body which awaited the impenitent after death. The message of the preacher was that of evangelist to Christian: "Flee from the wrath to come."

Here, then, we have a perfectly definite program. The minister of an earlier day, I repeat, knew just what he wanted to do. If you had asked him for his answer to our question today: From what and to what are we saved? his answer would have been instant and precise: We are saved from hell and to heaven.

There are many people today who no longer find this answer satisfying. A change has come over men's thought, but above all, over their feeling, of which

the thoughtful preacher is obliged to take account.

This change is due to two causes. It is due partly to a change in the conception of punishment, and partly to a new sense of the importance of the present life.

I have already had occasion to refer in another connection to the change which has taken place in our conception of justice. We no longer think of it as something which exacts punishment for its own sake. We think of justice as a means of bringing about right relations between man and his fellow-man, and punishment as one among other instruments to be used for that purpose. According to this view punishment is not something from which we need to be saved. It is itself the means of our salvation. Instead of being the vindication of an abstract principle of right, it is a tool put into our hands for the discipline and reformation of the offender. We have found in our prisons and our reformatories that when we treat men fairly, kindly, and hopefully, they respond to our treatment, and we see no reason why, when we are persuaded that their lives have been changed, they should not again be restored to society. We do not believe that God is less good than man, and so it is natural for us to think of him, too, as making justice the instrument of his love.

But it is not simply that we have a different conception of punishment. Our whole perspective has altered. The other-worldly Christianity of another generation has yielded to a view of religion which is primarily concerned with the life that now is. We wish a salvation for today—a salvation which can

deal with the specific evils of whose presence we are most conscious here and now—political evils like injustice, economic evils like poverty, physical evils like disease. It is not enough to believe that individuals here and there may be delivered from their present sinful environment. We wish to be assured that the environment itself is to be transformed into one that will favor and not hinder freedom and progress.

Into the causes of this change I need not enter here. In part it is due to a clearer recognition of the unity of life. We have learned for one thing that there is no such thing as a purely isolated individual, that we are literally members one of another, so involved with the men and women by our side, in a hundred complex relationships, that it is absolutely impossible for us to separate our interests from theirs. We have learned, too, how intimately and in how many ways the spiritual graces we value most highly are rooted in the homely soil of economic opportunity. We see that drunkenness and immorality are not simply sins of individuals. They are symptoms of an unsound social order, and so we are shifting our point of attack. We are trying not to save individual drunkards and prostitutes but simply to create such social standards and habits as will make their existence forever impossible, and in our devotion to this immediate task we have lost sight for the moment of the more distant future for which the present is a preparation.

I am not concerned here with passing judgment upon the change, but simply with registering the fact. We may admit that there is a truth in the older view

of punishment which many of us have too lightly dismissed. If punishment is really to reform, it must be recognized by the one who receives it as just. Take away its inevitableness and you impair its disciplinary value. The lawlessness which is so serious a menace to our social and political life is due in no small part to the fact that so many men have lost the sense of accountability to an authority which cannot be evaded.

We may admit, too, that any gospel of salvation which confines itself to the present merely, and does not take into account the longer future, is bound in the long run to prove unsatisfying. The richer and fuller we make life here, the more we put into it of spiritual meaning and value, the less we shall be content with the thought of its ultimate cessation. But however this may be, the fact remains that in both the respects to which I have referred, there has been a change of emphasis with which we must reckon. Even if we do not feel it ourselves, others do. There are many people for whom the old form of appeal has lost its force, and if our preaching of salvation is to be effective we must have some clear-cut message to take its place. What shall that message be?

This brings us to the first of our two questions: From what are we saved? The older answer was: "We are saved from punishment." In contrast to this, it would seem natural to say that we are saved from sin. If the older preaching was at fault in making too much of the consequences, let us go back to the cause. Sin at least is a present fact whose existence everyone recognizes, and no one will deny that we need to be saved from it.

But the trouble with this answer is that it is too vague. No doubt, everyone will admit that we need to be saved from sin in general, but our trouble begins when we try to deal with sins in detail. How can we tell whether any particular act is a sin? Is there any principle which will determine this for us?

This is a question which comes home with increasing force to every conscientious Christian. One of the most striking facts in the social life of today is the breaking-down of standards. The definite rules in which the older ethics formulated the ideal of human conduct can no longer count on an undivided public opinion. This is not necessarily due to any lack of moral sensitiveness. It is due in part to the growing complexity of modern life. New conditions are constantly arising which could not be foreseen; new factors entering the field which must be taken into account. I am not thinking simply of the changes which affect our individual standards, such as the new economic conditions which have modified our attitude toward Sunday observance, or the new attitude toward intellectual inquiry which has been the fruit of modern science. I am thinking of a whole group of sins which have grown out of the new social and economic environment, for which the older ethics made no explicit provision—the sins of the corporation, for example, sins for which we can hold no single individual exclusively responsible because we all alike share the responsibility. We need some principle at once definite and flexible which will unify our thinking and act as a positive guide in the new conditions which we face today.

Such a principle modern theology gives us in its teaching concerning the normative significance of Jesus Christ. Sin, it tells us, is any departure from the standard he has established, on the part either of the individual or of society. Sin is un-Christlikeness, and that is only another way of saying that it is selfishness. Sin is the preference from motives of self-indulgence of any other end for the supreme end which Christ has revealed, namely, the kingdom of God.

Such a definition helps us in two ways. In the first place, it gives us a general principle, simple enough to be easily intelligible, yet at the same time comprehensive enough to take in all forms of evil; and in the second place, it helps us to deal with specific evils by showing us wherein their real evil consists.

Take, for example, that old vice of intemperance which has been the text of so many a sermon. What is the real sin of drunkenness? There is a sin against the individual, no doubt, but there is a greater sin against society. The worst evil of the drink habit consists in the consequences which follow from it for others. It consists in the temptation which it puts in the way of those who have not the strength to resist. It consists in the decreased social efficiency of the men who have formed the habit, the fact that they are no longer so effective as workers, so responsible in positions of trust, so lovable and dependable as husbands and fathers; in the fact, in short, that they are no longer able worthily to fill their places in the great family of God.

It is so with all the other sins which are commonly catalogued as individual, such as gambling or impurity. The evil in each case includes not only the effect

produced upon the man himself, but the social consequences which follow from it. It is the fact that the self-indulgence which the habit fosters is bound to bear fruit in cruelty, misery, and degradation.

But our principle has a much wider application. It bears not only upon the individual sins which formed the staple of the older preaching, but upon those newer forms of social sin which have grown out of the changed conditions of our modern industrial life. It gives us a principle by which we can judge social practice everywhere. Does it advance or hinder the kingdom of God? Is it an expression of brotherhood, or its repudiation? Here is a wide field into which our present plan will not allow us to go in detail. It includes whatever affects the social welfare and efficiency of the people; the method of producing wealth and of distributing it; the conditions of housing and of education; the prevalence of social habits and standards—all, in short, that is either uplifting or debasing in a community.

Some years ago the country was stirred by the accounts of a lynching in a northern state, where a wounded negro under trial for his life was taken by force from his bed in a hospital by a mob of armed men, carried to a public place in the neighborhood, and burned to death in the presence of a crowd of more than four thousand people, none of whom made any protest or attempt at rescue. How shall we judge such an occurrence from the Christian standpoint? What is the sin which calls for national repentance? Not simply that the thing was done, but that conditions existed that made it possible. The sin was the

sin not simply of the men who piled the fagots or set the torch, not simply of the men who looked on with approval or at least acquiescence, but of the whole community in which there had grown up a spirit of brutality and lawlessness making possible such an outbreak. It was the sin of the churches which had failed in their preaching of brotherhood; it was the sin of the schools which had failed in their teaching of responsibility; it was the sin of the government which had failed in its enforcement of order; it was the sin of all of us whose omissions and commissions go to make up that mysterious force which we call public opinion, and which here, as so often in the past, had proved itself impotent for good. *If we had been the men we ought to be*, the evil thing could never have happened. The salvation we need—the salvation which is to deliver us from our real sin—cannot stop with the surface evils which show themselves openly in the body politic, but must attack the un-Christlikeness which is their underlying cause.

We have answered the first half of our question: From what are we saved? We are to be saved from un-Christlikeness which is selfishness. But our task is incomplete until we have answered the second part as well. To what are we saved? Here again the answer is clear. We are to be saved to Christlikeness, which means saviorhood.

This idea of salvation to service is no new idea. You will find it splendidly expressed in Luther's great tract *On Christian Liberty*. "A Christian man," says Luther, "is the most free lord of all men and subject to none; a Christian man is the most dutiful servant of all

and subject to every one."¹ He is free since Christ has saved him; he is servant since it is his part to be a Christ to others. Yet, closely as the two aspects of the Christian life are connected, they are yet independent. Service to Luther was something added to salvation, not a part of salvation itself. Salvation was complete when the saved man knew himself forgiven through Jesus Christ. Service was the life that followed as a consequence of this forgiveness. It was the way the Christian took of showing his thankfulness for having been saved.

To understand the significance of this distinction we must remember Luther's situation. He was facing a church that taught salvation by works, and he wished to make it perfectly clear that salvation was not something which a man could earn by his own merits, but must come to him as a free gift. Salvation was the renewal of fellowship with God which came with the consciousness of forgiveness. It was filial confidence, the upward look of the child to the father. Salvation, in a word, was sonship.

This is the meaning of that old doctrine of justification by faith, which has so often been misunderstood. Justification by faith is the theologian's way of saying what Jesus said when he talked about the childlike spirit, and it was to safeguard this great truth against the assaults of legalism in every form that the Reformers and their successors were so careful to distinguish between justification and sanctification; between salvation, which is forgiveness, and its consequence, which is service.

But we see today that the connection is even closer. Service is not something

added to salvation as its consequence. It is a part of salvation itself. You cannot love the God whom Christ revealed without beginning to love your fellow-man. The same experience which reveals to you your sonship shows you your brotherhood too. The test of being saved oneself is that one begins to save others.

This insistence upon the indissoluble connection between salvation and service is the characteristic note of our modern Christianity. It is not simply that we have come to see that you cannot have a salvation for the individual alone, but that we should not be satisfied with it, even if we could get it. We feel so keenly our kinship with the men and women all about us who are struggling for a larger and a fuller life that we cannot be content with any solution of our own problem which does not bring deliverance to them.

But when we ask ourselves what we can do to help these brothers of ours we find less clearness. We are saved to be saviors. But what does it mean to be a savior? From what and to what are we who have been saved to save others? Clearly from the same evil from which we have been saved ourselves. We are to save men from un-Christlikeness, which is selfishness, to Christlikeness, which means saviorhood.

When we bring our modern Christianity to this test the result is less satisfactory. There is an immense amount of activity among Christians. From morning till night, and often far into the night, we are at work with our clubs and our societies and our committee meetings. There is no one of all the

¹ Wace's ed., 1883, p. 104.

long list of ills at which we glanced a moment ago which is not being somewhere and somehow attacked. But the results do not seem commensurate with the effort. The forces of the enemy multiply faster than we can shoot them down. The weeds grow faster than we can pull them up. And the reason is not far to seek. We are dealing with consequences rather than causes, with symptoms rather than with the disease. In our own way we are repeating the mistake of the older preachers who tried to save men from punishment rather than from sin. All these evils of which we have been speaking are the effects of one fundamental and deep-seated evil—the radical selfishness of the human heart. We shall never have men really saved till we have saved them from this. How are we to do it?

Well, how were we saved ourselves? What was it that delivered us from the bondage of our own self-love and introduced us to the life of service? This is a very searching question for it pierces to the very roots of our being and forces us to ask ourselves anew how far we are saved ourselves—saved, I mean, in the full Christian sense of that great word. It is a question which each must answer for himself, in the solitude of his own soul. But I am sure of one thing, that so far as we can truthfully answer it in the affirmative we shall confess that what saved us was someone's love. There is only one way to produce love, and that is by loving. "We love," says the apostle, "because he first loved us."¹

This doctrine of salvation by love is the characteristic feature of the Christian religion. Ever since we were children

we have been told that God is love. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life."² We have heard the words so often that they have almost ceased to convey any meaning to us. To appreciate what such a phrase as salvation by love really means when applied to God we have to make a distinct effort of the imagination.

What does it mean to love in the sense in which Jesus used the term? It means to respect another's individuality. It means to make the interests of another your own interests, his fortune your fortune, his welfare your welfare. It means to desire earnestly his highest good. It means to carry him on your heart, hour by hour, day by day, year by year.

That was what gave Jesus his great power over men. He was the great lover. He was always thinking about other people's welfare. He went about doing good. He healed the sick, he fed the hungry, he comforted the sad, he forgave the sinful, he taught the ignorant. But these, after all, were only symptoms of something deeper. Jesus *cared* for men. He believed in their capacity for infinite development. He carried them on his heart, as the shepherd carries his sheep.

Now the Bible tells us that this is what God is always doing. He is doing a thousand things for us, supplying our physical needs through the bounties of Nature, ministering to our sense of beauty by sunrise and evening star, guiding our consciences by the warnings of his Spirit, rousing us to new activity

¹ I John 4:19.

² John 3:16.

by the call of duty or the spur of danger; in countless ways by his overshadowing providence making life the wonderful and fascinating thing it is, but above and beyond all this, he *cares* for us. He carries us on his heart, as the good father carries his children. He is the great Shepherd of our souls.

And that is what he wants us to do for one another. It is a good thing to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked and to visit the prisoner—nay, it is a necessary thing. Jesus has told us that they are his representatives and that when we minister to them we are ministering to him. But without love what is our ministering worth? "If I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and if I give my body to be burned, but have not love, it profiteth me nothing."¹ There is a worse evil than thirst from which men need deliverance—a worse evil than cold, a worse evil than imprisonment, a worse evil than nakedness, and that is selfishness, and the only thing that can save from this is love.

Near one of our great cities there is a reformatory for girls. It was the outgrowth of the efforts of a good woman who believed that the indiscriminate association of first offenders with hardened criminals was responsible for the destruction of many lives that might be saved to usefulness and self-respect. From the first the reformatory has been singularly fortunate in its management. It has been free from the curse of politics. It has secured the most highly trained women for its positions of responsibility, and its record of lives saved and characters transformed is a most encouraging witness to what can be accomplished by

the resources of modern science and modern philanthropy.

To this reformatory there came one day a girl with whom the superintendent and teachers could do nothing. Handsome, strong, intelligent, she was utterly reckless and self-willed, and much of the time it was necessary to keep her under physical restraint to prevent her from doing injury to herself and others. Her story, as it was subsequently learned, was the familiar story of early mismanagement resulting in the exaggeration of the evils it was designed to cure. "Kate," her parents used to say, "if you do this I'll kill you." "But I very soon found," she said, "that they did not kill me, and I determined that the way to have my own way was to have it, and I did." Against this ingrained self-will all the resources of the institution were tried in vain. Kindness and sternness, gentleness and force were equally ineffective, and all who had to do with Kate were in despair.

One night a message came to the superintendent from the matron in charge of the cottage where Kate was living to come over at once, as the girl was rebellious and her outcries were keeping all the other inmates awake. When the superintendent came she found Kate confined in a cell in handcuffs, sitting on the floor, since she had torn everything else in the cell to pieces. Like a wild animal she tossed from side to side, screaming in such a way that rest was impossible for anyone within range of her voice. The superintendent entered the cell, sat down beside her on the floor and tried to coax or reason her into a better frame of mind. At last,

¹I Cor. 13:3.

exhausted in body and worn out in spirit, she lost her self-control, and before she realized what she was doing, had burst into tears. Instantly Kate stopped screaming and for some time sat regarding her companion in silence. At last she spoke: "Miss Smith," she asked, "are you crying?" "Yes, Kate," the superintendent answered. "Why are you crying?" Kate continued. "I am crying because of you, to think that after all my effort I am unable to do anything for your good." Again there was silence. Then Kate said abruptly: "Miss Smith, that is the first time in my life that anyone ever shed a tear for me. This breaks my heart; I cannot stand it. You can take the handcuffs off. You won't have any more trouble with me."

The superintendent took her at her word. The handcuffs were removed and the miracle was wrought, not instantly or without many a struggle and some failures, yet certainly, the wild beast was tamed, the devil cast out, and Kate, once the despair of the institution, became the mainstay of superintendent and matron in dealing with the new cases that baffled them. "Leave her to me," she would say. "I know how she feels, I can deal with her," and she did. The saved had become a savior, and a savior she remains to this day.

It is the old story of redemptive love. You can hear its like in any rescue mission. But the interesting thing about the story and the reason I have told it here is that it did not happen at a rescue mission, but at a state reformatory which is the expression of the latest word in scientific charity. When everything had been tried that science could

suggest, the old doctor Love was called in and wrought the cure.

This does not mean that modern methods are useless; that we have nothing to learn from the new philanthropy as to how to help men and women in their need. You will surely not so far misunderstand me. Love cannot work in a vacuum. Like every other workman it needs tools, and the better the tools the better it can work. The inspiring thing about the whole scientific movement is that it has so mightily enlarged our capacity for service by showing us how many more things we can do than we had supposed to help people in their need. But after all, all these things are tools. Mighty as the instruments of love, in and of themselves, they are impotent. It is as true today as when Christ lived and died, that the only sure way to save is to love.

Now love is the most costly thing in the world. It cost Christ Calvary, and every man who shares Christ's spirit and gives himself to his work will find that he too will have to pay the price. "If any man would come after me, said Jesus, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me."¹ It is a law of life that we can have only what we pay for, and the things that are most valuable cost most.

That is the meaning of the doctrine of the atonement—that great truth which lies at the heart of the Christian religion. It is the expression of the fact that the law of cost is valid for God as well as for man. God, too, can have only what he pays for; and for him, too, the things which he values most highly cost most. God could not save without loving, and

¹ Mark 9:34.

he could not love without suffering. Even before Christ came Isaiah had grasped this great secret when he wrote of God: "In all their affliction he was afflicted; in his love and in his pity he redeemed them and he bare them and carried them all the days of old."¹ God is the great sufferer because he is the great lover. Atonement is not something which happens outside of God to make forgiveness possible. *Atonement is something which happens in God.* It was what it cost God to bear the world's sin, your sin and mine.

