

[\(Click here for Table of Contents\)](#)

THE EVERLASTING GOSPEL

R. C. FOSTER

The Everlasting Gospel

BY RUPERT CLINTON FOSTER, A.B, A.M., B.D.

Professor of New Testament in the Cincinnati Bible Seminary



THE STANDARD PUBLISHING COMPANY
CINCINNATI, OHIO

Copyrighted. 1929
The Standard Publishing Company

*To my Mother
and to the memory of my Father*

FOREWORD

THE EVERLASTING GOSPEL.

"But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of *the glorious gospel* of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them. For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord: and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake."—2 Cor. 4:3-5.

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."—Matt. 24:35.

"And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having *the everlasting gospel* to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people."—Rev. 14:6.

This volume of sermons and essays offers a discussion of salient elements of the gospel. The attempt has been made to examine carefully various tendencies in our day which imperil the gospel. It is my earnest hope that this volume may find its way into the hands of members of the younger generation caught in the bog of doubt.

R. C. FOSTER.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

(Click Chapter title for text)

I.	
A MIRROR FOR THE SOUL	11
II.	
THE CALL OF THE UNATTAINABLE	23
III.	
MESSENGERS OF THE CROSS	34
IV.	
SERVANTS OF THE KING	46
V.	
THE FUNDAMENTAL MOTIVES OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE	60
VI.	
THE MARKS OF A CHRISTIAN	72
VII.	
SOME USES OF MISFORTUNE	87
VIII.	
SPIRITUAL PARALYSIS	94
IX.	
WHENCE THE CHURCH—BY EVOLUTION OR BY REVELATION? .	110
X.	
DOCTRINAL OUTLINES	118
XI.	
MISSIONS AND CONTROVERSY	132
XII.	
THE CROWN OF LIFE (Part I.—The Mystery of God's Suffering)	144

	XIII.	
THE CROWN OF LIFE (Part II.—Suffering with Christ)		155
	XIV.	
BREAKING THE BONDS OF DEATH		167
	XV.	
MAKING OUR HOMES CHRISTIAN		172
	XVI.	
THE MESSAGE OF TWO ANCIENT TOMBS		181
	XVII.	
PAUL'S MISSIONARY METHODS (Part I.)		191
	XVIII.	
PAUL'S MISSIONARY METHODS (Part II.)		203
	XIX.	
CHRISTIANIZING HIGHER EDUCATION (Part I.—The Conservation of Faith)		214
	XX.	
CHRISTIANIZING HIGHER EDUCATION (Part II.— Maintaining a Spiritual Atmosphere)		230
	XXI.	
CHRISTIANIZING HIGHER EDUCATION (Part III.—The College Man and the Social Crisis)		244
	XXII.	
THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL		261
	XXIII.	
THE DEITY OF JESUS		280
	XXIV.	
THE LORDSHIP OF JESUS		297

I.

A MIRROR FOR THE SOUL

"For if any one is a hearer of the word ... he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass."—Jas. 1:23.

MAN has an innate curiosity about himself. He persistently seeks to solve the mystery of his own nature and personality. This intense longing is seen in the savage as amid the glorious light of another sunrise he pauses by the brink of a little pool and peers eagerly into it, for on its surface is mirrored his image. In a later stage of civilization the polished mirror of bronze afforded the constant pleasure of satisfying this desire. In our own time we have standing mirrors, folding mirrors, hanging mirrors, pocket mirrors, single mirrors, double and triple mirrors—a whole multitude of ingenious inventions that have as their object the satisfaction of man's curiosity about himself (or perhaps we should say woman's curiosity). The longing is an inherent part of man's make-up. Sufficient witness to the fact is the silent wonder with which the babe first views its own image in the glass.

But man has not been satisfied with the invention of a mirror to reveal the exterior of his being. His interest is not merely "skin deep." The inner workings of this marvelous mechanism have been a constant source of research. Hamlet voices a universal feeling when he says: "What a piece of work is man! How

noble in reason! How infinite in faculty! In form and moving how express and admirable! In action how like an angel! In apprehension how like a God} The beauty of the world! The paragon of animals!" But the perfection of man's organism has not merely aroused his admiration; it has stirred his curiosity. A thrill went through the human race when Harvey discovered the principle of the circulation of the blood, demonstrating how the life of man is maintained by the little pumping-station which sends the life-giving fluid pulsing through artery and vein. For long centuries man has patiently pieced together the bits of knowledge gained about his body. The eagerness with which dead bodies have been dissected and examined bears witness mainly to humanitarian interests, but also to this persistent curiosity of man about himself. All the while he has been longing for a mirror to reveal the interior of the body as the looking-glass reveals the exterior. Finally his strivings were rewarded in the invention of the X-ray. By the help of this marvelous invention you can see straight through a man's hand: actual muscle and tissue, the shadowy outline of bone and the delicate tracery of blood-vessel. You can look within the body and see the various organs performing their functions. The X-ray has been a great boon to the human race.

But man is not content even with this invention. He has a passion for seeking out this mysterious thing we call "life"—the thing that finally departs and leaves the physical body an insignificant bit of clay. He longs to see this thing which the philosopher calls the "ego" or the "I," which the common man on the street calls the "person" or "personality," and which God calls the "soul." There are scientists who refuse

to admit the existence of the soul because the scalpel does not reveal it when the corpse is dissected. But the overwhelming majority of men always have believed in its existence and longed to understand its nature. If men delight to possess a mirror, if the X-ray has brought great blessing to mankind, how great would be the rejoicing if some man would invent a mirror for the soul, so we could look within and discern the character and needs of the spirit. But man will never do this—it lies outside his sphere and province. It pertains to the infinite. Nevertheless, we have such a mirror—the *Bible*. It is not the invention of man. It is the gift of God. This is the meaning of James when he says: "For if any one is a hearer of the word, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a mirror."

When James says the Bible performs the office of a mirror, he certainly does not mean to suggest it reveals the physical features. The Bible is not a book on phrenology or physical culture. Neither is it a medical dictionary or a treatise on the diseases of the body. If the Bible be a mirror, then it is a mirror for the soul. How does it function?

The Bible reveals the origin of the soul. Man's point of approach to the question of origins has been on the material side. When the scientist addresses himself to this problem he usually talks of matter and motion. He tries to explain the origin of rocks, soil, trees, animals and men. If you should start to read all that man has written on the origin of material things, you would have to collect a vast library that would furnish many years of arduous reading. But you can read all that the word of God has to say on the subject in less than five minutes. The Bible has

no great interest on the material side of the problem. There is something very startling about the manner in which the Book of Genesis with a wonderful sweep passes over these questions over which man has vexed his reason and imagination for centuries, and rushes headlong to the discussion of the point of supreme interest—the origin and history of the spiritual life of man. The scientist who attempts to pick a quarrel with the Book of Genesis shows he has not discerned the purpose of the book. It is absurd to expect scientific details from Genesis, when it deliberately treats the origin of material things in the most cursory fashion, in order to devote itself to the matter of chief interest.

It is very interesting to hear the idealistic philosopher, who has long since abandoned the Book of Genesis as history and has set out to rewrite the story for himself, admit that Gen. 2:7 is the best explanation that can be offered of the origin of the soul. Baffled at this point in the attempt to find new explanations and to restate old ones, he finds himself forced back to the very words: "God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." As man was made in the image of God, so his soul is the very breath of life—a part of God, who is life itself; a thing which returns to God at death.

We need not be surprised that the mirror of things spiritual does not reflect as plainly as the looking-glass. The deep mysteries of the infinite must of necessity remain obscure until another world lifts the curtain and provides superior vision. As Paul says in 1 Cor. 13:12: "For now we see in a mirror, darkly; but then face to face."

The revelation of the origin of the soul which this mirror affords should increase our gratitude to God that our kinship is to divinity rather than bestiality. We should rejoice in a more splendid ancestry than monkeys and baboons. And it should increase our self-respect. These foreign debasing elements in our nature should be crushed out in our effort to rise and claim our glorious heritage.

Again, the Bible reveals the ills of the soul. This is the great advantage of mirrors; they enable us to see our own imperfections. Our neighbor's tie is twisted, a bit of dirt mars his countenance and it disturbs us much. But to "see ourselves as others see us" is more difficult. This is the function of the mirror. This, too, is the blessing the X-ray affords. When the body is racked with torture and well-nigh overwhelmed with some trouble which baffles the skill of the diagnostician, the X-ray often solves the riddle.

But the ills of the soul are more elusive than the diseases of the body. To see ourselves as God sees us—as we actually are—demands the aid of a divine mirror.

The Bible reveals the ills of a man's soul with startling distinctness. It has the universal qualities which enable it to meet the needs of every life. The man who is tempted to destroy the strength and possibilities of his life with strong drink sees in the divine mirror a picture of the incredible degradation into which he is sinking. The vision rouses memory and conscience, and there flashes before the mind the reflection of the sweet, innocent face he possessed in childhood and the features of early manhood—strong and full of promise—while haunting it all is the horrible ghost that stands at the end of the way. If a

woman's soul is burdened with deceit and is being twisted into a double form, she beholds in the Biblical account of Ananias and Sapphira the reflection of her own falseness and its results. If a man is enslaved to the lusts of the flesh and a stranger to self-control, the hand of the prophet Nathan is pointed not so much at David as at this modern reader, when he says: "Thou art the man." The habit of the faultfinding, ungenerous soul or the one full of jealousy or suspicion, the small, flint-like appearance of the soul encompassed by selfish ambition or greed, are all revealed by the divine mirror with unflinching fidelity.

Herein lies the secret of the closed Book when the Bible loses its popularity. Many refuse to come to church, and lay the Bible aside because they dread to look within and behold the reflection of their own guilty soul. While holding the pleasures of the world in determined and deadly embrace, a man dreads to see the deformed and defiled condition of his soul. The man who deliberately turns from the higher and nobler things of life and spends all his strength in the vain pursuit after gold, hesitates to look in the divine mirror and see how small, withered and emaciated his soul has become.

The Bible places alongside a man's life the ideal character of God's Son. Nothing makes the ills of the soul stand out any more clearly than this. The man who feels he is "good enough" has not looked into the mirror carefully. Lead him to do this, and when his life comes into touch with the Christ he will grow ashamed and dumb.

But Jesus is no mere standard of excellence. He is the Saviour of men. The Bible not only makes plain the defilement of sin, but it reveals God's remedy. The

action of the man who turns from the mirror to wash his face or correct his personal apparel is not more simple or logical than the way a man is led to cleanse his soul at the foot of the cross when he looks into the divine mirror.

More important than the origin of the soul and inseparably connected with its ills, the Bible reveals the destiny of the soul. This is life's greatest question. Whence we came was not of our choosing, and is now part of the irrevocable past. But the future lies in our own hands. Every man must choose his own destiny. And what will that be? This is the unavoidable problem of life. A woman may plunge desperately into the mad whirl of society and worldly pleasures, but this dread question haunts her soul. A man may isolate himself from things spiritual by the unrelenting pursuit of fame or profit, but the quiet hours will come when eternity and its vastness overshadow this puny world of ours. As childhood quickly merges into maturity, and feeble old age stalks into view, the question "Whither am I going?" thunders in the soul like a Banquo's ghost, and will not down. It must be answered.

This was the question which staggered Hamlet. When overwhelmed by the disasters and tasks that surrounded him, he began to consider suicide the best solution of his disordered and miserable life. His famous words are these:

"To be or not to be: that is the question,
Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer
The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune,
Or to take arms against a sea of troubles
And by opposing end them? To die, to sleep;
No more; and by a sleep to say we end

The heartache, and the thousand natural shocks
That flesh is heir to, 'tis a consummation
Devoutly to be wish'd. To die, to sleep;
To sleep: perchance to dream: *ay*, there's the rub.
For in that sleep of death what dreams may come
When we have shuffled off this mortal coil,
Must give us pause: there's the respect
That makes calamity of so long life:
But the dread of something after death,
The undiscovered country from whose bourne
No traveler returns, puzzles the will
And makes us rather bear those ills we have
Than fly to others that we know not of."

Now, the Bible answers this question. The Old Testament gives but a dim reflection of the destiny of the soul. It was left for the Son of God to make clear the possibilities of the future. With the conviction of One who knows, he reveals the land of eternal blessedness and the land of infinite, unending despair. It is Jesus, and not the apostles, who speaks most frequently of heaven and hell. His calm and beautiful assurances of the abundant entrance of the righteous into the Father's house of many mansions thrills the soul with faith and hope, while His repeated and solemn warnings of the unspeakable abyss of anguish into which a man may hurl his imperishable soul seek to turn man back from the path that leads to destruction. If the issues of life be such, if man's need of a mirror for the soul be so great, and if the Bible actually meets these needs in a satisfactory and unique fashion, how does a man dare to turn aside from the study of God's word to pursue the vain, elusive charms of the world? Can anything in this world consistently and logically keep a man from using this mirror in the Bible school and in his home? Woodrow Wilson

never said a truer word than this: "If a man deprives himself of an intimate knowledge of the Bible, he deprives himself of the best that there is in this world."

How must we use this mirror? Frequently and regularly. Here the looking-glass offers a more fitting comparison than the X-ray. It will not suffice to use the mirror once a week or month. Slovenly habits creep into the life by imperceptible degrees. The person who has not enough self-respect to use the mirror and keep clean and tidy merits the disgust of his fellow-men. But has he fallen any lower than the man who, though scrupulous about his external appearance, tolerates a filthy, unkempt soul? Can a man hope to keep his spiritual life presentable without daily use of the mirror and constant prayer? Not until we train ourselves to use the divine mirror each day—regularly and frequently—can we hope to maintain an attractive soul.

Again, the mirror must be used skillfully. Any one can use the looking-glass, but only the skilled hand can operate the X-ray. Many people have the idea that the Bible can be used effectively without study. A good example of the difficulties that confront such people is found in the case of the young woman who started out with her Bible to visit the sick. She had always heard that it was written in plain English and was such a wonderful book that you could open it at any point and find a passage suitable for the need of the hour. Accordingly, at the bedside she opened the mirror, but blindly and without skill. She chanced upon the sixteenth chapter of Romans and undertook to read it as a solace to the unfortunate. By the time she had concluded a desperate attempt to pronounce that long list of jaw-breaking proper names of people

in Rome to whom Paul was sending personal greeting, she gave up in despair and went back home. The Bible can meet the needs of every heart and hour, but only when it is used skillfully. Paul's advice to Timothy is still badly needed: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." A great philosopher once said that the reason the Bible has been able to hold the attention and respect of men of all kinds and times is that it unites the two qualities, simplicity and profundity. Parts of it are so plain and simple that even the most ignorant and untrained can understand and appreciate it. But parts are so profound that not even the combined wisdom of all the great scholars has been able to sound its depths.

Nothing less than the whole man will suffice for effective use of the divine mirror. Sometimes the question is asked: Ought a man to interpret the Bible literally or figuratively? Neither—but intelligently. Part of it is plain, historical narrative; part, deep and difficult figures of speech. The religious world has long suffered from the fact that men have laid aside common sense—have neglected to use intelligence—in the study of the Bible. They have not been able to use the mirror skillfully. The study of the Bible demands the keenest intellectual effort possible.

But man is a being capable of feeling as well as thought. Sometimes a man who uses only cold intellect returns empty-handed and full of doubt from some passage. It remains a sealed chapter until it is finally opened to him by the key of experience. Faith, hope, love, all the noble feelings of man, must be summoned to the aid of the intellect if a man would use the mirror for the soul effectively.

All else is in vain if a man does not use the mirror obediently. This is the heart of James' message: "If any one is a hearer of the word, *and not a doer*, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass. For he beholdeth himself and goeth away and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was." The man who looks in the mirror and sees his countenance and apparel soiled and unsightly, and has not even enough respect for himself or his fellows to correct his appearance, but goes off, "forgetting what manner of man he was," is well-nigh hopeless. But this man is not so low and debased as the one who beholds the outrageous condition of his soul and serenely goes on his way, refusing to let God help him to create a right spirit within himself. If your minister should enter the building to-night with the side of his face covered with filth, and some generous friend should intercept him, gently reveal to him his condition and remind him that there was still time to turn aside and prepare to come before the congregation, what would you think of him if he refused to act on the suggestion, saying he had no time to spend with such trifles? And what must God think of *you* if you dare to face Him with a filthy or disordered spiritual life, serene and unconcerned, after He has sent His own Son to give you this divine mirror? Some man may hear this message with favor, but if he goes off saying, "Well, the Bible is a wonderful book, isn't it?" and continues to desert the Bible school and to allow the dust to gather on the covers of his Bible, this man confirms his spiritual slovenliness. For him the tragic words have been spoken: "Ephraim is joined to idols; *let him alone.*"

"But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty and continueth therein," this man shall assuredly "be

blessed in his doing." Out of the ashes of a denied spiritual life there arise "a clean heart" and "a right spirit" dedicated to the service of Him who sent it forth into the world. Each day adds new joy and strength to his life, while a blessedness incomparable and without end portends in the bosom of the future.

II.

THE CALL OF THE UNATTAINABLE

"I have caused thee to see it with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither."—Deut. 34:4.

MOSES, like many another great man, was born of humble parentage. The stifling shadow of slavery was flung across his cradle. But, by the providence of God, the daughter of a king saw a wicker-work basket floating amid the flags on the edge of a great river, and Moses escaped the handicaps of poverty and ignorance. At the feet of the scholars of Egypt, the most learned men of the age, he was carefully trained in the arts and sciences.

When Moses reached the maturity of early manhood he faced the choice of a lifetime. Some one— probably his fond mother—revealed his true parentage to him. It was then he learned that he was not the scion, of a mighty Egyptian dynasty, but a member of a despised race of slaves. The Epistle to the Hebrews thus describes his decision: "By faith, Moses, when he was grown up, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; accounting the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt." This supreme sacrifice increased the bitterness of his disappointment when Israel rejected his leadership.

Forced to flee for his life, he became a shepherd amid the solitary wilds of the desert of Midian. On the anvil of bitter experience he hammered out the virtues of patience and self-mastery. When God's call came, he returned to Egypt and wrested Israel from bondage. In triumph he led them forth and witnessed the destruction of their relentless pursuers in the Red Sea.

Time would fail us to mention even in the most cursory fashion the incidents of the forty years' wandering. The necessities of our theme compel us to note two scenes. The children of Israel are encamped at Meribah. There is no water. They are about to perish from thirst. As usual, they upbraid and threaten Moses. God, in answer to Moses' appeal, commands him to speak to the rock, in the presence of the people, that it give forth its water. But Moses has that inherent arrogance of mankind that causes him to imagine he can improve on God's plans, that he can substitute something else which will work just as well, or better. Instead of speaking to the rock, he smites it with his rod twice and takes the credit of the miracle to himself and Aaron. Because of his sin, God decrees he can not enter the promised land.

The forty years of wandering are over. Encamped on the eastern bank of the Jordan, the people gaze eagerly across the swelling floods at the green fields and fertile valleys of Canaan. But their joy and enthusiasm are tempered with sorrow as they tell their great leader farewell. Moses delivers an impassioned appeal for them to be confident and loyal, and goes into the summit of Nebo, to die alone with God.

The message of this scene is "The Call of the Unattainable." How much of the inner life of Moses is

bound up with the longing and striving for an ideal that had become unattainable! "I have caused thee to see it with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither."

The call of the unattainable is always accompanied by sadness. Who can describe the sadness of Moses when he learned he could never enter the promised land? The long-cherished ideal of his youth, for which he had sacrificed a throne and endured endless labors and trials, had become impossible. How could he endure the shipwreck of his hope? Passionately he pleaded with God to revoke the decree, but the response was decisive: "Speak no more to me of this matter."

We are apt to think the experience of Moses unique, but it is not. While the call of the unattainable finds a picturesque embodiment in his life, it is a common experience of humanity. What life is there that does not at its close lay down many unfinished tasks? Ideals and plans over which many weary days and anxious nights have been spent seem hardly begun, and the call of the unattainable fills the soul with sadness.

Not only at life's close is the call heard. Some man who has longed for a place of prominence and usefulness in the world is forced by the hard pressure of circumstances to labor at some menial occupation which is perpetual drudgery to him. The door of opportunity for securing a higher education has long been closed; the alertness of the youthful mind is no longer his, and family obligations limit the activities of his life. As he looks with ceaseless longing on statesmanship, medicine, the ministry or the mission field, he hears with Moses the words: "I have caused thee to see it with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither."

The call of the unattainable is heard not merely in the great issues of life. We had planned to attend some religious gathering and gain enlightenment and inspiration for daily living, or a choice concert or lecture that was to add to the culture and enjoyment of our lives, but a combination of circumstances prevented our attendance. In gloom and disappointment we sit at home and nurse the broken image of our cherished plans. Sadness, misery, despair—these are the discordant keys in which the call of the unattainable is usually sounded forth.

But the greatness of Moses is revealed in this: He did not permit the eager longing for the unattainable to prevent him from achieving the attainable. The sin of Meribah occurred not at the close of the forty years' wandering, but early in this period. Years of patient labor in training a nation of former slaves to be men, and of persistent leading of the people nearer and nearer to the promised land, passed by in the life of Moses, and all the while the voice of the tempter kept reminding him that the pleasures of Canaan were not for him. Many would have cursed God in the bitterness of their soul. Others would have laid down in despair and died in the wilderness. But Moses did not refuse to do what he could because he could not reach the great goal of his life.

This was the fatal mistake of the man with the one talent. Because he could never start in life with five talents, or with two talents, he refused to do anything. He has a great following in modern times. There are a host of people who refuse to perform the every-day duties of life because they long to do greater things that are beyond their reach. They forget that "mony a mickle mak's a muckle." The great island is formed

as surely by the continual deposit of the tiny coral bodies as it is by the volcanic eruption. The life spent in the courageous and sustained effort to perform the multitude of life's daily tasks is more difficult and trying than the supreme effort of the martyr. And who can say that such a life is less useful? Moreover, we should not forget that the things of life which seem small to us may be great in God's sight. This is the story of the widow's mite. At any rate, in God's world everything has its place and each person his work. As Emerson well says:

"The mountain and the squirrel
Had a quarrel,
And the former called the latter 'Little Prig.'
Bun replied:
'You are doubtless very big;
But all sorts of things and weather
Must be taken in together
To make up a year
And a sphere,
And I think it no disgrace
To occupy my place.
If I'm not so large as you,
You are not so small as I,
And not half so spry.
I'll not deny you make
A very pretty squirrel track:
Talents differ; all is well and wisely put;
If I can not carry forests on my back,
Neither can you crack a nut!'"

The annals of history hold a place for but one Washington, Lincoln or Wilson. But the smallest boy or girl may perform some service that these men could not. If you refuse to do that service because it seems small, it will remain undone, for that was your part of the world's work. Do you long for some mission

which is noble and impressive? Do not, because of this, refuse to harvest the grain that lies just in front of your door.

"If you can not cross the ocean
And the heathen lands explore,
You can find the heathen nearer,
You can save them at your door.
"If you can not speak like angels,
If you can not preach like Paul,
You can tell the love of Jesus;
You can say He died for all."

Sometimes a fond mother, whose life is filled with loving self-sacrifice for her family, loses one dear child. No one but mother knows what anguish of soul that means. Nevertheless, she should not let the call of the unattainable embitter her life and prevent her from serving those in the home and the world who need her help. Too many refuse to be comforted, continue to stay away from the house of God, and deprive those that remain of the cheer and comfort they can give. Their lives become like the beautiful Jordan River sweeping past the green fields made fertile by its presence, to lose itself in the squalid inactivity of the Dead Sea. To call back the dead is not attainable, but to serve the living is our urgent duty.

The unattainable longings of life are not a hindrance or void, but a stirring inspiration. The great desire of Moses to lead Israel into a blessed land of security and plenty, even though unattainable, yet called him on and led him to do his utmost. It was a shining star, elusive, but compelling, that held him at the post of duty and led him to the Jordan River. Had it not been for this glorious ideal, how could he have endured the trying difficulties of the desert?

The fact of an ideal being unattained is the very thing that makes it an ideal. When attained, a thing passes from the realm of the ideal to the actual. Even though unattainable, it does not lose its power. As Browning says: "A man's reach should exceed his grasp, or what is a heaven for?" The man who has an ambition to be a missionary and can not accomplish his aim can so live that this great ideal will draw him on to effective missionary labor in his own neighborhood. We strive for social reform in this world, but we can not expect heaven on earth. But, nevertheless, the ideal state remains our goal, even though unattainable, and keeps us striving to come as close as possible to its blessedness. This, too, is the lure of the life of Christ. His perfection of character is not possible for us, but it inspires us to imitate as best we can.

The answer to the call of the unattainable fills one with the intense satisfaction of having done his best. And the sharpness of disappointment is always mitigated for him who has done his best, even though he has failed to reach his goal. The peace and joy that come of having done the best possible for him must have softened the tragedy of Moses' life as he turned his back on Israel and Canaan and climbed Nebo.

Again, the answer to the call furnishes a powerful example to others. In the camp of Israel there was a host of others who, because of their sin, could not enter the promised land. Had' Moses given up in despair when God closed the door of hope for him, what would have been the effect of his course upon the others? Was not the example of courage and fidelity that he did give them a thousand-fold more powerful because he refused to surrender to an unattainable ideal? When Moses looked down from the mountain-

top he saw not only the land flowing with milk and honey which he could not enjoy, but also a mighty people who had been trained and equipped for its conquest by his labors. Had Moses refused to continue his leadership from Meribah to Canaan, his bones would have whitened the desert sands. His name would have been swallowed in the oblivion of failure. No glorious sepulcher would have adorned Nebo. But, following the shining star of the call of the unattainable, he himself became a flaming light in the heavens of human history to guide the good and the great of all races and times in the path of duty.

Finally, the answer to the call gives one the assurance that the noble ideals unattainable in this life will be attained in eternity. Moses was not permitted to enter the promised land of Canaan, but by answering the call of his noble ideal he was ushered into that better land of promise where sin and sorrow are no more. And those who have ceaselessly striven for the perfection of Christ's character, and have been forced in the end to admit with Paul that they have "not yet attained," have also that comforting promise that "we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." The mother who has lost loved ones should remember that the child is not gone forever, but only "lost awhile." Faithful doing of the work that still remains here gives assurance of the joys of reunion over there. Several years ago I talked to a skeptic who asserted that no small children would reach heaven. Only character, he said, is eternal. Only by personal experience is character developed. The untimely end of the small child prevents the formation of character, and automatically prevents its entrance into eternity. This man was of the school that denies the record of the flood

in Genesis because "God would be unjust to slay people like that." But they perished because of their unspeakable sin, and their defiance of God's warnings and offers of mercy. Yet this same man would make God such a monster as to blot out forever the young life that for no fault of its own has been unable to develop character. But, never fear, God is not such. He is able and willing to care for "that which we have committed unto him against that day." An immortal soul has been born into the world and can not perish. Neither can it be punished for sin it never has committed. Was it not His own Son who said: "Suffer little children and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven"?

It was my privilege many years ago to visit frequently the home of Mrs. Murphy, of West Point, Ky. She was nearly one hundred years old. She had been an intimate friend of Alexander Campbell, and had taught a Sunday-school class for nearly sixty-five years. She talked of heaven in a very simple and convincing manner. The great desire of her soul was to continue in heaven the work she had loved and was leaving unfinished on earth. Frequently she would exclaim: "When I get to heaven, if I can only gather a group of little children about me and teach them, I shall be so happy." While heaven will probably be so different from earth that it is useless to speculate concerning its nature, yet I told her that her idea of heaven coincided with mine. Would heaven be satisfactory if it is a static condition of absolute perfection, where we will do nothing for ever and ever? Or may it not rather be a relative perfection that leaves room for development under more favorable conditions than earth affords? If the personality of God is infinite,

will it not require an infinity of time to understand, appreciate and serve Him? Does not the hope of Mrs. Murphy suggest a possible solution to the skeptic's puzzle as to the relative position of infants in eternity? We blunder so badly in this life; how often the desire comes to us to begin over again and correct the unworthy part! We leave so many unfinished tasks, and, in leaving them, it is inevitable that we should long to complete them. It is comforting to believe that in a better world we shall be able to attain unto the noble ideals that were unattainable here.

"When sometimes our feet grow weary
 On the rugged hills of life,
 The path stretching long and dreary
 With trial and labor rife,
 We pause on the toilsome journey,
 Glancing backward in valley and glen,
 And sigh with an infinite longing
 To return and begin again.

"Far behind is the dew of morning,
 In all its freshness and light,
 And before are doubts and shadows,
 And the chill and gloom of the night.
 We remember the sunny places
 We passed so carelessly then,
 And ask with a passionate longing
 To return and begin again.

"All! vain indeed is the asking.
 Life's duties press all of us on,
 And who dare shrink from the labor,
 Or sigh for the sunshine that's gone?
 And, it may be, not far on before us
 Wait fairer places than then—
 Life's path may yet lead by still waters,
 Tho' we may not begin again.

"Forevermore upward and onward
 Be our paths on the hills of life,
And soon will a radiant dawning
 Transfigure the toil and strife,
And our Father's hand will lead us
 Tenderly upward then;
In the joy and peace of a fairer world
 He'll let us begin again."

III.

MESSENGERS OF THE CROSS

HOW beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace, . . . that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth!" The beautiful imagery of the prophet suggests the inevitable joy of humanity in a messenger who brings good tidings. Yonder among the mountain crags that stand in striking silhouette against the setting sun, yonder where the century-old olive-trees stretch out their long, rakish branches over the ancient highway, can be seen the form of the messenger moving swiftly forward on his mission. His flying feet twinkle in the rays of the departing sun like winter stars that dance and gleam over fields of snow. His heart is light and his step eager, for he is the bearer of good news.

It is not surprising that Paul selects this revealing quotation from Isaiah as the climax of his incisive argument in the tenth chapter of Romans on God's plan for saving a lost world. "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How, then, shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent? As it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace and bring glad tidings of good things!" The capstone of this tower

of salvation is the yielded and transformed Christian life: salvation to the person who seeks it at God's hands and on God's terms. Remove this capstone and there lies beneath Christian faith, which is the source of noble conduct. Faith rests on the solid rock of hearing: the straightforward appeal to the intellect, emotions and will of the individual. Hearing rests upon the fearless and persistent public proclamation of consecrated messengers. The messengers rise out of the fervent congregations who lead them to the cross, thrill them with the desire to preach, train them for the task in painstaking fashion and "send" them forth. At the very foundation of Christianity—and what a broad and powerful base it is!—is the picture of the eager and devoted messenger speeding onward with a life-and-death message. Fundamentally, Christianity is a message.

Paul's presentation of Christianity is persistently and widely denied today. It is affirmed both by the student in his cloister and the busy man of affairs that matters of belief are insignificant and that only a man's actual life counts. As if conduct could be divorced from the thought life! We hear on all sides: "I abhor all this controversy about matters of belief. What difference does it make what a man believes, just so he lives right?" A more shallow or stupid philosophy of life was never uttered. A man can not live right and think wrong! "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." "Out of the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh." You can no more build a noble and useful life without the solid foundation of righteous and correct ideas than you can construct a concrete building on thin air. If Christianity does not actually transform the life, it is worthless. But the

rich fruitage of Christian works grows in the life that is rooted in Christian teaching. Portia said: "If to do were as easy as to know what were good to do, chapels had been churches and poor men's cottages princes' palaces." And yet to do without knowing what to do is impossible. How can a man live a life of which he knows nothing, or walk in a way which leads he knows not whither? The statement of Socrates, "Knowledge is virtue," has been rightly called "the great philosophical error of the ages." Knowledge is not necessarily virtue; a man does not always do what he knows to be right. The sin against knowledge persists in human experience. But knowledge is fundamental and essential to virtue. Man needs proper motives and the inner power to enable him to act upon the information God gives him. Christ furnishes the motives and the inner power along with the knowledge. The final word of Jesus, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," sets forth the supreme task of the Christian. Every man is some sort of a messenger. The true follower of Jesus will be both by life and word a messenger of the cross.

The first qualification of a messenger is that he treasure, guard and preserve the message. We do not entrust even so trivial a message as an ordinary letter to a child too young to understand the solemn responsibility of being a messenger. We impress on the young mind that he becomes immediately responsible for the safety and preservation of the letter. It must not be destroyed, lost or neglected. In the midst of the Spanish-American War, a small pamphlet was issued to the public-school students, entitled "A Message to Garcia." It told the thrilling story of the search for a stalwart young messenger with the necessary courage and skill

to break through the Spanish lines, which ringed the island about, and carry to the indomitable Cuban patriot Garcia the glorious, good news that America was coming to his assistance. Every American schoolboy received a new vision of the responsibility of being a messenger. One of the most famous war heroes of our country during this period was Colonel Funston. He was captured by the Spanish while carrying a message of supreme importance. In the very presence of his captors, and regardless of their baffled fury, he thrust the message into his mouth and swallowed it. They might take his life, but they should not have his message. Bulwer Lytton drives home the same thought in his "Richelieu." The old cardinal-statesman, surrounded by foes, learns that they are about to betray France into the hands of Spain. A document is being signed that night. All! if he can only find the trusty messenger to deliver it to him, he can show it to the king and break their hold at court and save France. But the messenger? Joseph? No, too much of the elder brother. Huguet? No, too well known and not altogether to be trusted. De Mauprat? The very man; but, alas! it is his wedding-day. All! he has it! It is to be the young man Francois. Swiftly he summons him and delivers the following orders: "Take my fleetest steed. Arm thyself to the teeth. A packet will be given you, with orders. No matter what! The instant your hands close upon it, clutch it, like your honor, which death alone can steal or ravish; set spurs to your steed; be breathless till you stand again before me."

Francois: "If I fail?"

Richelieu: "Fail! *Fail!* In the lexicon of youth which fate reserves for a bright manhood there is no

such word as 'fail.' . . . Farewell, boy! Never say 'fail' again."

Could God have conferred a greater honor or responsibility upon man than to make him His messenger to a lost world? It is a life-and-death message. The results are in God's hands, not ours. We are not obligated to be successful, but faithful, messengers. God's word shall not return unto Him void. We should clutch the message as our honor, and be breathless in the execution of His commission. This very conception was impressed by Jesus upon His apostles continually as He delivered a clear-cut, definite message unto their hands, commanded them to carry it forth to the world, predicted unending persecution and suffering for them in the task, and warned them they would no longer be His disciples if they did not "continue in his word." Acts and the Epistles, as well as the Gospels, resound with this same conception. "Contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints." "Take heed unto thyself and the doctrine; continue in them; for in so doing thou shalt save both thyself and them that hear thee." "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the Holy Spirit which dwelleth in us." "And the things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." "O Timothy, *keep that which is committed to thy trust*, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called: which some professing have erred concerning the faith."

A second elemental qualification of a messenger is that he deliver the message. A keen realization of this

will be felt by the man who has thoughtlessly accepted the responsibility of becoming a messenger for his wife, and who has not forgotten what happened when she found the letter still in his pocket after some weeks. Guarded and protected? Yes, not lost or destroyed— just a trifle pocket-worn, but not *delivered*. A lot of people talk about "my faith," "I have not lost my faith," etc., as if it was something which they kept in the ice-box and took out occasionally to smell it and see if it was not yet spoiled, and replaced for further preservation. Faith on ice will never save the world. It must be on fire. Many "still have their faith" in the sense that they have never shared it with a lost world. Jesus said "Go" and "Preach," "The field is the world," "Teach all nations," "Preach the gospel to every creature."

In one of these two directions the church has continually failed. It has suffered from a lost messenger and a lost message. Jesus said "Go," but the church, through selfishness and indifference, has refused to obey. We try to substitute "write," "send" or "give" for "go." We try to salve our conscience by turning over the task of "going" to some one else and giving languidly for their support. Of course we must send where we can not go. But we must remember our "money talks." If it maintains those who are betraying Jesus and His word, we also are traitors. We can not shuffle off our responsibility by merely giving; we must concentrate our prayers and attention as well and see to it that the message is delivered. "Missions belong in the retail, rather than the wholesale, department of the church." Because we can not go across the world does not excuse us for refusing to go across the street in Jesus' name.

The task of the messenger demands intelligence and courage of the highest order. The personal gifts of the individual should be developed to the utmost. The messenger of the cross should read constantly the tenth chapter of Matthew, and understand that the most contemptible creature alive is the preacher who sells out his commission from high heaven for the savory pottage of popularity, a fat salary and personal comfort. How much gospel would have been preached by Peter, John, Stephen and Paul if they had paused each time to weigh the personal consequences? What would have happened to Christianity if Paul had trimmed his messages with an eye to avoiding the criticisms of the ladies' missionary organizations in the churches? Exactly what is happening to-day! Our prayer should be: "*O God, give us men who are not afraid to preach the gospel.*"

The messenger should be so thoroughly trained as to understand both the message and the field. The ignorance of the modern preacher about the Bible is pathetic. The weakness arises from the college curriculum which has deserted the Bible in favor of scientific and philosophical speculation. If the doctor who answers our call is versed in poetry and politics, philosophy, art and music, we enjoy a pleasant half-hour while he waits on the sick; but, if our child is desperately ill, we want a doctor who knows disease and *medicine*. If he does not know that, he has no business pretending to be a doctor, and we do not want him. The preacher who does not know his message is an impostor. Here is one of the great tasks of the church. "How shall they preach except they be sent?" The messenger must be inspired, trained and sent forth.

The most tragic failure of the modern church is in the betrayal of its message. A little boy runs the two squares to the grocery, arriving exhausted and out of breath. The clerk kindly asks: "What do you want, little man?" The boy looks blankly about, and finally stammers out: "I don't know. I have forgotten. I will have to run back home and find out." The only difference between that boy and many preachers, teachers and missionaries to-day is that the boy had gumption enough to go home when he found he had lost his message. Many are fairly running over with zeal to "go." They can tell the facts about the field—the customs and needs of this country and that. But they are utterly ignorant or indifferent as to the message. "We have no time for the discussion of matters of religious belief in our conventions," said one of our "leaders" recently. "We have only time on our programs for the big things." "And what are the big things?" I asked him. "Are there not just three elements—the message, the messenger and the field—while over all is the personality of God? What greater folly could we commit than to study the disorder, but neglect the remedy; to know how many people have not yet heard, but to be ignorant of what they should hear!" What inconceivable trifling with almighty God and His divine message!

An imbecile middle-of-the-roadism is one of the great curses of the church. Many are merely unsophisticated or bewildered by false leadership, but the present calamity is not the result of a neglected message merely, but of a deliberate attempt to assassinate the gospel. The shrewd and unscrupulous policy of the modernist has been to seize all sources for the supply of leadership with one hand, and with the other to still

the multitude. Back of the twaddle about "world tasks," "the new age" and "the big things" is the fundamental proposition that there is no divine message—nothing definite or final to give to a lost world. The attempt of the modernist to piece together some sort of a "scientific," compromising hotch-potch goes hand in hand with his attempt to destroy the message our Christ has commanded us to "preach to every creature," "even to the end of the world."

Is this but the inevitable agony of world progress? Are we reminded that, if the conclusions of modern Biblical criticism be true, then it must prevail, no matter how numerous or vehement the protests? Granted. And we are not raising any pitiful cry for quarter in the terrific controversy which envelops Christianity. *Let God's truth prevail.* But the thing which fires our blood is this: We contend against adversaries who are about as invisible as "the prince of the powers of the air." They steal into our colleges under cover of night. They wear an assumed name. While their brother works trustingly out in the field, they steal his garments and beguile the treasured blessing from the blind multitude. When those who are aged and feeble question them, they trifle with the truth and will not answer in a straightforward manner. There are some of us who have heard the instructions given at headquarters, who understand what is going on, but it is seldom that adequate proof can be secured to convince the multitudes until it is too late. The college is captured, complete control is gained, and then, they turn and snap their fingers in the faces of those who have toiled and labored long years to build the institution, and who now sit and watch the dull embers of fading dreams. The college gained, the march then begins on

the churches and the various general agencies they have constructed. And practically the whole campaign is carried on through underground channels. About nine-tenths of the radicals in our midst this moment are hiding in the catacombs by day and working feverishly through the long hours of the night. From such conduct any one "ordinarily or commonly honest and decent" recoils in dismay.

In the midst of such diabolical betrayals as this, to the rescue of a movement rent asunder and wounded in the house of its friends and in defense of the gospel of Jesus for which we are admonished to "contend," the Cincinnati Bible Seminary has arisen. We are confessedly militant. We believe in freedom of investigation, and welcome all the light which known scientific facts can throw upon the Bible. We believe the preacher of to-day must be master of his Bible and able to defend it against all comers. We believe it will not avail for a college to give its students correct interpretation of Scripture and leave them in ignorance as to the desperate battle on in our midst. We would not compel others to follow our course, but we haul our flag to the mast where it can be seen and distinguished afar. We would not limit the freedom of thought of our students and would allow them to hold what conclusions they will, but we would have them face the facts. We have already exploded the sophistry that "the psychology of this age" prevents young people of to-day from accepting the word of God. The marvelous growth of our student body in number, caliber and academic standing during the six short years of the life of the Seminary gives promise of a great future and an ever-increasing line of young soldiers of the cross, trained to the minute and able to cross swords

with the multitudinous prophets of Baal through the length and breadth of our brotherhood.

The final qualification of the messenger of the cross is that he shall live the message. The simple piety of the New Testament is needed to match its simple faith. Hand in hand with the command "to contend earnestly for the faith," the inspired writers urge the Christian messenger to "walk worthily of the calling." The great need of this pleasure-mad, sensual, selfish, unbelieving age is for leadership which has spiritual depth. Compare the little prayer-meeting circles of ministerial students when companies of young people from, all over the world sat at the feet of such reverent scholars as J. W. McGarvey with the "preacher fraternities" which infest our colleges to-day, where card parties crowd out the prayer-meetings, and dances chaperoned by teachers of theology bestow the marvelous skill which cause the girls of a college to testify that "the young preachers are the best dancers we have in our college." May Heaven help the churches which fall into the clutches of such leadership! Such a downfall of conduct is the inevitable result of the downfall of faith. We should pray for men of passionate devotion who will "go," men of dauntless courage who will "preach," and men of strong character who will give the people of God the inspiring example of a godly life.

What though the mountains stay our progress to the right and the left. What though the restless waters of the Red Sea defy our advance. What though the rumble of Pharaoh's chariots be heard and the glint of Egyptian armor flash through the darkness. *Let us on to Canaan!* Out upon those who cry, "Would to God we had died in Egypt," rather than endure the slings and arrows of endless persecution. Away with the

thought that we meekly bow our necks to the radical yoke and go into slavery. Let us no longer tarry in helplessness with those who cry: "Stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord." Let us launch out on a great program of training up sturdy, devout messengers of the cross. Let us no longer withhold our **treasures**, but invest them in building up a great school where Christ shall be honored and His message taught. "Speak unto the children of Israel that they *go forward*."

IV.

SERVANTS OF THE KING

"Ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake."—2 Cor. 4:5.

IN the fourth chapter of 2 Corinthians, Paul expresses within the limits of a brief paragraph the essence of Christianity and its effect on humanity. The gospel is divided into two phases. The one deals with the personality, mission and message of the Christ. ("For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord.") The other treats of the personality, work and ideals of the Christian. ("And ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake.") Humanity also parts asunder. The one class opens their hearts to the Christ and His message, and walk in the glorious, heaven-revealing light of the gospel. ("Light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.") The other class pursue so madly the pleasures and false goals of the world that they do not see the light; they do not find the path; they miss the goal of life and drift into the land of unending darkness and despair. ("The God of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn upon them.")

In a single clause of six words, Paul sums up the gospel of the Christian life: "Ourselves your servants

for Jesus' sake." The central feature of this summary is the emphasis upon the power of personality. And this is the heart of the Christian gospel from which radiate all its doctrines. This is shown by the emphasis of Jesus on the value of the soul or personality ("What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"), His insistence on the unlimited possibilities of the human personality when kept in touch with the divine ("All things are possible to them that believe"), His perpetual appeals to the individual as master of his own destiny ("If any man would come after me"), and finally His frequent warnings of the responsibility of the individual to God for his opportunities—all show that the Christian religion places the supreme emphasis upon the individual. When God sends a soul forth into the world, He bestows various capacities, and certain work is expected of the individual. It is a primary duty of life for every man to discover the power and possibilities of his life and find his place in the world. All men admire power. We pause before a great piece of machinery and marvel at its power. But the most powerful factor in the world is personality—first, the personality of God; after that, the personality of His chief creation, man. And man's power develops in the ratio of his fellowship with God.

When Paul begins his summary of the gospel of the Christian life with the word "ourselves," he lays hold of this central doctrine of Christianity. It is a common thing for people to consider themselves in the matter of personal appearance and attainments. Some people are reputed to spend hours in front of the looking-glass, studying minutely the peculiarities of the physical features with which God has endowed them.

Others will talk for hours of petty victories and triumphs. But how often these people spend not one moment in the consideration of "themselves" in relation to duty and right living. The Irish bride who had been given, a gorgeous wedding by her rich uncle is a good sample. There had been a wonderful ceremony in a crowded and decorated church, throngs, rice, cheers, laughter, an amazing banquet and all the rest. Finally, as the young couple were about to step into the limousine, the uncle called the bride aside and asked her if there was anything at all her heart could desire to make the occasion perfect. She replied: "Faith an' uncle, we would just like now to stand out on the street corner and see ourselves go by!" But Paul means each man shall consider himself not in regard to pleasure or selfish aims, but in relation to the higher and nobler possibilities of his life.

Socrates chose a high theme when he said that the chief motto of life should be this: "Know thyself." This is a primary obligation. The foundation of good and successful living is laid on an intimate knowledge of the strength, weakness, needs and possibilities of "ourselves." To overestimate one's personality is often fatal. To underestimate it is to live in a prison-house.

The power of personality lies at the root of the great missionary program of Jesus: "Go ye into all the world and preach." The world of industry has been revolutionized by the machinery invented to take the place of swarms of workers. But the day of the preacher will never pass. Some suggest that the phonograph and radio sound the death-knell of the simple messenger of the gospel. Congregations in the future will buy an Edison or Victrola and a number of records of the sermons of the world's greatest preachers, or install

a radio with a loud speaker to relay the words spoken in the great pulpits of the land, and the preacher's salary will no longer burden the congregation, and the day of tedious and feeble sermons will be no more. But this will never be. Machinery can never replace personality in the proclamation of the gospel. When God would give His revelation to a sinful world, He did not drop the Bible out of heaven already printed and bound; He sent His messengers that the truth might be learned through the medium of human personalities. And Jesus came in person to earth that, through our association with Him, God might become known intimately and His final dispensation effected. One of the most profound sayings of Jesus shows that, in the final analysis, truth itself is to be identified with personality: "I am the truth." In proportion as a preacher's personality becomes identified with the gospel he proclaims does a preacher's message have power to grip and uplift the souls of men. The facts always become more tangible and useful when they are transmitted through a living personality which is known and loved.

The power of personality is in evidence in the pew as well as the pulpit. The person who tries to imbibe his religion by radio loses not merely the intimate touch of power that comes from the presence of the speaker, but he misses the thrill of seeing this faithful mother walk down the aisle with these children she has toiled over, and that prodigal as he returns repentant to the Father's house. The electric influence of one personality on another is one of the great sources of power in the church and one of the salient purposes of the assembly of Christians together on the Lord's Day. The coal of fire withdrawn from the hearth soon grows cold;

so does the Christian life when separated from the warmth of fellowship in the church.

Real growth and progress are impossible for a church until the rank and file come to recognize the power and possibilities of their lives. Loyalty and devotion are as important in the ranks as in the general staff. When the messenger came rushing to George Washington with the news of Bunker Hill, he swept aside the details of defeat or victory with the passionate question: "Did the militia stand fire?" For even the humblest personality there is work in the Master's vineyard. Some little boy or girl in a congregation may often accomplish things which are impossible for its minister by reason of the peculiar ties which bind their young lives to some soul lost from the Father's house. "A little child shall lead them." A young office-boy was once the butt of ridicule in a famous business house in Boston. They were running him hard one day, and had reminded him again that he was such a little runt that he would never amount to anything. The boy finally straightened up and faced the crowd in the office with the quiet remark: "I know all that; but then I can do something which none of you men can do." "And what is that?" they asked in a chorus. "I can keep from swearing," the boy answered, and the discussion ended suddenly. This boy had discovered the secret of the power of personality—self-control.

The Christian religion is unique in the stimulus and guidance it gives for the development of personality. Every life is left free to follow its own bent, so long as that course be honorable and useful. We are servants of the King and each one has some useful mission. Not all can occupy the pulpit. Some serve Him best on the farm, in the office or the courtroom. Paul's

favorite comparison for the church is the human body. It has many members—hands, feet, eyes—and each has a different work. The individual is led out to develop and use to the utmost the gifts that God entrusted to His keeping and to use them in the direction where they will count for the most.

"This above all: to thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man."