Religion is fellowship with God, and fellowship means unity in thought, in purpose, and in feeling. To be a Christian means to make God's point of view one's own—to feel toward men as he feels toward them, to desire for them what he desires for them, to care for them so much that one is willing to suffer for them—nay, to love them so much that one cannot help suffering for them, when one sees them fail of their highest good.

This does not mean that we are to go through life heavy-hearted, as though the burden of the world's salvation rested upon our shoulders; as though God's redemption needed some supplement that our suffering must supply. It does not mean that we should always be looking on the dark side of life, that we are to be blind to the joy and beauty of which the world is full. It does not require us to shut our eyes to the fact that God's method is one of progress, and that the standards by which we judge the beginners in the moral life are very different from those which we apply to those who are further advanced. But it

¹ Isa. 63:9.

does mean that the standards which we apply must be those of Christ. It means that we shall grieve over the things that grieved him and rejoice over that which gave him joy. It means that that mind should be in us which was also in Christ Jesus, of whom we read that, "being in the form of God," he "counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea the death of the cross."²

Have we the mind of Christ? Is our attitude toward life and its problems his attitude? Does he determine our estimate of values? Do we measure success by the standard by which he measures it—our own success, the success of our children, of our churches, of the community in which we live, of society as a whole? Is love our final test of salvation?

Above all, have we the heart of Christ? Does he set the tone of our feeling? Do we grieve as he grieved over loveless lives? Do we find our greatest happiness in the winning of new recruits to that great purpose of love to which he gave his life? Can we say with truth, as he said, that "it is more blessed to give than to receive"? If so—and only so—are we ready for the work to which he has called us as preachers of his salvation.

I thank thee, Lord, for strength of arm
To earn my bread,
And that beyond my need is meat
For friend unfed.

I thank thee much for bread to live,
I thank thee more for bread to give.

² Phil. 2:7, 8.

I thank thee, Lord, for snug thatched roof
 In cold and storm,
 And that beyond my need is room
 For friend forlorn.
 I thank thee much for place to rest,
 But more for shelter for my guest.

I thank thee, Lord, for lavish love
 On me bestowed,
 Enough to share with loveless folk,
 To ease their load.
 Thy love to me I ill could spare,
 Yet dearer is the love I share.¹

THE TEACHING OF JESUS

LUCIUS HOPKINS MILLER

Professor of Biblical Instruction, Princeton University

This is the third of a series of articles by Professor Miller dealing with Jesus. The others have been in the November number, "The Source of Our Information regarding the Life of Jesus," and in the February number, "The Life of Jesus in the Light of Modern Criticism." We suggest the reading of this article in connection with the sermon in this number by Dr. Ross.

So much is made of the supposed insufficiency and uncertainty of the Gospels that it is well to lay this bogey to rest at once, so far as the teaching of Jesus is concerned. Of course, we should like to have a much fuller record, but that is no reason for shutting our eyes to the fact that we have, nevertheless, a fairly large amount of reported teaching. But is it credibly reported? This question raises serious problems into which we cannot enter here. But the existence of these problems need not paralyze our practical judgment. We may leave much in doubt without depriving ourselves of the assurance that we do know, or can know, the main lines along which Jesus' thought ran. To be sure, Jesus spoke in Aramaic and all the Gospels were written in Greek. Further the accounts of what he said have certainly been colored by the minds through which the stream of tradition flowed.

But let all be said that can be said, and we may still maintain that we know what Jesus taught.

A few words about interpretation. In interpreting the Bible many mistakes are made and many errors arise. Jesus' teaching has not been exempt from these things. It is so easy to see in a word what we wish to see in it, and it is so comfortable to insert our pet convictions in a verse, surreptitiously, and then to draw them out again triumphantly, with an air of scientific discovery and of divine authority. In interpreting the teaching of Jesus we must not change parables into allegories, seeking all sorts of complicated meanings where usually one great truth is to be found. We must remember that "the words of Jesus are important, not as precepts, but as indicative of principles," for he was not interested in regulating the outward life but in filling the soul with

¹ Davis, *The Better Prayer*.

divine enthusiasm. In fine, we must always be alive to the underlying principles and then regard them as revelations of Jesus' own mind; for he was not so much a teacher of spiritual life as a revealer of it. Thus Paul was quite right in emphasizing the spirit against the letter, and in this emphasis he followed in the footsteps of the Master.

Matthew Arnold, with his usual keenness of insight, realized that a dominant note in Jesus' words was that of *inwardness*. It does not require the insight of a Matthew Arnold to discern this, however. The most striking thing about Christianity has been its unerring tendency to lay its finger on the heart; on the thoughts, motives, impulses, and purposes of men; on all the inner cross- and counter-currents that go to make up our real life in the everyday world.

This element of Jesus' teaching most naturally appears in strongest light where the Jewish law is discussed. We are prone to think of Paul as the great protagonist of faith, the spirit, and the inner life, against dead works, the mere letter of life, and the externalism of legalism. In this we are right. Paul's fight meant the possibility of full freedom for the Christian movement, and his victory meant its realization. But we must remember that Paul was merely the captain who led the last assault in a campaign that had been conducted, indeed, for centuries; from the skirmishes of the Hebrew prophets to the fundamental plan of attack revealed

in the Gospels by the greatest of spiritual commanders.

Jesus' attitude toward the law was prophetic, rather than scribal. That is, it was vital rather than formal, inward rather than outward, spiritual rather than literal. There is nothing more stirring or more searching in the whole Bible, nay, in all literature, than the series of antithetic passages in the fifth chapter of Matthew, beginning in each case, "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time," and ending with, "But I say unto you." There is a sureness of aim here that begets confidence and wins admiration, both because of that which the shots destroy and that which they spare and defend. One is tempted to quote at length but a few verses must suffice: "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you that every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment. . . . Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you that every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart."¹

It may be that our usual idea of Paul, as a more outspoken antagonist of the law than Jesus, is due to his methods of presentation. However, to Paul the law was still "a slave to bring us unto Christ." Jesus, too, seems to have been

¹ Matt. 5:21-24, 27-28, 38-48. In this article I shall use, of course, only such teaching of Jesus as I consider genuine. One or two reservations will be indicated later. I may say, further, that the teaching selected, minor details aside, is not seriously questioned by those critics whose leadership is worthy of acceptance. The genuine teaching of Jesus far exceeds, in amount, that utilized here. Limits of space compel a selection. I have tried to make this selection thoroughly representative.

accustomed to send inquirers back to the law, bidding them seek light from it. But, close as these two ideas are, there is a difference. For Paul, the work of the law was done. It was all a thing of the past. Christ had ended it. The present was the age of the Spirit and there was a clear break between the two, of time as well as of quality. Jesus, on the contrary, seemed to think of the law, not as superseded, but as outgrowing itself, so to speak. In it were continually to be found the germinating seeds of a new life that was to fulfil the law. "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished."¹

This is a strong passage and not without disquieting suggestions. The "jot and tittle" phraseology sounds altogether rabbinical, and it may be that we have here the work of some misguided Jewish Christian, anxious to save the orthodoxy of the Master. I am inclined to think this is the case. But, on the other hand, one of the guiding principles of a correct interpretation of Jesus' teaching is a recognition of his tendency to push a truth to the extreme, in order to get it out into the open, as it were, free from the inevitable background of expediency. The famous "turn the cheek" passage is an example of this, and it may be that the present passage is another. This does not seem at all likely, however, for the Jews did not need to be harangued into legalism,

nor was Jesus at all interested in that sort of thing. The meaning may possibly be that the law contains the gist of the whole matter, therefore we cannot think of its passing away any more than of the disappearance of the eternal truth of which it is the bearer.

But we do not have to base on such disputable ground the thesis that Jesus sought and found, inside the law itself, the interpretative principle of the new life. In Matthew and in Luke we have parallel accounts of the famous question of the lawyer. "Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? And he said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do and thou shalt live."

The lawyer's answer to his own question was taken partly from Deuteronomy and partly from Leviticus, and Jesus stamped it with the seal of his approval.² On another occasion he expressed the opinion that "every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old."³ In other words, the law is far from discarded. It is God's law and salvation is in it. "This do and thou shalt live." But the law must be interpreted according to a principle to be found within itself, a principle that has to do with the heart and the motives. A sifting pro-

¹ Matt. 5:17-20.

² Luke 10:25-28; Matt. 22:34-40; Deut. 6:4; Lev. 17:17-18.

³ Matt. 13:52.

cess results by which the wheat of the permanent is separated from the temporary Jewish chaff.

Jesus did not content himself with mere enunciation of the principle, leaving the application to us. He applied it rigorously to the contemporaneous perversions which characterized Pharisaism, in language which has become classic. Indeed, orations of invective might quite as reasonably be called "rabbinics" as "philippics." When the Pharisees were quibbling about the relation of hand-washing to religion, Jesus uttered the trenchant saying, "There is nothing from without the man, that going into him can defile him; but the things which proceed out of the man are those that defile the man."¹ Elsewhere scorn is heaped upon rabbinical exaggeration and hypocrisy in words of cutting irony and indignant emotion. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye cleanse the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full from extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first the inside of the cup and of the platter, that the outside thereof may become clean also."²

This invective is directed against rabbinical refinements of the law, but it is clear that Jesus everywhere subordinates the legal and ceremonial elements of the original law to his inner principle and practically excludes them from consideration. Thus we see that Matthew Arnold was right in holding up inwardness as a fundamental mark of Christian teaching.

But mere inwardness is, to a large extent, a colorless term; a formal de-

scription without essential content. We now know where to look, but we do not yet know what to look for. To be sure, when we learn that righteousness is a thing of the heart and not a matter of washing pots, pans, cups, and platters, we have made progress. This progress carries us beyond and above the boggy levels of Pharisaism, but it does not bring us to the fork of the road where the peculiarly Christian path leads out. In other words, there are kinds of inwardness not distinctively Christian, and thus we see that Matthew Arnold's criterion is only a tentative and partial one, not final. "Out of the heart are the issues of life," no matter what those issues may be. Envy is quite as inward as benevolence. Hatred is quite as inward as love. Lust is just as much a thing of the heart as purity. "That which proceedeth out of the man, that defileth the man. For from within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed, fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness: all these evil things proceed from within, and defile the man."³ Besides, Christianity is not the only religion that possesses this trait of inwardness. Both Brahmanism and Buddhism are essentially inward in their emphasis.

No, we must delve deeper into the teaching of Jesus if we are to fathom its unique depths. Can we find there distinctive meanings which will mark off the Christian life of the spirit from other kinds of spiritual life? Can we discern in his teaching thoughts that may be

¹ Mark 7:1-23.

² Matt. 23.

³ Mark 7:20-23; vs. 21-23 seem to be an expansion by the evangelist of the thought of Jesus in vs. 20.

described as characteristically Christian? In short, is there a peculiarly Christian inwardness, and, if so, what is it? To find what we seek we must answer the questions, "What does Jesus teach regarding God?" and, "What does He teach concerning man?" We may link to one or the other of these two queries all others that might conceivably be asked, such as those concerning sin, forgiveness, faith, salvation, the future life.

Let us first examine, therefore, the doctrine of Jesus concerning God. Most non-Christians, and many Christians, think of God as a God of power essentially. He is omniscient. He knows everything. He is omnipotent. He can do anything. It is well known how large this element looms in the Moslem conception of God. The recognition of fate and the inculcation of blind submission express this emphasis of Islam. The inscrutability of the all-powerful purposes of Allah and the uselessness of resisting them are cardinal Mohammedan doctrines.

In a similar way, the rabbis of late Judaism magnified the element of aloofness in God's nature. In the thought of the Jews, from the time of the Babylonian exile, the gap between Jehovah and his people tended to increase. The sense of sin and of its curse brought with it a sense of moral separation. The growing belief in intermediary beings emphasized this separation quite as much as did the connection between God and man. The whole relationship was usually conceived of in despotic terms which linked the aloofness of Jehovah with the essential thought of power. The Jews did not dare to use

Jehovah's real name, "Jahwé." It was too sacred. They employed circumlocutions, or combined the consonants of that name with the vowels of another and less sacred name, "Adonai," thus creating the familiar but linguistically unjustifiable word, "Jehovah."

Jesus, on the other hand, emphasized other phases of the nature of God more strongly than that of power. Still we must not forget that the God of Jesus is clearly a powerful God. In the famous colloquy with his disciples regarding the future chances of rich men, Jesus asserts, "With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible." The relative dreadfulness of falling into the hands of angry men or of an offended God is described in these undoubtedly genuine words: "And I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will warn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, who after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him."² Elsewhere, simple trust is commended in the words of a nature lover, "Consider the lilies, how they grow: they toil not, neither do they spin; yet I say unto you, Even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. But if God doth so clothe the grass in the field, which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven; how much more shall He clothe you, O ye of little faith?"³

That everything is in God's hands, Jesus everywhere assumes and occasionally asserts. But there is nothing speculative about his assertions. Many of our theological garments have been woven with omnipotence as the warp

² Matt. 19:23-26.

³ Luke 12:4-5.

³ Luke 12:22-30; Matt. 6:25-34.

and omniscience the woof. This may do for sackcloth but not for work-a-day clothes. Jesus cut his cloth from another pattern. God is powerful—all-powerful, in fact—but his power is a practical and not a speculative matter. Like the Sabbath, "it was made for man and not man for it."

But Jesus' emphasis is not on power at all, but on the love of God. The special term he used for God, the name "Father," which has ever since been considered distinctively Christian, symbolizes beautifully both the inclusiveness of Jesus' conception and its special interest. The name was not a new one. It appears several times in the Old Testament and was not unfamiliar to the rabbis; but with Jesus it seems to have taken on a new connotation. But even his meaning was not absolutely new. Hosea, Jeremiah, and Second Isaiah, among others, had stressed the loving phase of Jehovah's nature. Still, the depth and range of God's gracious love are so much greater in the Gospels that they stamp the whole conception as something new. New it still is, in large part. After two thousand years of training, even Christian theory still finds it hard to survive at the altitude of the Sermon on the Mount, and Christian practice lags far behind its theory. "Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. . . . Whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him two. . . . Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy: but I say unto

you, Love your enemies, . . . that ye may be sons of your Father who is in heaven."¹

Love, in the specially Christian sense, in the sense determined by God's own nature, is graciousness, kindness, and helpfulness to those who cannot or will not require it. Grasp this and you are ready to understand the heart of the gospel of Jesus. The gist of the parable of the Prodigal Son is in the very phase of the story which causes many to sympathize with the elder brother. The whole point is the very lack of desert in the Prodigal, his previous selfishness and ingratitude, and his present inability to offer his father anything but a contrite heart. "And he arose and came to his father . . . his father saw him, and was moved with compassion. . . . And the son said, Father, I have sinned . . . I am no more worthy to be called thy son. . . . But the father said, . . . let us . . . make merry: for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found."²

The ethical difficulties in the parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard are solved in the same way. The parable is introduced with the words, "For the Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a man that was a householder." The householder is the central figure of the story and, in him, one characteristic is featured, namely, the desire to help others needlessly. The parable does not show perfect literary execution, but it is not lacking in clarity. It teaches the free, boundless, uncalculating graciousness of the Father.³

The unapproachably beautiful parable of the Good Samaritan leads in the same direction by a different path. The

¹ Matt. 5:38-48.

² Luke 15:11-32.

³ Matt. 20:1-16.

virtue of the Samaritan consisted in his rising above the ordinary separations of life by means of a broad, human sympathy. The prologue of the parable connects this sort of neighborly love with a right relation to God and consequently presupposes the existence of the same quality in God himself.¹

Wherever we touch the teaching of Jesus, we feel this throbbing sympathy, expressed or implied. It is not strange, therefore, that the symbol, "Father," was his favorite name for God, for it expresses most aptly Jesus' supreme interest in the practical relation of God to the world: a relation of good-will, which is the essential content of the "inwardness" of God.

But, can we not go farther in analyzing the content of this good-will? No doubt we are learning more about it all the time. The revelation of God's love is not yet complete. It is growing with the consciousness of the race. Each generation adds details to fill out the concept. But Jesus did not leave all this to those who should come after Him. He himself tells us a number of important things.

For instance, we learn that the love which the Father expects from his children, namely, his own loving kindness, is not a weak and pliant thing. It must not be confused with softness. The Father hates sin. "If thy right eye causeth thee to stumble, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not thy whole body be cast into hell."² Though his sympathy is as wide as the horizon, and as deep as the

ocean, it does not and cannot separate sin from punishment. "And if thy right hand causeth thee to stumble, cut it off and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not thy whole body go into hell."³ These and other stern passages do not enable us to paint the picture in detail. In fact, we are told not to judge, "that ye be not judged." The court dealing with such things is one over which we are not called to preside; but we must hold, if only as a word of admonition, that Jesus' conception of God includes some relation to "the wages of sin."

Further, we learn that God's love is of a sort that demands purity of heart. "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God."⁴ It generates a modest willingness to sink fame and personal glory in glad service of others. "And Jesus called them to him, and saith unto them, Ye know that they who are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall be servant of all. For the Son of Man also came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."⁵ It demands a peace-loving disposition, "Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called sons of God";⁶ singleness of purpose, "The lamp of the body is the eye; if therefore thine eye be single thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body

¹ Luke 10:25-37.

² Matt. 5:30.

³ Mark 10:42-45.

⁴ Matt. 5:29.

⁵ Matt. 5:8.

⁶ Matt. 5:9.

shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is the darkness! No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon."¹

The divine love is of a sort that can work only through obedient wills. In fact, it is only through action prompted by obedience to the divine impulse that this God-like structure can be built up. "Every one therefore that heareth these words of mine, and doeth them, shall be likened unto a wise man, who built his house upon the rock: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon the rock. And every one that heareth these words of mine and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and smote upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall thereof."² Finally, this love includes a whole-souled and eager devotion to righteousness, hungering and thirsting, as it were, for everything good. "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled."³ The nature of these demands reveals the nature of the love that makes them, and in these things is the true love from God made manifest.

The patience and persistence of true love is clearly indicated in the words, "Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake for theirs

is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye when men shall reproach you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets that were before you."⁴ These qualities Jesus pre-eminently embodied in his own life, alike in his relations with slow-minded disciples and exasperating enemies.

He often insists on the forgiving spirit, also, as part and parcel of a love that shares the divine nature. "Then came Peter and said to him, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? until seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times; but, Until seventy times seven."⁵ Then follows the condemnation of the "Unmerciful Servant." Lastly, true love, the love characteristic of the Father, inevitably entails suffering. There is in it something essentially vicarious, something that involves suffering with and for others. "And he began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and the chief priests, and be killed, and after three days rise again. And he spake the saying openly. And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him. But he, turning about, and seeing his disciples, rebuked Peter, and saith, Get thee behind me, Satan; for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men. And he called unto him the multitude with his disciples, and said unto them, If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his

¹ Matt. 6:22-24.

² Matt. 5:6.

³ Matt. 7:24-27.

⁴ Matt. 5:10-12.

⁵ Matt. 18:21-22; 5:43-48; 6:12-15.

cross, and follow me. For whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it. . . ."

The Cross is not merely an essential part of the original gospel. It is an essential element in every man's true appropriation of the "Good News," because it is essential to the "things of God." When, therefore, we speak of love without including in our conception lines of demarkation—separations, hardness, suffering—we substitute for the true conception a soft, emasculated sentimentality which is quite a different thing. We mind "not the things of God, but the things of men."

The distinctive thing, therefore, about Jesus' emphasis upon love in the character of God is not its separation from other ethical qualities and its exaltation in disregard of them, or at their expense. It is, rather, that all possible virtues are subsumed under this all-controlling principle in which they become fused, by which they are energized, and through which a proper balance may be secured in their exercise. In a sense, the thought of God and of his demands is thus immensely simplified, in that the eye may be focused on one point instead of on many. But this is truly a terrible simplicity. It is so rich, varied, many-sided, and all-embracing, and hence so hard to acquire. These things enable us to understand how two diverse and apparently contradictory sayings of Jesus may both be true, namely, "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; . . . for my yoke is easy, and my

burden is light"; and, "Enter ye in by the narrow gate: . . . for narrow is the gate and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life."

We must not forget to add a word regarding Jesus' conception of God's relation to the physical universe. Man's conquest of nature has caused many terrors to vanish like a morning cloud, but others have arisen to take their place. Whatever the development of science, man will never entirely conquer nature. On the contrary, nature is bound to conquer man, sooner or later; at death, if not before. A religion that does not meet the needs arising from this condition cannot permanently satisfy the heart of man. In this connection, Jesus everywhere builds on the basis already laid down by the Hebrew prophets. His teaching, as usual, is practical and not speculative. He assumes that God is the creator of the universe and clearly teaches that the universe is good because it is God's work. There is no essential gap between this phase of things and the human phase. Both alike are objects of his loving care. "Therefore I say unto you, Be not anxious for your life. . . . Behold the birds of the heaven, that they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; and your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not ye of much more value than they?"³

This leads naturally to another element in Jesus' conception of God, and with this we may conclude. In Jesus' thought, the Father was very near to him. This sense of the nearness of God

¹ Mark 8:31-35. In this passage the specific nature of the resurrection prediction is probably due to the evangelist.

² Matt. 11:28-30; 7:13-14.

³ Matt. 6:26-30.

was one of the characteristics which marked him off from his contemporaries. They prayed publicly and elaborately. He sought silence and solitude in which to meet his Father. "He withdrew himself into the deserts and prayed."¹ In silence and in solitude he cultivated simplicity in prayer. "And when ye pray, ye shall not be as the hypocrites: for they love to stand and pray in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. . . . But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thine inner chamber, and having shut thy door, pray to thy Father who is in secret."² Why use many words? The Father is there and knoweth your needs before you ask. In simple heart-confession we should lay our needs before God with the sincerity and desire of the Publican, knowing that God is near and will hear the cry of the soul. To Jesus, God was an all-powerful and an all-righteous God, but he was especially the all-loving and ever-present one. This is the particular content of Jesus' thought of God and of the symbol "Father" which he has made distinctively Christian.

What did Jesus teach concerning man; his nature, place, and destiny? We have already answered this question, in part, while setting forth Jesus' conception of God. It is important to call attention to the fact that this overlapping in the presentation is due largely to the complete fusion of the ethical and religious elements of life in Jesus' view of things. This fusion is one of the central facts of Christian teaching; a fact which allies it closely with He-

brew prophetism and clearly distinguishes them both, in degree, if not in kind, from all other historic religious viewpoints. In other words, Christianity is not merely an ethical system. It is, rather, an ethico-religious life.

But we can, and we must, say much more than has been said about Jesus' teaching concerning man's nature, relations, and destiny. The filial nature of man is the natural corollary which Jesus drew from his paternal conception of God. Man is the child of God, the son of the Father. "I say unto you, Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be sons of your Father who is in heaven." "Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister and mother." "Suffer the little children to come unto me; forbid them not: for to such belongeth the Kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein."³

In a sense, all men are sons of the Father; that is, potentially. Throughout his life and teaching, while limiting his work almost entirely to members of his own race, Jesus evidently deals with man as man. The Good Samaritan steps across the high barrier between his people and the Jews and is commended therefor. Jesus recognizes the great faith of the Roman centurion with the striking words, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel."⁴ Human life, as such, possesses worth and dignity and is full of boundless possibilities. There is not an absolute difference of kind between the human spirit and the

¹ Luke 5:16.

² Matt. 6:5-15.

³ Matt. 5:43-48; 18:1-3; Mark 3:31-35; 10:13-15.

⁴ Matt. 8:10-12.

divine; no complete gap or break that needs to be artificially bridged. Jesus accepted the old Hebrew thought expressed in one of the creation stories, "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him."¹

In man as man, therefore, resides an infinite capacity God-ward. This gives a basis for endless effort, not only in self-development, but also in behalf of others. This faith in man also is itself a progress-producing conviction, for men will attack the most difficult problems if only they can believe that a solution is possible. Jesus was never tired of helping those about him, even the most despised and degenerate, because he saw in them the possibilities of Christian sonship. This is the basal idea of man which he tried to inculcate by precept and example, "Every one is *worthful*."

This worth is due, however, to the kind of life of which man is capable, even though he may not yet be the possessor of it; namely, the divine life. It is due to the fact that he is a potential child of God, even though actual sonship is yet to be achieved. In a real sense, man as man *is* a child of God and in another sense, equally real, he must *become* a child of God. "Verily I say unto you, Except ye turn, and *become* as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven."²

"Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect."³ This must be taken in the light of the context and can only mean, "Ye shall be controlled by the same loving purpose which controls the Father." That is, man *becomes* a son of God by submitting willingly and joyfully to the divine will which is one of uncalculating love. In becoming a child of the Father, he becomes like God in this particular. In other words, the divine element in man is not different from the divine element above man. There is but one principle for both, and what God is in respect to that principle, man may become. This is his manifest destiny.

No conception of human nature could be more exalted, and yet it does not ignore the hard facts of life. It transcends them, not by ignoring, but by conquering them. Ignorance, filth, vice, and disease often force us to ask whether the ideal of actual divine sonship is at all possible. In many cases it seems like a utopian dream; and yet, history and present-day experience afford us ample testimony to the power of God in bringing men to himself, even out of apparently hopeless conditions. The justification of this faith must be sought in a progressive realization of the ideal among men, in signs that this process is really taking place.

This ideal of divine sonship is realized whenever loving service, of an entirely disinterested sort, goes forth from man to man. Here is the fusion of the ethical and the religious in Jesus' teaching. In the Old Testament, "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart" and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as

¹ Gen. 1:26-27.

² Matt. 18:3.

³ Matt. 5:48.

thyselves" appear in different books. In the gospels, Jesus is represented as bringing them together.¹ Throughout all his teaching these two truths are inseparable. "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me." Brotherly love is the central and controlling ethical principle. Faithful devotion to the will of God is the religious principle. But each is the converse of the other and its complement. In Jesus' teaching, and in true, complete, Christian living, they are not sundered.

The teaching of Jesus was promulgated by him under the Jewish caption, "The kingdom of heaven." "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." "Many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven." "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a grain of mustard seed leaven a treasure hid in a field a merchant seeking goodly pearls." "She saith unto him, Command that these my two sons may sit, one on thy right hand, and one thy left hand, in thy kingdom. . . . But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you: but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister"²

It may be that Jesus thought of the future establishment of the kingdom in a somewhat Jewish way; that is, a king-

dom to be miraculously set up by God himself soon after Jesus' death. Certainly we must beware of modernizing his conception by reading into it social ideas which are current today. This is a knotty problem, and perhaps an insoluble one. We do not have to wait for its solution, however, for whatever conclusion we reach, all must agree that the kingdom was to Jesus a spiritual thing, fundamentally. It signified the inner union of man with God and with his fellow-man; a great, congenial family of men at one with God and devoted to the execution of his will.

All Jesus' teaching concerning the fundamental issues of religion should be interpreted in the light of the controlling emphasis already mentioned. Sin is anything that interferes with true sonship. It is not so much an act as an attitude. Hence, pride and hypocrisy may be worse than sins usually deemed much baser. Righteousness, too, is not a mosaic of correct performances, but a rightly directed personal attitude. Personality is indivisible and so is righteousness; a personal thing which exceeds the "righteousness" of the scribes and Pharisees in that it is inward, real, sincere, and freed from the thought of self by being itself, essentially, regard for the welfare of others. Forgiveness flows forth from the ever-ready love of God to everyone who sincerely repents. When thus received, it necessarily propagates, in and through the recipient, the forgiving spirit. Repentance is the portal to the kingdom, as with John the Baptist, and forgiveness the joyous expe-

¹ Deut. 6:4-5; Lev. 19:18; Luke 10:25-29.

² Matt. 25:31-46.

³ Matt. 5:3; 8:11; 13:31-33, 44-47; 20:20-28.

rience of an actual child of God, the fact of being, or of becoming, reconciled with him.

Finally, his conception of salvation and of the judgment is inextricably bound up with the kingdom idea. If the Jewish emphasis was controlling, then the idea of *future* salvation and judgment must have been Jesus' paramount thought. That the future was included in his teaching on these subjects seems clear to me, but the content of this teaching is not so clear. We may say with perfect assurance, however, that whether present or future, in this world or in the beyond, or both, salvation and judgment could have had only one qualitative meaning for Jesus. When Zaccheus rises to a nobler plane of motive, Jesus cries, "Today is salvation come to this house." And elsewhere he says, "He that loses his life shall save it and he that saveth his life shall lose it." Salvation comes by losing oneself in the all-compelling purpose of the Father's kingdom, and judgment rests on him who treasures his own life for its own sake and is loath to let it go.

The kingdom concept, as adopted by Jesus, necessarily implies a social reference and emphasis, but it is not social in the current sense of that word. Jesus' teaching was primarily individualistic;

but it affords ground for, and imparts a great impetus to, an extended social application.

Such was Jesus' teaching, and, as we saw at the beginning, such must have been his life; for these sayings have a flavor about them betraying the fact that they have been *lived* out, not *thought* out, merely. Had Jesus been a mere teacher, whose life did not especially exemplify what he taught, we might be justified in maintaining that the essence of Christianity lies in the controlling ideas of his teaching. But it is evident that Jesus lived out what he taught, and that it is the spirit of his actual life, even more than of his sublime teaching, that has given us historical Christianity. Thus the church has been right in insisting on the person of Christ as central. Of course we must change our formulae, for we are now obliged to approach this religious question, and all others, from a standpoint far different from that of our ancestors. But the cardinal thing about Christianity is still the fact that "the Word became flesh and dwelt among us," and the cardinal experience awaiting each one of us, if we have not already had it, is to behold "his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth."

AN ATTEMPT AT A SCIENTIFIC CLASSIFICATION OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE¹

GEORGE A. BARTON, PH.D.

Professor of Biblical Literature and Semitic Languages, Bryn Mawr College

To one who looks at the Bible from the standpoint of any other literature it seems to have a unity both of purpose and of style. This is recognized by writers so diverse in their interests as von Soden² and Gardiner.³ This unity comes in part from the intensity with which the biblical writers felt the reality of the deepest inner life, and in part from the fact that the book from beginning to end is so largely dominated by the point of view and the culture of Palestine.

No one who approaches the study of the Bible closely, however, can remain unaware that it is not a book, but a library, containing a considerable variety of literature. There is history, poetry, philosophy, biography, and epistolary literature. It seems at first an easy task to classify this library and put each kind of literature into its proper alcove, and, like a good administrator of the Dewey library system, place over each alcove its proper number from 1 to 1,000. When, however, one approaches the task, as I am asked to do, and make a scientific classification of this library from the literary point of view, he finds it a different matter.

The older classification into historical, prophetic, poetical, and epistolary books

is obviously inadequate. "Prophetic" can be applied to such books as Daniel and Revelation, only if used in a very different sense from that applicable to Amos and Hosea. Some of the books which used to be counted as historical are not histories, but laws. Large sections of the prophets and fragments of the historical books are poetical, and deserve to be so called as much as Job or the Psalms. Some of the so-called Epistles, as Hebrews and James, are obviously not letters at all, but slightly disguised orations.

The modern critical analysis, which enables us to treat of J, E, D, and P, and to separate editorial material from the oracles of the prophets, seems, at first sight, to make classification easier, but does not in reality enable one to carry it through, for after all our analysis one form of literature blends into another in many of the writings and defies classification. This is why the books on the history of the literature of ancient Israel, such as Budde's *Geschichte der althebräischen Literatur*, Leipzig, 1906, and Fowler's *History of the Literature of Ancient Israel*, New York, 1912, attempt no classification, but endeavor to trace the genetic origins of existing writings.

The most obvious literary distinction

¹ A paper read at a conference of collegiate and secondary-school Bible teachers, December 30, 1913.

² *History of Early Christian Literature* (New York and London, 1906), p. 9.

³ *The Bible as English Literature* (New York, 1907), p. 2.

with which to begin a classification of any literature is the division between prose and poetry, but this distinction is applied to the books of the Bible only with great difficulty, partly because of the mixture already mentioned, and partly because of differences of opinion as to what in Hebrew actually constitutes poetry. The late David Heinrich Müller¹ held that most of the prophetic writings were not only in poetry, but that they exhibited a highly complicated poetical structure, while Sievers² will have it that large parts of Genesis, which to less highly attuned intellects seem to be prose, are really poetry. One wonders if the sensitive perceptions of the last mentioned investigator would not find poetry in the *Century Dictionary* or the latest edition of the *New York Telephone Book*.

Even if experts may differ as to where the line between prose and poetry should be drawn, doubtless there is such a line. We may then take the first step in an attempted classification by dividing the poetical material from the prose. Among the Hebrews, as among other nations, the poetry developed first; we accordingly consider it first.

The poetry of the Bible may obviously be divided into lyric, epic, elegiac, and didactic; whether we may add dramatic is in dispute.

As lyric poems we may enumerate the Song of Lamech, the Song of the Well, the Song of Hannah, the Psalms, the *Magnificat*, the *Nunc dimittis*, the Song of Zachariah, and many passages of the Prophets, such as Isaiah's Song

of the Vineyard. The lyric poetry begins in the celebration of external events, such as the digging of a well, or the invention of the art of metal-working, and passes, as in the Psalter, to the expression of the deepest emotions of the soul.

It is often said that the Hebrews had no epic poetry. If we mean by epic long-sustained poetical treatment of a great theme or cycle of events, such as are treated in the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, Gilgamesh Epic, the *Aeneid*, or *Paradise Lost*, the Hebrews had no epic poetry; but, if we take the strict literary classification, which restricts the term lyric to poetry which expresses the emotions or feelings of the singer, and classes as epic all poetry which describes external events, then the Song of Deborah, the *Mashals* of Baalam, the song of the *Moshlim*, or Hebrew rhapsodists, in Num. 21:27-30, the Song of Miriam, the Blessing of Jacob, and the Blessing of Moses are all epic poems. Elegy is represented by the Lament of David over Saul and Jonathan, by the Book of Lamentations, and by numerous passages in the prophets, such as, Yahweh roars from Zion and from Jerusalem utters his voice

And the pastures of the shepherds shall mourn, and the top of Carmel wither (Amos 1:2),

and the poem in Isa. 47, beginning: Come down and sit in the dust, virgin daughter of Babylon Sit on the ground disenthroned, daughter of the Chaldaeans.

Didactic poetry is represented by the Book of Proverbs, the Wisdom of the

¹ *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form*, Wien, 1896.

² *Studien zur hebräischen Metrik*, Leipzig, 1901.

Son of Sirach, the poetical parts of Ecclesiastes, and by numerous oracles of the prophets. The elevated passion of the prophets often bore them into that rhythmic form of expression which is the heart of Hebrew poetry. Sometimes this expression was lyric, sometimes didactic, and sometimes elegiac. Indeed there are those who contend that all that is not poetic is editorial addition. Jeremiah, who could not write, was one of Israel's greatest souls, and is often poetic. Baruch, his stenographer, seems to have had as little poetry in his soul as some of the modern representatives of his profession, and in the hands of later editors Baruch's prose has sometimes become one seven times more prosaic than it was wont to be; but nevertheless even in Jeremiah poetry is to be found.

The greatest of all biblical poems is the Book of Job, a poem which treats a perennially vital theme in a most masterly way, a poem too great to be rightly classified. That it is didactic goes without saying. That there is in it action of a high order cannot be denied; but it is not a drama in the technical sense. It was never intended to be acted. Four men sitting on a dunghill and disagreeing with one another about eternal themes do not constitute a play. Professor Genung's designation, "The Epic of the Inner Life," most aptly describes it. It really falls into no common category. It is *sui generis* and must be placed by itself apart. It is, nevertheless, when the Bible is viewed simply as literature, the greatest piece of literature in the Bible. Its visage has been somewhat

marred by editorial additions, but these can easily be detected. The teacher who would arouse the interest of the non-religious literary student in the Bible as literature has in the Book of Job his strongest ally.