After emphasizing the supreme power of personality, Paul sets forth the supreme method for the expression of personality. This is the inherent desire of all. The cultured scholar in his study is moved by the profound desire to so express his personality that the world shall be moved thereby. The savage Indian paints himself all the colors of the rainbow and bends in the wild contortions of the war-dance with the same motive of compelling attention. It is to be presumed that a like purpose moves the ultra-fashionable women of to-day when they attempt to imitate the aborigines of North America. The ideas of the world as to how personality can be most forcibly expressed furnish an interesting study. The newly rich usually outrun all others in their comical antics by which they attempt to impress upon their fellows their increased worth. Some Americans of this class have been trying to ape the broken-down nobility of Europe and adopt a coat-of-arms with which to adorn door-plate, equipage and livery in order to bestow distinction. An Eastern newspaper wit asked permission to suggest suitable insignia. For some of the millionaires of Wall Street he suggested coats-of-arms copied from the figures on playing-cards as best representing the manner in which

their new-found greatness had been secured. For John D. Rockefeller he suggested an oil-can. Through all the centuries kings and rulers have sought to impress their greatness by lavish show and display. A vain and foolish woman, who had been lifted from poverty by marriage and whose daughter married a still larger income, protested that the people of her home town would never really appreciate her worth until her daughter should return for a visit and they might then get into her daughter's new limousine and ride up and down Main Street so that everybody might observe. Anna Held, famous actress of the last generation, is another example. She was the precursor of our modern movie stars. She caused to be published in the newspapers, wherever she played, the glowing account of how many thousands of dollars she had spent on the gorgeous gowns she was wearing, and announced that she took her baths in milk instead of water, in order to preserve her marvelous complexion. Poor, silly creature! She imagined that this was the best way to express her personality. Former Senator Vardaman, of Mississippi, after two terms in the U. S. Senate, returned to his constituency for re-election, and, in order to impress his personality, drove through the cities and towns of his home State in an emblazoned chariot drawn by fifty yoke of snow-white oxen. Think of a man facing the supreme opportunities of the Senate for eight years with little children dying at their work under intolerable conditions in mine and mill, with all the suffering and crying needs of a great nation demanding reformation and redress, and then having recourse to fifty yoke of snow-white oxen and an old Roman chariot to recommend himself for reelection! Such is the way of the world!

But this is not the way of Jesus. "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." Here is the supreme method for the expression of personality: "Ourselves your servants." Like the morning star, shining out through the enshrouding darkness at dawn, the simplicity and passionate devotion of Jesus' life of service directs us through the bog of selfishness. He gave "the last full measure of devotion" and the world passes by the towering pyramids of Egypt, the triumphal arches of Rome and the mausoleums of modern heroes, to bow in humble adoration at a rude cross and an empty tomb. "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever would save his life shall lose it: and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake shall find it." Read again the opening phrases of the letters of Paul and see the titles he loved to wear. When he was not compelled to defend his apostleship from scurrilous attack, he loved to call himself "Paul, the servant of Christ," or "Paul, the bondsman of Christ." And this was the man who turned the whole world upside down.

We are servants of the King. We are joined in a glorious service. Our partnership with Jesus is the sublime privilege of life. His intimate understanding and sympathy bear us up amid failure and discouragements, and give us strength to carry on through

"the burden of the day and the scorching heat." As we contemplate how He left heaven to walk the way of suffering and death; how He gave Himself so unsparingly in daily ministry to the sinful, suffering multitudes; how the sunshine of His smile broke through the clouds of grief and uplifted and redeemed, we must remember He said: "As the Father hath sent me, so send I you."

The concluding phrase of Paul's summary uncovers the supreme motive for the expression of personality. The bizarre methods of the world are equaled by the selfish motives out of which they rise. Motives are the mainsprings of life. They are the sources of power. It is not enough that we serve. Our service may be denied by unworthy motives. One of the most overworked and abused words in our vocabulary is "service." The church has no monopoly on "service." We are surrounded by those who desire to serve. As soon as we step into a hotel, department store or any sort of business house some one comes hurrying to us with warm smiles of greeting and affable words of welcome. The universal salutation prevails: "Is there anything I can do to serve you?" What is their motive? *Profit*. Dollars and cents. What a contrast between this and Paul's passionate declarations to the Corinthians: "I will not be a burden unto you: for I seek not yours, but you: for the children ought not to lay up for the parents, but the parents for the children. And I will most gladly spend and be spent for your souls." And to the Ephesian elders he gave this account of his long ministry in Ephesus: "I coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel. Ye yourselves know that these hands ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me. In all things I gave

you an example, that so laboring ye ought to help the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, that he himself said, It is more blessed to give than to receive." How far short does the church fall of this life of unselfish service? Dare we be less courteous, self-effacing and eager to serve in the church for Jesus' sake than the world is for profit?

Another common motive for service is fame. Many persons extend themselves to the utmost to lend a helping hand, but when you trace the stream to its source you find a selfish ambition for glory. "Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men to be seen of them: else ye have no reward with your Father who is in heaven." The world is still filled with the hypocrites who sound a trumpet before them as they make a great offering in a great humanitarian or religious drive. The brilliant Mrs. Palmer, wife of the popular professor of philosophy at Harvard, was asked one day by her friends: "Why don't you write a book and thus erect a monument to your name? You will die one of these days and people will be asking who Mrs. Palmer was, and won't know." She replied: "Why should I have a monument? Do I deserve a monument? If I do, I will not write a book to make it, but I will continue to serve other people, and if there is anything of worth in my personality, then it will impress itself in their lives and they will be my monument." This is what the apostle to the Gentiles said: "Ye are my epistles known and read of men." If we perform the loving service, we need not be anxious about the credit. Not even a cup of cold water is overlooked by the recording angel. Mary of Bethany, who forgot self in the consuming desire to serve the Master, heard the wonderful word: "She

hath done what she could. And verily I say unto you, Wheresoever the gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, that also which this woman hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her." Those who are forever "seeking to save their lives," and gain, riches, glory and luxury for themselves, lose the best of life here and eternal blessedness hereafter. Those who "lose themselves for Jesus' sake" find the abundant and unending life.

Another motive for service is sympathy. This is of a higher order. But it is not sufficient. A life with only this mainspring is apt to lack continuity in service. We need the challenge of a great cause and a divine ideal. God has given us this in Jesus. A great cause draws out the best that is in the individual and leads on to the heights. See Abe Lincoln, an uncouth farm-hand in the Southern slave market. As he sees homes torn asunder by the auction-block, he turns aside with tears in his eyes and cries: "If I ever get a chance to hit this thing, I am going to hit it hard." And he did. The challenge of a great cause is the secret of his career. "For Jesus' sake" furnishes a challenge which reaches to the ends of the earth and to the gates of heaven. It is the only all-inclusive and all-sufficient motive.

"Ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." This is the gospel of the Christian life. How tragic the picture which Paul presents in this passage of those whose minds have been blinded by the God of this world! And men forsake the divine ideal for such as this—the tinsel and glitter that leave the life barren and hopeless, the things that defile and destroy? A typical tragedy is witnessed in the life of Edgar Allen Poe, the most brilliant poet America has produced.

Drinking and gambling were his besetting sins, for which he was expelled from the University of Virginia and from the West Point Military Academy. The one bright spot in his life came with his marriage to his child-wife, Virginia. After six happy years she died at the age of twenty. Poe went from bad to worse down to his miserable death. The tragedy of his life, and all who refuse to walk in the way of service for Jesus' sake, is revealed in his weird poem "Ulalume." The religious element is sadly lacking in his work as a whole, but there seems to be something more than mere anguish of soul over the death of his lost wife in this poem. "Ulalume," from which his soul draws back in horror as he and Psyche (*i. e.*, his soul) walk together through the night, seems to entomb not merely his beloved Virginia, but his better self and all the higher and nobler possibilities of his life which he buried with her.

ULALUME.

" The skies they were ashen and sober;
 The leaves they were crisped and sere—
 The leaves they were withering and sere;
 It was night in the lonesome October
 Of my most immemorial year;
 It was hard by the dim lake of Auber,
 In the misty mid-region of Weir—
 It was down by the dank tarn of Auber,
 In the ghoul-haunted woodland of Weir.

"But Psyche, uplifting her ringer,
 Said, 'Sadly this star I mistrust—
 Her pallor I strangely mistrust:—
 Oh, hasten! oh, let us not linger!
 Oh, fly!—let us fly—for we must.'
 In terror she spoke, letting sink her
 Wings until they trailed in the dust—

In agony sobbed, letting sink her
 Plumes till they trailed in the dust—
 Till they sorrowfully trailed in the dust.
 "I replied, 'This is nothing but dreaming:
 Let us on by this tremulous light!
 Let us bathe in this crystalline light!
 Its Sibyllic splendor is beaming
 With Hope and in Beauty to-night:
 See! it flickers up the sky through the night!
 All, we safely may trust to its gleaming,
 And be sure it will lead us aright—
 We safely may trust to a gleaming
 What can not but guide us aright,
 Since it flickers up to heaven through the night.'

"Thus I pacified Psyche and kissed her,
 And tempted her out of her gloom—
 And conquered her scruples and gloom;
 And we passed to the end of the vista,
 But were stopped by the door of a tomb—
 By the door of a legended tomb;
 And I said, 'What is written, sweet sister,
 On the door of this legended tomb?'
 She replied, 'Ulalume—Ulalume—
 'Tis the vault of thy lost Ulalume!' "

Poe's star, which seduced his soul and led him to the vault of Ulalume, was the call of wild, reckless, dissolute living. Is not this the very picture Paul presents: "And even if our gospel is veiled, it is veiled in them that perish: in whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn upon them"? Above all the wild clamor of the world Jesus pleads: "Take my yoke upon you, and ye shall find rest unto your souls."

"Jesus calls us o'er the tumult
 Of our life's wild, restless sea;

Day by day His sweet voice soundeth,
 Saying, 'Christian, follow me.'
 "Jesus calls us from the worship
 Of the vain world's golden store,
 From each idol that would keep us,
 Saying, 'Christian, love me more.'"

The little daughter of a telegraph operator, who lived beside one of the great transcontinental railroads, ran down to the station to visit her father. As she walked down the track she saw the rail was broken. Her tiny mind foresaw some terrible tragedy. She rushed into the station, but her father was not there. Quickly she ran to the phone and called the first station to the east. The west-bound flier was almost due. "Please, sir, this is Mary. There is something very wrong over here. A rail is broken. Can't you stop the express?" "My God, *no!* It has gone. Can't you stop it?" There was a momentary pause and then a fluttering reply: "I—I—don't know. I'm pretty little, you know. But I'll try." And in a moment her mother saw with amazement a red flag flying down the track over tiny, winged feet. The great train stopped suddenly with a terrible roar, grinding of wheels and clouds of dust. Little Mary received a letter a few days later from the superintendent of the road: "In all my twenty years of railroading I have never known a finer thing."

"A charge to keep I have,
 A God to glorify,
 A never-dying soul to save,
 And fit it for the sky.

"To serve the present age,
 My calling to fulfill—
 Oh, may it all my powers engage
 To do my Master's will!"

V.
**THE FUNDAMENTAL MOTIVES OF THE
CHRISTIAN LIFE**

MOTIVES are the mainsprings of life. When interest is keen and motives are strong, then action is energetic and persistent. But when interest sags and motives grow weak and conflicting, then action is spasmodic and ineffectual.

The farmer who owns the field and harvests his own crops works in a more steady and vigorous manner than the hired hand who has no other motive but to put in his time. If the employer works alongside, then the employee has the additional motive of making a good showing of strength and skill. The ambition to rise, the desire to provide for the future and the determination to provide for loved ones carry on a continual battle in the soul of the worker with the desire to spare his body and mind and yield to sloth. As the soul is to the body, so is the motive to the action.

The evident inability of man to determine the motives of his fellows limits his ability to judge the quality of their actions. Here sits the prisoner at the bar; before he can be convicted the prosecuting attorney must show the motive for the crime. And sometimes a good deed is actuated by an evil motive. The hypocrite stands on the street corner. He prays (a good thing) to be seen of men (a bad motive). The whole action is vitiated by the evil motive.

Motives are varied and conflicting. A common fallacy of the student of history is to presuppose a single motive as the cause of an action or a movement. Motives are usually combined and curiously intertwined in both good and evil actions. Sometimes a base and a high motive are joined in utter inconsistency behind a seemingly noble deed.

The Christian ought to examine his own motives persistently. "Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life." The true Christian must unite the spirit with the letter. He should guard the secret source of his conduct with as much care as he guards his speech or his action. The old negro folksong, "Some people go to church to say their prayers and some go to church to put on airs; some go to church to bawl and shout," illustrates the common peril which surrounds us constantly. What are the ruling motives of the Christian life? What motives are right and proper? Which are the noblest? How can we make them dominant? Certainly these are all-important questions.

An intelligent evangelist demands a careful study of the ruling motives of the Christian life. As a musician can not hope to play an instrument harmoniously unless he understands its nature, so the gospel messenger should know what type of appeal can be legitimately and most effectively made to the various individuals sought. From how many angles should he approach the lost? How many motives should he seek to stir? Upon which should he lay the greatest stress? When one begins to study the various motives which actuate people to "join the church," it is not surprising that so many Christians are so indifferent, warped, spasmodic and inconsistent. Good and evil motives

fight in mortal combat in a man's soul. "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." The Christian gospel must transform the motives before the life can be turned to God.

Obedience to God furnishes one of the fundamental motives of the Christian life. The desire to obey is a strong and worthy motive. It is a broad and solid base on which to erect the building of life. "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." Law and order are essential to our existence. Plant and animal life exist through their yielding to the laws God has ordained for them. If a man would find and fill his place in this world, he must obey the laws of God. This is man's highest destiny: to find out God's will concerning his life and fulfill it.

Some laugh at the idea of doing a thing because it is commanded in the word of God. But if there would be found no other motive to support the Christian life, this motive of obedience would suffice. The objections offered against it but illustrate man's perversity—his eternal impulse to revolt against authority. We do not count a man a patriot who does not yield obedience to the laws of his country. And yet the law of one's country may or may not be wise. How much more should we yield to the authority of God, when His wisdom and goodness match His final authority? "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Shall we not say with God's Son, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me"?

The fear of punishment is a second ruling motive in the life of a Christian. The heart responds to the fear of the results of sin—fear of loss of possessions or of health, fear of detection and shame, fear of loss of life, fear of hell. Obviously, this is not a very high motive, but it is a very powerful one. Many mock at this motive and abandon all attempt to stir such a motive in the heart of any one. They sneer at the idea of the devil or hell and denounce the proclamation of a message which includes the idea of eternal punishment for sin. And yet the man does not live whose conduct is not ruled in a certain measure by the motive of fear. This motive is God's provision for enabling us to preserve our lives from omnipresent destruction. The water or fire would momentarily destroy us but for the influence of the motive of fear upon our conduct. The little boy who leaped from the top of the barn with an old umbrella as a parachute, and broke his leg, did not repeat the performance—thanks to the motive of fear. What keeps us from "stepping on the gas" and traveling fifty miles an hour, regardless of attendant circumstances? Fear is the dominant motive in such a case. "The fear of Jehovah is the beginning of wisdom." It is not the end, but the beginning. A man ought to come up higher than this in his Christian life, and not serve God simply because he fears eternal punishment. But does the man exist who is not influenced in some measure on some occasions to turn from the wrong to the right because of fear? When those times of storm and stress come in each life, when the moral nature sags, do we not all need the under-girding of this powerful motive?

The people who ridicule the motive of fear and decry the idea of God punishing sin have not given the

world any convincing testimony of superior living. It is rather oppressive to see the downfall of moral standards resultant from discarding this motive. It would be a tragic thing if the world should abandon belief in the devil and hell. What community would maintain itself a single week if all officers of the law were discharged, all laws with attendant punishment annulled? The *Literary Digest* has unconsciously given demonstration by its extended studies of the dancing craze, the immodest dress and general looseness of morals prevalent in schools and colleges of America, for these revelations immediately focus the attention of the reader on the persistent propaganda of the religious editor of the *Digest* in favor of the floodtide of rationalism which is sweeping American colleges. When students in schools committed to the modernistic viewpoint, even students who are preparing for the ministry and actually preaching, plunge into orgies of dancing, card-playing and attendance at vulgar theaters on Sunday afternoons, and the ministerial students in colleges where the Bible is believed and taught still maintain the "old-fashioned" high standards of morality, then the conclusions are self-evident. One of these conclusions is that one of the tap-roots of the tree of righteousness has been severed and the tree can not but wither. Modernism destroys other motives besides weakening the fear of suffering the results of sin. But this one loss is tremendous.

The famous London preacher, Dr. Jowett, delivered a series of lectures at the Yale Convocation in 1912. His first lecture centered in the definition of "gospel" as "good news." He drove home the thought from many angles that the whole business of the preacher was to proclaim "good news." The audience was made

up of professors, students and preachers—nearly all of them radical. One asked Dr. Jowett this question: "If the preacher's task is to proclaim 'good news,' what is he to do with the part of his message which *is* 'bad news'?" Dr. Jowett did not understand the question at first. Then the question was put flatly: "If the gospel is 'good news,' how can there be any eternal punishment or such a place as hell?" Dr. Jowett met the issue squarely, saying that the very term "good news" implies that there is such a thing as "bad news"; the very proclamation of salvation presupposes a state of being lost. He said that he preached hell to his congregations, but that he kept it in the background. Hell is the dark background on which the brilliant picture of the gospel is painted. But without the background you have no picture. I never heard a finer statement of the necessity of preaching hell and the proper emphasis necessary to make a balanced gospel. Certainly we should concentrate attention on the cross of Christ, but can this be done without an occasional recognition of the fact that man is eternally lost unless divine aid is extended? No more slashing denunciations or fearful predictions of destruction ever were uttered than the messages of the Old Testament prophets and of Jesus Himself. Before a preacher ceases to preach messages of this type, he ought to read through the four Gospels and see how often Jesus preached terrific words of impending destruction. One of the reasons for loss of evangelistic zeal is our waning appreciation of what the word "lost" means.

The hope of reward is a constant source of appeal in the teaching of Jesus. The keynote sermon preached at the very opening of His ministry outlined the virtues of the citizens of the kingdom of God and the re-

wards to be expected: "for they shall be comforted," "for they shall inherit the earth," etc. How many of the parables of Jesus are built upon the comparison of diligent labor for a just master and abundant reward for faithfulness to a trust. Yet we hear an increasing number of criticisms of this motive from those who are trying to create "a new religion." They protest that it is utterly selfish and base to do righteous acts for the sake of reward. And yet their own lives afford ready refutation to their criticism. For where is the life that is not actuated by this motive? The farmer sows his grain in hope of a harvest. The business man buys and sells, expecting profit. Even the servant of Christ prays, proclaims and labors earnestly, hoping that "God will grant the increase," and that he shall be able to garner in the souls of lost men. The hope of personal reward is not the highest motive in the world, but, like the fear of punishment, it is elemental. It is fundamental to all life, and the very continuation of our lives is not conceivable without it. If this motive is unworthy, then we must cast aside heaven. In fact, how much of the Bible or Christianity would we have left?

The crowning word of the critic against this motive is the supercilious sneer that the appeal of Jesus for each man to seek to save his own soul is an appeal to a motive that is utterly selfish. Seeking to save your own soul! Many humble Christians are thrown into confusion by this criticism. Is it a noble or a selfish thing for a man to labor and pray for the salvation of his own soul? In reply, it may be noted that life is the gift of God. The soul is of supreme value in the eyes of God. It is our precious treasure entrusted to us of God, and it should be our solemn and joyful duty

to fit our souls for the high destiny with which God has honored us. Moreover, the people who have surrendered belief in heaven and scorn the hope of reward have signally failed in the realm of moral achievement. They can find no motive to take the place of this one. Their lives grow cold and barren. There is no surcease for their hours of anguish. They grovel in the dust as compared with the man of Galilee. In the dark, stormy night of death the Christian's faith shines out like the steady gleam of the searchlight on the ocean vessel bravely forging its way into the harbor.

"Save yourselves from this crooked generation" may sound like a selfish appeal. But it is only selfish if we try to rise by casting others down. It is only selfish if our salvation becomes the means of death to others. Here is a sinking ship; the lifeboats are lowered; the passengers struggle to enter and save themselves. "Women and children first!" is the ringing cry. What could be more base than for a man by brute force to fling these helpless ones aside and save himself? But this offers no parallel to Christianity. For "God is not willing that any should perish." "He is able to save unto the uttermost." If some insist on clinging to their bags of gold or indulging in riotous pleasures while the ship sinks beneath the waves, is it any discredit to the man who, finding all his warnings futile, and receiving only derision and contempt for his pains, refuses to share their fate? It is only a base thing to seek to save our own souls when we refuse to share this blessed salvation with all who will accept. If a man becomes so interested in seeking to save his own soul that he forgets the thousands of lost souls about him, then his attitude is utterly unworthy and unchristian. One of the most difficult, but

magnificent, sayings of the Master is this: "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it."

The desire for happiness is another potent motive. "I want to have a good time" is the continual wish of our young people. But how brief and fleeting is our "time." And what is really "good"? This is a final question. The rich young ruler used this word glibly: "Good Master, what shall I do?" "Get a clear conception of what the word 'good' means," was the first step in Jesus' reply. "Why callest thou me good? none is good, save one, even God." If Christ is really "good," then He is God. His sinlessness is one of the indubitable proofs of His deity. The eternal human search for the "good" leads us directly to Christ—to God.

The ancient philosophers urged the search for "the good, the true and the beautiful." This is right and proper. All three of these roads lead directly to God. Aside from the ordinary essentials for daily life, every home should contain flowers, books, pictures and music. How a flower lightens a desolate home! If only a poor, modest flower blooms in the window, there is the evidence that the poverty and squalor have not completely destroyed the love of the beautiful. Jesus pointed to the inimitable beauty of the lily of the field and reminded His disciples that God is the source of this beauty. The love of music finds its truest delight in the hymns of faith by which "we sing and make melody in our hearts to the Lord." The response to the aesthetic sense is a noble motive and it leads to God.

Books and pictures minister largely to the intellect. It is no unseemly motive to seek intellectual satisfaction. The cynical question asked by the agnostic Pi-

late, "What is truth?" finds its answer in that sublime word of Jesus, "I am the truth." Jesus urged this motive of desire to know the truth. He emphasized the duty of investigation. The Queen of Sheba is to stand up in the day of judgment and bear witness against those of every generation who stifle the universal desire to know the truth. It is well for every Christian to keep strong and active this motive in his soul.

The search for the "good" ministers to man's moral nature. Here the urgent cry of conscience is heard, and the sweet blessings of forgiveness that are only to be received at the feet of Jesus are enjoyed. This is one of the most deep-rooted motives. Notice how the fear of punishment and hope of reward intertwine themselves about this motive through the action of conscience and the longing for relief from the burden of sin. Read again the Beatitudes, "For they shall be comforted," "for they shall be filled." The translators struggle in vain for a sufficient rendering: "Blessed," "happy," "fortunate." The desire for the true happiness of life lures us on. Life more abundant and unending is the vista which Christianity opens to the tortured souls of men. Hear the voice of Jesus urging us to strive to enter into life, even though the gate be narrow and the way straitened.

There are two other motives that rule in the heart of the Christian. These two are the noblest motives which stir the human heart. They are closely allied. The one is that of gratitude to God. Gratitude is a final test of character. The person who does not appreciate what is done for him is well-nigh hopeless. Our lives, the means of maintaining them, uncounted daily blessings and especially the "unspeakable gift of

his Son," should stir us to "leave all" that stains or hinders and follow Him. The gentle, merciful attitude of God toward us should rouse a like response. He has the power to destroy, and yet He seeks to save. "Behold, I stand at the door and knock!" Can any heart look upon that patient, suffering figure and not be moved? The heart of our appeal to lost men should be the cross of Jesus. There is no higher appeal than this. The Christian should not ponder forever his fear, or even his hope, but rather say in his heart: "The love of Christ constraineth us." The other motives will always be present in the heart, but we should "think on these things" and strive daily to live nobly "for Jesus' sake."

The last motive is the desire to develop personality in order to serve God and man. The motive of gratitude is negative; this is positive. The former places man in the receptive mood; this last reveals him in action. The two motives are inseparable. We can not really be grateful without seeking to express our gratitude.

The desire to develop one's self to the highest point of efficiency may seem selfish, and is certain to become so if it is not surmounted by the desire to spend and be spent in the cause of Christ. If one's powers are spent for self, then the desire to increase these powers is utterly unworthy. It is mere barren ambition—the lust for power and the desire to lord it over others. "Not so shall it be among you, but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." This is the divine example. Higher

than this we can not go. To lose our lives for Jesus' sake in the consuming attempt to help save a lost world is the supreme motive of the Christian.

How much time should be spent in self-culture, and how much in self-denying service? Sufficient time and energy should be spent on self to maintain our lives and develop them to the highest point of efficiency, and then the whole life thrown into self-sacrificing service. But we never reach this highest point of efficiency. Something always intervenes. Sometimes we can scarcely start, when we find our way blockaded by the pressing duties of caring for those dependent upon us. Yet these very tragic burdens often develop us in undreamed-of ways. Christianity stimulates and directs the development of individual powers in unique fashion. It does not deny temptation, sin and death, but leads us through the fire more than conquerors. It does not remove the burdens from our shoulders, but gives strength to bear the load. Moreover, the whole sweep of human nature is touched and charmed into melody by Christianity as the master harpist would set his whole instrument athrill. The challenge of the perfect example and the tremendous program of the Son of God should lift us out of selfishness into the heavenly places, to serve, to suffer and to reign with Him.

VI.