Another poem difficult to classify is the Song of Songs. That it is not an allegory, as was thought from the time of Rabbi Aqiba down to the last century, one need not now waste time to prove. Scientific students of the Bible are no longer tempted to hold this view. But what is it? Is it a drama? This has often been held by scholars since 1616, when Caspar Sanctius first suggested it. Some have regarded it as a sacred drama; some as a secular. So eminent a scholar as Ewald held to the dramatic theory of Canticles, and such eminent names as those of Driver, Koenig, and Duhm may be counted among the living advocates of this view. Nevertheless it is not a drama. The advocates of the dramatic theory have never been able to agree as to how the supposed drama should be divided into acts and scenes, as to who the speakers are, what the plot is, where the action takes place, or how it is carried out. They have to suppose that the lover is spoken to as a present person when he is absent, that the Shunemite encourages Solomon's passion by her words, when she is really rejecting it. Entire scenes have to be regarded as dreams, and a secondary stage has to be resorted to as incidental to scenes that would not occupy two minutes. The scenes are too short to be acted. If it be a drama, the work is without parallel in any literature.¹

¹ Cf. Schmidt, *Messages of the Poets* (New York, 1911), p. 222.

Wetzstein¹ and Budde² have developed the theory that Canticles is an epithalamium or collection of songs sung during the week of a wedding festival, when, after oriental fashion, the bridal pair play at being king and queen. This view has been accepted by Siegfried³ and others. According to this view the songs treat of wedded love, and include *wasfs* in praise of the bride, and groom, and their early wedded experiences. This view is, however, as untenable as the other. Many passages show that wedded love is not the theme at all. In 2:8-17 the lover peeps in through the window; he is, then, not a bridegroom. In 3:1-5 the love-lorn woman runs through the streets asking for her lover that she may bring him to her mother's house; she is, then, not a bride. In 5:2-9 she is alone in bed, and after her lover has knocked at the door and she has declined to let him in, goes out in search of him and is insulted by the city watchmen—certainly not an ordinary scene from a honeymoon!

We conclude, therefore, with Professor Schmidt,⁴ that the book is a collection of love lyrics, in which the elemental passion is artistically praised, as it is in Theocritus, without reference to conventions or the laws of matrimony. The poems have received some additions from editors, and have suffered somewhat in transmission, but are purely lyrical.

Biblical poetry, then, falls into the four divisions, lyric, epic, elegiac, and didactic.

Of the prose compositions of the Bible historiography constitutes the

largest division. These writings are not histories in the modern scientific sense of the word, but are, like the work of Herodotus, historiographical writings of the ancient type. In such writings a dominant purpose might dictate the selection of materials and the treatment of the subject, and shape the result. These writings come from centuries scattered over a thousand years of time, and range from the matchless stories of the "Unknown Homer of the Hebrews," whom we designate the J document, to the idealistic Memorabilia of Jesus called the Gospel of John. Sometimes the interest of the writer is legal, as was that of the author of the P document, and his narrative forms but a brief setting to his code, and corresponds to the Code of Hammurabi, with its prologue and epilogue.

Another writer, though his interest is legal, was an orator by nature, and with marked literary ability transforms his code into an impressive address, which constitutes the Book of Deuteronomy. The authors of Kings and Chronicles were interested in special forms of religion, and conceived history in accordance with the demands of that religion. The interest of ancient historians was always personal and concrete, so these books are a galaxy of personal portraits—Moses, Joshua, Deborah, Gideon, Jephthah, Samson, Samuel, Saul, David, Jesus, in the Gospels, and Paul in the Acts of the Apostles. In ancient historiography the line between myth and history is not closely drawn. The Hebrews, like other nations, had their heroic age, which

¹ *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, 1873, pp. 170 f.

² *New World*, 1894; Marti's *Hand-Kommentar*.

³ *Nowack's Kommentar*.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, 228 f.

included legends of the patriarchs, and myths of Paradise, the divinely begotten heroes (Gen. 6:2-4), the tower of Babel, the antediluvian patriarchs, etc. In another way at a later time the line between history and myth was lost, and a Babylonian allegory, based on a Babylonian myth, was transformed by a Jewish nomenclature into the Book of Esther, and regarded as history. Another class of prose writing contained in the Bible is the epistolary. Here, of course, we place the Epistles of Paul, and the general Epistles of the New Testament. These have the same general form as other ancient letters, and have long been compared as to form with the letters of Cicero, Seneca, Pliny, and others, but the many letters in Greek, from the general period of the New Testament, which the sands of Egypt have in recent years yielded up, throw unexpected light upon the epistolary form of literature, and make it possible to arouse new interest in its study. There are differences in the New Testament letters. Some of them are real letters, called out by definite occasions; such certainly are the epistles to the Thessalonians and Galatians. Some, however, are not letters in the real sense of the term. Von Soden¹ claims that all of the post-Pauline letters are not, strictly speaking, letters at all; they were not called out by the concrete needs of a particular moment of time. Torrey² has shown that the Epistle to the Hebrews is not a letter, but an early Christian sermon, to which some editor attached at a later time an epistolary beginning and ending. The same is

probably true of the Epistle of James. Letters here merge into oratory.

Another class of biblical literature is the prophetic. We have already found in the prophets lyric and didactic poetry. They also contain oratory of a high order, as may be seen from reading Isa., chaps. 40-45, together with much editorial material. Mixed as the contents of the prophetic books are, however, they form a class of literature by themselves, a class difficult to define by reason of this mixture, yet pervaded by a definite and deeply religious purpose.

Closely related to prophecy is apocalypse, which now must be recognized as a distinct class of writing. It is true that prophetic books sometimes approach apocalypse, as in Isa., chaps. 24-27, and Zech., chaps. 1-8, but nevertheless apocalypse is a form apart. It is in the Bible represented by Daniel and the Book of Revelation alone, but outside the Canon by numerous examples, such as the Book of Enoch, the Book of the Secrets of Enoch, the Apocalypse of Baruch, IV Esdras, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Assumption of Moses, the Ascension of Isaiah, etc. Canonical apocalypse cannot profitably be taught apart from a knowledge of these, and a knowledge of the principles of apocalyptic writing which a study of these reveals.

Another class of literature is the short story. As in modern times, so among the Hebrews, the story was usually told for a purpose. Ruth, Jonah, and Esther are biblical short stories, to which, if we include the apocrypha, we should add

¹ *History of the Early Christian Literature*, 202.

² *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXX, 137-56.

Tobit and Judith. Ruth was written to show that non-Israelitish wives were not undesirable, but had become mothers of most notable Israelites; Esther, to justify the observance of Purim; Jonah as a missionary tract. Its author by the use of allegory made fun of Israel for her unwillingness to carry out the ideal of service set forth in Isa., chap. 53. We lose his humor by taking his fish literally, but he intended it to provoke a smile.

Our survey has made it clear that the Bible contains lyric, epic, elegiac, and didactic poetry, historiography, letters, prophecy, and apocalypse. It has also made it clear that in some of the biblical books these are so mingled that the book might be put in two or more categories. Indeed, from these categories we could make up still another, orations which would consist of Deuteronomy, Hebrews, James, and large sections of the prophetic writings. Any attempt to pigeonhole each writing in one compartment only is doomed to failure, because impossible.

In conclusion, permit me to point out that, though Israel had no poetical epic of like extent to the *Iliad* or the *Aeneid*, the teacher of the Bible as literature cannot afford to lose sight of the epic significance of the Hexateuch as it now stands. While not in poetic form, it is epic in conception, and the epic of no other nation is as magnificently conceived. The world and man are formed; man loses his Eden; in discovering the arts man becomes corrupt; ultimately the flood destroys him. The descendants of Noah, like the earlier descendants of Adam, corrupt themselves, so God chooses to prepare a special people

for his service. Then follow the choice of Abraham, the epic fortunes of his descendants through famine, bondage, and release, the giving of the law amid the volcanic terrors of Sinai, the wanderings and wanderings in the wilderness, and the conquest of Canaan. The whole world becomes but the theater of the epic which places the chosen people in the promised land. The campaign against Troy, or the wanderings of Odysseus or Aeneas sink into insignificance in comparison with this theme, which might well be called from Creation to Canaan. We miss an opportunity to impress upon our students the literary and religious genius of Israel, if in our zeal for documents and redactors we let them miss the masterly sweep and significance of Israel's prose epic.

In reality the Hexateuch is but the first book of a greater epic, the fortunes and mission of Israel. The author of Isa., chap. 53, saw in vision something of the splendid vistas of service through suffering which was to constitute the theme of the later books of Israel's epic. His vision, too ideal for a nation ever to realize, was crystallized in the Person of the great Suffering Servant of the New Testament, who gave it new vitality and significance, and who said of His followers: "As thou hast sent me into the world, so have I also sent them into the world." Through Him the epic which began in the Hexateuch is still being lived. It not only welds the Bible into an epic, giving it the unity to which attention was called at the beginning, but it adds all Christian history to the same great story. Thus the student who begins with literature, if rightly taught, should see in the classroom a new

vision of how he may, as a social worker, or a student volunteer, or a preacher of the gospel, or a Christian citizen, enter as a character into the epic, the final books of which can never be written till the kingdom of God shall come.

THE PROBLEMS OF BOYHOOD

A COURSE OF ETHICS FOR BOYS IN THE SUNDAY SCHOOL

FRANKLIN W. JOHNSON

Principal of the University of Chicago High School

Study IX. Speech: Slang and Profanity

Our home training, our education, our character are constantly being reflected by our speech. Men's judgment of us is more likely to be based upon how we speak and what we say than upon anything else. Men's judgment of each other in this respect may sometimes be wrong, but it is generally correct. A man's speech usually betrays his inner life. What he thinks determines what he is, and what he thinks determines what he says. "Out of the abundance of the heart," said Jesus, "the mouth speaketh." Think of the people you know best and see if this is not so in their cases.

The characteristics of speech include not only the words used, but the tone of the voice and the inflection given to the spoken words. These are first acquired by imitation and early become fixed habits. Members of the same family often show marked similarities in tone and manner of speech. Certain differences of pronunciation of the vowels mark the person born in New England, in the South, and in other parts of the

country, so that one may tell pretty accurately from another's speech in what region he has lived. Certain words and phrases mark certain localities. The New Englander "guesses," the Southerner "reckons." Give some other illustrations.

What is the value of an agreeable voice? Think of the teachers you have had, the preachers and other public speakers you have listened to. Has the quality of their voices had anything to do with their effect upon you? You must have known some boy who was a bully among his fellows. Did his voice and manner of speech give any clue to his character? Apply the same test to any brutal or vulgar person whom you have seen.

What are the qualities of voice and manner of speech that seem to you most attractive and effective in others? Are not these worth your striving hard to secure? If you have already fallen into other habits it is not an easy task. How will you go about it?

However desirable a pleasing voice

and manner of speech may be, these are of far less importance than the words spoken. If one has thoughts worth expressing they are most effective when expressed in clear, direct speech. A vocabulary large enough to express careful distinctions in thought is necessary and should be used with discrimination. Discuss the training in English which you have received in school, with especial reference to the value of composition and extemporaneous speaking. One ought constantly to be enlarging the stock of words which he can use. One of the axioms which we laid down when we were studying habit will help us greatly. Use the word you wish to add to your vocabulary at the earliest opportunity and find several occasions to use it. It will then become a permanent acquisition.

The habit of using slang is very common. Where does slang originate? Does it serve any useful purpose? Would a newspaper account of a baseball game be as interesting and effective if written without slang? It might be a valuable exercise to translate such a "story" into the sort of English that your teacher in the high school would approve. Some slang expressions may seem to be more expressive and picturesque in a particular case than any other words. The chief objection to slang is that it is usually made to serve too wide a use and to take the place of more carefully selected words. At the present time such inane expressions as "I should worry" and "I should say" are heard on every hand and indicate either that the speaker has no thoughts to express or has fallen into a most unfortunate habit of concealing such thoughts as he has.

Whatever defense may be offered for the use of slang there is absolutely no excuse for profanity. Among the Ten Commandments we find "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless who taketh his name in vain." Was profanity wrong before the Ten Commandments were written? Would it be wrong now if the commandment had never been written? The real essence of profanity is irreverence. Why is irreverence sinful? Read the teaching of Jesus on this in Matt. 5:33-37. What did he mean when he said, "But let your communication be yea, yea; nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil"?

Swearing is a habit easily acquired and not easily broken. The habitual swearer does not think of the meaning of his words, but uses them to give emphasis to his speech. In this respect swearing is like slang, showing lack of discrimination in the use of language. Is swearing less wicked because used without thought of the real meaning of the words? Boys are not likely to swear in the presence of their mothers or others for whom they have respect. What does this show?

What kind of people are most addicted to profanity? In what places are you most likely to hear it? Why is profanity so frequent in connection with athletics? There is probably more swearing in football than in connection with any other game. Why? Football coaches often swear at a player who makes a misplay, and "cursing up" a team between the halves is a frequent practice and is supposed to put "pep" into a team. Many schools would not tolerate such a thing, and a coach would

send from the field a player who was profane. Would such a team be less likely to win? Would you rather play on such a team?

You may know of some strong and able man who uses profanity. Is this characteristic of such men? Does it add to their strength or is it a hindrance to them?

Study X. Clean Thinking and Speaking

We have said in an earlier study that the mind is like the sensitive plate of the photographer. If you will consider, you will see that this plate is much more sensitive to some impressions than to others. It probably took a good many exposures to fix permanently in your mind the multiplication tables or the inflection of a Latin verb. Other impressions you will find there, still vivid, from a single exposure. I recall vividly the words of a "smutty" song which I heard when a boy which I have never repeated in speech, but which I can never forget. Many things which I once learned laboriously and which I would gladly remember, I cannot recall. We cannot always avoid hearing improper speech, nor keep from having improper thoughts. We can avoid seeking and dwelling upon them. Examine your own mind and see whether you enjoy thinking of these things.

A self-controlled man has control of his thoughts as well as of his words and other outward acts. Two helps may be suggested. First, avoid whatever suggests impure thoughts. What are some of these? Second, keep your mind busy with wholesome things. Athletic games are of great value because they give boys so much to think and talk about. What else do you think of that serves the same purpose? Perhaps you have discovered that it is more difficult to control your thoughts at certain times or in certain places. The condition of

your body has much to do with this. If you take plenty of exercise, do not overeat, sleep with your window open, get up when you first wake and take a bath, a cold one preferably, you will find it easy to keep your body strong and your mind clean. You will find these matters fully and helpfully treated in *From Youth to Manhood*, by Dr. Winfield S. Hall, published by the Y.M.C.A. Press, New York.

As we have seen, clean speech follows clean thought. While it may be that a person of unclean thought may not always give expression to these thoughts, a person whose inner life is clean will not use unclean speech. "Smutty" storytelling and other forms of vulgar speech are very common among boys, and it is easy to fall into the habit without realizing how demoralizing are its effects. The gymnasium locker-rooms, school corridors, fraternity houses, poolrooms, and other places where boys gather by themselves offer frequent opportunity for such talk. In what places and under what circumstances have you heard or used such language? Boys sometimes think it is a sign of smartness or manliness to use vulgar language. This is more likely to be the case if the captain of the team or some other prominent boy has this habit. Discuss the responsibility which this places upon the captain.

If you have made up your mind that unclean speech is wrong, what can and

ought you to do about it? You can and must keep your own speech clean. The habit of clean speech once formed is a safeguard against much that is degrading. But is this enough? What should you do when others use "smutty" language? A group of boys in school drew up and signed an agreement that they would not use vulgar language and would not allow another to use it in their presence without protest. The result was an immediate lessening of the amount of "smut" in that school. Would such decision and action in your "bunch" make you unpopular? If so, would it not be better for you to get out of the "bunch"? A certain boy to whom another had made an improper proposal told him never to repeat it, and when he did so, promptly knocked him down. A well-known college ath-

lete at the close of his last football season was given a dinner by his friends. In the course of the dinner one of the men told a vile story, and the guest of honor without a word walked out of the room. These boys valued their own self-respect more highly than any temporary consideration of popularity. No one with the manly courage required to administer such a rebuke as this need fear being called a "goody-goody" or a prig. There are persons to whom an acquaintance would never think of telling a vulgar story. This is the highest possible tribute to a man's character. Do your friends tell vulgar stories to you?

The devout psalmist offered this prayer: "Let the words of my mouth and the meditations of my heart be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer."

Study XI. The Problem of Sex

The period of adolescence is marked by the development of the organs of sex. At this period the boy grows rapidly, his voice becomes deeper, his beard begins to grow. He is thus taking on the physical characteristics of a man. These physical changes are accompanied by corresponding changes in his inner life. His mind dwells strangely upon thoughts of the opposite sex. He begins to chafe at the restraints placed upon him at home or in school. He is shaken by forces the source and nature of which he does not understand. It is not necessary nor desirable that a boy should think much upon those changes taking place in him. It is not desirable that he should worry about them at all. They are simply Nature's

way of turning a boy into a man. It is, however, important that he should early know the truth about certain things concerning which he is naturally inquisitive and about which he is almost certain otherwise to receive false or misleading information. Ignorance here, as perhaps nowhere else, breeds disaster.

The organs of sex are provided for the purpose of reproduction. In the study of botany or zoölogy you may have become familiar with this wonderful process, by which from the union of male and female cells plants and animals reproduce their kind. This is, perhaps, the most wonderful of all the processes of nature. It is, however, a subject about which boys hear little except in the form of vulgar jest. Do fathers

generally talk frankly with their sons about this? Where did you get your knowledge of the subject? Do you know words which are not vulgar in which you can talk of the organs of sex and the facts of reproduction? Do you think that sex hygiene should be taught in the schools? If not, why, and where should it be taught?

The desire for reproduction is one of the strongest forces in our lives. Man alone of all the animals has polluted this natural instinct. This is due in some degree to the delay which our social customs have placed in the way of marriage. The power and desire of reproduction come long before the boy has completed his education and is ready to assume the responsibilities of married life. There are other reasons which cause late marriages or even prevent marriage at all. Discuss some of these. Anything which discourages marriage at a reasonable age or lessens the sense of responsibility which marriage involves tends toward moral deterioration. Discuss the effect of divorce.

From the earliest times of which we know there has been prostitution. Of late there has been much discussion of the social evil, and investigations have been made as to its causes and effects. It is well known that there are thousands of women, mainly young girls, who live in prostitution. These girls are mostly recruited from the ignorant classes and are seldom led into a life of shame by their own deliberate choice, but often by deceit and not infrequently by actual force. Once started upon this life they seldom emerge, but continue to pander to the evil passions of men, cast out by their own sex and despised by the

men whose lust they satisfy, until within a few years, usually not more than five or six, they die miserably as a result of the diseases almost certain to be contracted in this sort of life. And their places must be filled by others, and so the ceaseless sacrifice goes on.

A boy of clean mind and manly spirit who knows the truth will not cause a girl to fall nor share in her degradation once she has fallen. To do so is essentially unfair and unsportsmanlike. Seldom does a girl fall who has not yielded to the stronger force or deception of man. What would you do to the boy who had wronged your sister? The double standard of morality required of men and women is also unsportsmanlike. A girl who has fallen becomes an outcast. A man who contributes to her shame is socially acceptable. You would not marry such a girl. Is it fair for a man to demand that his wife be purer than he is?

All boys should expect to become husbands and fathers. Association with loose women is almost certain to bring diseases of the most loathsome sort, sometimes incurable. These may be communicated to one's wife and children. In this way much suffering is caused to those who are innocent of fault. From the manly feeling of chivalry toward women as well as from consideration of fairness toward the pure girl whom he will some day ask to marry him, and the children whom they will rear, a boy should keep himself from sexual contamination.

Many boys who are not tempted to sexual immorality of this sort are yet in danger of yielding through ignorance or the suggestion of vicious companions

to the habit of self-abuse. This, if persisted in, will lead to harmful results. It is an unnatural practice in which no boy of clean mind and self-control will persist. If continued, the practice tends to weaken a boy's will and leads to his moral and physical degeneracy. A good antidote for this is to keep the mind free from evil by filling it with something else of engrossing interest. Avoid any place, picture, or whatever else gives evil suggestion. Above all, have nothing

to do with anyone who suggests sexual excess of any sort. I know a boy who promptly knocked down another who made such a suggestion to him.

Because the impulses and desires of our sexual natures are so strong, constant watchfulness and restraint are necessary. The fight for clean living is a hard one, calling for the best there is in any boy. The penalty for defeat is heavy, but the reward of victory is sure and enduring.

Study XII. Alcoholic Liquors and Tobacco

The census reports for 1910 show that \$1,800,000⁰⁰ is annually spent for liquor in the United States. This is the same amount that is spent for food and clothing. If you can find the figures, compare this sum with the cost of education, the value of the property of our colleges and universities, the value of church property, or make any other comparison that occurs to you. The average consumption of liquor for every person in the United States is about twenty-three gallons per year.

We should naturally assume that in a country whose people are intelligent, any article of food or drink, consumed in such quantities and at such cost, must be beneficial. What is the fact regarding liquor? Can you think of any beneficial results from its use? How do you account for its extensive use?

The arguments against the use of intoxicating liquors are manifold and convincing. Its effect upon health and length of life may be computed accurately. The statistics of English life insurance companies show that the average

death-rate per thousand among total abstainers is 9.14 per cent, among drinkers 26.82 per cent, almost three times as great. That the use of liquor reduces a man's efficiency is evidenced by the fact that the employers of men in industry and commerce discriminate against drinkers in favor of total abstainers. Discuss this with some railroad official, manufacturer, or other employer of labor.

You will frequently hear the claim made that the revenue obtained from licenses adds to the public funds and reduces taxation, or that the liquor business makes business good in other lines. What can be said against these claims? If you can get the statistics for any town which has voted out the saloon, compare the tax rate before and after; also compare the cost of maintaining the police force and jails. Make any other comparisons that seem to bear on the question.

At present there is a nation-wide, even a world-wide, movement against the liquor traffic. Many states and large portions of other states prohibit

the manufacture and sale of liquors. You will hear it said that "prohibition does not prohibit." What other laws do you think of that do not prohibit the crimes against which they aim? What makes it more difficult to prohibit liquor-selling than murder or theft? What do you think of the argument that preventing the sale of liquor is an infraction of a man's "personal liberty"? What limits may society place to the liberty of one of its members?

Topics for further discussion: The saloon and the home; its relation to crime and pauperism; its relation to politics and government.

We have discussed the subject in its general aspects, but like all other moral problems, its final application is a personal one. The drinking habit is easily acquired and, once acquired, is perhaps the most difficult one to break. No one expects to become a drunkard. Have you any reason to think that your will is stronger than that of others? In its beginning, drinking is almost always social. Our American custom of treating is an important factor. Contrast this with the "Dutch treat," and show how our custom leads to harmful results. A group of young men with no serious purpose set out to see the sights. Some one of them takes the lead and the party finds itself in a saloon; a few drinks follow, and on they go to some worse resort. Next morning some of the boys to whom this was the first experience of the sort are overwhelmed with regret. The important question then is, Are they strong enough not to repeat the experience? A boy shrinks from seeming to his companions to be a prig. Should one fear this when it is a

question of drinking? Among men there is no need of hesitation to decline a drink. Discuss Secretary of State Bryan's practice of serving no liquor at state dinners in his home. Does the fact that the foreign guests who sit at his table are accustomed to drink at dinner place any obligation upon him to serve wines?

In many cities there are large numbers of young men whose boarding-places or homes are unattractive, to whom the saloon affords an opportunity for brightness and social pleasure. What other places are there to which they might go and find a welcome? Cities are seeing the need of providing at public expense attractive places for healthful recreation for young people. Chicago's system of small recreation parks providing attractive places for reading, dancing, athletic games, swimming, and other forms of recreation is providing for an important need which is being felt and similarly provided for in other cities. What might be done to meet this need in our school buildings and churches?

Little need be said regarding the use of tobacco. The amount of money spent annually for tobacco, though less than that for liquor, is enormous. Look up the figures. That the use of tobacco is harmful in youth is a well-known fact; that it is also injurious to many mature men is also certain; probably it cannot be shown to benefit anyone who uses it. However, the habit is very common, even among very estimable men.

Smoking is an acquired habit against which the body usually rebels at first. How do you account for its prevalence among boys? When training for the

team or for the track boys know that their physical fitness will be greater without tobacco. Why do they not give it up completely?

The use of tobacco is a selfish habit. A man often smokes in the presence of those to whom it is objectionable. Discuss the rights of the motorman on the streetcar to pure air during his working day, or of the stenographer in the office of her employer. Give some other illustrations of the selfishness of the smoker.

It is also, like drinking, an expensive habit for which many men spend money which is needed for the comfort of those dependent upon them. Compute the cost for a period of years of the cigars

of a moderate smoker, reckoning interest at the current rate.

What other arguments can you make against the use of tobacco?

What good reason can you give to justify the use of tobacco for anyone? You doubtless know some men, whose opinions you respect, who use tobacco. Ask them to give you some good reason why they smoke. If they undertake this, see if their reasons are valid. A good rule for a boy in this matter is, wait until you are fully developed physically, say, twenty-one years, before using tobacco. Then do not take it up unless you can find some reason that will satisfy a self-respecting man, even though your father and minister may be addicted to the habit.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE

A PROFESSIONAL READING COURSE ON THE EDUCATIONAL WORK OF THE CHURCH. III

THEODORE GERALD SOARES, PH.D.

Professor of Religious Education, University of Chicago

After all possible emphasis has been put upon religious education in the home and the school, it will remain that the institution which must make this subject its supreme interest is the church. We shall therefore need a growing literature, scientifically prepared, upon principles and methods for the educational work of the church. The number of books of the first rank in this field is not yet very large, but there are a dozen or so that every minister should know. We select for special study:

Burton and Mathews, *Principles and Ideals in the Sunday School*.
Cope, *Efficiency in the Sunday School*.
Cope, *The Efficient Layman*.
Haslett, *The Pedagogical Bible School*.

The first of these books was an outgrowth of the experience of the Hyde Park Baptist Sunday School of Chicago, of which the late President Harper was the superintendent. He was a pioneer in the organization of the religious mass-meeting, which had been known as a Sunday school, upon the lines of a pedagogical institution. Professor E. D. Burton was the director of religious education in this school and Professor Mathews one of the teachers. The

book, *Principles and Ideals in the Sunday School*, represents the experience up to the year 1903. The authors would be the first to insist that account must be taken of developments in religious pedagogy since that time, to which we may call special attention. The work is in two parts, the first dealing with the teacher, the second with the school. The Bible, as the subject-matter of the teaching, is very definitely in mind in this treatment. The preparation of the teacher, the methods of biblical interpretation, the pedagogical procedure, the moral and spiritual results to be sought are the subjects here dealt with. It is expected that there shall be a very definite intellectual content in the work of the pupils. At the same time the goal ever kept in view is the attainment of a clear personal religious faith. An excellent chapter on the pastor as the teacher of teachers indicates his responsibility in view of the new appreciation of the Bible.

The second part deals with Sunday-school organization. The theory of a completely graded school is carried out. And, notwithstanding the advance in this direction that has been made in the last twenty years, this discussion of

grading is still very timely. Those who have not yet got away from the old idea of the Sunday-school superintendent as a platform leader of a mass of people from infants to adults should consider carefully the duties of the various departmental officers here suggested.

It is likely that the ideal curriculum will not be as exclusively biblical as this plan of ten years ago contemplated. And later experience would change the three years of study in the books of the Bible to studies more definitely biographical. The question of examinations is bound up with the larger question: How far can our Sunday-school work be of a severe intellectual nature? It is proving exceedingly difficult to secure this from older students. The North Dakota plan of high-school credit would of course put the matter on a different basis.

The chapter on "The Function of a Sunday-School Ritual" deals with a most important subject. The ordinary "opening and closing exercises" have little of the worshipful character. But there is great opportunity here for education in religious feeling.

The most recent work upon our problem by an expert is Cope's *Efficiency in the Sunday School*. The author is the general secretary of the Religious Education Association and therefore has the opportunity of first-hand knowledge of a great range of religious educational problems. He believes strongly that the church is a teaching institution and that it should take the matter of training its teachers very seriously. The problem of grading is here discussed with some very much-needed warnings. Indeed, wherever an attempt has been

made to improve the educational work of the church there has been the danger of allowing some intellectual aim to become dominant. Of course intellectual achievement is not religious efficiency.

Dr. Cope makes his efficiency tests very clear. He deals with building and equipment, where very much remains to be done; with results in life, where clear understanding is most necessary; with order and discipline, where some very fine educational values are possible; with efficiency in the critical years, analyzing the problem which so often baffles Sunday schools.

This book is not a list of ready-made devices, but it does present in a most practical way methods for improving our work. The discussions on music, boys' activities, rural and city schools, and teacher preparation will be found full of suggestion.

The religious education of the adult is a matter that has received all too little consideration. And yet a church is largely a school for adults. Indeed it is the only formal school that the majority of our people ever get beyond the grammar school. We have been so much concerned with securing the performance of the necessary church work, that we have not realized enough that the activities in which church members engage constitute a most valuable practical education for them. This needs to be scientifically evaluated if the best results are to be obtained. Moreover the instruction given to adults has not generally been carefully planned to suit their needs. There ought to be a definite progress from the young people's classes to those of adults. The books already discussed have dealt with adult

classes, but the whole problem of adult education as applied to men is the subject of Cope's *The Efficient Layman*. A study is made in that book of the various men's clubs, leagues, brotherhoods, organized classes throughout the country, and of their various activities. It is a comment on the difficulty of the endeavor to secure the special interest of men in the church that a number of the organizations discussed in this book are already moribund. The life of a new male movement for the resuscitation of the church is generally from two to five years. And yet some of the methods here discussed have proved their permanent value and have survived the mortality of infant schemes.

It may be questioned whether all writers on men and boys do not exaggerate the differences between the sexes in religious matters. The vigorous girl or the effective woman of today would scarcely recognize her own religious experience in the passive, subjective, feminine type, which is so often presented as unattractive to the masculine nature. Probably all of us, women as well as men, believe in a religion of action, of effectiveness against misery and evil, and of fellowship with God in positive goodness.

The principles of adult training and development in religious service laid down in *The Efficient Layman* can be applied to the whole work of the church. We do not so much need subsidiary organizations as competent leaders in the various branches of church endeavor.

The Pedagogical Bible School by Haslett is an elaborate discussion of a curriculum of religious education on the basis of a presentation of the results of

genetic psychology. The author is of the school of Dr. G. Stanley Hall, whose positions in his large work on *Adolescence* are well represented here. The theory of race recapitulation needs to be accepted with great care, but the general characterizations of childhood and youth are very suggestive.

Part I gives in outline the history of religious education. Great changes have taken place in the International Sunday-School organization in the last ten years, and the reader who has not kept himself informed of these advances would do well to see how largely Dr. Haslett's criticisms are happily out of date.

The subject of genetic psychology is of greatest importance for our problem. Haslett in Part II has treated it in a popular and interesting manner, which affords a good introduction to an understanding of the stages of development of childhood and youth. He has included a genetic study of the psychology of religion, indicating the moral and religious manifestations at the various periods of life. His treatment of the emotional instability of adolescence is especially full.

The principal portion of the book, Part III, is the discussion of the curriculum, one of the most complete that has been made. It is of especial value because he has discussed all available material, not limiting himself to the Bible. His treatment of stories, of the miraculous, of pictures, poetry, nature material is excellent. And every minister who tries to preach children's sermons should take warning from the section on "Object Teaching."

After treating the general principles of the curriculum, Haslett gives a

detailed course of studies for seven periods of life. It is so full as to include practically everything available in religious material. It might be possible to disagree with incidental points, but in the main all scientific opinion would indorse the presentation here made.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. May the Sunday school use extra-biblical material? If so, to what extent?
2. What is the specific responsibility of the pastor for an efficient Sunday school?
3. Can the entire educational work of the church be organically related in one comprehensive scheme?
4. What is the difference between masculine and feminine religion?
5. Can we train the lay administrative officers of a church?
6. What Sunday-school textbooks have proved satisfactory?
7. Should we build an auditorium and use it for an educational institution?

SOME FURTHER WORKS

- Pease, *An Outline of a Bible-School Curriculum.*
 Alexander, *The Sunday School and the Teens.*
 Cope, *The Modern Sunday School in Principle and Practice.*
 Littlefield, *Handwork in the Sunday School.*
 Crooker, *The Church of Today.*
 Barbour, *Making Religion Efficient.*
 Cressey, *The Church and the Young Man.*
 Raymont, *The Use of the Bible in the Education of the Young.*
 Hartshorne, *Worship in the Sunday School.*

SUGGESTIONS TO LEADERS OF CLASSES USING THE ORIGIN AND TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS¹

For several reasons the work of the present month is of very great value to the students of this course, and especially to those who are studying in groups. Because of the fact that the story reverts, in this second book written by Luke, to Paul with whose life the class became familiar in the first three months of the course, the present chapter presents an opportunity for a thorough review and a rapid survey of the life of Paul, without the hampering necessity of the consideration of the letters which he wrote.

More than this, however, the Book of Acts, which contains the material for our present study, presents to the class for the

first time a full picture of the pre-Pauline work of the early church. Centering at first around the enthusiastic preaching of Peter and the Jerusalem apostles, Luke carries us in his fascinating narrative through all of the period of the missionary activities of the church, the great problems arising out of the conversion of the gentiles, and the endeavors of the Christians to interpret their new experiences in the light of their early training as well as upon the basis of the principles set forth by Jesus. Through this book we come into close contact with the bitter division of the Jewish society into Christian and non-Christian groups, and the persecutions which arose out of this division.

¹The suggestions relate to the eighth month's work, the student's material for which appears in the *Biblical World* for April and may be obtained in pamphlet reprints for use with classes. Address: THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE, The University of Chicago.

Perhaps for the first time the members of the class will also appreciate the fact that for centuries the Christian church has devoted large attention to the effort to discover the details of the early life of the Christians, and to mold their own organization and doctrines accordingly. This process has resulted in denominations too numerous to mention, each priding itself on the scriptural correctness of its views. Only in recent years has the emphasis upon these details been shifted to a reconsideration and reinterpretation of the principles and life of Jesus. To this new movement toward finding the vital elements in Christianity is largely due the social and religious awakening of the present day, and the tendency toward union of effort in Christian service, regardless of denominational lines.

Program I

Leader: A careful reading with the class of the outline of the Book of Acts given in the study for the month as a basis for recalling the incidents connected with Paul's labors, and the spirit, atmosphere, and problems of the journeys of Paul.

Members: (1) The story of Pentecost and what it signifies concerning the new religion; (2) the social organization of the early church; (3) the leaders, methods, victims, and larger results of the organized persecution of the Christians; (4) a brief biography of Peter; (5) themes chiefly emphasized by the early evangelist.

Subject for discussion: Of what importance is it that the church of today should be organized and conducted upon the same basis and by the same methods as that of the Apostles?

Program II

Leader: A geographical survey of the early church in its relation to the world of its day.

Members: (1) The diary of Luke; (2) the missionary enterprises of the early church; (3) the story of Paul's arrest and various trials from the point of view of the non-Christian Jews, and the Romans; (4) traces of Luke's admiration for Paul in his story of the arrest, trial, and journey to Rome; (5) steps in the growth of the belief of the early church in the universal gospel.

Subject for discussion: (1) How much is our conception of Paul due to the character of his biographer, or (2) is the church of today comparable in missionary enthusiasm with that of Paul's day? If not, why not?

REFERENCE READING

Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, pp. 282-314; Julicher, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 430-56; Peake, *Introduction to the New Testament*, chap. xiii; Milligan, *Documents of the New Testament*, pp. 161-67; Burton, *Records and Letters of the Apostolic Age*, entire volume; Wrede, *The Origin of the New Testament*, pp. 91-102; Moore, *The New Testament in the Christian Church*, pp. 225-61; von Soden, *History of Early Christian Literature*, pp. 210-48; Bacon, *The Making of the New Testament*, chaps. iii and iv; Gilbert, *Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, pp. 4, 5, and extracts from each chapter; Scott, *The Apologetic of the New Testament*, chaps. iii, iv, and vii; Harnack, *Luke, the Physician*, entire volume; *Acts of the Apostles*, entire volume; McGiffert, *The Apostolic Age*, chap. ii and selections from chaps. iii and iv; Weiss, *Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 315-54; Mathews, *New Testament Times in Palestine*, chaps. xiv and xv; Volume on Acts in each of the following series: *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*; *The Bible for Home and School*; *The Century Bible*. Articles too numerous to mention by title will be found in the *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible*, four-volume and one-volume editions, in the *Standard Dictionary of the Bible*, and in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

CURRENT OPINION

More Uniformity in Worship

Mr. W. H. Erb writes on "Uniformity in Public Worship" in the *Reformed Church Review* for January, 1914. Prescribed forms of worship were in general use in the third century. The church of the fifth century, which was really one and therefore truly catholic, used in divers countries liturgies which were strikingly similar, and this manifestation of the unity of the church impressed favorably the pagan world. In our times and in this country there is a distinct evolution in the matter of public worship. Some things have come to be accepted as a matter of course; there is less rant and confusion, there is just as much sincerity and spirituality. Speaking for his own denomination, Mr. Erb would like some specific form of service embodying the spirit of the church, showing her peculiar mission. The prayerbook of the Episcopal church has done more to make that denomination distinct than her doctrines, which certainly admit of variety.