THE MARKS OF A CHRISTIAN

THE rich young ruler was a man of most admirable character. Probably he was regarded by his fellows as "a model young man." Mark, in spite of his terse style, pauses to note the impression the splendid character of this young man made on Jesus. "And Jesus looking upon him, loved him." The young man was just full of goodness. And he was very conscious of the fact. But there was a tremendous lack—a tragic flaw in his character. And he seemed strangely ignorant concerning this. The young man talked fluently concerning "good" people and "good" things. He talked a little too fluently, for he betrayed a lack of thought and every evidence of shallow conceptions. "Good Master, what good thing shall I do?" "Not so fast," said the Master; "tarry long enough to consider what you are saying. Do you know what that word 'good' means? If you call me *good* in the full meaning of the term, you affirm that I am God, for only God is good." "What lack I yet?" is the inevitable terminus of such a conversation.

Our revival had just closed and a weary brain and burdened soul refused to rest. In the long hours of the night I pondered the rich young ruler. Wherein had he measured up to the stature of a Christian, and how had he fallen short? What are the marks of the Christian? And how far had our revival carried us

forward toward our goal? Do we now know enough and believe enough to dare call Jesus "good"? Would we suffer rebuke also? Dare we ask after some "good" thing? What lack I yet?

In the confused fancies that visit a tired brain in that borderland of dreams I found myself conjuring up a visit from an angel and working out question and answer of discussion concerning the little congregation I serve. Calmly the white-robed stranger took his seat and opened a beautiful book all covered with gold. "I would learn," said he, "how many of your congregation you consider *good*. But first you must give me the names of the *best* members of the church." Quite glibly I began to name in rapid succession the men who are leaders and upon whom the life of the congregation depends. I paused to note that other churches might boast of men more prominent in the affairs of the social, business and political world, but I was willing to pit these men against any they might name for real "goodness." I then hastened to call the roll of the names of "good" women in the church, and my heart swelled with pride as I recalled what brilliant and noble women they were. But the angel raised his pen and halted me with a frown: "You go too fast. And you seem to have queer standards of judgment. What do you mean by *good*? How do you measure in choosing the *best* members of this congregation? Some of these people you have named seem to owe their high rating to *your* faults, instead of *their* virtues. You seem to be particularly easy on some of these people who have the same kind of faults that trouble you. And there are some of these folk you have named that don't weigh very heavy on my scales. You seem to have named them simply because you like

them personally. Suppose we begin all over again." I answered more humbly, and yet boldly enough, that perhaps we had better understand one another's standards of judgment before we tried to make out the list. He agreed, and I was too stupid to see why he invited me to outline first the marks of a Christian life as I saw them.

"Come, sit with me in the pulpit on Sunday morning, and I will show you the best members of our congregation. It is to be a great day. We have just closed our revival and we are to welcome all our new members to-day. All the members of the church who are worth anything at all will be there. Then, come back on Sunday night. You won't find so many, but we can begin to sift and choose better after we see the night crowd. But, best of all, come around to prayer-meeting. Do you really want to know who are the 'good,' the very 'best' people in our congregation? Then, don't fail to come to prayer-meeting. I know these are the best members of the church, because, if it were not for these members, we would not have any church. And I want you to watch during the service. See how they sing and how those who can't sing listen to the words with deep devotion, following the words in the hymnal. Watch how reverently they bow in prayer and listen to Scripture and sermon. But pay especial attention during the invitation; that is the time to sift the wheat from the chaff. Notice some are yawning and looking toward the door; cross them off. Others are restless; their name is Esau; their stomachs are empty and all they see is a mess of pottage. Do you see that girl in the sixth row there to the right? See how she giggles and talks during the invitation, and there in the same row is another girl of the same

age, who is gently whispering to a neighbor: 'Why not give your heart to Christ this morning?' See those boys yonder? Two of them are teasing a boy who is not a Christian. They have forgotten how hard it was for them. And see that other earnest boy? He is trying to persuade his friend to go forward. Yes," said I, "I think we could almost make out the list Sunday morning after the service of worship was closed."

The angel lifted his head thoughtfully and said: "I am glad to see you have thought over these matters. But you have much to learn. Have you never discovered that you can not pick the good and bad people by a single moment or act? This girl may never be so thoughtless again. And these people you have praised for being at church this morning, did you know that this young man over on the tenth row has not heard one word of the service? He came merely to see some one he is interested in." "But he comes every Sunday," I protested. "I know that as well as you," said the angel, "and he always has the same purpose, although sometimes he gets something out of the service. And this woman just here to our right—she has heard nothing of the service either. She can hardly wait to get home to ridicule Mrs. Jones' new hat, and to tell all about the duties of parents in the light of Jimmy Smith's dirty face, and to talk about the preacher's dingy clothes and wonder what he does with all his salary." "But," said I, "she looked so pious all during the service and she seemed to pay the strictest attention to my sermon." "You have much to learn," patiently repeated the angel. "And this man whom you named among the very best of your congregation has thought of nothing but his tobacco and hogs all during the prayer and sermon."

This was becoming somewhat trying, so I said:

"Then, come with me into the Bible school and let us test the knowledge of this people. Let us see how they study their Bibles. Let us meet them at the door after church and ask them to repeat for us the Scripture lesson, sermon text and central message. I had meant to begin with prayer and devotion, but now let us come to knowledge."

"That is well," said the angel. "But, first, let me add that your first test was well chosen, for you usually must go to the church to find the best. Remember this: No man can ever claim to honor Christ and at the same time dishonor His church." I expected him to quote with vigor, "Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together," but, instead, he repeated in a subdued voice, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst," and "As oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death." He pointed out the exceeding love of Christ for His church; how He gave His life for it; how He longed for the eternal meeting as the bridegroom for the bride. Then he said the sincerity of a man's faith in Christ and his love for Christ and his fellowmen might be measured by his devotion to the church of Christ. "But you seem to have forgotten an important thing. Are you real sure that the best members of your church were present this morning? How about this faithful and devout woman who has been stricken down at her post of duty, and for more than a year has been confined to her home? Is her name no longer among the 'best'? Is her character less devout because she has suffered such grievous burdens? Is her usefulness less or greater, now that her life shines out from the intensified focus of the

four walls of a sick-room? And this aged saint, who was the mainstay of the church through the years, shall he not be counted because he has become old and feeble? And this little girl, whose mother died recently, and who had to stay at home this morning to help care for a little brother who is sick, have you overlooked her when you name the 'good' members? And you must always remember that some of these 'good' women had to get up at daylight and dress a family of children and come six or eight miles to church, but still found time to get two strangers to come to church with them, while some other folk came strolling into church when it is about half over, with an air of conferring a favor on the Lord. How can you judge the 'goodness' of people by their church attendance unless you know all of this?"

Considerably humbled, I suggested again that we visit the Bible school. We started into the room of a class in the Junior department, when, to my dismay, I discovered that their teacher was absent and that the children were tearing up the expensive church hymnals to make paper wads, and two boys were trying to see if they could climb in and out of one of the windows. The boys all collapsed into their seats when they saw the angel, and hung their heads in shame— all except two, who had been earnestly trying to keep order until their substitute teacher arrived. I stepped back to let the angel have leeway for the tremendous burst of indignation which I felt sure he would hurl at the boys, but, to my surprise, he looked at them for a moment in a pitying way, and then turned a long, stern look upon me that threw me into confusion. Then I remembered that I had never preached a sermon on the proper care of the church building and the things

dedicated to God's service, and that I had been slow in securing a more prompt and efficient teacher for this class. We then visited some of the other classes and heard the little children reciting "Bible Gists," and he commended this work highly. A number of the classes had a perfect record, with every member on time, with their Bibles, a studied lesson, an offering and ready to remain for the church service. This pleased the angel, but he stopped to question some of the older classes, and seemed to feel that the older the children the less Scripture they could quote and the fewer questions they could answer, and he asked me to explain. I was afraid some of the teachers might feel badly about it, so I called him aside and explained that these teachers were very capable and studied their lessons faithfully, but many of the young men and young women would not study because they were too busy or too interested in having a good time. He said the teachers had his sympathy, and he listened carefully as I explained how much more interest the pupils had been taking in preparing their lessons lately, and that I hoped we could build a real school. But he remained in a deep study as we came down the stairs, and softly hummed the strains of "No Room in the Inn, No Room, No Room for Jesus."

I invited him to teach the adult class, but he refused, reminding me that I had agreed to point out to Mm the "best" members of the church, judged by the standard as to how much they knew about the word of God, I was glad that they had already taken the offering, for I dreaded to let the angel see how many grown people dropped a penny in the basket. When I started to teach the lesson, the class was afraid to speak a word because of the angel. Even Mrs. Roberts

refused to answer my questions for fear the answer might not be correct. I stumbled through the recitation, period, and the angel arose and asked to see how many had brought their Bibles. He shook his head sadly, as not more than half the class responded. Then he asked how many had studied the lesson, and not a hand was raised, but I think that was just because they were afraid the angel might ask them a question. "They know more than they are willing to admit," said I, with a poor attempt at humor. But he looked at the class solemnly and said: "If ye *continue* in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed." But he whispered to me a little later that many are handicapped by timidity and others by a limited education, while some had the advantage of a particularly good mind. "Christians are responsible," said he, "not for what they know, but for what they know measured in terms of what it is possible for them to know."

I suggested that we go back and look at the new tract library while the classes reassembled. I explained that I had no money to buy a bookcase, and that a good friend had given the material, and another, who was a carpenter, had helped make it, and shyly added how late I had stayed up the last two nights painting it and getting it ready, and pointed with pride to the sixteen different varieties of tracts. I had expected a compliment for economy and industry or our interest in missionary work through tracts, but he gave me another searching look and asked: "Why have you no money in the Lord's treasury?" I threw up my hands at this question and said, "You tell me." But he only murmured, "We will come to that after awhile." He examined the library a little too carefully, for, when he had uncovered several little corners that had not

been very neatly varnished, he gave me a sly wink and said something about "a workman that needeth to be ashamed." He scanned the tracts dealing with the present missionary controversy and heaved a gentle sigh, but turned with a flash in his eye and quoted: "Fight the good fight of faith." Turning through the doctrinal tracts, he remarked: "Preach the Word. This crude case doesn't matter, if you can get the congregation to use the tracts. Many of these people have Bibles in their homes, but they are covered with dust. Don't let your tracts collect dust—that is the main thing."

We had agreed that we would continue our testing after the preaching service by questioning the members, as they left the building, as to the sermon—topic, text and subject-matter, and especially the controlling object or goal of the sermon. We stood at different doors, and when we met to compare notes I sat down with tears and quoted: "For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed." But he said kindly: "You seem to have overlooked the fact that there are two sides to a sermon—the preacher and the hearers. You would test the 'goodness' of church-members in the scales of devotion and knowledge by weighing the net recollections of the sermon. Did it occur to you that the same test applies to the preacher? Some sermons," and he looked at me with a quizzical smile, "are somewhat related to Melchizedek, who was without beginning or end of days. You can not expect people to remember anything of a sermon that is like a bolt of ribbon. When you asked each in turn to tell you the driving objective of the morning sermon, did you have a clear-cut answer in your own mind which you have longed to have then

remember? If you did not, then the fault is mainly yours, not theirs." I had no heart to continue the testing further on that day, but promised to meet the angel the next day.

/ "If you want to discover who are the best members of the church," said the angel the next day, when we started out to do some ministerial calling, "you must' follow them into their homes and places of business, and see if they measure up to the showing made on Sunday." "Exactly so," said I, for I had recovered some self-possession; "the test of uprightness and righteousness." "You will find some whose religion responds to a high test when they are in the church building, but it all evaporates in the heat of business or home life. Some pray loudly on Sunday and swear just as loudly on Monday. Some can reel off the Sermon on the Mount in Bible school, but spend most of their business hours trying to evade the Golden Rule or nursing a grudge against a brother. Some good women can repeat the twelfth chapter of Romans, and their house always looks like a Kansas cyclone had just passed."

We had a long, trying day and found many things to encourage us and many that were full of shame. As we were starting home, the angel insisted on stopping to examine the billboard of the moving-picture show. I grew uneasy as he continued long, for the hour was late and I had heard that a dance was to be given in the building that night, and I was afraid some of my members might be attending. What if the angel should propose that we go up and watch the proceedings? Just then a jazz orchestra began to play overhead, and I knew the dance had started. The angel lifted high an arm in an eloquent gesture, and I shall never for-

get the agonized look on his face as we hurried away. There was a light in the barber-shop. He paused. "Your financial secretary works here, does he not?" "How did you know?" said I. "You can never tell who are the 'best' members of the church until you have examined the books of the treasurer and financial secretary," said the angel. "I have often thought of that," I murmured; "my salary is nearly always in arrears." I could not forget the test of generosity. I began to prepare his mind by recounting how few people in our congregation had any wealth, but he waved me off with a gesture, and said: "It isn't lack of money that troubles your congregation. It is the lack of religion—the scarcity of devotion and love." The financial secretary was busy with the work of the Master, working late over the records of the envelopes given in the offering the day before. The angel began to examine the record. "Here is a man," said the angel, "who makes a reasonable pledge to the church every year, but he has no evidence of ever having paid anything." "No," said the secretary, "he has never paid a cent since I have kept the books. He always pledges every year. I think he does it to get rid of the workers who are canvassing." All the while I noticed the angel kept referring to a little book he carried, and comparing it with the church-book. Upon inquiry, he told us it was the records of the earthly possessions of our members: houses and lands, stock and bonds, bank accounts and insurance policies, together with the itemized account of expenditures for pleasure. "If you want to make the generosity test, you must compare the expenditures for self with those for God. Here is a man who has spent one hundred times as much on his automobile this year as he did

for Christ. Here is another man who has made ten times as much this year as last year, but he is not giving one cent more to the Lord. Here is a woman who spent fifty times as much for fine clothes as she did for food for the soul." He sat back with a far-away look in his eyes and began to hum: "I gave, I gave my life for thee; what hast thou given for me?" "Here is one of the best members, judged by the treasurer's record—only a small contribution, but what a sacrifice this little woman makes and how faithful she is, as on the first day of every week she brings her tithe."

"Why is it that so many of our members who have so much for themselves have so little for Christ? And why is it that so many pledges are never paid, or are only paid at the last of the year?" The angel stopped to answer in front of a bank building and took out a little New Testament. By the light streaming from the window I could see he was pointing to the passage about the rich young ruler, and I remembered, "What lack I yet?" and how we had started on our present mission. He said nothing, but kept pointing to this passage and the one about the apostles giving up all to follow Christ, and I knew he meant to say that I must preach the Word—lead people into the presence of Jesus—and their pocketbooks would open, if we could ever get their hearts open. "The love of money," he seemed to say, "versus the love of Christ. Conquer one by the other." Then he turned and pointed a significant finger at a ray of light that came from the directors' meeting in the rear of the bank building, and my conscience smote me as I thought how long it had been since we had been able to get our entire official board together, and how slipshod our business

methods were in the church. Then he turned with a wide-sweeping, wonderful gesture that seemed to take in all of a lost world, and I knew he meant that missionary zeal is the soul of church finance; that the church never existed which gave liberally for others that did not have for its own, or that lost the worldwide vision without drying up the springs of its own daily subsistence.

We walked slowly home, and he talked of the last test of real "goodness"—the test of love, of sacrificial service, and many a gracious and merciful deed he related which some member of the congregation had done all unknown by their minister. My heart filled with gratitude at this revelation, but he took another little book from his robe, and I saw he had the names of all the members and their rating according to the five tests: of devotion to the church, knowledge of the word of God, righteousness, generosity and loving service. I studied the record with great interest and marveled at how uneven it ran. Here was one man who was ever so faithful in church attendance, but who gave practically nothing. I wondered how such things could be. Here was another man who prayed in agony of tears and who gave with great-souled liberality, and yet I saw with dismay that the trail of his daily life often led along dizzy precipices and through dark, slimy waters. "His is a stormy nature," said the angel; "he was born with deadly traits in his character. Many never know the desperate battles he fights; they only note how often he fails. He may be saved yet, if he will but continue the fight. Men must be judged, not merely by achievement, but by the inner purpose and earnest effort. Men answer according to their opportunities—one-talent men only answer for

one talent, and not for five or ten talents." I looked long and hard for one member with a perfect record. Some averaged high in all five tests, but they were few, and after every name were those tell-tale black marks which marred the record. "There is none perfect; no, not one," I quoted under my breath. "Would you like to see your record? I keep it on a separate page." My heart stood still and I could only nod my head, and I held my breath as he prepared to turn the page. But he paused to say again that men were judged by their opportunities, and, while five tests might sum up the life of a Christian, the responsibilities that rested on the shoulders of a minister could hardly be numbered. Just one standard of judgment, the standard of opportunity, but the opportunities are so unlimited. I grew cold and shivered, for we stood under the street light near the parsonage. The events of the last two days had destroyed my self-confidence and humbled me into the dust. But at last he turned the page, and then I feared to look. And when I did, I saw only vast arrays of tests and possibilities and opportunities; and, overwhelmed by the vision, the falling tears blurred my sight and I was never able to perceive what sort of a record had been made.

Solemnly he closed the book, and lo! the sky flamed up with a wonderful light! Each separate star seemed aglow with divine glory, and, falling on my knees, I heard a gentle voice saying: "I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up; and his train filled the temple. Above him stood the seraphim: each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full

of his glory." And then I quoted brokenly: "Woe is me! For I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips."

After a time a loving hand was laid upon my shoulder, and I looked, and, behold, the angel was transfigured before me, "and his face did shine as the sun, and his garments became white as the light." His arms were uplifted, and, as the November moon began to glow from a distant hilltop, His form stood out in the silhouette of a cross. I saw the prints of nails in His hands and the robe was rent over a spear thrust in His side, and I fell on my face, crying: "Blessed Master, forgive!" But the calm voice said: "Yea, fear not!" "Prove all things. Hold fast that which is good." "And the things which thou hast heard from me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." "I know thy works, and thy toil and patience, and that thou canst not bear evil men, and didst try them that call themselves apostles, and they are not, and didst find them false." "Pray without ceasing." "Lord, be merciful to me a sinner." "Preach the word." "Freely ye received, freely give." "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these." "Greater love hath no man than this." "As the Father hath sent me, so send I you." "Be thou faithful unto death."

VII.

SOME USES OF MISFORTUNE

IF God is good, and if He loves us, why is it that eternal sunshine does not light our path? Why is the jocund day followed in endless round by the dark and gloomy night? If God really loves us, why is not our path always strewn with roses? Whence cruel thorns that block our path and sorely wound us?

Why is it that prosperity does not always surround us? Why does our neighbor count his fertile fields by the hundreds of acres, while we have but a mite or none at all? Why does another luxuriate in a house of a thousand candles, while we have but a thatched cottage or a miserable hovel? When fortune seems at last to smile upon us, and we are borne aloft on a tide of prosperity, why is it that prices must collapse and embitter our lives with disappointed hopes and broken dreams? Why is it, when we have about ascended the hill, that something always seems to overtake us and send us hurtling clear to the bottom?

If God desires our well-being, why do pain and sickness assail us? Why can we not always be hale and healthy, full of vigor and energy? Why so many days languished on the bed of affliction? Why so many years made barren by feebleness?

And when God once blesses our lives with the precious gift of love, why is it ever blotted out? The little child that sums up our life-dreams suddenly

snatched back again into the great unseen? If husband and wife are so inseparable in devotion, why the anguish of parting? If no other name is so dear and so unforgettable as "mother," why must the day come when we look on the silent form and call her name in vain? And why does our own youth vanish so quickly and old age creep on us so stealthily, until finally that which was once so precious is now but dust and ashes?

If a man could answer these questions satisfactorily, he would immediately become world-famous. No man has ever yet answered them fully. Our Saviour has thrown much light upon the problem, but He did not see fit to reveal all its secrets.

Every generation, every life, sooner or later, comes face to face with this problem. Every preacher is forced to wrestle with it through the long night hours as Jacob struggled with the angel at Peniel.

It would seem that some part of the machinery of the universe had been thrown out of gear. Many have exclaimed, with Hamlet, that "the time is out of joint." It is evident that there are two forces—two personalities—at war with one another in the world. A study of the world—past and present—forces us to postulate •God. Such a study also forces one to presuppose a malignant personality seeking man's destruction. Divine revelation in both cases confirms the conclusion of our reasoning. The crude imaginations of the savage heart and the actual experience of Jesus in the wilderness point alike to the existence of a personality persistently tempting man into the ways of misery. Some in our day have undertaken to deny the existence of a devil, while still others claim to be able to explain the world rationally without a God. Both deny the accuracy of the Scriptures, make of Jesus a ridiculous

ignoramus, and multiply the difficulties that surround the problem of man's suffering.

A third factor is evident: man, as an independent agent, choosing his own path and reaping as he sows. But the problem does not disappear even with the admission of the freedom of the will—sin and righteousness, punishment and reward. The dual personalities of the universe become mirrored in the double nature of man, waging the eternal warfare with one another so vividly described by Paul in Romans. But we should then expect the wicked man to suffer consistently, and the good man to prosper in comparison. But such is not the case. A railroad wreck occurs. Some one says it is God's wrath. It is to punish the wicked people on the train. But some of the noblest people on the train are killed, and some of the vilest are spared. San Francisco is visited by an earthquake. Some one remarks that God is showing His wrath at the wickedness of great cities. But why San Francisco rather than Chicago or New York? Why the good and bad in San Francisco indiscriminately? This is the heart of Job's discussion with his three friends. Was not Jesus driving at this same thing when He denied that those on whom the tower in Siloam fell were sinners above all men?

Job felt intuitively that a fourth factor was unescapable—eternity. And so he asks: "If a man die, shall he live again?" The Stoic philosopher, wrestling with the same problem, felt there must be a place of future punishment. In no other way could he explain the evident failure of a benign Providence to punish the wicked and reward the righteous in this world. And nothing is any stronger or clearer in the teaching of Jesus than His insistent appeal to eternity. To the

Jews, who were moralizing on the Siloam tragedy, Jesus said: "Except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish." To His disciples there was the oft-repeated promise that, while this world afforded persecution and suffering, eternity would offer endless and unspeakable joy. The rich man might receive his "good things" in this life, but his heartless cruelty to Lazarus would necessarily close heaven's gate to him in eternity.

Not all four of these factors render a complete solution of human suffering. There are still times when the breaking heart cries out: "My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" And oftentimes one lacks the insight into the divine will and purpose that will enable us to add in resignation: "It is finished." One of the chief points of emphasis of Paul is that eternity will give us God's viewpoint and enable us to understand the things that baffled us here. We see now but in part, but when we see Him as He is, then all will be plain. Our present affliction will seem light in the presence of the "far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

Whatever may be the ultimate answer to the philosophical aspects of the problem, the Christian following the example of his Lord should be more interested in its practical phases. Just as Jesus did not spend His days trying to explain how sin first came into the world, but devoted Himself to the supreme task of effecting a remedy, so He devoted Himself well-nigh exclusively to the practical side of the problem of suffering, seeking, with tender sympathy and miraculous power, to soothe and heal. This is significant, that the supreme religious figure of history was not Himself deeply troubled by the theoretical aspects of the prob-

lem. Jesus, with His clear and unfaltering vision of God, had at the same time the keenest appreciation of the suffering of men. Not philosophical discussion, but practical living, was His aim. His appeal to eternity is as clear and strong as His faith in God. His example of suffering, while it somewhat deepens the problem, revealing as it does that suffering is also a part of the experience of God, yet offers the supreme example to the disciple who "suffers as a Christian." It lifts nobility of character as far above bodily comfort as is the eternal weight of glory above our present light affliction. In the presence of Jesus' example, suffering and death are not to be feared. The loss of earthly possessions is as nothing, and for parted friends there is the blessed hope of reunion. Above all are the love and protecting care of the heavenly Father. Hear His bold challenge: "Fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul."

Would it not be wise to follow the example of Jesus and inquire into the uses of misfortune, rather than disclaim against a God who could permit suffering? Many consider suffering a curse, but Jesus was able calmly to point out uses of misfortune. The early Christians adopted His viewpoint and immortalized the crimson pages of early Christian history.

The story of the lame man who was laid at the Gate Beautiful offers ready illustration of some of the uses of misfortune. For it gave opportunity for the expression of the power with which the apostles had been endowed. Man's extremity is always God's opportunity. Hard as it is to understand human suffering, it is well to remember that it affords constant opportunity for the expression of the nobler powers and capacities of the soul. Jesus pointed this out when

curing the man born blind. Refusing to endorse either of the current philosophical theories that the man's or his parents' sins had caused the calamity, He nevertheless paused to point out that the man's misfortune had as one of its uses the opportunity offered to the Son of God to exercise His divine power. On the same principle is based Jesus' conduct at the time of the illness and death of Lazarus. With the weeping sister our hearts cry out: "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." But with all the world we recognize that their extremity of anguish gave to Jesus the opportunity to offer indubitable evidence and everlasting comfort to all the ages.

Again, the lame man's misfortune was for him a door opening into a larger spiritual life. Through the years of suffering he had developed patience, that rare flower which blooms only in the atmosphere of suffering. And in our imagination we see a Romola slowly, but surely, ascending the thorny path to nobility; or a Lear—stormy, tempestuous, hasty and thoughtless— gradually ascending through the incalculable suffering heaped upon him, until, in his dying breath, to the devoted Kent, who loosens the stifling button at his throat, he gives the evidence of infinite patience in the gentle "Thank you, sir."

Furthermore, the lame man had developed faith, as is seen in the courageous fashion in which he responded to the apostle's command. A religious attitude of mind was also his, as is shown by his thankful praise. And through the instruction of the apostles there came the larger spiritual view: that "silver and gold" are not the chief blessings of life. Many another man needs to learn this same lesson in this hour. The war did not bring the tremendous spiritual revival that so many

predicted. The high tide of prosperity carried people away from the church to the market-place and the theater, if not to places unmentionable. Will the receding currents bring the world back to the church—to the cross? Not unless the church is able to bear the world a convincing message on the uses of misfortune.

The lame man's misfortune gave an opportunity for presenting the claims of the kingdom of God to the world. It brought together a great throng and opened their ears and hearts to the gospel message. Men whose condition was more perilous and poverty-stricken than his were made to feel their need and seek a Saviour. In like manner, Paul, suffering for his Lord in the Philippian jail; Bunyan, enduring an English prison, or a poor widow, whose dire poverty could boast but two mites—all proclaimed with infinite power a gospel echoing to the ages of the ages.

Our present light affliction has, then, its uses. Let the church awaken to its opportunity. Suffering may bring nobility of character as its fruitage, or it may lead to bitterness of soul. It all depends on the attitude of the sufferer. It is only when "your heart keeps right" that "every cloud will bear a rainbow." By a courageous, positive and practical message let us direct aright the great, troubled spirit of the world. Bring home to every sufferer the question, "Does Jesus care, when my heart is pained too deeply for mirth or song, or when I've said good-by to the dearest on earth to me?" and make deep and sure the conviction: "Oh, yes, He cares; I know He cares; His heart is touched with my grief. When the days are weary and the long nights dreary, I know my Saviour cares." Then, with His gospel of faith, joy, hope and peace, let us go forth on a practical ministry of loving service.

VIII.

SPIRITUAL PARALYSIS

UPON this rock I will build my church." The interest of the Protestant world in this passage largely had exhausted itself in refuting the exaggerated interpretation of the phrase "on this rock" by the Roman Catholics, but the keen eyes of Alexander Campbell saw that here was the dramatic climax of the gospel story, the very center of the gospel message. In clear and unmistakable fashion Jesus links His life, His deliberate plans and His infinite power with the church. All the world can not separate them. Not even the gates of Hades shall prevail.

This passage shows that personal allegiance to Christ as the Son of God and the Saviour of the world is the basic principle of the church. "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ," and a living faith such as Peter expressed is the vital principle which joins Jesus in mystical union with His followers as the foundation of the church. "On this rock" it is built.

This declaration of Jesus clearly shows the church had not been established up to this time. The future tense, "I will build," can not be evaded. It points not backward to Abraham or John the Baptist, but forward to Pentecost.

Again Jesus asserts that the church is His own— "my church." The family altar of Abraham, the as-

sembly of the prophets and the regal worship of the temple are no more. It is the church of Christ. With Matt. 16:18 in our hands we are forced to set aside the whole Old Testament. Much illumination and inspiration come from the Old Testament; but authoritative and detailed information concerning the church of Christ must come from the New Testament. We are not subject to Moses, but to Christ. Jesus established a new, independent and complete religion. Not merely the content, but the very form of the church of Christ, is independent. The new wine was not put in old skins, but in new, lest both perish.

The Dark Ages thrust the church under the shadow of the Old Testament, and one of the greatest struggles in its history has been the attempt to restore its primitive teachings, institutions and spirit. Heathen philosophies and heathen religions also brought the church into bondage, and the struggle to emancipate the church from this ancient slavery meets to-day the counter-movement to enslave the church anew to rationalistic theories and compromising tendencies of the modern world.

What is the hope of the church in this critical age? It is to preach the gospel. By forgetting the gospel, the church has fallen into devious ways, and only by the persistent proclamation of the gospel can the church be called back to the straight path that leads to the redemption of the world. The whole gospel must be preached, and with the New Testament emphasis.

The Protestant world speaks with one voice concerning the gospel, except in respect to certain phases of the message and certain institutions of the church. Common honesty demands that, instead of hiding our doctrinal differences under a bushel, we bring them

forth into the white light of the gospel, and allow only that which is able to stand this searching test to remain. We must concentrate our attention on the phases of the gospel, concerning which there is still much misunderstanding and difference of opinion. We must seek for the facts—for the will of the Christ—and then commit ourselves to a frank and friendly, but insistent, proclamation of the facts. In the midst of pressure from German rationalism without, and from compromising movements within, seeking to silence the preaching of the gospel, we must take as our watchword the marching orders of Jesus: "Fear them not, therefore . . . what I tell you in the darkness, speak ye in the light; and what ye hear in the ear, proclaim upon the housetops."

These words of Jesus reveal how close is the relation of moral courage to a full proclamation of the gospel. He had just described in detail the perils and persecutions that would surround the disciples *if they preached the gospel*. Arrests, trials, imprisonments and death awaited them. They must be constantly prepared to flee from one inhospitable city to another. For the gospel was to prove a very unpopular message. It was certain to arouse opposition. This has always been true. It is often said that Christianity has now become the honorable and popular thing, and this is true of a superficial and diluted Christianity. It is the correct thing socially to have your name on a church-book, but the life of consecration and self-sacrifice and the gospel of condemnation and reconciliation have never been, and never will be, popular in this world. And the great curse of the age is the persistent attempt to make the gospel popular, to transform the gospel in order to suit the scientific fancies or social

fads of the world, instead of redeeming the world by preaching the gospel.

The question may be asked: Why did Jesus lay the burden of the bold proclamation from the housetops upon the disciples, instead of bearing the burden Himself? Why did He speak to them "in the darkness" and "in the ear"? It is not that Jesus was lacking in moral courage. Can any man see Him stilling the tempest and rebuking the frightened disciples and say Jesus was a coward? Can any one hear Him face the Pharisees in furious public discussion, when He knew they were constantly plotting to assassinate Him, and doubt the quality of His courage? Was it not His absolute self-possession and amazing confidence that baffled Pilate? It was the danger of misunderstanding and violence in regard to the kingdom that caused Jesus to train the Twelve privately for their great mission, to instruct the multitudes and gradually reveal to them the kind of Messiah they must expect before He proclaimed Himself that Messiah. No untimely abortion must overtake the kingdom. Not in some dark prison, but on Calvary, must the Christ suffer and die. Not according to excited dreams of Galileans in the wilderness where the five thousand were fed, but at the dictation of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, must the kingdom be ushered in.

It was for this that the disciples "left all and followed him"—that they might preach His gospel. It was for this He gave even His life—that forgiveness and eternal salvation might be preached in His name. Wherefore He prepared their minds for the stormy days to come: "Fear them not, proclaim it from the housetops." Practically all the ills that have befallen the church in every age have been the result of the

cowardly failure of the church to proclaim the divine message. There have constantly been lions in the path, but short-sighted leaders could not see that the lions were chained.

Is not this the cause of our present confusion? A century ago our forebears chose the motto: "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent." This has been changed in the last two decades to read: "Where the Scriptures speak, we are silent; where the Scriptures are silent, we speak." Concerning multitudinous theories and methods we have become vocal, even vociferous, but, as touching the gospel, strangely silent. It is right that we should face modern social problems and strive for solutions; this we ought to do. But should we "leave undone" the supreme task of preaching a gospel of redemption to a lost world?

Behold how we have changed our emphasis! The gospel has been so completely humanized that its divinity is obscured. We think so constantly in terms of the brotherhood of man that we have lost sight of the Lordship of Jesus. Both elements of the gospel are essential; but, when either displaces the other, the church is in peril. If we think only in terms of the Lordship of Jesus, pride and bigotry arise and stalk giantlike through the kingdom. If the brotherhood of man sums up our message, then compromise results as the gospel is delivered up to be crucified on the cross of human prejudice.

And why have we changed our message? "Fear them not, proclaim it from the housetops." Fear of financial loss, or the loss of friendships, or fear of ridicule and persecution have been powerful motives. We formerly complained that our pedo-baptist friends de-

liberately chose sprinkling and pouring, and avoided immersion, because the former are easier and more comfortable. But why, pray, have we ceased to preach the gospel that Jesus committed to His followers? Because it has proved to be a thorny path; because it arouses opposition; because it is very much easier and more comfortable to preach "interchurch messages for all the people." We try to glorify our disloyalty by calling it "courtesy;" but the naked truth is that like craven cowards we haul down God's banner and surrender the gospel, scarlet-robed and thorn-crowned, into the hands of human prejudice. We do not shout aloud, "Crucify him!" but call for a basin of water to wash our hands and try to quiet an outraged conscience by saying: "Long live the brotherhood of man." If Jesus was never immersed or never commanded immersion, if He did not desire His followers to remember His death and suffering by partaking of the Lord's Supper on the first day of each week, if He did not desire His followers to wear His name, then, by all that is fair and honest, let us come out before the world and admit our errors, and never preach such a message again. If Christ did not link baptism inseparably with the forgiveness of sins and eternal salvation, if it is a mere "technicality," if the partaking of the Lord's Supper is a mere form and of no significance to the church, if there is nothing at all in a name, and if, while professing to believe in the gospel of Christ, we feel that it won't do to preach it in this modern time, then let's cast aside hypocrisy and close our church doors, sell our church property and aid in the process of "unification" by joining some of "the other denominations"! But if this be a part, and an essential part, of the gospel, "fear them not, proclaim

it upon the housetops." We have come to the parting of the ways. In the next decade the Restoration movement will either arouse itself from its spiritual paralysis, cast from the high place every one who would betray his sacred trust, whether in college hall, missionary headquarters or on the field, and proclaim with renewed zeal and success the message of Christ, or we who once dreamed a wonderful dream of the union of God's people will gradually disintegrate and drift into "the ghoul-haunted woodland of Weir."

There are several classes of preachers among us. One group has completely abandoned the gospel. Their message comes from the German rationalist and from the modern sociologist, but not from Jesus. The phases of the gospel which are still under the cloud of the Dark Ages—the points of emphasis in our message— are to them of no importance. With might and main they are working to swing the Restoration movement away from its loyalty to Christ and His message, and to commit it to any sort of "unification scheme" which happens to appeal to the popular fancy. Having surrendered their faith in the divinity and authority of Jesus and the accuracy of the New Testament records, they have no longer any interest in the attempt to restore the New Testament church.

The second class still profess to believe in the Christ and His church as revealed in the New Testament, but they are not proclaiming it from the housetops. They claim to believe that everybody ought to be immersed, but are very anxious that no one find it out. Strange paradox! When they are called to hold a revival meeting in some out-of-the-way place, they preach the gospel with clarity and power, and then come back into their own pulpit and preach about everything else ex-

cept what a person, ought to do to be saved. They may discuss some of the disputed phases of the gospel at a prayer-meeting, where all of those present are the faithful few who already understand the teaching of the New Testament; but they would not think of being so unspeakably discourteous as to mention the subject of baptism or the Lord's Supper from the pulpit. The young people in these churches grow up in absolute ignorance of the teachings of Jesus. If you asked them why they belonged to a church of Christ, they would be completely at sea. Some evangelists come to a town and are so eager to preach a popular message that they shun the gospel. They passionately plead for men to turn from sin and become Christians, but fail to offer the simple and plain instruction as to how they may do this. Our cowardly silence has brought us down to the same level with our Roman Catholic friends—our young people belong to a church simply because their fathers and mothers did.

There is another class of preachers, and they are still numerous. They proclaim the gospel—the whole gospel—and they proclaim it from the housetops. If the preacher who always discussed the subject of baptism every time he got into the pulpit ever existed outside of fairy tales and anecdotes, he is now extinct. (To preach constantly on how a person may become a Christian, and never at all on how to remain one, is of course as unbalanced a message as the opposite program.) The first and second classes are joined together in a common endeavor—the first working deliberately, and the second unconsciously, for the destruction of the gospel of Christ. In a time like this, silence is well-nigh as deadly as deliberate assault. Only by heroic effort can a loyal preacher stem the tide.

We are in the grip of persistent propaganda from a militant minority. The great majority do not understand its purposes or aims. They stand by in helpless silence. What is needed, above all else, just now is a nationwide campaign of gospel instruction. By the use of concise tracts the phases of the gospel about which there is still much misunderstanding and difference of opinion in the Christian world can be presented to congregations sorely in need of such instruction. The evidence in each case can be brought before the general public. If the rank and file of the brotherhood shall rise to the call of Christ in this critical hour they have an unparalleled opportunity to obey the words of Jesus: "Fear them not; what ye hear in the ear, proclaim upon the housetops." Almost any one will read a tract. Every one can use them. No man is a true Christian who does not proclaim the gospel from the housetop with all the capacity God has granted him.

The *Literary Digest* recently offered an editorial on the subject of Christian union. Several denominational papers were quoted discouraging the idea of organic union, and then the *Digest* offered a brilliant paragraph in answer. It might well have been written one hundred years ago by Alexander Campbell. It asked if the time had not come when the various Christian bodies could now lay aside prejudice and inherited ideas and come to the New Testament for a new and frank study and find thereby the way out of our seemingly hopeless tangle. Then, in rebuttal to its own argument, the *Digest* offered a quotation from one of the "representatives" (?) of our people, taken from the *Christian Century*, to the effect that such an attempt was entirely futile, for the New Testament offered no adequate basis for union. If the light that is among us be

darkness, how great is that darkness! If our leadership fail us, is it not time to begin anew a tremendous proclamation of the gospel message? Is there any other religious body which can call the Christian world back to the person and teaching of the Christ with such power? With all kindness and love, but with untiring persistence, let us get the facts of the New Testament before the religious world. If we are in error in our message, if it does not measure up to the New Testament both in fact and in emphasis, then we must be willing to surrender anything that can not stand this searching test. No one has ever claimed we are infallible. In such a spirit, can we not continue to urge our denominational friends to a renewed study of the word of God? Away with shameful silence! "Fear them not, therefore; what ye hear in the ear, proclaim upon the housetops."

The spirit of compromise overshadows the church and all its future. Where is the layman to be found to-day who in his store, shop or field proclaims the gospel "from the housetops" as it was done in the Pentecostal age? The ~~SPIRITUAL PARALYSIS~~ body of the church. The congregation is not only silent, but it sometimes asks that the pulpit be silent in order that the community may sleep on in peace. And how often the preacher keeps his ear to the ground. He preaches not to please the Christ, but the community. And while we know our differences on vital matters *must* be settled some day, either according to the facts or by way of the prejudice of the majority, yet we drift on in silence. Meanwhile the spirit of compromise, this creeping paralysis, spreads further. The Jews meet in New York City and offer heated protest to the Presbyterian Mission Board

because the latter has appropriated a large sum for preaching Christ to the Jews of America. The very idea of such a thing! How discourteous to attempt to tell anybody about Christ and try to get him to believe in Him! Horrible! In the name of the brotherhood of man, the Jew forbids it. And the matter is settled amicably. The Presbyterian still claims the privilege of preaching Christ, but will not claim any patriotic motives in so doing. He will no longer speak of Christian America or claim to be helping the work of Americanization. The Buddhists meet in Tokyo and demand admission into the World's Sunday School Convention. Are their Sunday schools not as good as ours? They are deliberately copied after the Christian pattern. Of course, there is a little matter of Christ and Buddha, the worship of one God and many idols; but, then, can we ever hope for uniformity in such trifles? Is not Buddha just as good as Christ, and are not Buddhists striving for the moral uplift of the world? In the name of the brotherhood of man, the Buddhist demands recognition. And some of the leaders in the Sunday School Convention in Tokyo argued that courtesy and the true Christian spirit demanded such fraternal relations.

And while the church plays the coward, and is paralyzed by fear, its foes work with feverish intensity. Buddhism cries "Peace!" in Asia, but invades America boldly in widespread printed propaganda under the title "Theosophy." The woman who has jumped from Christ to Mrs. Eddy becomes the ready tool of the Buddhist propagandist. And the peril of the church increases so long as she remains in the present state of coma—paralyzed and afraid to preach the gospel. The church must live by preaching; silence is death.

The situation becomes a thousand-fold worse because of the hold materialism has upon our colleges and many of our pulpits. The bold and insistent attack on the supernatural character of Christ and Christianity is sifting down to the masses, and even where it is not definitely understood and adopted, yet its skeptical declarations constantly react to create a condition of indifference and listlessness on the part of the church as a whole toward the teachings of the New Testament. The emphasis of "brotherhood," "good fellowship," "courtesy" and other diplomatic appeals tends to cause many to say: "Well, is it really worth while to contend any longer 'for the faith once for all delivered to the saints'? Of course, union ought to come by restoring the New Testament church; but, then, we have been trying to preach that for a long time and have never brought it about, and compromise seems now the only method." They forget what a long, discouraging road led to the abolition of slavery and the liquor traffic. They do not realize the secret force back of this paralysis of the church is the radical propoganda that Christ is not divine and that the Bible is not inspired in the unique sense the church has always believed, and the church therefore is free to follow its own inclinations, and is no longer bound by the authority of Christ.

Add to this the tremendous drive of Bolshevism and related radical socialists in all countries against the church. Lenine and Trotsky and their successors have devoted uncounted millions to the work of sending out tracts against the established principles and institutions of civilization. The effect of this printed propoganda has been terrific. Even though much of the argument has been ridiculous, it has fairly shaken the foundations of civilization. How long will the church

remain asleep, unaware of its peril and supreme opportunity?

See the apostles arrested and led before the Sanhedrin. Pentecost has turned Jerusalem upside down. The proclamation of the gospel must be stopped, and the apostles are commanded to keep silent on pain of death.

Hear the magnificent response of Peter and John: "Whether it is right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye: for we cannot but speak the things which we saw and heard."

Stephen is stoned to death. James is beheaded. Hundreds of the early Christians are torn from their homes and thrown in prison. The church is rent asunder and scattered to the four winds. Do they slink into caves and holes? Do they hide in strange communities their new-found faith? Do suffering and impending death silence their message? No. They go everywhere preaching the gospel, and they proclaim it from the housetops.

Paul and Silas sit with bleeding backs and with feet and hands confined in the stocks. They recount the victories, the joys and the sufferings of the day. A Christian hymn full of undying devotion is sung with passionate intensity, and the foundations of the prison-house are shaken and doors opened. The gospel again triumphs over all difficulties.

Paul faces death in prison at Rome. Is he diplomatically silent? Nay; bonds, imprisonment and waiting death add glorious, overpowering weight to his message. The faint-hearted who had spoken only in feeble whispers take courage and proclaim aloud. Even the household of Caesar feels the thrill of God's coming kingdom. "Most of the brethren in the Lord, being

confident through my bonds, are more abundantly bold to speak the word of God without fear" (Phil. 1:14).

The early Christians are flung to the wild beasts in the arena, but they will not deny their Christ. They are crucified, but Christ's words ring in their hearts: "Fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." They proclaim the gospel from the crosses where they hang.

Martin Luther stands before Charles V. and all the high and mighty dignitaries, civil and ecclesiastical, of the empire. They demand retraction and silence. Staring death in the face, Luther in the supreme moment of his life refuses to retract one single sentence unless it be proved false. And his voice, thundering from the housetops of the Dark Ages, proclaims the dawn of a new day.

The Campbells, Stone and their contemporaries are voices crying in the wilderness, and they can not be silenced. Not death, but deadly ridicule and persecution, beset their path. But they shout the message of restoration and union from the housetops, and a divided world recovers from spiritual paralysis and awakens to a new life.

Can we share this glorious heritage and not have fellowship in their sufferings? Can the church of Christ be rescued, revived, restored by any other than the thorny path—the *via sacra*?

When Oliver Wendell Holmes was a law student at Harvard, he read one day in the paper the announcement of the Secretary of the Navy that the old battleship "Constitution" was to be dismantled and the valuable parts salvaged and used in the construction of more modern vessels. The old ship was one of the most famous monuments of our struggles for freedom.

She was launched in 1797 and bore the scars of many a victorious sea-fight. Holmes, in hot wrath, flung himself into his college room and scratched off the ringing verses of "Old Ironsides" that stirred the whole nation. For to Holmes the ship was no mere collection of boards and rivets, but the sacred monument of his country's freedom. And now the poem comes thundering back, and this time the old ship seems to take on the mantle of God's glorious kingdom, the hope of the human race which some seek to destroy, others to dismantle that they may rebuild to suit their own peculiar fancies, and which many view with stupid indifference while they are robbed of the pearl of great price. Holmes' words which saved the famous ship were these:

"Ay, tear her tattered ensign down!
Long has it waved on high,
And many an eye has danced to see
That banner in the sky;
Beneath it rang the battle shout
And burst the cannon's roar;
The meteor of the ocean air
Shall sweep the clouds no more.

"Her deck, once red with heroes' blood,
Where knelt the vanquished foe,
When winds were hurrying o'er the flood,
And waves were white below,
No more shall feel the victor's tread,
Or know the conquered knee;
The harpies of the shore shall pluck
The eagle of the sea!

"Oh, better that her shattered hulk
Should sink beneath the wave;
Her thunders shook the mighty deep,
And there should be her grave;

Nail to the mast her holy flag,
Set every threadbare sail,
And give her to the God of storms,
The lightning and the gale! "

Out upon the skeptic who would lay insolent and unholy hands upon the church of Christ! Everlasting shame upon the selfish and cowardly ingrate who refuses to speak for the Christ and His church in an hour like this! Remember that God's Son said: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away." "Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." Hear and heed His challenge: "Go, preach my gospel."

"Thou, too, sail on (O church of Christ!),
Sail on (O Kingdom), strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!
We know what Master laid thy keel,
What Workman wrought thy ribs of steel,
Who made each mast and sail and rope,
What anvils rang, what hammers beat,
In what a forge and what a heat
Were shaped the anchors of thy hope!
Fear not each sudden sound and shock,
'Tis of the wave and not the rock;
'Tis but the flapping of the sail,
And not a rent made by the gale!
In spite of rock and tempest's roar,
In spite of false lights on the shore,
Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea!
Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee;
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee—are all with thee!"

IX.

WHENCE THE CHURCH—BY EVOLUTION OR BY REVELATION?

IF Jesus came into the world to save sinners, then it is self-evident He must have made known to men how they might obtain this salvation. In clear and emphatic language He declared His purpose to build His church, and designated Peter as His agent and spokesman. It is unthinkable, then, that He should have failed to make known the fundamental or constitutional elements of this organization.

There are two views abroad to-day concerning the church. One is that it came by evolution. "In the beginning" the church was a sort of formless void that came into being like a snowball rolling down the hill and shaping itself according to the inequalities of the earth. This has been called the "*dynamic view*" of the origin of the church. The form of church government is represented as a mere development of the synagogue system and the teachings of the church—a combination of Judaism and Hellenism. Some radical scholars hold that the very ordinances of the church are but imitations of the customs of Greek mystery religions or other cults. It need hardly be remarked that this view cuts the New Testament to ribbons. And in the light of the calm and explicit declaration of Jesus, "Upon this rock I will build *my* church," this evolutionary view impeaches not merely the divinity, but

also the common honesty and common sense, of the Master.

The other view is that the church came by revelation. The Saviour, who gave His life for the church, Himself laid down the regulations as to how a man might get into the church and remain in it. The two great ordinances rest upon the authority of Christ, either in His express words or in the inspired leading of His apostles or spokesmen. The fact that the church was not established during the public ministry of Jesus does not divorce its origin from the Master, for He explicitly committed the task of its organization into the hands of Peter and the other apostles, stating that He would send the Holy Spirit to guide them in their pronouncements and labors. The fact that not all the features of the church were ordained at the same time does not prove that they came by a process of natural evolution. The church developed, but at each stage the inspired apostles dictated its development, so that it came by stages of revelation. The Pentecostal pronouncement does not seem to contain any instruction as to the Lord's Supper; but as soon as the church was organized this instruction was given by the apostles, for we find the church immediately began to commemorate the Lord's death by partaking of the Supper at the same time that it commemorated His resurrection by assembling on the first day of the week. Even Acts 2:42 sets this forth by the inseparable manner in which the "breaking of bread" is linked up with the other features of their regular worship in public assembly. "The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch," and not at Jerusalem. At the proper time this feature of the church was ordained. It makes no difference whether the Greek word *chrematidzo* does

or does not mean that the Holy Spirit first gave this name to the disciples. The fact remains that the apostles dictated its permanent use. Thus the fact that the revelations as to the will of Christ were not given all at one time, but were made known by the apostles when the proper moment came, does not prove that the church arose by a mere course of natural evolution. Neither does the fact that the church developed, after the days of the apostles, in directions contrary to their instructions prove that it was of human, rather than of divine, origin. For the apostles foresaw and clearly predicted the apostasy of the church and sought in every way to help the church to remain loyal to the will of Christ. This has been called the static view of the origin of the church. It insists that "other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." It insists that the initiatory regulations and fundamental framework rest upon the authority of Christ, and no man has the right to change them. It holds that Christ spoke not merely for one age or people, but for all time and for the whole world. The church, then, does not rest on the dynamite of man's ever-changing theories or restless desire for convenience or his personal whims, but on the solid rock Christ Jesus through implicit obedience to His commands.