A Modernist's View of Authority in Religion

Miss M. D. Petre publishes in the *Hibbert Journal* for January, 1914, her address to the International Congress of Religious Progress, held in Paris last year, under the title "The Advantages and Disadvantages of Authority in Religion." It is not easy to define Modernism. This very able piece of work, called the encyclic *Pascendi*, has given us a *credo* of Modernism, and upon this basis the *Curia romana* has gone to work. And some say that now, as a result of this activity, Modernism is dead. It is true that reaction triumphs now in the Roman church and that many a Modernist has ceased to hope for victory, but Modernism can no more perish than the air which we breathe: the church herself cannot live

without it for any length of time. Modernism is the right conception of liberty and authority, adjusting their rival claims, utilizing both principles in the building-up of religion and the church. Religion cannot be understood without an institution, the church. No institution can exist without a principle of authority. It is true that most men care for comfort and ease more than for freedom, and in the majority of cases they get more of that comfort if they live in subjection than when they are entirely free. Again there is an obedience inspired by love of the ideal, be it the service of the country, or of a great man like Napoleon, or of a religious leader. Therefore, no criticism of authority will be useful for practical purposes if it fails to take account of this double tendency to obey, the one springing from the natural sloth of many characters, the other from an ideal of self-sacrifice. It seems a truism that the right conception of authority will be such as to compel no man to obey without his full consent. External obedience is only an apparent triumph of authority; no obedience is perfect which does not comprise that of the will and of the intelligence. The soldier is asked to pay only outward respect, but in religious matters nothing short of a tribute of the entire man, soul and body, can be demanded. And for this reason it is evident that the law must cease to bind when the reason, the self-governing faculty, can go no farther.

It is certain that the Roman hierarchy and other seats of authority in matters of faith would object very much to this treatment of their prerogatives. We seem to hear in this view of Miss Petre an echo or a restatement of Calvin's theory of "the Mastery of the Spirit" (*la maîtrise de l'esprit*).

In the conclusion of her paper Miss Petre

shows that the advantages of authority are that it guides those who cannot guide themselves and stands for the high principle of love and union by the subjection of the private to the Universal Will. Its disadvantages are that being centered in limited beings it can wander. Yes, and we may add here, the excommunication of men like Tyrrell and more recently of Lemire shows how authority can be oppressive and become retrograde.

The Old Testament a Modern Message

Much has been written on this subject, but we can never say too often that constructive criticism has given to the church a living Old Testament, throbbing with actuality. Dr. MacFadyen writes on this theme of "The Old Testament and the Modern World" in the *Expositor* for January, 1914. It is certain that God spoke to the Fathers by the prophets; the question now is, Does he speak to us through them? The world seems to change in a terrific evolution, but the problems and sorrows of life are ever the same. The Old Testament is intensely human; it is a book of hope, but hope in this world and for this world; it teaches us how to interpret the great currents of life, of these mysterious forces of history through which suffering humanity is to be redeemed. The Hebrew seers did not dogmatize about metaphysical niceties; life was too real for them; they believed in a God who was molding nature and society and gave life because he was life. They saw God in the joys of a wedding and of a vintage festival, they heard his voice in the thundering clash of war, they divined him beyond the mysteries of birth, death, and sorrow. While the Old Testament has its roots in those enduring realities, it speaks to us men of the twentieth century with an accent that is peculiarly modern in its treatment of the problems of the individual, of society, and of the world at large. The great prob-

lem of justice was just as acute for the Hebrew believers as for us; they solved it in a practical way, binding together by an indissoluble link the service of God and the service of man, inspiring ethics with a sublime faith, pure and adamant-like: God's cause *will* triumph in a future which is the issue of the present.

Japan and Christianity

The Churchman for January, 1914, devotes a page to an article by a member of the Japanese Imperial Diet, Dr. Uzawa, M.P., in answer to the question "Does Japan Need Christianity?" It is a clear, affirmative answer. His position rests upon the assumption that religion in some form is essential to man's wholesome existence as well as to human progress. The question, then, is not, Does Japan need a religion? but, What religion does Japan need? "We in the East," he goes on to say, "have been a civilized people for some three thousand years, but our religion in that time did not do as much for us as Christianity did for Europe and the West in half that time. No religion exists which does not contain some light, however crude the religion; but only from Christian sources comes the pure, white light of lucid personality and transparent character. Christianity is the white corpuscle to protect the soul's blood, and consequently the whole man, from evil spiritual influences. Our country," he adds, "is very successful at producing criminals and incorrigible youth; why not now welcome an influence that will make men? When I say what this religion can do for a man, I speak out of the seriousness and fulness of my own experience. Both in my experience as a lawyer and as a member of the Imperial Diet I have been confirmed in my conviction that no nation can successfully entertain world-wide hopes and ambitions without the help of a universal religion, nor can she make a universal appeal without the inspiration of the Christian

religion." Referring to the California situation and the recent Korean conspiracy trial, he very graciously suggests that possibly both sides need more Christianity.

The Meaning of Tradition

Professor W. R. Arnold writes in the *Harvard Theological Review* for January, 1914, on "Theology and Tradition." There is, in academic circles, a widespread conviction that theology is not and can never be scientific, mainly because theology is tradition. This however is not exact; religion is necessarily traditional; its domain is not science but concrete life and experience; theology is not religion but the interpretation of it. Just like other sciences, a free theology will look facts squarely in the face; it will not content itself with repeating ancient and perhaps dead formulas, but, considering the evolution of humanity and the enlargement of our horizon, theology will adjust itself to new conditions. There is nothing to be afraid of or ashamed of in the word "tradition." The faculty of language, for instance, is a tradition: it is an organism carried by the living spirit of the race, constantly changing on its fringes while it remains a syntactical whole. Such is living tradition; such is Christianity. Our religion is an inheritance, not because we have received it in purely passive fashion as into a receptacle, but because we make it ours. Theology will humanize the records of our faith, so that we may truly assimilate them and grow into a better knowledge of the life that was in the prophets, the apostles, and the saints.

The Religious Crisis in Portugal

The January number of *Études* contains an article by Camille Torrend on "La crise religieuse en Portugal." The leaders of the young Lusitanian republic found out very soon that the Roman Catholic hierarchy was hostile to the new régime. They had fully expected it. In 1911 the law of

separation between church and state was promulgated. It was not intended to give freedom to the church, but to weaken her power. It was still less liberal than the French law of separation. Rome took up the same antagonistic position and refused to acknowledge the law. Now the church is in a precarious condition, and although persecution has abated, there is still a good deal of hostility against the clergy. Priests are not allowed to wear a cassock outside of a church. Some zealous "anticlericals" have even prescribed that the length of their frock coats must not be longer than the coats usually worn in the country. A preacher who happened to say in his sermon that "the Providence governs us" was interrupted by the mayor, who cried out, "No, Affonso Costa [the President] only governs us." A very large number of churches have been closed.

The immediate result has been the weakening of the liberal-minded clergy of the church in Portugal. M. Torrend, voicing the opinion of the Jesuits, sees in an absolute obedience and conformity to the spirit of Rome and the forsaking of lingering Jansenist ideas the only hope of saving the Lusitanian church and redeeming Portugal.

Early Babylonian Laws

In the *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* for January, 1914, A. T. Clay writes on "A Sumerian Prototype of the Hammurabi Code." He publishes a Sumerian tablet from the Yale collection where we find two laws bearing upon the injury done to pregnant women and one making provision if a lion kills a hired ox, which are strikingly parallel to the Hammurabi Code. That the code, as we have it, is based on older Sumerian laws can now be looked upon as established. In the light of such facts the assertion of Hammurabi that he received the Code from the god Shamash himself is very interesting as a sample of oriental accuracy.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD

MISSIONS

Co-operation in China

In China—and elsewhere—the free-lance missionary and the independent small mission have often proved a hindrance rather than a help, first because the Chinese failed to understand the purpose of such a mission, and also because its views were, as a matter of course, peculiar. So confederation of churches belonging to the same body and co-operation of these churches on the base of interdenominationalism will give a real impetus to mission work. It is hoped that before long a scheme for a union Christian University in Peking will be a tangible result of the new spirit of co-operation.

The Kikuyu Conference

A conference of representatives of missionary societies working in British East Africa was held at Kikuyu in June. This gathering drew up a scheme of federation of Protestant missions. Two bishops of the Anglican church entered heartily into the agreement. It was decided that each mission would accept as communicants members of other churches who would come and live in the vicinity, if these members brought a ticket or letter of transfer. Preachers belonging to any denomination would be allowed to preach in other churches. A simplified form of liturgical service would be composed and this form would be used at stated times in the divers churches, so that Christians belonging to every denomination may get accustomed to it. When the Bishop of Zanzibar, part of whose diocese is in British East Africa, and whose views are of the type usually called "high church," heard of the results of the Conference, he protested against the federation scheme and accused his two colleagues of heresy. It is much to be regretted that the

Bishop of Zanzibar failed to attend the Conference. His presence would have been a safeguard against hasty decisions and the historic position of the Church of England would probably not have been abandoned, as it seems to have been, by the Bishops of Uganda and Mombasa. From the point of view of strict legality, the Bishop of Zanzibar may be right, but there are duties which transcend legality and Christian union is one of these. The agitation created in England over this affair has abated. It seems probable that the scheme of Kikuyu will be dropped or at least made less complete. It would probably have been a better scheme if it had been less drastic.

Mass Movements in the Dutch East Indies

The mass movement toward Christianity among the animistic tribes in the Dutch East Indies spreads rapidly. The German Rhenish mission among the Bataks in Sumatra reports 14,000 baptisms, bringing the total Christian community among the people to 140,000. There is also a very large increase of church membership among the Borneo Dayaks. The peril of the future seems to be the influence of a materialistic European civilization. Javanese of the upper class will be tempted to adopt only certain features of western culture—and these not always the best—without acquiring a real knowledge of its higher principles.

The Lokoja Conference

A United Missionary Conference was held at Lokoja, in July. Various missionary societies working in Northern Nigeria were represented. No ecclesiastical discussion took place: some common points were agreed to concerning the policy to be

followed in respect to certain native customs. It was decided, for instance, that the native form of marriage was not to be regarded as being a marriage at all, because it is not binding for life. Mohammedan missionaries do not usually attack native customs so sharply. Perhaps they are wiser. The British government puts restrictions on mission work among Mohammedans in Northern Nigeria. Early in 1913, an agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society was expelled from Northern Nigeria by the British authorities.

Mission Work in Japan

There are in Japan 92,595 non-Roman Christians and 63,081 Roman Catholics. There are 80 Protestant houses of worship in Tokyo and their total church attendance on Sunday morning is 5,000 on the average.

American Missionary Budget for 1913

Nearly sixteen and one-half million dollars were given last year for Foreign Missions by the Protestant churches of the United States and of Canada. Advance toward self-support is shown by the fact that nearly four million dollars were contributed by the native churches on the foreign field under American supervision. There were last year 6,979 American missionaries in foreign countries, in addition to 2,807 wives of missionaries. Native workers numbered 48,454 and the full communicant members of the native churches belonging to American missions are 1,366,551, a remarkable increase of 200,000 over last year. During the same period \$400,000,000 were spent on local American churches.

Mission Work of the American Catholic Church in Cuba

The ancient colonies of Spain are just as much in need of missionaries as the heathen world. The Roman Catholic church has lost her hold upon the people, and millions are now shepherdless in these nominally Christian countries. The Protestant Episcopal church in Cuba has increased in 9 years from 200 to 1,700 communicants and from 2 clergymen to 24. Half of these communicants are English-speaking people. The Spanish-speaking members of the church are usually of the lower class, as in most foreign fields.

What the Chinese Think of Mission Work

During the Boxer rebellion, many missionaries were massacred in Shansi, China. Now the government of this province has asked the American Board of Foreign Missions to take charge of a very large number of the public schools of Shansi, with liberty to teach the Bible and the Christian religion. A large grant is also promised by the government. It is doubtful whether the American Board will accept this offer because of the heavy expenditure already incurred by the Society.

The Outcome of the Conspiracy Trials in Korea

The high-handed treatment of Christian Nationalists in Korea by the Japanese has brought about a decrease in the number of catechumens. The Presbyterian and Methodist missions work in good harmony and have formed together a Federal Council. These missions report 11,700 baptisms during the last year. The circulation of Scriptures has been a record one.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The Religious Education Association

The annual convention of this association is always a gathering of significance in the religious world. The twelfth convention, which met at New Haven, March 4-7, was not a meeting of the association as a whole, but of the council which is charged with the study of special topics. Consideration this year was given to the subject "Higher Education and the Social Order." The concentration of interest thus secured gave weight to the discussions. The moral and religious quality of the college life as of fundamental importance was discussed by presidents, deans, instructors, Christian Association officers, and others. Among the problems considered were the moral values of the curriculum, student honor, athletics, fraternity life, altruistic activities. As indicating the breadth of the interest it was noteworthy that conditions in the colleges of the non-Christian world were given consideration side by side with our own. In addition to the professional workers in religious education, the convention was made noteworthy by the presence of Mr. Whitman, ex-President Taft, Dr. Mott, besides President Hadley of Yale University. The convention elected President George E. Vincent of Minnesota as its presiding officer for the coming year and appointed Buffalo as the next place of meeting.

Hymns in Religious Education

The importance of hymns as material for religious education has been receiving very little consideration in the present-day publications on Sunday-school work and efficiency. In Rev. Bernard Feeney's *The Catholic Sunday School* hymns are shown to be an integral part of the Sunday-school curriculum of that communion. In the different grades the Catholic children

are taught to memorize hymns appropriate to their years. They memorize them and are taught to understand their meaning before they learn to sing them. The "Constructive Studies" include books of this character for an awakening consciousness of need for hymns that will more adequately express as well as deepen the fundamental religious emotions. A hymnbook of from fifty to one hundred hymns in our Sunday schools, every one worthy of memorizing and set to appropriate music, is evidently the desirable thing.

Significant in this connection as relating to the social side of religion is a list of one hundred and ten hymns published in *The Survey* of January 3, 1914. They are presented under the title "One Hundred Hymns of Brotherhood and Social Aspiration." The words of the hymns are printed and the tunes to which the hymns have been set are indicated. In a few instances the music is shown. This list is a result of invitations sent out by *The Survey* to contributors asking for favorite hymns or hymns of their own composing that might be classed as social. The response was so generous that the task of selection became enormous. This work was intrusted to a temporary Editor-of-hymns with twelve helpers, or "eminent jurors," as the report says.

The hymns are classified as follows: I, Aspiration and Faith, 35 hymns; II, Liberty and Justice, 16; III, Peace, 6; IV, Labor and Conflict, 19; V, Brotherhood, 18; VI, Patriotism, 16. Of the 110 hymns 11 were written in 1913 according to the date they bear, and twenty-one others within the last decade. Still others, while bearing no date, are the production of present-day writers. In the editor's acknowledgments to authors, composers, and publishers of social hymns (p. 421) reference is made to the space given to this class of hymns in the hymnbooks published last year.

In *The Hymnal of Praise*, 20 per cent are social hymns; in *Songs of Worship and Service*, 18 per cent; in *The Pilgrim Hymnal*, 14 per cent; in *The American Hymnal*, 12 per cent; in *Service Songs* (Christian Endeavor), 7 per cent; in *Songs of the Christian Life*, 6 per cent.

Special commendation is given to *The Hymnal of Praise* (A. S. Barnes & Co.). It is spoken of as "a collection particularly suited for young people. It builds up the theme of the Christian kingdom—from the home, through the school and church, to the city, the nation, and the world—with International Brotherhood and Peace."

Religious Instruction in Germany

In the *Methodist Review* for January, 1914, appears an article by Professor W. K. Matthews, of the Kwansei Gakuin, Kobe, Japan, on the subject, "Some Features of Higher Education in Germany." The article is a report of an investigation made chiefly in and around Berlin, more especially of the work of the higher schools. Speaking of the German school system in general, the writer says: "It has been worked out with German thoroughness by the best minds of the nation, and is as complete, and as nicely adjusted as the mechanism of a clock." Constant, close, and impartial government supervision insures its effectiveness.

Instruction in religion is as thorough as in other subjects. Examinations are as carefully given, and the grades are counted in deciding the pupil's standing. For three years before entering the higher schools the pupils have had in the primary school from two to four hours a week of religious instruction consisting chiefly of Bible stories. Three hours a week for the first year in the higher schools and two hours a week for eight succeeding years are devoted to distinctively religious education.

The course is comprehensive, progressive, well articulated, and at each stage well

adapted to the development of the pupil's mind. While the course (as given in Protestant schools) is clearly made for the purpose of teaching the Prussian state religion, yet it has features "well worth our study when planning our course of instruction in religion," according to Mr. Matthews' judgment. A detailed statement of this course is given in James E. Russell's work on *German Higher Schools*, new edition, 1907, published by Longmans, Green & Co., New York.

Mr. Matthews spent considerable time in visiting schools and class exercises. His observations were that the interest of the students and the success of the teaching seemed to vary greatly. The work in the higher classes seemed generally to be well done, and yet it was evident that the pupils did not enjoy the study. The teachers who make this their chief subject usually teach one or two other subjects. They have the same rank and draw the same salary as the other teachers in the school, and are appointed in the same way. The writer speaks of being impressed with the superior scholarship and attractive personality of these men, as well as with the seriousness and thoroughness of their work. Yet notwithstanding all this, the results are generally declared to be far from satisfactory. A large majority of the boys leave the schools at the end having little interest in religion and none in the church. They have much scholastic knowledge but no religious life.

Why then does not so much and so thorough religious instruction make religious citizens? Five reasons are set forth. The essence of these reasons is that the failure seems to be due to a lack of vital personal religion. Germany, in its religious education, is holding to outworn forms which have long since lost the spirit. One scarcely needs a better illustration of the inadequacy of mere systems or methods of religious education, however excellently organized.

The Bane of Bad Hymns

In a penetrative article on "Theology of Hymns," Edward S. Worcester of Norwich, Conn., has this to say in the *Hartford Seminary Record*: "It is a reflection upon the otherwise good judgment of some missionary bodies that they have not infrequently chosen our feebler efforts [in hymn-writing] for translation into foreign tongues. It is a reflection upon the discernment which should accompany zeal that we at home so readily surrender our people's prayers and praise to the random and ephemeral jingles of the professional revivalist. . . . There are compositions in vogue in certain

quarters which musically are beneath the level of the street piano and poetically are not good enough to commit to memory in a district school. . . . Men will yet summon a congregation to worship in rhymes which are false in sentiment, cheap in expression, and half-baked in theology, if only they will assume the name of 'gospel' songs. If ever a body of literature needed to be looked into with discrimination before use, it is that which is turned out with increasing fluency these days by men whose acquaintance with accurate religious thought is almost nil and whose chief inspiration would seem to be commercial."

CHURCH EFFICIENCY**The Problem of the Prayer Meeting**

One of the most aggressive churches in the East—the Lake Avenue Baptist of Rochester, N.Y.—has recently inaugurated a scheme for the solution of the insistent prayer-meeting problem which would seem feasible for many other perplexed churches. At Lake Avenue they have this fall instituted the "Big Wednesday Evening," which has proved very successful both in point of numbers and in interest. The activities of the church are concentrated upon this one week-day evening to prevent loss through too great scattering of meetings throughout the week. Once a month the ladies have their meeting at 2:30 in the afternoon but the rest of the features of the "Big Wednesday Evening" occur every week. The hour from five to six is reserved for various committee meetings and at 6:20 the ladies of the church serve a supper at a very nominal cost to everyone who can attend. This supper is made the occasion of much informality and fun, everyone wearing a tag on which is his or her name and joining in the informal "sing" with which the meal closes under the able assistance of a voluntary orchestra of young people. At

7 there are various study groups on missionary topics under competent leadership, or, as in the case of the first three weeks of the fall, an entertainment illustrating some theme of missionary significance, such as the incoming immigrants at Ellis Island. Sometimes some prominent missionary speaker is secured for this period. At 8:15 occurs the regular church prayer meeting, at which the orchestra is again in evidence, assisted by a young people's choir. The hour from 9 to 10 is again reserved for committee sessions of various kinds. Among the most successful of the mission-study groups were courses upon the Appeal of the Missionary Task, The Emergency in China, The Church and the City Problem, Mormonism, Islam of America, The Business Side of the Missionary Task, Missionary Biography, Contemporary Missionary Leaders, Medical Missions, The Bible and Missions, Comparative Religions, and others.

This church is supporting three missionary families in the foreign field besides workers in the home field. Much intelligent interest in the undertaking is largely generated at these "Big Wednesday Evenings."

BOOK NOTICES

A Source Book for Ancient Church History.

By Joseph Cullen Ayer, Jr. New York: Scribner, 1913. Pp. xxi+707. \$4.50.

Dr. Ayer is professor of ecclesiastical history in the Philadelphia Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal church. The volume covers the epoch from the Apostolic age to the close of the conciliar period in the eighth century. It is a volume which will be a standard tool for work in the field of ancient and mediaeval history. Present-day tendencies toward the blending of interests and the interpretation of all special problems in terms of a larger outlook give a culture value to sourcebooks which they could not have possessed in the eyes of earlier generations of scholars. Indeed, sourcebooks and broader insights are characteristic of the present age. Dr. Ayer's choice of material, and the comments which he intersperses, make this work highly valuable. The documents reproduced begin with the Apostolic age, and relate to such matters as Judaism and Christianity, the early persecutions and martyrdoms, church organization, heathenism in relation to Christianity, the great gnostic heresy and other heretical movements, the beginnings of Catholic theology, extension of the church, the Council of Nicea and other councils, monasticism, clerical celibacy, Augustinianism, the transition to the Middle Ages, etc. The book will be useful, not only to students of ecclesiastical history, but to students of general history as well.

The Quakers in England and America. By

Charles Frederick Holder. Los Angeles: The Neuner Co., 1913. Pp. 669. Double vol. \$6.25.

Dr. Holder's large literary experience, and his interest in the subject through his Quaker ancestry, have combined to produce a readable and instructive work. America and England are not so conscious of the debt they owe to the Quakers as they will be in years to come. The present volume should have a place in the awakening of the Anglo-Saxon peoples to the realities of English and American history. As the author says, there is not a great moral reform, from the abolition of capital punishment to the equality of women, or the freedom of slaves to civic righteousness, worked for today by organized forces, that the Quakers had not thought of, and were demanding from the house-tops two hundred and fifty years ago. They fought and died for the simple life, morality, and virtue. Such lives should not be forgotten; they should be known to the people of today, who are enjoy-

ing the religious liberty for which the early Quakers fought and died. Dr. Holder carries the reader along over a narrative which is full of detail and color, and which preserves the sense of historical perspective. The book does not pay that formal deference to the "sources" which the rigidly scientific student of history demands, and which is found in such volumes on Quaker history as those of Braithwaite and Jones. The author states explicitly that he is writing a popular history (Preface, pp. 11 and 12); and the book must, of course, be judged with this fact in mind. It begins with a sketch of religious and political conditions in England "previous to the nineteenth century," and then goes on to consider the rise of Quakerism in England, its invasion of America, and its course on both sides of the sea to the present time. The volume is supplied with many well-chosen illustrations. Altogether, it gives a vivid and realistic sense of its interesting theme.

My Father: Reminiscences of W. T. Stead.

By Estelle W. Stead. New York: G. H. Doran Co., 1913. Pp. xii+351. \$2.50.

This biographical study follows in the wake of the "Titanic" disaster. W. T. Stead was sixty-three years of age at the time he took passage on the ill-fated vessel; and he had a longer normal expectation of life. The book before us is not a systematic "Life"; but it gives all the essential facts in the career of Mr. Stead. His daughter has chosen to dwell especially upon his interest in Spiritualism, and has sought to show, from his own writings, the influence of Spiritualism upon Mr. Stead's career. This aspect of his thought will unfavorably affect the judgment which most people pass upon him. Mr. Stead, however, did quite a number of things in addition to studying and practicing the occult; and although the latter takes what we feel is a disproportionate space in the volume before us, it is by his non-spiritualistic doings that he is best known. His more conventional activities include his work in exposing the white slave traffic in England, his participation in politics, his campaign for international arbitration, and his editorial work on *The Pall Mall Gazette*, *The Review of Reviews*, and other publications. The reminiscences before us give a number of intimate side-lights upon public life, and a good idea of the part played by one who was a vital and enterprising, but hardly a great, figure in the events of his time. The book furnishes good material for study of contemporary history, and should find its way to the attention of a considerable audience.

- (1) **The Book of Judges in the Revised Version with Introduction and Notes** and (2) **The Book of Ruth in the Revised Version with Introduction and Notes.** By G. A. Cooke. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. Pp. xlii+204 and xviii+22. 2s. 6d.

These two commentaries, bound together in one volume, make a useful addition to the "Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges." The introductions gather up and present in clear and interesting form the commonly accepted conclusions of modern scholarship regarding Judges and Ruth. The author parts with the majority of scholars in one main point, viz., in that he refuses to accept Ruth as a book written to enforce a protest against the narrowness and exclusiveness of the days of Nehemiah and Ezra. In the analysis of Judges, he shrinks from identifying himself with the school that finds in Judges the J and E of the Hexateuch. The scholarship of these commentaries is adequate; but the technicalities of scholarship are allowed to disappear. The comments are brief and clarifying and maintain well the standard of the best volumes of the series. No book of the Old Testament conveys so well as Judges an idea of the primitive and crude character of early Hebrew life in Canaan, and Professor Cooke has made good use of his opportunity in this respect.

- An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States.** By Charles A. Beard. New York: Macmillan, 1913. Pp. vii+330. \$2.25.

Religious workers have been repelled, with good reason, by the manner in which the "economic interpretation of history" has been presented in the past. Today, however, this view of the progress of civilization is finding a more temperate and scholarly treatment; and it is rapidly becoming familiar to ministers and theologians. The present book is by a well-equipped professor in Columbia University, New York City. It is based upon a great variety of documents and sources, many of which belong to our national and state governments. The data are adequate; and most of the conclusions will be anticipated and accepted by careful readers before coming to those portions of the text in which they are explicitly drawn. Not only is there in the book nothing which will alarm or unsettle the well-grounded modern minister; but the volume is replete with information which the minister ought to possess if he is to have an intelligent background for his thought about national problems.

Professor Beard deals with the fundamental economic conditions involved in the origin and adoption of the Constitution of the United States. He makes a careful survey of American

economic interests prior to the establishment of the Constitution, and shows the economic nature of the campaign for a new national government. Taking up, in alphabetical order, the men composing the Philadelphia convention, the author shows in detail what were the economic circumstances and interests of each one. The overwhelming majority of members were immediately, directly, and personally interested in the outcome of their labors at Philadelphia, and were to a greater or less extent economic beneficiaries from the adoption of the Constitution. Most of the members came from towns on or near the coast, that is, from the regions in which personal property was largely concentrated. Not one member represented, in his immediate, personal, economic interests, the small farming or mechanic classes. The treatise then goes on to consider the Constitution itself as an economic document, the process of ratification, etc. The volume is most important and significant, marking, as we believe, a new era in the interpretation of American history.

- The Reformation in Germany.** By Henry C. Vedder. New York: Macmillan, 1914. Pp. xlix+466. \$3.00 net.

A volume on the Reformation would certainly seem to be either daring or unnecessary. If one comes to the subject from the traditional point of view and with little sympathy with modern historical method, there is no place for the new volume. But Professor Vedder has done something more than retell a tale. He has written a work which treats the Reformation as something more than a bit of pictorial biography. In his introduction he describes Germany as it was in the sixteenth century, with particular reference to the economic condition. Out from that economic condition he holds that the Reformation movement in large part sprang. Not that he would reduce the Reformation to an economic struggle merely, but he has no illusions as to the significance of Luther. In fact, the volume subjects the reformer and his movement to severe criticism. More than that Professor Vedder is convinced, as every unbiased historian must be convinced, that the Reformation movement, after its first break with Rome, tended to re-establish a state—instead of an imperial autocracy in religion. His estimate of the Reformation movement is to the effect that it was complex, anything but exclusively religious, however large a rôle religion played within it. But it was not a religion of freedom nor did it aim at the emancipation of religion from the control of the state. It marked the re-establishment of the higher feudal aristocracy and the beginning of capitalism in the triumph of the middle class. The peasants gained nothing from the movement and the knights were ruined. It perverted the Renaissance, enforced the supremacy of the Scriptures in

unworthy and inconsistent ways, resulted in a new scholasticism, and had no immediate ethical force.

This partial summary of his conclusions will show that the book is anything but conventional. If we were asked, however, how far Professor Vedder had actually traced economic forces, we should have to say that the volume appears to have been the re-working from the point of view of the new economic history, of earlier studies which but superficially regarded economic matters. Certainly it is not a thorough-going economic interpretation, as indeed it should not be. Yet, although the economic element is not as prominent in the book as its introduction would lead us to expect, it is so far recognized as to give the work a vigor and modernness of treatment which makes it outstanding. If it is not altogether written up from the sources in complete fashion, the book's use of secondary authorities indicates Professor Vedder's acquaintance with the newer type of Reformation studies, and therefore it will give wider currency to the more impartial and scientific estimates of an epoch whose real significance has too often been obscured by dogmatic sympathies and purposes.

Our Neighbors, the Chinese. By Joseph K. Goodrich. Chicago: Browne & Howell Co., 1913. Pp. 279. \$1.25.

A very readable sketch of contemporary Chinese society from all angles of approach. It may be used in connection with Dr. Soothill's work, noticed above, as it admirably supplements a volume dealing with China's religion. It gives a view of literature and folk-lore; education; home life; industry; social classes; the provinces; Mongols, Manchus, and Tibetans; child life; travel in China, etc. The book is equipped with sixteen illustrations from photographs, an index, and a good bibliography of English titles. It is well adapted both for general reading and for use in study clubs and mission classes.

Marxism versus Socialism. By Vladimir G. Simkhovitch. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1913. Pp. xvi+298. \$1.75.

Everybody who has paid any serious attention to socialism in recent years is more or less aware that the movement has, with comparative suddenness, developed a bifurcation of tendencies which is both startling and mysterious. Some years ago, socialists were quite sure that they had the true scientific keys to the past and the future. Today, they have separated into right and left wings called, respectively, "yellow" and "red." The affiliations of the yellow

right are with "social reform" and "political action." Those of the red left are with "revolution," "syndicalism," and "direct action." To the layman, all this is rather confusing; but fundamentally the situation is not so mysterious as it seems. The author of the volume before us is a professor of economic history in Columbia University; and in this book he makes a clear and scholarly statement of the philosophical position of socialism today. While we cannot agree with all the author's positions, which in some cases appear to be unfair to the socialists, we have no hesitation in recommending the book to students of the movement. The author points out that of all the doctrines of Marx, the "economic interpretation of history" has suffered least from the ravages of time and criticism. Only a layman, however, could regard this method as a complete and perfect instrument of social research and interpretation. Professor Simkhovitch argues that nearly all the tendencies upon which Marx counted have failed him, and that, from the standpoint of the economic interpretation of history itself, the revolution whereby capitalism is to be subverted is not the inevitable future of social progress, but a concept in the realm of Utopianism. The book is one which appeals rather to the philosopher than to the general reader; and it ought to have a wide reading among students.

Professor G. A. Johnston Ross, of Union Theological Seminary, is the author of a devotional study of the Apostles' Creed, which is entitled *The God We Trust* (Revell, \$1.25). Dr. Ross holds that the present-day reduction of homiletic and theological emphasis to one or two very simple truths and appeals deprives many religious persons of that "plan," or "system," which they crave in their desire to square faith with all the facts of life. To meet this contemporary spiritual hunger, he would employ the Apostles' Creed as a devotional symbol for a systematic faith in which we associate ourselves with the church of the past while holding ourselves free from the tyranny of words and phrases.

A translation of a German work on the Apostles' Creed by Professor Johannes Kunze, of the University of Greifswald, is published as *The Apostles' Creed and the New Testament* (Funk & Wagnalls, \$1.25). Instead of deriving the creed from the New Testament, the author takes opposite ground, regarding the creed as anterior to the earliest parts of the New Testament. The book is polemical, and will not find much response in America. It was occasioned by the attempts of liberal German theologians to have the creed omitted from church usage.

THE ORIGIN AND TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS. VIII

By ERNEST DE WITT BURTON and FRED MERRIFIELD

AN OUTLINE BIBLE-STUDY COURSE OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE

This course is published in ten leaflets issued on the fifteenth of each month from September, 1913, to June, 1914. It is sent free to all members of the AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE enrolling for this course. Membership in the INSTITUTE may be secured by sending the annual membership fee of fifty cents and four cents for postage to the headquarters of the INSTITUTE, at the University of Chicago.

STUDY VII

CHAPTER XII

THE TRIUMPHANT SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY FROM JERUSALEM TO ROME, AS TOLD IN THE BOOK OF ACTS

First day.—§ 75. *The authorship and scope of the Book of Acts.* Scholars are practically unanimous in the judgment that this book (Acts) and the Third Gospel (Luke) were written by the same author, as language, style, and subject-matter abundantly show. Furthermore, Acts, like Luke, contains many common and not a few carefully chosen technical, medical terms, pointing to a Greek physician as the probable author. Early church tradition strongly favors the Lukan authorship of both works. Four passages from a diary kept by one of Paul's co-workers used in Acts (16:10-17; 20:5-15; 21:1-18; 27:1-28:16), combined with certain references in Paul's letters (Col. 4:14a; Philem., vs. 24b; II Tim. 4:11a) suggest that Luke is the probable companion, and the author of both diary and the complete Book of Acts. While this book deals actually with only a few of the apostles and their careers, chiefly that of Paul, it tells practically all that we know of their methods of work, their message, and their indomitable faith, and helps us to picture to ourselves how boldly and successfully they carried on the work left them by their Master, whose spirit indeed continued to work in them mightily. (See outline of Acts which follows.)

ANALYSIS OF THE ACTS

- I. The Reassembling and Organization of Jesus' Followers:
 1. The promise of the spirit, and the ascension of Jesus (1:1-14).
 2. The choosing of Matthias (1:15-26).
 3. The coming of the Spirit (2:1-13).