The term "static" is of course an epithet—applied in derision by our radical friends. If it be meant by the term "static" that this view stultifies the intellect and leaves no room for freedom of thought or development of the church in any direction under modern leadership, then such an opprobrium should be repudiated. For this viewpoint asserts that, while the fundamental elements of the church are revealed and

unchangeable, the multitudinous matters of expediency have been, left to the wisdom of the disciples. It does not hold that the church has been given to us in all its details, as a blueprint or pattern let down from heaven that can be followed without the use of the intelligence. Here, as elsewhere, there is a field of faith and opinion. Here also the touchstone is the word and saving work of the Christ—that which has His express command, that which pertains to man's salvation, that which sets forth His saving death and His resurrection, stands near the center of the circle. These things must be preserved intact and defended at all costs. Besides these, there is a vast fringe of matters about which we must allow the utmost liberty of opinion.

The dictionary says that the term "static" applies to bodies at rest or in equilibrium, to passive as distinguished from active elements. Now, when this word is bestowed upon the conservative viewpoint, is it intended to suggest that such a view chocks the wheels of progress, kills the missionary vision and zeal of the church and causes it to perish from dry rot? A sufficient rejoinder is to point out the history of Unitarianism, the boldest and clearest example of the radical viewpoint—the pattern par excellence of the "dynamic" theory. Has Unitarianism been so full of inner power that it has conquered the world, while the rest of Christianity sat still and watched the performance? Has Unitarianism ever made any discernible impression outside of New England, the place of its birth? Did it even have the "dynamics" to stay the inundation of Christian Science in Boston itself?

"Static" comes from the good old Latin word *sto*, which means "to stand," and there is a sense in which

its use here is appropriate. Christ compared His church to a building, and the very fundamental quality of a building is that it be able to stand after it has once been constructed. Dynamite has its uses, but I have not heard that it afforded a permanent and desirable foundation for a great building. At any rate, Christ preferred a "rock" as the foundation for this structure—the church. And no building can long endure without a solid foundation, and without some solid framework that renders it permanent.

Given a "static" building, there should be "dynamic" inhabitants to justify its existence and make it useful in the world. The "dynamics," the vital energy of the church, comes not from the power to move it away from its foundation or alter its architecture to suit the passing whim, but from "love." This is the motive power of God and man—of all the world. When the soul of the Christian becomes full of a consuming love for God and his fellow-man, then his life becomes full of power, then the church begins to throb with power and to move the world. Upon what has the evolutionary theory fed that it has grown so great in its own eyes as to arrogate to itself the title "dynamic," which belongs to love? Has evolution revealed dynamics which lift men above Jesus?

Both the radical and the conservative deplore the present divided condition of the church, but the former, with his evolutionary idea of the origin of the church, is ready for union at any price. Not all of the group have followed on to this logical conclusion, but it is inevitable that they either separate themselves from the group or yield to its relentless pressure. For if by man came the church, then by the dictation of man may come the reunion.

The conservative is eager for union, but it must ever remain secondary to loyalty to the Christ Himself. For if by Christ came the church, and through man's sinful compromising came its fall, then only by a return to the original church established by Christ's direction can come permanent reunion.

With such a background it is inevitable that the radical should reckon by majorities. This is the way of the world. And it would seem thoroughly democratic to let the majority vote decide the questions at issue in the Christian world. But dare we barter away our vital faith in this fashion? The Interchurch World Movement proposed to count by majorities. There was in the early promulgation of plans not even the respectability of an appeal to a general majority, but to a local one. In a given town or village the majority should rule, the weaker churches should close up and join with the church that happened to have the majority in that particular community.

And when we are reminded that in China "those who practice immersion are few, while those who practice sprinkling are many," we have the same appeal to majorities. The conclusion is that therefore, when union comes in China, immersion must give way.

Strange to say, this was the opening gun fired by Mr. Rice in the Campbell-Rice debate. He held that the majority was about one thousand to one in favor of sprinkling. But Mr. Campbell replied that practically all the Christian world for the first thirteen centuries, and fully one-half for the last five centuries, have been immersed, and the majority is therefore on the other side. Moreover, in the most incisive manner, he pointed out that it was not a question of the opinion of the majority, but of the actual facts in the case.

A recent Roman Catholic writer argues that every Roman Catholic living or dead is an additional argument for the truth of the teachings of the Catholic Church. But just how much weight should be allowed the unsupported opinion of a person born and bred in a belief that he accepted without question or consideration? Can the opinion of the uninstructed majority be allowed to outweigh an irrefragable statement of the evidence?

The "dynamist" has generally abandoned the proclamation of the evidence for the institutions and principles of the church of Christ which the world has found so convincing throughout the whole history of the Restoration movement. He is intent on other propaganda—to prove that the church arose by mere course of natural evolution (in that case, the Roman Catholic is justified in his assumption of the right to add or subtract at will, and the Protestant theorist at liberty to work out any sort of compromise that suits his fancy); to prove that the Bible is no such accurate and all-sufficient guide for the Christian as has been proclaimed, but that it is merely a bit of very fine, ancient literature, that, however, is as full of fable and falsehood as any other book of the same period; to prove that Jesus is not the supreme Being that has been preached for two thousand years, but very little above the modern radical scholar, different only in degree; and hence the "inner conscience" shall have the authority to say: "Get Thee behind me, O Christ, for the things which Thou speakest savorest of the supernatural, the unscientific, the superstitious and the impossible."

But the great hosts of the church still hear the words of the Master, "If ye continue in my word, then

are ye my disciples indeed," and there they *stand* and listen and then *go forward* and proclaim. One of the most critical need's of this hour is for a tremendous revival of the discussion of the fundamental issues of Christianity. The truth should be proclaimed, insistently and fearlessly, but in the most fraternal spirit. The man who would cease the proclamation because some of his friends differ from him, and would rest the case in the hands of an uninstructed majority, is not true to the Christ. From Bolshevism and Christian Science we should learn the value of printed propaganda and endeavor to send broadcast in wholesale fashion brief and pointed statements of the "New Testament Evidence on Baptism," "The Lord's Supper," "The Name and Constitution of the Church," "The Place of Christ in the Thinking and Life of the Christian" and "The Permanence and Uniqueness of the Word of God." With tracts circulating throughout the country, many a congregation floundering in the mire of doubt can be reached, and the irresistible march of the truth will continue.

X.

DOCTRINAL OUTLINES

ACTION OF BAPTISM.

EVIDENCE FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT.

"They were baptized of him in the river Jordan" (Matt. 3:6).

CONCLUSION.—It is possible to lead a person out into a river and then sprinkle him. *Possible, but not sensible.* Did you ever see it done that way?

"And John also was baptizing in Ænon near to Salim, because there was much water there" (John 3:23).

Not "many springs" (drinking-water for the multitudes), for why, then, did not the learned pedobaptist translators so render it? The multitudes are not mentioned. John was not *preaching* in Ænon because of "many springs," but *baptizing* in Ænon because of "much water" necessary for immersion.

"They came unto a certain water" (Acts 8:36).

Thus only can one be immersed. Where is the New Testament passage that asserts water was ever brought to a candidate to baptize him?

"They both went down into the water" (Acts 8:38).

Not "near to" or "close by," for why, then, did not the pedobaptist translators themselves so render

it? And why, then, not say the wicked east "near to" or "close by" hell, and not "into hell"? (Matt. 18:9.)

"Came up out of the water" (Acts 8:39; Matt. 3:16).

This necessary in immersion, but not for sprinkling or pouring.

"Buried with 'him in 'baptism" (Col. 2:12; Rom. 6:4).

Not "baptism in the Holy Spirit," for why, then, "buried *with Mm*," instead of "in the Holy Spirit"? And if "baptize in Holy Spirit" should mean "*bury* in Holy Spirit," then must not "baptize in water" (Matt. 3:11) mean "bury in water"? Baptism is a burial.

"Wherein ye were also raised with him" (Col. 2:12). *"Like as Christ was raised from the dead . . . so we also might walk in newness of life"* (Rom. 6:4).

And also a resurrection. This not "baptism in Holy Spirit," for how are we *raised out of* the Holy Spirit to a new life? Buried in the watery grave as Christ in the tomb, raised therefrom a new creature— a Christian.

"One Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph. 4:5).

One universal baptism for all believers—immersion in water in name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

"Except one be born of water and the Spirit" (John 3:5).

What is there about sprinkling or pouring that suggests to the witnesses the burial and resurrection of Jesus? In what way are they like a birth? DECISIVE QUOTATIONS FROM LEXICONS AND SCHOLARS.

Baptizo.

F. Brenner (Roman Catholic): "Thirteen hundred years was baptism generally and ordinarily performed by the

immersion of a man under water, and only in extraordinary cases was sprinkling or affusion permitted. These latter methods of baptism were called in question and even prohibited." ("Work on Baptism," Augusti, Denkwurd, VII., p. 68.)

1. Liddell and Scott—"Baptize, to dip in or under water."

Luther: "On this account I could wish that such as are baptized should be completely immersed into water according to the meaning of the word and the signification of the ordinance ... as also without doubt, it was instituted by Christ." ("Works," Vol. XI., p. 76, Ed. 1551.)

2. Sophocles—"To dip, to immerse, to sink."

Calvin (Presbyterian): "The very word 'baptize' signifies 'to immerse,' and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the primitive church." ("Institutes," Vol. XL, chap. 15, sec. 49.)

3. Cremer—"To immerse; to submerge."

Philip Schaff (Presbyterian): "Immersion, and not sprinkling, was unquestionably the original form of baptism. Baptism is to immerse in water." ("History of Apostolic Church," pp. 568, 569.)

4. Greenfield—"Immerse, immerge, submerge, sink." Also Robinson, Anthon, Scapula, Stephanus, Robertson, Schleusner, Pasor, Donnegan, etc.

Wesley (Methodist): "We are buried with Him, alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." ("Notes on the New Testament," Rom. 6:3.)

"Baptized according to the custom of the first church and the rule of the Church of England, by immersion." ("Journal," Vol. I., p. 20.)

IN THE FAMOUS CAMPBELL-RICE DEBATE.

Mr. Campbell piled up lexicons mountain high that translated *baptizo* by "immerse." He repeatedly chal-

lenged Mr. Rice to produce one reputable lexicon that translated it "sprinkle." (C.-R. Debate, pp. 58-62.)

Mr. Rice was able to assemble two lexicons that translated *baptizo* by "sprinkle." One by a man named Groves, who proved to be a recent writer of no scholarly reputation, who had inserted the word "sprinkle" without any authority for so doing. The other was by Ursinus, a famous ancient scholar, but it turned out that the earlier copies did not contain the definition "sprinkle"—late editors had deliberately inserted it. (C.-R. Debate, pp. 68, 69, 75.)

The word "baptize" occurs 120 times in the New Testament. Mr. Campbell cited thirty-six different translations of the Bible into different languages, making 4,320 times the word is translated. He challenged Mr. Rice to show a single time it is rendered "sprinkle." (C.-R. Debate, pp. 110, 111.)

Mr. Rice thought that he had found such a case—Rev. 19:13, as rendered in Vulgate, Ethiopia and Syriac by "sprinkle." But Mr. Campbell argued that the verb in the original text must have been *rantizo* (sprinkle), as it is an impossibility for *baptizo* to be translated 4,319 times by one meaning and once by an exactly opposite meaning. Manuscripts now available show that the original word was from *rantizo*, and the standard editions of the Greek New Testament now so record it. (C.-R. Debate, pp. 119, 139.)

THE SUBJECT AND DESIGN OF BAPTISM.

"John . . . preached the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins" (Mark 1:4).

"And they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins" (Matt. 3:6).

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16).

"Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your

ferring to baptism; and if it be not so understood, it is difficult to give an account how a person is born of water, any more than born of wood." ("History of Baptism," Vol. I., p. 110.)

Timothy Dwight (former president of Yale—Congregationalist) : "To be born of water here means baptism, and in my view it is as necessary to our admission into the visible church; as to be born of the Spirit is to our admission into the invisible kingdom." "He who understands the authority of this institution, and refuses to obey it, will never enter into either the visible or the invisible kingdom." (Vol. IV., pp. 300, 301.)

John Wesley (Methodist) : "By water, then, as a mean, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again; whence it is also called by the apostle 'the washing of regeneration.' Our church, therefore, ascribes no greater virtue to baptism than Christ Himself has done. Nor does she ascribe it to the outward washing, but to the inward grace, which, added thereto, makes it sacrament." ("Treatise on Baptism," 1825.)

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

THE TIME OF THE OBSERVANCE.

Evidence from the New Testament shows that Christ gave it as a permanent institution of the church. He asks frequency of observance.

Luke 22:19: "This do in remembrance of me."

1 Cor. 11:26: "For as *often* as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come."

Acts 2:42: "And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in *the breaking of bread* and the prayers."

The church, when established, immediately began the observance and continued with the same persistence and frequency that marked their regular assembling.

Acts 20:7: "And upon *the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread*, Paul discoursed with them."

The church at Troas was accustomed to meet on the first day of every week to partake of the Lord's Supper.

1 Cor. 16:2: "Upon *the first day of the week* let each one of you lay by him in store."

1 Cor. 11:20: "*When therefore ye assemble yourselves together, it is not possible to eat the Lord's supper.*"

The church at Corinth met on the first day of every week. At its regular meeting they partook of the Lord's Supper.

Query: Why commemorate the *resurrection* (by assembling on the first day of the week) more frequently than the *death* of Jesus (by partaking of the Lord's Supper)?

Query: What New Testament passage argues for any sort of service on the Lord's Day that does not also argue for the observance of the Lord's Supper on that day?

EVIDENCE FROM EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

Justin Martyr (Apologia 1:67. Justin Martyr wrote about 140 A. D.): "*And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the Memoirs of the Apostles or the Writings of the Prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imita-*

tion of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgiving, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons."

In like manner—Pliny, Epistles, Book 10; Tertullian, De Oro, page 135.

QUOTATIONS FROM SCHOLARS.

John Calvin (Presbyterian) : "It ought to have been far otherwise. *Every week*, at least, the table of the Lord should have been spread for Christian assemblies, and the promises declared by which, in partaking of it, we might be spiritually fed." (Book VI., chap. 18, sec. 56.)

Dr. John Mason (Presbyterian) : "Mr. Fuller does not deny the *Lord's Supper was observed by the first Christians every Lord's Day* (nor will this be denied by any man who has candidly investigated the subject). . . . Dr. Scott, in his valuable Commentary, observes on this passage (Acts 20:7): 'Breaking of bread, or commemorating the death of Christ in the Eucharist, was one chief end of their assembling; this ordinance seems to have been *constantly administered every Lord's Day*.'" ("Fuller's Strictures on Sandemanianism," New York edition, p. 188.)

"Weekly communions did not die with the apostles and their contemporaries. There is a cloud of witnesses to testify that they were kept up by succeeding

Christians, with great care and tenderness, for above two centuries. It is not necessary to swell these pages with quotations. The fact is indisputable.

"Communion every Lord's Day was universal, and was preserved in the Greek church till the seventh century; and such as neglected three weeks together were excommunicated." ("Letters on Frequent Communion," pp. 34-38.)

John Wesley (Methodist) : *"I also advise the elders to administer the Supper of the Lord on every Lord's Day."* ("Letters to America," 1784.)

Remarks: Concerning other phases of the institution about which there is more unanimity of opinion—

1. As to the interpretation of "This is my body," cf. 1 Cor. 11:24 and 26, 27; John 15:1-5.

2. As to who should partake of the Lord's Supper, cf. 1 Cor. 11:27-29. The decision rests with the individual.

3. Manner of observance, cf. Matt. 26:26-30; Mark 14:22-26; Luke 22:14-20; 1 Cor. 11:20-34.

THE NAME OF THE CHURCH.

"CHURCHES OF CHRIST."

The church is called by various names in the New Testament—"the church" (Acts 2:47; 5:11; 8:1, etc.); "church of God" (1 Cor. 1:2); "churches of Christ" (Rom. 16:16).

The name "*church of Christ*" is the distinctive name of the church.

1. This is the only Scriptural title that honors its head. "And he is the head of the body, the church . . . that in all things he might have the pre-eminence" (Col. 1:18).

"Now ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof" (1 Cor. 12:27).

2. No other title so fitly proclaims the mystical union of Christ with His church. "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church and gave himself up for it" (Eph. 5:25).

3. No other title so completely reveals the ownership of Christ. "On this rock I will build *my* church" (Matt. 16:18).

The individual followers of Christ are called by various names in the New Testament. Disciples—Luke 14:26; Acts 6:1, etc.; Believers—Acts 5:14; Brethren—Acts 10:23; Saints—Acts 9:13, etc. But the distinctive title is "Christian."

1. "The disciples were called *Christians* first in Antioch" (Acts 11:26). Whether called by the Holy Spirit or by the heathen does not matter—for the inspired apostles accepted and used the name; cf. the following passage.

2. "If a man suffer as a *Christian*, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God in *this name*" (1 Pet. 4:16).

3. "Almost thou persuadest me to be a *Christian*" (Acts 26:28).

4. We should wear the name of Him who was crucified for us and into whose name we were baptized. Paul besought the Corinthians not to wear his name, for "was Paul *crucified* for you? or were ye *baptized into the name of Paul?*" "They were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. 1:13; cf. Acts 19:5).

5. No other name honors Christ as our Saviour. "Neither is there *any other name* under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved" (Acts 4:12; cf. Acts 3:6; 4:10).

QUOTATIONS FROM FAMOUS SCHOLARS.

Martin Luther: "I pray you to leave my name alone, and call not yourselves Lutherans, but *Christians*. Who is Luther? My doctrine is not mine. I have not been crucified for any one. St. Paul (1 Cor. 1:13) would not have any should call themselves of Paul, nor of Peter, but of Christ. How, then, does it befit me, a miserable bag of dust and ashes, to give my name to the children of Christ? Cease, my dear friends, to cling to these party names and distinctions; away with them all; and let us call ourselves only Christians after Him from whom our doctrine comes." ("Life of Luther," by Stork, p. 289.)

John Wesley (Methodist) : "Would to God that all party names and unscriptural phrases and forms which have divided the Christian world were forgot; that we might all agree to sit down together as humble, loving disciples at the feet of the common Master to hear His word, to imbibe His spirit and to transcribe His life in our own."

And again he wished that "the very name [Methodist] might never be mentioned more, but be buried in eternal oblivion." ("Universal Knowledge," Vol. IX., p. 540.)

Alexander Campbell: "But, alas! the enemies have blasphemed the blessed gospel by pasting our sinful names upon it to bring it into disrepute."

EMINENT BAPTISTS ON THE NAME "CHRISTIAN."

Of course, Dr. Dawes' terminology to which exception was taken is but the accommodation of my good brother to a name given us as a people in opprobrium. In the records of all our older churches will be found

the name "The Church of Christ."—M. P. Hunt, Field Sec., Southern Baptist Convention, Kansas City, Mo., June 9, 1904.

I sometimes feel sorry that the word "Baptist," which was flung at us by our enemies and stuck, should be our name, for often its accent of an act obscures to others our great mission to the world. Perhaps yet we will go back to the name "Christian."—Dr. Henson, in the General Convention of Baptist Churches at Cleveland, O., May 19, 1904.

If the church is the bride of Christ, the bride must have been the same as the bridegroom. If the church is the body of Christ, she must have the same name as her Head. It would be strange if my body and my head should bear different names. In some comments on the passage, "The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch," it is held that this name was given in derision. I think not. If you study the use of the Greek word "called," you will conclude that they were divinely called Christians. God gave them that name. James speaks about rich men blaspheming that "beautiful name by which you are called."—A. J. Gordon, in "Select Northfield Sermons."

The name "Presbyterian," "Congregationalist," "Methodist" or "Baptist," however much we love it, and however loyal we are to it now, is to give place to that name which is above every other name. The day will come when those dashing waves of time and eternity shall strip off every name but one—not our name, but the name of our Lord and Saviour, our Prophet, Priest and King, will abide, and amid the light of earth and the increasing glory of eternity that name shall alone be read, Jesus Christ.—R. S. McArthur, New York City.

I look forward with pleasure to the day when there will not be a Baptist living. I hope they will soon be gone. I hope the Baptist name will soon perish; but let Christ's name last forever.—Spurgeon Mem. Library, Vol. I., p. 168.

XI.

MISSIONS AND CONTROVERSY

THE intense concentration of Jesus' ministry is a thing of very deep significance. During those three years He might easily have taught in Athens and Rome, as well *as* Jerusalem, or have even visited Spain. But He did not. The stony soil could be cultivated later on; it was wise to first sow the seed in the fertile and carefully prepared field—the chosen race—Israel. The disciples, also, on their first mission, were commanded to go only to those of the house of Israel. It would seem the logical thing for Jesus to have centered His ministry in the capital, so thought His unbelieving brethren (John 7:4). But to the Galileans—bold and fearless, untrammled in their ideals and ways of living, and eager in their expectation of the Messiah—Jesus committed the most of His ministry. Even among the Galileans Jesus did not undertake to secure a great mass of heterogeneous followers, who, because of their numbers, must necessarily be uninstructed. For the moment His personality was withdrawn such a following would immediately dissolve in misunderstandings and controversy. What Jesus actually did was to gather a little band of disciples and get a new species of life started among them, to make their instruction and preparation thorough and complete, to send the Holy Spirit upon them with great power, so that they might proclaim the full gospel,

organize a church, start Christianity on its world-wide conquest and commit the account of His life and teaching and the early history of the church to writing, so that all generations might be guided thereby.

The history of Christian missions is a thrilling narrative. It is a story of supreme self-sacrifice amid incredible hardships, of ultimate victory in spite of towering obstacles, but of continual setbacks and defeat through false leadership within the church. Wherever Christianity has met with disaster, it has almost invariably been through the disloyalty and treason of those within its own ranks. The checkered career of Israel—first faithful and triumphant, then compromising with idolatry and suffering defeat, and again repentant at the call of the faithful few—has been repeated over and over again in the history of Christianity.

From Jerusalem "they went everywhere preaching the gospel," and the whole world opened its heart to receive the divine message. Its conquering march had scarcely begun before some half-Christian Jews proposed a compromise with Judaism. "And certain men came down from Judaea and taught the brethren, saying, Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses, ye cannot be saved. And Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and questioning with them" (Acts 15:1, 2). It was a difficult thing to overcome Jewish prejudice. A crucified Messiah was bad enough, but when the law was also nailed to the cross, it was too much. And so some of the self-appointed leaders at Jerusalem decided that Christianity could never hope to overcome Jewish prejudice, and, besides, the only courteous thing to do with such religious neighbors was to recognize "the essential validity" of the Old Testa-

ment law, and proceed to practice a sort of "open membership," so that the Jew might be received without the embarrassment of asking him to surrender his loyalty to Moses and the law, and without asking him to acknowledge the exclusive authority of Jesus. And, of course, the high moral character of the Jew was plain to all, and it would have been an "entirely unchristian thing" to cast insinuations upon him by asking him to surrender the very foundation on which his system of morals was built! Christ, of course, must be accepted as Saviour, but the Old Testament law was also to be retained as obligatory. Thus Christianity and Judaism were to be combined. The manifest absurdity of a salvation only through Christ and also through the law, of a salvation through grace and also through works, did not disturb the equanimity of these leaders.

What a towering figure is Paul standing for the truth of Christ amidst all sorts of reviling and criticism! How many Jewish Christians must have denounced him as narrow-minded for urging the exclusive supremacy of Christ! How many epithets must have been heaped upon him as his critics represented him as a "false apostle," hard-hearted, narrow-minded, a self-seeker! Their "inner conscience" assured them—and of course this final source of authority is infallible—that Paul was utterly lacking in love for his brethren. The letters of Paul teem with references to the Judaizers—how they dogged his steps, following him all over the Christian world; how they replied to his clear-cut, trenchant and ringing arguments by pusillanimous slander. They must have represented Paul as a base ingrate; he had received his life training at the feet of Gamaliel, the master exponent of the law, and now

he represented the law as of no importance. They tried to make the churches he had established in Galatia and elsewhere believe he was a selfish scoundrel who would disrupt the church in order to elevate himself. There is something distinctly modern about this controversy. As one attempts to trace the Judaizers through the Pauline Epistles, their trail suggests the aroma of certain educational institutions and missionary organizations of to-day.