4. Peter's sermon on the Day of Pentecost (2:14-36).
 5. The conversion of the three thousand (2:37-42).
 6. The church in peace and favor (2:43-47).
- II. The Growth of the Church in Jerusalem:
1. The healing of the lame man by Peter and John (3:1-10).
 2. Peter's sermon in Solomon's Porch (3:11-26).
 3. The first imprisonment of Peter and John (4:1-31).
 4. The unity of the church and the community of goods (4:32-37).
 5. Ananias and Sapphira (5:1-11).
 6. Signs and wonders done by the apostles (5:12-16).
 7. The second imprisonment of the apostles (5:17-42).
 8. The appointment of the Seven (6:1-7).
 9. The trial and death of Stephen the martyr (6:8-8:1a).
- III. The Church Scattered by Persecution: The Work Broadened and Deepened:
1. The scattering of the church by persecution (8:1b-3[4]).
 2. The planting of the church in the city of Samaria (8:4-25).
 3. Philip and the Ethiopian treasurer (8:26-40).
 4. The conversion of Saul (9:1-19a [cf. 22:5-16; 26:12-18]).
 5. The three years in Damascus and Arabia (9:19b-25 [cf. Gal. 1:17b (18a)]).
 6. Saul in Jerusalem, Syria, and Cilicia (9:26-31 [cf. 22:17-21; Gal. 1:18-24]).
 7. The healing of Aeneas (9:32-35).
 8. The raising of Dorcas (9:36-43).
 9. Peter's visit to Cornelius (chap. 10).
 10. Peter's defense of his action respecting Cornelius (11:1-18).
 11. The beginning of the gospel in Antioch (11:19-26).
 12. Relief sent from Antioch to the brethren in Judea (11:27-30).
 13. The persecution of the church by Herod Agrippa I (12:1-24).
 14. The return to Antioch of the messengers to Jerusalem (12:25).
- IV. Missions to Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece:
1. Barnabas and Saul sent forth from Antioch (13:1-3).
 2. Preaching the Word at Salamis and Paphos (13:4-12).
 3. At Pisidian Antioch (13:13-52).
 4. At Iconium (14:1-7).
 5. At Lystra and Derbe, and the return to Antioch in Syria (14:8-28).
 6. The council at Jerusalem (15:1-29; Gal. 2:1-10).
 7. Report of the council's action to the church at Antioch (15:30-35).
 8. Peter's visit to Antioch (Gal. 2:11-21).
 9. The dissension between Paul and Barnabas (15:36-41).
 10. The churches in southern Asia Minor revisited (16:1-5).
 11. The journey to Troas, and the vision of Paul (16:6-10).
 12. The beginning of the gospel in Philippi (16:11-40).
 13. The planting of the church in Thessalonica (17:1-9; I Thess. 1:1-2:14)
 14. Preaching in the synagogue at Berea (17:10-15).
 15. Paul at Athens (17:16-34).
 16. Paul's first ministry in Corinth (18:1-17).

17. Paul's return to Syria and third sojourn in Antioch (18:18-23a).
 18. The churches of the Galatian region and Phrygia revisited (18:23b).
 19. Apollos in Ephesus and Corinth (18:24-28).
 20. Paul's ministry in Ephesus (chap. 19 [20:1]).
 21. From Ephesus to Macedonia (20:1).
 22. In Macedonia and Achaia (20:2, 3).
 23. The journey from Corinth to Jerusalem (20:4-21:16).
- V. Paul's Imprisonment and Final Work at Rome:
1. Paul's reception by the church in Jerusalem (21:17-26).
 2. Paul's arrest in Jerusalem (21:27-36).
 3. Address to the people in the Hebrew language (21:37-22:29).
 4. Address before the Sanhedrin (22:30-23:11).
 5. The plot of the Jews, and Paul's removal to Caesarea (23:12-35).
 6. Paul's examination before Felix (24:1-23).
 7. Paul before Felix and Drusilla (24:24-27).
 8. Examination before Festus: Appeal to Caesar (25:1-12).
 9. Before Agrippa and Bernice (25:13-26:32).
 10. The voyage from Caesarea to Fair Havens (27:1-8).
 11. The storm and the shipwreck (27:9-44).
 12. On the island of Melita (28:1-10).
 13. From Melita to Rome (28:11-15).
 14. Paul's conference with the Jews in Rome (28:16-28).
 15. Two years' labor in Rome (28:30, 31).

Second day.—§ 76. *The reassembling and organization of Jesus' followers:* Acts 1:1-2:47. Read 1:1-14, noticing Luke's reference to his previous book (vs. 1a) and its contents (vss. 1b-3); how these opening verses connect themselves with and enlarge upon the closing part of the Gospel, especially the faith that Christ is in heaven and yet will be with them in power (vss. 4-11) until his final return in glory (vs. 11). Why this repeated emphasis upon these ideas so earnestly held by the more ardent Christians of the first century? Were some disciples growing lukewarm in faith, beginning to doubt the truth of these beliefs? How startling to find Jesus' mother and brothers in this early assembly at Jerusalem (though, to be sure, Luke excluded Mark's account of their previous unbelief: Mark 3:20-21, 31:35)! After reading vss. 15-26, ask why Judas' place had to be filled at all, and what the chief qualifications and tasks of an apostle were (cf. Luke 24:47, 48).

Third day.—Read 2:1-47. What was the real religious experience that lay behind the symbolic narrative in 2:1-13? What do the words "rushing," "tongues," "fire," and "Spirit" suggest as to the startling power and joyful inspiration of this revival experience? What do the names of vss. 8-12 suggest to Luke as he writes years after the gospel has begun its larger work? How does Peter explain this new enthusiasm and power displayed by Jesus' followers (vss. 14-36)? How do you account for such great results as those mentioned in vss. 37-47? Does Jesus' ministry in Galilee and Jerusalem account for this, in part?

Fourth day.—§ 77. *The growth of the church in Jerusalem:* Acts 3:1-8:1a. Read chap. 3. Did the early church at once renounce Judaism and temple-

worship, its members calling themselves Christians instead of Jews (vss. 1 and 13 especially)? Were these people now beginning to see the real significance of Jesus' life and death (vss. 13-26)? Notice the striking titles here applied to Jesus.

Fifth day.—According to chap. 4, what was the emphatic creed of these first Christians? What great experiences gave them this courage and daily increased their power as religious leaders?

Sixth day.—How, according to 5:1-11, did the disciples express their sense of brotherhood? How do you account for such power as vss. 12-16 suggest? Read vss. 17-42 (and cf. 4:1, as well as the case of Jesus). Who were the most determined enemies of this Jesus movement? What great convictions held the disciples loyal to their message (vss. 29, 32, 42)? Note the author's slight confusion of dates (cf. Josephus, *Antiquities*, XX, v, 1, 2) in vss. 33-37. Judas of Galilee appeared when Jesus was a boy of about ten years of age (6 A.D.); Gamaliel, of course, lived about 30 A.D.; and Theudas led his fated movement about 44 A.D., some fourteen years after these events are said to have occurred.

Seventh day.—In 6:1-7, notice the two types of people in the early church, and how naturally offices were created to meet actual need. How were these first officials chosen? Summarize all the factors which tend to explain so great success (vs. 7). Read 6:8-8:1a. Why did Stephen take up this larger and more trying work (vss. 8-10)? Was their charge against Stephen well-founded (vss. 13, 14)? How radical is his position; and does he admit the charge? How great a character is here revealed; and what effect upon the church life and activities did his martyrdom have? Note Saul's dramatic position and influence (8:1a).

Eighth day.—§ 78. *The church scattered by persecution: the work broadened and deepened:* 8:1b-12:25. Read 8:1b-4. Why should Stephen's death stir up so much trouble, and who now stands out as leader of the anti-Jesus movement? Notice how this persecution differed from those that preceded, and the effect of it as respects the spread of the gospel. Putting yourself as much as possible in Saul's place, try to form a just idea of his character and of the motives with which he persecuted Christians.

Ninth day.—In reading 8:5-40, notice what various types were attracted by the gospel; what emphasis the evangelists laid upon the Holy Spirit, baptism, belief in Jesus as Messiah, and Old Testament prophecy. Read 9:1-31. Gain a definite idea of the author's view of Paul's spiritual experience—the change that took place in his opinions, convictions, feelings, purposes, and relations in life. Recall from Gal. 1:15-24 Paul's own story as to how he spent the next preparatory years, and consider the bearing of these events upon his future career.

Tenth day.—Follow Peter's early evangelistic work in Acts 9:32-10:48. How do time and experience gradually enlarge his views of Jesus' mission and God's plan for the world (especially 10:28, 29, 34, 35)? May years of tradition and our author's highly dramatic nature possibly have led to more or less idealization with regard to these narratives?

Eleventh day.—Read 11:1-18. In breaking away from these deepest and long-cherished convictions of the Jewish people, do you imagine that Peter's conscience was ill at ease, accusing and defending him by turns? Why should the

Jerusalem brethren reprimand him so sternly (vs. 2)? Had they forgotten the broader spirit of their Master as expressed in Matt. 28:19, 20? Is there danger today that, in our zeal for the upholding of church customs, we may be working against the clear will of God?

Twelfth day.—Read 11:19—12:25. How valuable to us would be the records of these devoted evangelists whose names, even, have not been handed down in history! Note how very gradually these Jewish workers broadened their sympathies to take in the gentiles; and how even Barnabas, so cautiously sent out by the conservative disciples of Jerusalem, was swept away by the power of the revival among the gentiles (11:19b-24). No wonder he felt the need of Saul of Tarsus, a great spirit akin to his own (11:25-26). Think of a Jewish-gentile church! Does the name "Christian," never used till now (vs. 26), suggest the new and wonderful bond which united these hitherto hostile peoples?

Thirteenth day.—§ 79. *Missions to Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece:* Acts 13:1—21:16. Read 13:1—14:28. What does 13:2-4a suggest as to the unique importance of this tour of Barnabas and Paul? Note again the sterling worth of these two men (11:22-26; 12:25; 13:1, 2a). Tracing the journey upon the map, ask: With whom (Jews or gentiles) did they begin their work? What obstacles did they meet? Remember the history of John Mark, later the honored author of our Second Gospel (see 12:12; 15:37-39; Col. 4:10; Philem., vs. 24; II Tim. 4:11). How significant is this journey when you recall what it cost Paul (14:19); also in the light of the letter written by Paul to these Galatian Christians?

Fourteenth day.—Read 15:1-35. Recall that you have read in Gal. 2:1-12 Paul's account of this same event; but read the Acts story as revealing the viewpoint held thirty or forty years later. Why does the present author pass so lightly over this controversy, leaving the impression of perfect harmony, while Paul's words suggest no compromise whatever, but rather a fight to the end for the principle at stake? Does time usually tend to soften the memory of differences?

Fifteenth day.—Read 15:36—16:10. Recalling Mark's seeming lack of heroism during the first journey (13:13), note the author's further comment (15:38) and judge as to which side he seems to take (vs. 40). In the light of the Galatian letter and Paul's well-known convictions, may we say that Paul is justified in having Timothy circumcised (16:3); or is this a compromise again, as seen by the author? How did the Spirit make his will known to Paul (16:6, 7)? Imagine Paul's feelings as he plans to enter Europe with his message! Follow Paul's journey on the map.

Sixteenth day.—Glance hastily over the four "we-sections" referred to in § 75 (16:10-17; 20:5-15; 21:1-18; 27:1-28:16), noting the use of the first personal pronoun, the wealth of detail in the sections, and the vivid touches of the eyewitness, who must have been with Paul as companion. Is this a portion of Luke's diary, kept in his youthful days of travel with the great apostle? This is, at any rate, evidently a written source employed by the author of Acts.

Seventeenth day.—Read 16:11—18:23a. Recalling II Cor. 11:23-29, and putting yourself in the place of these uncomplaining heroes, ask what your feelings would be under such circumstances. Could you be faithful "even unto death,"

as were these men? Think of the weariness, yet the untold joy, they had as they reached home again (18:22, 23a) and told what God had accomplished through their labors and sufferings!

Eighteenth day.—In similar fashion, trace Paul's third journey (18:23b—21:16), noting his affectionate interest in his Galatian friends; the fact that Ephesus contained, even after a quarter of a century, men who were proud to acknowledge themselves as disciples of John the Baptist (18:24—19:7); the new hardships encountered so fearlessly; the increasing success of the work; and the growing body of able workers who rallied to the help of Paul. Luke has seen these men and often heard their stories of adventure.

Nineteenth day.—§ 80. *Paul's imprisonment and final work at Rome:* Acts 21:17—28:31. Recall the events which have happened since Paul's last arrival at Jerusalem (15:1—29; Gal. 2:1—10); what journeys he has made; what letters he has written; what mental experiences he has passed through; what conflicts and oppositions he has endured.

Twentieth day.—Read with care 21:17—26, noticing (1) who is the head of the church in Jerusalem, (2) to whom Paul gave an account of his work, and how it was received, (3) the position of the major portion of the Jewish Christians in relation to the law, (4) the course Paul was urged to pursue, (5) the motives for this course. (Recall, why he had come to Jerusalem [Rom. 15:25—27].)

Twenty-first day.—Read 21:27—36 attentively, noticing (1) with whom the attack on Paul originated, (2) what they charged against him, (3) to what motives they appealed, (4) the relation of the Roman authorities to the affair. Imagine the feelings of Luke, as he peruses his diary and recalls these stirring events. What changes since then!

Twenty-second day.—In the face of such danger, could Paul fail to recall Jesus' last days, and the stoning of Stephen—two martyrs to this same cause for which Paul was pleading? Read 21:37—22:29. In reading Paul's speech, remember the circumstances that led to it, the persons to whom it was addressed, and noticing that it is biographical in form (telling facts about his own life), but evidently argumentative in purpose, consider what Paul meant to prove to his hearers by it.

Twenty-third day.—What in Paul's speech so angered the Jews? Could he not have presented his message more tactfully and have won these many Jews, as Jesus succeeded in doing, rather than demanding too much of them? Notice the use which Paul made of his Roman citizenship and recall a previous occasion on which he referred to it; also in general the relation of the Roman government to the Jews and to the other nations among whom Paul labored. Thus far, has the imperial government been a hindrance or a help to the progress of Christianity? What pride must Luke have taken in this thought?

Twenty-fourth day.—Having read 22:30—23:11, consider (1) in what sense Paul's statement (23:1) was true, (2) whether the action of the high priest was justified or not, (3) whether Paul did right in his answer to the high priest, (4) in what sense Paul could say that he was a Pharisee; and in what sense he was on trial for believing in the resurrection. What does vs. 11 suggest as to the secret of Paul's power and courage? Read vs. 12—15, and consider the reason of the bitter hatred of the Jews toward Paul. Read vs. 16—24, and consider what led

Lysias to protect Paul; was it personal attachment to him or favorable attitude toward Christianity, or only a sense of official duty? Read vss. 26-30, and notice whether Lysias told the truth throughout. Read vss. 31-35, and with the map trace the route. Note Luke's propensity for details, as in 23:23-34. Does this characteristic tend to prove Luke's claim to accuracy in his investigations (cf. Luke 1:1-4)? Note, also, our author's dramatic power in presenting scenes in the lives of his heroes.

Twenty-fifth day.—Read 24:1-23. Notice the method of the trial (what should we call Tertullus in our courts today?). Notice carefully the charges made against Paul and consider how far they were true. Observe this early occurrence of the name Nazarenes as applied to Christians. In vss. 10-13 recall the charges and notice Paul's answer. In vss. 14-16 notice that Paul refers to the charge with reference to the "sect" of the Nazarenes, and bearing in mind that this same word "sect" was used with reference to the Sadducees (5:17) and Pharisees (15:5) notice what Paul claims as the belief of his sect. Notice in vs. 17 the allusion to his purpose in coming to Jerusalem, and in vs. 18 the reference to the charge of vs. 6. Is vs. 20 a confession that he did wrong in uttering the words he referred to? Notice especially in this whole speech what Paul says as to whether to be a Christian, such as he, was to be a renegade Jew, or most truly a Jew. Did Paul, or Stephen, or Peter, or Jesus ever think for a moment that this "new teaching" was anything other than purest Judaism? Think back over Paul's teaching and ask yourself what Paul's idea of Christian manhood was. Did he probably present these, his deepest convictions, before his judge, as well as the few ideas which Luke has recorded?

Twenty-sixth day.—Read 24:24-26:32. Consider what the facts here recorded indicate as to the character of Felix, and what side of the character of the Roman ruler is here illustrated. Consider (1) what it meant to appeal to Caesar, (2) Paul's probable motive in appealing, and (3) the effect of the appeal. Read 25:13-27 carefully, and, bearing in mind the character of the several persons present, form a conception of the scene, both in its outward features and more especially in its moral significance. In chap. 26 notice especially the emphasis here laid upon the resurrection of Jesus and the preaching of the gospel to the gentiles. Why does Paul so closely connect them?

Twenty-seventh day.—Again Luke seems to draw upon his journal for the many details which are crowded into 27:1-28:16. Look back over the preceding excerpts from the diary and then read this final portion (see § 75 for the four passages), noting the Lukan style, dramatic, detailed, idealistic as it is. Note the author's evident admiration for Paul; what a masterly picture he draws of the great hero. Does 27:34b (cf. Luke 21:18) suggest the comforting saying which Paul and Luke remembered and talked over as coming from the lips of the Christ? Again a Roman official extends courtesy to bearers of the gospel message (28:7). Trace the entire journey on the map. How had Paul planned to enter Rome (Rom. 1:15; 15:22-24, 28-32)? Could anything be more discouraging?

Twenty-eighth day.—Read 28:17-31. Notice the character of Paul's imprisonment in Rome, and the use which he made of the comparative freedom which he enjoyed. Conceive as definitely as possible Paul's position in Rome, including his relation (1) to the Roman authorities, and particularly to the soldiers, (2) to

the Jews, (3) to the Christians; recall his letter to the Romans. Does Paul ever seem to weary of his message (vs. 23*b*)? How does he prove Jesus' messiahship from the Old Testament Law? From the Prophets? Recall the frequent and unique emphasis Luke (like Paul) lays upon the work, power, and directing presence of the Holy Spirit throughout his two books (as in vs. 25).

Twenty-ninth day.—Glance through the Book of Acts now, searching out all references to gentiles and the broader sweep of the gospel, noticing, however, that in practically every case, Paul and the other workers give the Jews first chance to accept the message. In spite of all difficulties and dangers and disappointments, observe how Paul (and Luke) bears up bravely, determined to make all experiences further the deathless message of the Cross.

Thirtieth day.—Thinking back over the literature so far studied (Paul's letters, Mark, Matthew, Luke, and Acts), observe, how, at first no doubt with hesitation and amazement, but finally with gratitude and joy, these Christian evangelists have all come to see that God has taken the whole world into his consideration and deals with all on the same terms. How hard it is for them, in spite of the utterances of some of the prophets (not to mention Jesus' acts and words along this same line) to grasp the inclusiveness of the divine love and the universal scope of the gospel! But all of these authors now write from the broader world, and its viewpoint. Are not Paul's words in Rom. 11:33-36, implying so much hope for both gentile and Jew, really echoed in the climactic thoughts of Matthew (Matt. 28:18-20), and in Luke's writings (Luke 24:47) and Acts 10:34-38? No wonder these men all write with passionate enthusiasm: with such a God, such a Christ, such a guiding Spirit, and such a gospel, can anything be impossible? Past victories are but a foretaste of the great Day which is surely fast approaching!