At the great assembly at Jerusalem this question was threshed out and decided for all time. One of the master strokes of his opponents must have been to argue the utter impossibility of ever spreading the gospel if it kept its exclusive Christian message; it must be broadened out to take in the tenets of Judaism if the Jews were ever to be won.

But Paul scored a strong point by showing the wonderful victories his message had already achieved on the mission fields.

At Antioch the controversy broke out anew. The dissension between Peter and Paul was not because these two leaders had different "theologies," different conceptions of the fundamental teaching of Christianity, as some learned "modernists" inform us. The trouble arose because Peter failed to live up to what both knew to be the truth of the gospel. When Peter first came to Antioch he thrust the Old Testament law behind him, and ate and associated with the Gentiles, but when representatives of the Judaizers came from Jerusalem, Peter became fearful that a controversy would arise again, and so he withdrew himself and no longer associated with the Gentile Christians. Even Barnabas yielded to the pressure. It was feared the early church might split asunder. "Peace at all costs"

seems to have been their maxim. But when Paul came, he did not yield the truth of Christ for a moment. Neither did he call a committee meeting and keep the thing under cover. The future of Christianity was at stake, and he faced Peter, with his inconsistency, before them all, and the final victory was won.

The disastrous effects of this controversy on the missionary labors of the church can easily be imagined. The group of Judaizers kept up the struggle and followed Paul from one mission station to another, seeking to disrupt his work and destroy the truth of the gospel. But two things stand out: Christianity outrode the storm; the missionary work was retarded and hindered, but victory finally came to the incessant labors of Paul. Again, the gospel itself was preserved. What would have been the result if Paul had yielded to the aggressive propagandists, as the "peace at any price" advocates were willing to do? What if Paul had said that the work of spreading the gospel was the primary consideration, and that the message itself was a mere secondary matter? Is the course of our present missionary conventions wise? Only the "big things" may find a place on the program, and these are the discussion of the field and the messengers. Because there has arisen a difference of opinion about the message itself, all discussion of this is taboo. The absurdity of this course is manifest. We must have no controversy, we are told. But will it suffice to cover up these differences? It is not courteous to discuss baptism and other disputed topics in the pulpit, we are told. But must not these questions be settled? With John R. Most we may ask: Is Christianity all hands and feet? Is the whole message summed up in the word "go," or does Christianity demand the use

of the head also? Does it demand that the messenger preach, that he understand and proclaim a definite, saving message?

Again, when Christianity had conquered heathen Rome, and the empire had become nominally Christian, the fires of other controversies arose. This is to be deplored. They proved disastrous to the progress of Christianity; but what lessons are we to learn from them to-day?

An essay recently published by a great missionary organization for use in Christian Endeavor societies describes the wonderful extent and prosperity of Christianity in northern Africa in the early period of the Christian era. Then, in sharp contrast, is pictured the desolate wastes, and the difference is represented by "controversy" that has swept this region and destroyed the unity and vital life of these Christian communities. The inference is left on the surface that all controversy is sinful, and he who lifts his voice in the discussion of disputed topics in the church is betraying the cause of missions and bringing ruin to the church. This is a very beautiful, sentimental appeal, but what are the facts in the case?

When the church began to be flooded with the erroneous teaching of the Sabellians and of Arius, what would have happened to Christianity if there had not been an Athanasius to defend the truth and to carry the conviction of the Christian world with him? It is too bad that the controversy arose. But was it a misfortune that the church had such an able thinker and leader as Athanasius? Was he striking a blow at the progress of Christianity when he took up the gauntlet and answered the various heresies that were threatening to overrun Christianity? What speedier doom

could have overtaken Christianity than for Arius to have enslaved the Christian world to his sterile Unitarianism? Athanasius performed a notable service to the church and laid the foundations for effective missionary labors by helping to preserve the gospel message. If the divine message of salvation had been lost, the motive power of missions would have perished.

Desolation and heathen darkness in northern Africa to-day must be traced to the terrific sweep of the Mohammedan hosts, who not only overcame northern Africa, but almost inundated Europe also. It should be admitted, however, that the needless controversies over innumerable speculative questions did weaken the church and check the progress of Christian missions. The history of the church has contained periods of intense missionary zeal and periods of heated theological discussion. In general, the two periods do not coincide. When the church has committed its energies to clarifying its message and overcoming false teaching, it has not, as a rule, been able to carry forward intensive missionary programs at the same time. The period which gave birth to the Restoration movement was distinctly one of controversy. When the Baptists found the ground cut clean from under them in their arguments with Alexander Campbell, Stone and others, they set up the cry that such discussions were sinful, anyway; that Mr. Campbell was anti-missionary and a stumbling-block in the path of Christian conquest and progress. But Mr. Campbell replied that the ultimate triumph of Christianity over heathen religions must necessarily wait on the vital unity of Christendom; that the carrying of the message to far-away lands must ever depend on a proper understanding of the message itself.

The triumphant progress of Christianity has not found its chief foe in controversy—the mere fact of public discussion of mooted questions—but in the ever-recurring compromises of Christianity with heathen philosophies and systems of religion or rationalistic theories of science. It was not controversy that thrust the church into the darkness of the Middle Ages, but disloyalty to Christ and His message. Sea and land were compassed to win over whole nations at once, but they were made Christian only in name. The messengers swapped off their vital message for an empty triumph, and betrayed Christianity into the hands of its heathen foes. Thus Christianity, in its very hour of world supremacy, lost its essential character and became a syncretistic religion—an amalgamation of Christianity, Judaism and heathenism. The moral downfall of Christianity in the Middle Ages hastened on the very heels of its doctrinal betrayal.

It was controversy—an age of the fiercest controversy that the Christian world has known, the age of Luther and Calvin—that saved the church from its shameful degradation. It took more than "the keen rapier of Erasmus," it demanded "the broadsword of Martin Luther," to hew a way for the church back to the truth. It was an age of controversy that thus became the stepping-stone to the great sweep of modern missionary endeavor. The *vital message* of Christianity had to be dug out of the debris of heathenism before the messengers could be sent forth to the ends of the earth on a mission conquest.

How like unto the age of Constantino is our own day! We, too, have emblazoned on our banner, "By this sign conquer," but have we forgot the real significance of the sign? Heathen China hesitates on the

threshold of Christ's kingdom, and we thrill at the prospect. India seethes with unrest, and, with Christian faith and love burning in our hearts, we are confident that only Christ can soothe and satisfy India. Voices of victory come from the ends of the earth, but can we close our eyes to the appalling catastrophe of Constantine's day? German rationalism has been eating at the vitals of Christianity, as did certain systems of philosophy in that early day of the church's seeming victory, but terrible defeat. As the heathen religions of that day succumbed to Christianity only to destroy the primitive message that the first Christians proclaimed, so to-day Shintoism, Confucianism and Buddhism clamor for recognition and compromise. They are perfectly willing to sign an armistice. They desire to be received by a sort of "open-membership" agreement into the fellowship of the "essentially valid" world religions seeking the betterment of moral conditions. Plagiarism and amalgamation have become their long suit. At the World Sunday School Convention at Tokyo they raised the familiar cry that we are "lacking in love for our brother" if we continue our inroads on their idol-filled temples. Unbelief or indifference to the distinctive message of Christ, compromise or the complete subordination of loyalty to Christ and His word to "good fellowship," is in the scholastic atmosphere many of our young ministers breathe in their decisive period of life. Is Christianity about to suffer another tremendous relapse?

Have we not exalted the hands and feet of Christianity above its head when we accept a man's willingness to "go" as a substitute for his determination to "preach the gospel"? Because a man loves and pities the suffering millions of China, dare we overlook the

fact that he insolently sets his "inner conscience" on Christ's throne and refuses to proclaim Christ's message? Did not Robert Ingersoll have a keen sense of the brotherhood of man? Is it not religious suicide to send into this critical situation in foreign lands men who are committed to the "modernistic" program—that the Bible is a conglomeration of fiction and truth, that the authority of Christ is not binding, that it is honorable to deceive a church or a brotherhood as to what you believe, in order to squeeze into a position where the new theology may be propagated?

If Christianity is to be saved in her hour of peril, it is to be done only by the *sword of the Spirit*. "Peace! peace!" is the cry of many of our leaders. And where is the man who does not desire peace? But can peace be attained by compromising our faith? Will the elusive search for a wonderful new revelation from the "Christ of experience" warrant us in setting aside and neglecting the "Christ of history"—Jesus of Nazareth, as He has revealed Himself to all the world for all time? Those who are crying "Peace, peace," in a soft, persuasive voice, are themselves fighting with all their might and main under cover and in the most unscrupulous fashion to turn the Restoration movement away from the Christ of the New Testament to the evanescent visions of modern theorists.

Blind and foolish is the man who lays aside his armor amid such circumstances. Christ came not merely "to send peace," but also "a sword"—the sword of the Spirit—and it is for such critical times as this. An age of controversy is before us. We can no more evade it than could Belgium evade conflict with ruthless German hordes. Through controversy the church must be cleansed of the dark blots of false

teaching and disloyal propaganda. Let us have controversy in its best and highest sense of frank, friendly, public discussion of the issues that vitally concern the whole people.

If this is to be an age of controversy, must it necessarily be an age of the decline of missionary fervor? Dare we not pray and agonize that this be like the age of Paul, rather than of Constantino? In spite of all the dissension and insistent discussion that surrounded the early church in its first period of expansion, it did not lose its passion for lost men. Paul preached and wrote fearlessly on all the controverted subjects, but, while holding the church steady, he turned the world upside down with his impetuous missionary labors. While settling these disturbing and vital questions, the church did not slacken its campaign for world evangelization. The piteous appeal of the uncounted millions who still wait for the end of the long night "until the day dawn, and the day-star arise," in the lonely, dark corners of the earth, should penetrate our conscience and stir us to action. But let us be certain that we do not perpetrate the travesty of giving "a stone" to those who ask for the bread of life. To those who are crying out for "a fish," let us not send a deadly "serpent" full of venom.

What if the shadows overhang great educational and missionary enterprises for which we have spent our toil and prayers and tears, and over which we have dreamed these many years, let us on to the world-wide task! Doors are wide open everywhere. The disloyal must not be aided. All through history the faithful have found new avenues of service when old organizations have become corrupt. Missionary heroes, who have dared to cut loose from disloyal comrades and

management, challenge us to suffer with them in the great cause. Let our voices be lifted boldly in defense of the gospel. But let us exercise the greater zeal and self-sacrifice to carry the message into the lonely quarters of the earth.

XII.

THE CROWN OF LIFE

PART I.—THE MYSTERY OF GOD'S SUFFERING.

IN naming the intellectual difficulties which surround the Christian conception of God, it is customary to mention at the outset the problem of the Trinity. How can God, Christ and the Holy Spirit be explained as separate personalities, and yet as a single personality? This is baffling and simply beyond our comprehension. Yet a problem almost as great is that of God's suffering. How can God be perfect and all-powerful and yet suffer? We are accustomed to conceive of perfection in terms of joy, peace, satisfaction and blessedness. How can perfection and suffering exist in the same personality? We inevitably associate suffering with limitations and weakness. We suffer because we lack money, health, friends, purity of character or because of some other limitations. But why does God suffer? The suffering of God is sympathetic. The word "sympathize" means "to suffer with." God suffers with us in our weakness and failures. His heart is grieved because we are lost without His aid. The atonement, with all its unfathomed mystery, is but the concrete expression of God's suffering. The cross of Christ affords a staggering intellectual problem. But if we reject the atonement we must reject the whole moral conception of God.

The mother sits by the bedside of her child. Her health is good, but her soul is racked with suffering because her child lies at the point of death. Her whole being droops in the anguish of sympathetic suffering. The father watches his boy in a contest. It is a football game, a race or an oratorical contest, and at the end he is about as weary as his boy. He had been struggling in his soul—meeting every critical test at the very side of his boy in all the deep experience of true sympathy. Such suffering is the very crown of life in a father or mother. There is no true parenthood without such acute sympathy. A father and mother may have wealth and culture. They may furnish their children the necessities of physical life. But if this spiritual fellowship is lacking, the whole relationship is barren. God is our heavenly Father, and His sympathetic suffering with His earthly children is the very crown of His being. "God is love." "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son."

Unsolved problems still remain as to why man suffers and why Jesus had to die, but we should not disturb ourselves unduly about the philosophical problems. What if we can not explain the Trinity? Can we explain how man can possibly unite body, mind and spirit in his single personality? Is there not here the suggestion of how three entities can thus be joined in the divine personality? What if we can not explain the atonement? If the theist has his problems that remain baffling, the atheist has a thousand times as many unanswered questions. The Christian has never claimed to know everything. He has attributed omniscience only to God. And the Christian believes in God. Our religion is a matter of faith. We would have to be omniscient if we solved all the problems of life. Many

of the so-called scientific arguments which, disturb "the modern mind" are based on the ridiculous presumption of man's omniscience. The atheist argues: "Here is the vermiform appendix. We have found no use for it. It has no use in the human body. Therefore there is no God, for He must be a God of law and order, and would not create a useless organ." The evolutionist succeeds the atheist and argues: "There is no function performed by the appendix; therefore this is a leftover from some former state when we were some kind of beast, and in which state it did have a function." Both arguments stand on one leg, and that prop is the presumption of man's omniscience. There is a vast chasm between the statements, "Man has not yet found out what use the appendix has," and "The appendix performs no useful function in the human body." How do we know? How can we know unless we know everything about the human body? As a matter of fact, the great medical authorities are even now smashing both arguments by declaring that the appendix is one of the secretive organs of the body. The fact that the human body can function without the appendix after it has been removed does not prove it has no use, for the same argument could be made concerning an arm, foot, leg or half a hundred parts of the body that plainly have functions. It is an amazing thing how the body can continue to exist minus so many important parts. A would-be wit among the students asked Professor Fairhurst one day in the chemistry class: "Professor, how long can a man live without brains?" But the answer came promptly: "Well, Mr. -----, how old are you?" The much-heralded appendix argument falls under its own weight. When we announce our conclusions, we ought to remember

we are not infallible. When we attempt to pronounce upon the unseen world, God, the beginning and end of the world, eternity, etc., we are entirely dependent on God's revelation. Our own experience is closely limited. We simply reach out and touch this vast, unseen world by faith in God's revelation of Himself in the Bible and in Christ. Henry Watterson wrote a very fine editorial some years ago on the Christian religion. In discussing the problem of future life, he emphasized the fact that it is entirely a matter of faith. He described the stacks of man-made books he had read on eternity and then said: "Each and every one of them leaves a mystery still. For all their learning and research, their positivity and contradiction, none of the writers know more than I think I know myself, and all that I think I know myself may be abridged to the simple rescript, 'I know nothing.'

"The night has a thousand eyes,
And the day but one;
Yet the light of the bright world dies
With the dying sun.

"The mind has a thousand eyes,
And the heart but one;
Yet the light of a whole life dies
When love is done.'

"All there is to religion, therefore, is faith."

Through all our perplexities we should cling to the divine revelation God has given. We can not solve all the problems of life. The Bible does not attempt to satisfy our curiosity or even to argue with man; it grandly affirms the glorious saving revelation of God to His children. "And now abideth faith, hope, love." The love of God for His erring children is the most sublime mystery in the world. If we surrender this,

we have lost the very "crown of life." The Old Testament fairly teems with revelations of God's love for His people and His suffering with them. God was "longsuffering in the days of Noah." The brokenhearted Hosea, yearning for his faithless bride, becomes the type of God's compassionate and undying love for His wayward people. Even toward the heathen in all their vileness God felt compassion. To Jonah He said: "Thou hast had pity on the gourd. And should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that can not discern between their right hand and their left hand?" With Israel in her punishment, in her captivity and desolation, God always suffered, enduring, as it were, blow for blow and anguish for anguish. God stood by when His people toiled under the yoke of Egyptian bondage. "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." When Israel, ungrateful and willful, was led captive into Babylon, God was around about His people, watching over them and raising a Daniel or an Esther, lest they utterly perish. By night and day, amid all their wickedness, God was always crying out through some chosen messenger: "Turn ye, turn ye, from your wicked ways, for why will ye die, O house of Israel?"

The climax of God's suffering is revealed in the incarnation. When "the Word became flesh," when the only begotten Son came to live among us, humbling Himself to be born of a virgin and to be fashioned like unto men, then did the infinite love of the heavenly Father shine upon us in full splendor. What is it about the personality and life of Jesus that touches us most deeply? It is not the inconceivable glory of His pre-existence in heaven, nor His activities in the crea-

tion of the world with its uncounted marvels, but the sublime expression of His love as He came to live and die among us to save us from our sins. The suffering of Jesus is the very crown of life. The cross of Jesus overtops every earthly monument, unless it be the empty tomb by which it stands and without which it would be hopeless tragedy.

The birth of Jesus is typical of His life of suffering. Although He had created the worlds, when He came to live among us He was not born in a king's palace, but amid the poverty and squalor of the manger in Bethlehem. Although He had been accustomed to the ministrations of tens of thousands of angels, He entered this world "not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." The lonely birth of Jesus was the harbinger of His life of suffering.

"No beautiful chamber, no soft trundle-bed,
No place but a manger, no place for His head;
No room, no room for Jesus."

Those who are deeply troubled with the problem of the death of Jesus on the cross usually overlook the fact that His whole earthly ministry was full of suffering, and that the incarnation itself furnishes the same problem as the atonement. Those who give up the fundamental teaching of the gospel that Jesus died for our sins must also yield the whole earthly ministry of Jesus. The prophet pictured His entire earthly career: "He was despised, and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was

wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed" (Isa. 53:3-5).

It was not merely at the trial and crucifixion that Jesus was "despised, and rejected of men." How often during His ministry He cried out in anguish of soul: "How long must I suffer with this generation?" or "Have ye not yet faith *I*" Not merely were the scribes and Pharisees bitter and malicious in their unbelief, but His own circle of disciples was slow to comprehend and accept Him and His teaching. All of this meant endless suffering. Three times the gospel represents Jesus in tears. From the summit of Olivet He looked down on the Holy City at the very moment of His triumphal entry, and wept tears of anguish: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" Who can fathom the depth of suffering revealed by the words: "And ye would not"? At the tomb of Lazarus "Jesus wept" in loving sympathy with His devoted friends. In Gethsemane He wept the tears of woe as He must drain the cup of misery to the dregs. He did not weep because shaken by physical fear of death, else was our Christ enslaved to the very fear from which He came to set us free. He did not weep at an untimely end or failure of His plans, else was He circumscribed in His understanding and vision even as we, and His predictions are as scraps of paper. There is a profound mystery that surrounds His agony in Gethsemane, even as there is to His death on the cross and His whole life of suffering. "The bitter cup" concerning which He prayed in

Gethsemane is related to the fact, not merely of His approaching death, but that He "his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed" (1 Pet. 2:24).

The suffering of Jesus was as staggering a problem to His apostles as it is to us. In that glorious moment of exaltation at Caesarea Philippi, when Peter made the confession of his faith in Christ, "from that time began Jesus to show unto his disciples that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up." The disciples were amazed and appalled at the revelation. Peter "began to rebuke him" and had to be silenced in severe fashion (Matt. 16:21ff.). Again and again Jesus referred to His approaching death, seeking to prepare the minds of His followers for the tragic event. Even in those last moments before His ascension He was still offering instruction on the mysterious theme of His suffering: "Then opened he their mind, that they might understand the scriptures: and he said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations" (Luke 24:45-47). One of the first things to be explained on the day of Pentecost was how "God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer" (Acts 3:18). In one of the last sermons reported in the Book of Acts, the same engrossing theme is being discussed. Paul is before Agrippa, arguing "that Christ should suffer" (Acts 26:23). In writing to the church at Corinth, he reminded them that his whole message was

"Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumbling-block, and unto Gentiles foolishness" (1 Cor. 1:23). Peter urges the truth of the Scripture "when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow" (1 Pet. 1:11). "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God" (1 Pet. 3:18). The author of Hebrews sets forth: "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered" (Heb. 5:8). "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate" (Heb. 13:12). The Epistle to the Hebrews returns to the suffering of Jesus over and over again. It represents Jesus as "being made perfect through suffering." Jesus was perfect in His own personality before His death, but He had to die on the cross to perfect or complete His mission as Saviour. "By the grace of God he should taste of death for every man."

A German scholar once indulging his fine scorn for the personality of Jesus, whom he considered a very ordinary man, said that the fame of Jesus would never have outlived His own generation if it had not been for the peculiarly tragic death which He suffered and which lifted His life out of the ordinary. Another German theologian responded by saying that "it was not the *death* of Christ, but the death of *Christ*," that furnished the mystery of the ages and the source of Christianity's perennial power. He pointed out that many other famous men had died a martyr's death for the truth; as, for example, Socrates. Yet none of these had stirred the veneration of the world. It was not the mere fact of a great man dying a tragic death, but the fact that it was Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who died on the cross, which gave Christianity its universal

and unique message of salvation. It was not the mere fact of a death, but who it was that died.

This is indeed the problem of the atonement. Suffering and death are perplexing facts for mere men, *'but* in the earthly life of Jesus they become acute problems. While we may not hope to sound the depths of the mystery of the atonement, does it not vastly relieve the problem to view it in the light of the whole course of God's sympathetic suffering with a lost world? Here is the crowning glory of His Fatherhood. And, although the whole gospel story fills us with delight, we still must say:

"In the cross of Christ I glory,
 Towering o'er the wrecks of time;
All the light of sacred story
 Gathers round its head sublime.

"When the woes of life o'ertake me,
 Hopes deceive and fears annoy,
Never shall the cross forsake me;
 Lo! it glows with peace and joy.

"When the sun of bliss is beaming
 Light and love upon my way,
From the cross the radiance streaming
 Adds more luster to the day.

"Bane and blessing, pain and pleasure,
 By the cross are sanctified;
Peace is there that knows no measure,
 Joys that through all time abide."

The sufferings of Christ still continue. He suffered on the cross once for all, bringing salvation to all the world. But He still suffers *with* us. If the dullness of His disciples and their lack of faith caused Him to cry out in grief during His earthly ministry, how must our unbelief weigh upon His heart to-day! When we doubt His divinity and cast aside our Bible, does

He not still stand with bowed head and heart of anguish as when He cried: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, . . . and ye would not"? When we walk the *via sacra*, bending under the burdens of broken health or fortunes, or standing by the casket, weeping for those who are dearer to us than our own lives, does He not stand by our side even as He stood by the tomb of Lazarus and wept with the grief-stricken sisters? If, in such moments, we doubt His goodness and love, if we lift up our voices with words of distrust that God has forsaken us, what affliction and grief do we heap upon our blessed Master! If not even a sparrow "shall fall on the ground" without the knowledge of God, if "the very hairs of your head are all numbered," shall we not trust and be of good courage, remembering that Jesus has given us not merely the example of how to suffer, but that He still suffers with us? When we turn away from the narrow way, from walking with Jesus, to wander again in the depths of sin, we crucify Jesus afresh before the world. What poignant suffering this must bring to our Saviour! Does some person "in a far country," long lost from the Father's house and wandering in sin, read these poor, feeble words? Oh, look upon the cross of Jesus! Does it not melt your hardened heart? He suffered for you. Do you not see that patient, waiting form? "Behold, I stand at the door and knock!" Would you increase and continue His suffering?

XIII.

THE CROWN OF LIFE

PART II.—SUFFERING WITH CHRIST.

THE fact of God's suffering is one of the most startling and mysterious things in the universe. But upon closer study it unfolds the most touching and beautiful vision of God's nature. "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." With infinite love each moment of the day and night He enters into our experiences and shares our sufferings. He suffers with us in our sorrows, our failures and weaknesses. The challenge that immediately arises is: Do we suffer with God in His desires, plans and program? Christ is suffering with us daily. Are we suffering with Christ? Christ died for us. When have we ever surrendered aught or suffered for Him? Suffering with Christ is a fundamental element of the gospel. It was the very crown of glory upon the lives of the early Christians. In that very first revelation of His approaching death to the apostles, He linked His suffering for their sake with their suffering for Him. Peter's amazement at the possibility that Jesus, whom he had just declared to be the Son of God, could suffer and die on the cross, brought forth the sublime pronouncement of Jesus: "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take Up his cross, and follow me." When the apostles were

sent forth under the first commission, Jesus warned them that they must be prepared to suffer for His sake. "Beware of men: for they will deliver you up to the councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues." "The disciple is not above his master . . . if they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?" "When they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another." "And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake." "And a man's foes shall be they of his own household" (Matt. 10). When James and John came seeking the chief places in the kingdom, the Lord asked: "Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" The answer, "We are able," shows that they had come to understand they must suffer with their Master, although they had not yet understood that "whoever will be great among you, let him be your minister" (Matt. 20:26). "Let us also go, that we may die with him," said Thomas, when they saw their Master walking into the jaws of death (John 11:16). What a picture Mark gives of that journey! Jesus must needs go up to die. He sets His face stedfastly toward Jerusalem. Calm and determined, amid the frowning shadows of tragedy, He strides on. The disciples accompany Him, that they also "may die with him," but they follow in a huddled group, full of fear. The Son of God leads the way. They can not find the courage to walk beside Him, nor can they stifle their devotion and desert Him. "And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus went before them: and they were amazed; and as they followed, they were afraid. And he took again the twelve, and began to tell them what things

should happen unto him" (Mark 10:32). Although they failed Jesus in the hour of His humiliation and death, yet Jesus in one of those final moments of intimate fellowship revealed the fact that the very apostle who had denied Him before the Sanhedrin should suffer glorious martyrdom. "When thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not. This spake he, signifying by what death he should glorify God" (John 21:18, 19). And the day came when, instead of being full of fear, "they therefore departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonor for the Name" (Acts 5:41). When Paul was arrested amid his mad course of persecution, Jesus said: "For I will show him how many things he must suffer for my name's sake" (Acts 9:16). Paul's writings fairly glow with the passionate joy of suffering with Christ: "Because to you it hath been granted in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer in his behalf" (Phil. 1:29). "For ye also suffered the same things of your own countrymen, even as they did of the Jews; who both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets and drove out us" (1 These. 2:14, 15). "For verily, when we were with you, we told you beforehand that we are to suffer affliction" (1 These. 3:4). "To the end that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer" (2 These. 1:5). "Suffer hardship with the gospel according to the power of God . . . for which cause I suffer also these things" (2 Tim. 1:8, 12). "Wherein I suffer hardship unto bonds, as a malefactor . . . for if we die with him, we shall also live with him; if we endure, we shall also reign with him" (2 Tim. 2:

9, 11, 12). These are but a few fragments of the persistent and thrilling discussions concerning suffering with Christ. As one begins to ponder his New Testament with this theme in mind, it grows larger each moment, until it seems to encompass the whole life of the early church.

Suffering with Christ not merely constitutes a fundamental element of the earthly relationship to Him, but it is the foundation on which rests the hope of eternal glory. It fills the lives of the early Christians with the radiant splendor of the sunset glow. This fervent hope kept them following after their crucified Leader "as unto a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts" (2 Pet. 1:19). "Did ye suffer so many things in vain?" is Paul's poignant rebuke to the Galatians (Gal. 3:4). "I count all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but refuse, that I may gain Christ . . . that I may know him and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, becoming conformed unto his death; if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead" (Phil. 3:8, 10, 11). Paul builds his hope of eternity on his willingness to share the sufferings of Christ—to walk in the way of the cross. We have but a fragmentary account of the sufferings of Paul. The Book of Acts must have been written before his death, for it stops abruptly with Paul in prison at Borne. Tradition tells the story of his martyrdom. In 2 Cor. 11:23-27, he suggests something of his endless sufferings: "In labors more abundantly, in prisons more abundantly, in stripes above measure, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty

stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of rivers, in perils of robbers, in perils from my countrymen, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in labor and travail, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness." Yet he who wrote such a stirring review of his sufferings could also write that we are joint-heirs with Christ. "If so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified with him. For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed to usward" (Rom. 8:17, 18). "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal" (2 Cor. 4:17, 18). "We are oppressed on every side, yet not straitened; perplexed, yet not unto despair; pursued, yet not forsaken; smitten down, yet not destroyed; always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body. For we who live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh" (2 Cor. 4:8-10).

Sienkiewics has portrayed an immortal picture of the sufferings of the early Christians in his masterpiece, "Quo Vadis." The impression made upon the venomous and depraved old Chilo by the marvelous fashion in which the multitudes of Christians met death is one

of the most arresting things in the book. How his superstitious terror was stirred! How the flames of an unspeakable hell of remorse burned his soul to a cinder! When all hope had vanished, he at least can fling the horrible burden of his treachery from his soul by denouncing Nero as the real incendiary before the multitudes, and then dying with these whom he has wronged. Beautiful as the spirit of Christ is the way in which in the apostle Paul is pictured as seeking out the broken old Greek and leading him to yield himself to Christ. And then behold how Chilo dies! It is a good thing in these dull, drab days of seeking the Christ in the course of least resistance, instead of the way of the cross, to catch the vision of "Quo Vadis, Domine?"

Does some one rise to say: "Yes, that is all great and impressive. But it is ancient history. It is all very well for those ancient worthies. But how does that affect us? There is no call to suffer now as then. The time for such suffering with Christ has passed." It is true that persecutions and martyrdoms are not the order of the day in these United States in this year of our Lord as in Rome under Nero. The crosses do not fill the amphitheater, nor do the wild beasts roar and tear at their cages, nor the human torches flame up in imperial gardens. Christianity seems to have become the popular instead of the despised religion. It is the honorable thing to be a Christian. But this is the very secret of the weakness of modern Christianity. This is what invites people to "join a church," to be with their friends, to enjoy delightful music, to hear eloquent sermons, or even to forward their business interests. How often, even when religious motives actuate a man to become a Christian, there is no clear idea of

suffering with Christ or any sense of obligation in that direction. Is it any wonder that such a chorus of complaints arises as soon as the Christian life begins to cost anything? Verily, the seed is sown on the stony ground. It is shallow. The heat of persecution and suffering soon withers the religious aspirations.

If Christianity costs nothing, it is worth nothing. The popular type of Christianity is worth little. And religion that is popular in this world of sin and shame is bound to be shallow. The religion of Jesus never has been and never will be popular. It is only the flimsy counterfeit that is popular. Real Christianity will always meet opposition and cost suffering. The man whose religion is not a source of suffering has really traded his soul to the devil over the bargain-counter of compromise.

How may we expect to suffer with Christ to-day? Of course, there are always those extraordinary events, even in the most peaceful and monotonous times and communities, which remind us that the call still comes at times for an individual to rise to the heights of actual martyrdom and die a heroic death in the name of Christ. But there are ways in which all of us may expect to suffer with Christ daily.

One of these is by living a life of righteousness in a wicked world. The suggestion that there is no cause for the Christian to suffer with Christ to-day is absurd when one begins to examine it. Is not the world still full of sin? Is not the devil still at work? Can a Christian find continuous peace and quiet except by shameful surrender and retreat and compromise? If you do not meet opposition, then this is a sure sign you are not living the Christian life, for the devil is certain to oppose the uncompromising life of righteous-

ness. If he doesn't trouble you much, he evidently doesn't think you count much. The people do not count who maintain the milk-and-water type of Christianity, agree with everybody, do as Rome does when they are in Rome, and walk in peace with citizens of Babylon the mighty.

Peter contrasts in his first Epistle the suffering because of sin as an evil-doer with the suffering for Jesus' sake as a Christian. "But inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings, rejoice. ... If ye are reproached for the name of Christ, blessed are ye. ... For let none of you suffer as a murderer, or a thief, or an evil-doer, or as a meddler in other men's matters: but if a man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God in this name" (1 Pet. 4:13-16). This noble type of suffering finds a beautiful illustration in Moses, "choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt." This same choice is faced by all. How many business men who wear the name of Christ suffer poverty rather than sacrifice their conscience to the God of mammon and trample underfoot the Golden Rule as their competitors are doing? Verily they must count "the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt." When the young man with religious scruples refuses to join in the reckless riot of his comrades in school or business, is he not termed effeminate and subjected to "reproach for the name of Christ"? When the young woman gives a resolute "No" to the invitation to the dance with its bacchanalian orgies, and to a whole world of pleasures that flatter and deceive, does she not find herself ostracized

and scorned by many? Whoever lives a life of faithfulness and uprightness in this wicked world finds himself suffering with his Christ.

Christ made "self-denial" the primary element of discipleship. "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." How few of us ever learn what it means to deny ourselves! How hard it is to pitch our lives on this high plane and not descend to compromise! Paul urges us to put to death the lusts of the flesh. He daily sought to bring his body "into bondage" as an athlete training for the games, "lest by any means, after that I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected." Jesus advised that the desire or habit which is incompatible with the nobler life should be sacrificed even as one would cut off the arm or foot and pluck out the eye to save the rest of the body. It is better to amputate the arm than allow the poison to destroy the whole body. Whenever we voluntarily surrender that which is dear to us because it does not harmonize with Christ's program of righteousness, we suffer with Him.

A further way in which we have fellowship with His sufferings is by a life of self-sacrifice in a world of self-seeking. The combat here is as strong as elsewhere. We can not serve God and mammon. Here is mortal combat—a life-and-death struggle with no quarter given. The world is as mad for gain as ever it was. Gold, fame, power and a thousand satellites allure us. The challenge of Christ to the rich young ruler was that he should "deny himself"—that he should have fellowship with the poverty and sufferings of Jesus. What a touching scene follows as Peter, who has listened with awe to the conversation between the

young man and his Master, thinks out loud, as was his custom, and raises the question as to the reward which shall fall to them, inasmuch as they have literally fulfilled the demand of Jesus to "leave all and follow him"! How many of us really suffer with Christ by sharing our earthly possessions with Him—with the needy and suffering, with the lost? As we witness His sufferings on the cross and look abroad on a vast world still untouched by the gospel, need we ask the foolish question: Can we find some way to suffer with Him to-day?

We share the sufferings of Christ by preaching a gospel of salvation amid an indifferent, skeptical and lost world. If a child of our own was lost out in the waste places, and "the wild bells rang out to a wild sky" that alarm to go out amid the storm to search for the lost, would we sit at ease by our fireside? Would we eat or sleep, smile and be happy, while the fate of the lost child hung in the balances? If Christ wept such bitter tears over Jerusalem, does He not sorrow to-day over the absentees on our Bible-school roll—those who desert the church to seek the ways of pleasure and the multitudes who rush on heedlessly down the broad path? Do we suffer with Jesus in this unceasing longing and effort to save the lost and revive the indifferent? Do we really care?

One of the present calamities of the church is a lost sense of responsibility toward the unsaved. We no longer have any clear-cut realization of the meaning of the word "lost." How often that word is found on the lips of Jesus! He portrayed its meaning in decisive fashion. He used the most telling contrasts when He painted the picture. He used His own life-blood to complete the heart-breaking portrait. But we have

allowed the skepticism and recklessness of the world and our indifference to fade out the colors. The skeptic cries out that there is no sin, and hence no condemnation. He scorns the declarations of Jesus that the broad way leads to destruction, and we must labor day and night to save those from the flood who are willing to be saved. He asserts instead that all the world will be saved by the inner forces that gradually evolve through education. And such easy-going speculations pass with many for facts and with others cut off the keen edge of their anxiety for the lost. Jesus laid off a definite course and promised salvation to those who followed it. But men have arisen on all sides, declaring that it is not necessary to walk in this way. They have discovered a way which is just as good and much more convenient and pleasant. Where is the innovation in Christianity which did not arise from the attempt to make the way easier—to rid Christianity of the demand that we suffer with Christ? And the preacher who stands squarely in the midst of the stream against current philosophical and popular tendencies which are antichristian finds persecution his lot. The preacher who does not suffer persecution does not preach the gospel. Jesus warned His apostles of the endless persecution which awaited them as they proclaimed His message. Of course our lives are not often forfeited for this cause, but the subtle temptation to betray our Master by compromise confronts us daily. Straightforward proclamation always spells opposition. It is so much easier to drift with the crowd—to agree with everybody, or at least not to disagree in such decided fashion as to produce an issue. The preacher who wields "the sword of the Spirit" in the terrific controversy which envelops Christianity at this present

time can expect a reward of persecution, and must stand ready to sacrifice his all for the Christ. Yet may not we also rejoice that we are "counted worthy to suffer dishonor for the Name"?

"Am I a soldier of the cross,
A follower of the Lamb?
And shall I fear to own His cause,
Or blush to speak His name?"

"Must I be carried to the skies
On flowery beds of ease,
While others fought to win the prize,
And sailed through bloody seas?"

"Are there no foes for me to face?
Must I not stem the flood?
Is this vile world a friend to grace,
To help me on to God?"

"Since I must fight if I would reign,
Increase my courage, Lord;
I'll bear the toil, endure the pain,
Supported by Thy word.

"Thy saints in all this glorious war
Shall conquer, though they die;
They view the triumph from afar
And seize it with their eye.

"When that illustrious day shall rise,
And all Thine armies shine
In robes of victory through the skies,
The glory shall be Thine."

XIV.

BREAKING THE BONDS OF DEATH

A STUDY IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

DEATH has always been man's relentless pursuer. In his hour of greatest strength and triumph, death lurks in the outlying shadows. It enters at the most unexpected moment and despoils his dreams, his home, or ends his own earthly career.

It is this certainty of death, coupled with the equal certainty of life after death, that makes the Epistle to the Hebrews a letter of tremendous interest.

Through the ages man has sought in vain to escape death. The Spanish explorers seeking the fabled fountain of youth, the scientist seeking the elixir of life, the philosopher seeking the ultimate explanation of death and life, have alike failed and come short of the goal. In spite of everything, men still die.

There is a wonderful democracy about death. The rich and the poor, the learned and the ignorant, the strong and the weak, the good and the bad, all alike succumb. The wealthy and the illustrious may surround themselves with indescribable luxury and isolate themselves from the world by towering barriers, but they can not keep out death.

One of the leading problems with which the author of the Epistle concerns himself is the question of the death of Jesus. The Hebrew Christians to whom he is writing, by reason of their inheritance of prejudice, are

still finding the death of the Messiah a stumbling-block. The author undertakes to set forth that the death of Jesus, instead of disqualifying Him as Christ, is the crowning act of His life which makes Him "perfect" or complete in His work as Saviour (Heb. 2:9, 10).

The death of Christ is, then, not a thing of which the "Hebrews" should be ashamed, or over which they should be troubled, for it all happened according to God's deliberate plan and gracious purpose through which "the pioneer" or "the leader" of our salvation brings "many sons unto glory."

Again the author of the Hebrew letter argues: "Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same; that through death he might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage" (Heb. 2:14, 15). Death, then, was the objective of the incarnation. It was the path by which He became victorious over Satan and redeemed mankind.

The whole Epistle undertakes to emphasize the terrible dominion of death over man, and how Jesus by His shameful, but eternally glorious, death frees man from this dominion and leads him from death unto life.

The uncertainty of death is another of the underlying currents of Hebrews. "Once to die;" yes, but when? The author talks of "men that die" (Heb. 7:8); "by death they are hindered from continuing" (Heb. 7:23); "these all died in faith" (Heb. 11:13).

It is the uncertainty of the future that furnishes one of the chief causes of human distress. "It is appointed unto men once to die," and the certainty and uncertainty of death combine to cause men "through

fear of death" to be "all their lifetime subject to bondage" (Heb. 2:15). For who can foretell the time? To-day? Or to-morrow? Who knoweth? The rich sometimes precede the poor, rushing headlong in the way of death through the wide-open gates of excess which their wealth swings ajar. Or perchance disease assails and the untold riches of a kingdom do not avail. Behold the mute witness of a Tut-hankh-amen buried amid gorgeous splendor at the age of eighteen!

The educated sometimes precede the ignorant, having exhausted their vital resources in the search for knowledge, which was unable to fend off the hour of death. Behold the brilliant Keats dying in his youth!

The strong often die before the weak. We have all seen children at play, standing in a circle and waiting with bated breath as one slowly, with an uncertain jingle, counts out, "Eenie, meenie, miney, mo!" It is ever thus with life and death.

The finality of death is another of the points of emphasis in the Epistle. "But after this the judgment." "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." "Aye, there's the rub. For in that sleep of death what dreams may come."

Death brings the end of man's earthly life. It is fraught with the sorrows of parting. Death sums up a man's life and condenses it into a sentence as he stands at the judgment-bar of God. When students know they must take a rigid examination on the course of study, they take their work more seriously. The business man may spend with careless hand the money from his pocket or bank account, but when he accepts a trust fund for which he must give exact account, he invests it cautiously and with unceasing concern. Death gives to life a deep solemnity. The Epistle to the

Hebrews continually emphasizes the power of sin in life in the light of God's final judgment.

A message of hope, rather than despair, is the keynote of the Epistle. Alongside the uncertainty of death the author places the certainty of God's loving care. Jesus is the "great high priest who hath passed through the heavens," and is both willing and able to sympathize and aid us in our distress. He "hath been in all points tempted like as we are," and can enter into our sufferings. We can "come boldly unto the throne of grace" through Him. Jesus came among us to die in order that He might "deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." It matters not what hour of the day the righteous fall asleep. His tender reminders of the sympathy of Jesus suggest all of the beautiful words of our Master spoken to breaking hearts: "Not even a sparrow shall fall on the ground without your Father;" "Fear not them which kill the body;" "Come unto me, all ye that labor;" "Let not your heart be troubled: . . . In my Father's house are many mansions."

The certainty of death is countered by the certainty of life. "There remaineth therefore a sabbath rest for the people of God." Behold, "Jesus because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, that by the grace of God he should taste of death for every man."

Jesus passed from death unto life. So shall we. In His death He brings "many sons unto glory." "We may have a strong encouragement, who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us: which we have as an anchor of the soul, a hope both sure and stedfast and entering into that which is within the veil."

"We have an anchor that keeps the soul
Stedfast and sure while the billows roll,
Fastened to the rock which can not move,
Grounded firm and deep in the Saviour's love."

The finality of death is matched with the assurance of salvation in Christ. "After this the judgment," but "Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many," comes! "We have not here an abiding city, but we seek after the city which is to come." "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and for ever," "whose house are we, if we hold fast our boldness and the glorying of our hope firm unto the end." Jesus by His death has brought to naught "him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." The devil never had the power to summon death at will and sweep men from the earth, but he, by luring them into the ways of death, rules here. It is, after a fashion, his kingdom. But Christ "paralyzed" the devil and destroyed his power when on the cross He wrought man's redemption and made possible the forgiveness of sins. Death has lost its power since man can meet his eternal Judge in peace. Jesus' resurrection completes His saving work and gives man the concrete assurance that he, too, shall ultimately break the bonds of death.

After this unfolding of the significance of the death of Jesus and the manifold assurances that man likewise shall pass from death unto life, the author of the Epistle climbs to the glory of a transfiguration mount as he bestows the exalted benediction: "Now the God of peace, who brought again from the dead the great shepherd of the sheep with the blood of an eternal covenant, even our Lord Jesus, make you perfect in every good thing to do his will, working in us that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ."

XV.

MAKING OUR HOMES CHRISTIAN

THE fifth chapter of Ephesians offers the advice of a homeless man concerning the essential elements of a happy home. Paul, like his divine Master, had no place to lay his head. By day and by night he toiled across the Roman Empire, carrying his flaming evangel into its great cities, over mountain and desert, founding churches and enduring persecution and long years of imprisonment. There is something pathetic about Paul's declaration in the midst of a fiery defense of his apostleship and mission to the Galatians: "I, too, might lead about a wife as the other apostles." But Paul, though he had no leisure or opportunity in his far-flung evangelistic campaigns to establish a home, offers here the most practical and uplifting program for a happy Christian family. This text from Ephesians offers not merely the concise summary of the world-wide, lifelong observation of one of its keenest intellects, but also the divinely inspired message of heaven to earth.

The topic "Making Our Homes Christian" rests upon three assumptions:

1. That the Christian home is desirable—in fact, the ideal home.
2. That our homes are not in the highest sense Christian.
3. That they can be so made.

What are the essential elements of an ideal home? What is a Christian home? This question can be answered in one word—"heaven." "I am a pilgrim and heaven is my home." The Bible continually represents heaven as a family and as a home. In this text Paul most beautifully intertwines the home and the church—the earthly and the heavenly home. The relation of husband and wife is taken as parallel to that of Jesus to His church. The New Testament repeatedly declares that heaven is to be inaugurated by the wedding of the Lamb of God. The church, which is the bride, shall rise beautifully adorned to meet the bridegroom—Jesus. The home which is thus established shall be eternal. There shall be no night there, no pinching poverty, no cruel slander or the harassing strain of contention and nagging tongues, no betrayal of solemn trusts, no jealousy or wrath, no prodigal sons breaking mothers' hearts, no dear old mother going over the hill to the poorhouse, no sickness and the agonized midnight vigils by the bedside, no heartbreaking separations, no tears cast upon a newly made grave, no sin to leave its slimy trail in the home—but all shall be peace and joy and love.

All this, of course, in its perfection is as far above us as the heaven is above the earth. Yet in our struggles, disappointments and pitiful failures we look upward and cry out: "I am a pilgrim and heaven is my home."

Wherein do our homes fall short of the heavenly home? Most elemental is the ominous degradation of the marriage relation—the lost sense of reverence for the marriage vow. Hasty, unseemly marriages fill the divorce courts with the wail of broken homes and lives. Witness the brazen substitution of commercial

motives for true love as the foundation for the marriage altar.

A second shortcoming is the emphasis upon the physical rather than the spiritual qualities of a home. A home can not be built merely of bricks and mortar. Strict observance of the construction regulations under the building commissioners of our great cities can not produce a real home if the building regulations of high heaven are defied. A young lady is said to marry well if the groom is worth a few thousand or hundred thousand dollars, but she may live to echo the plaint of the old maid who exclaimed: "Why should I marry? I have a lamp that smokes, a parrot that swears and a cat that stays out at night."

Of course certain physical qualifications are essential to a happy home. Overcrowded tenements reeking with filth, interior bedrooms that never see a ray of sunlight, tubercular mothers and children crowded in damp, noisome apartments—all cry out for correction; but the tendency has been to sacrifice the physical qualities which are essential to happiness to those which produce mere physical comfort. The modern home contains no fireside where the family can assemble—a symbol of its lost fellowship and unity. The old-fashioned home allowed the wind to whistle through the cracks and the snow sometimes sifted in on the beds of the children in the attic. But there was some privacy about the home and a place for the children to play in God's out-of-doors. The terrific overcrowding of our cities has about destroyed the privacy of the American home. The fundamental purpose of the home in affording a place to protect, train and develop the young and old of the family group is imperiled, if not completely annulled. Can we make our homes

Christian until we begin to return to God's out-of-doors, sending some back to the denuded farms and spreading out the teeming cities into the open regions by rapid transit?

A third element of peril for the modern home is the wild orgy of extravagance and luxury which threatens to break the back of the breadwinner and grind his face into the sod, while bringing no lasting satisfaction, but only heart-burnings for things still out of reach. If every American family would start to-morrow to live within its own income, the chances of Christianizing our homes would be immeasurably increased. If the thousands who are buying automobiles on credit and imperiling their whole economic future would start "Own your home" and "Pay as you go" movements, the insatiate, modern lust for excitement would begin to give place to the lasting joys of home life. One of the most salutary influences that have come to this luxurious and extravagant generation from Calvin Coolidge, scion of the sturdy Pilgrims, has been his steady insistence upon economy and simplicity of living.

Two other factors which influence the problem of making our homes Christian are the wonderful new freedom which has come to woman, suddenly expanding her sphere of activities from the home and church to the wide world and the amazing growth of educational and benevolent institutions—schools, colleges, kindergartens, old people's homes, hospitals, poorhouses, insane asylums, houses of correction, Y. M. C. A.'s and Y. W. C. A.'s, social settlement houses, nurseries, community centers, and the like. These institutions are the blessed fruits of Christianity. For each of them we thank God. They arose out of the failure of many homes to meet the problems involved. But, once estab-

lished, the tendency has been to gradually surrender to these institutions the very functions and burdens which are most distinctively Christian and productive of the spirit of self-sacrifice. Whenever the normal home has surrendered a natural function to an institution, it has lost something in importance. Whenever the home has shifted a burden, it has lost a blessing. The poverty-stricken home where both father and mother must work in a factory finds the nursery a great boon, but the parents who, in order to pursue pleasure, thrust upon some public institution the burden of caring for their children, illustrate a growing peril to the home. The new freedom which has come to woman, giving her an equal place with man in the educational, social, political and business world, has been in many homes a profound blessing, but in others it has given new point to the old question: "What is a home without children or a mother?" We should not attempt to deprive woman of her new freedom, but exalt the primacy of the home. We should not relax our zeal for our great public institutions, but should make them more thoroughly Christian. We should show the same zeal for our homes, and not crush our overburdened institutions with unnecessary demands.

A final obstacle to making our homes Christian is the reckless, riotous frenzy of a pleasure-mad generation. "All roads lead to Home" was the ancient maxim. But all roads lead from the modern home. From the innumerable lodges, clubs, societies and organizations that offer elevating fellowship and recreation to the low-flung places of amusement with their wild excesses, all roads lead away from the home. The home has been depopulated. It remains in many cases an empty shell. The birds have flown. They return

to lie down and rest a few hours during the night, but their waking hours are spent elsewhere.

The most frequent causes of divorce and unhappy homes may be summarized as follows: (1) Hasty marriages. Instead of considering marriage a very solemn and sacred obligation, many seem to consider it a lark without any responsibility. Entering into the holy of holies of married life with contemptuous disregard for its sacredness, they often reap the bitter fruits through the rest of life. (2) Marriages based on false motives. When people marry for money, social position, title, instead of founding the home on true, self-sacrificing love, it can not be expected to endure. (3) Mixed marriages. When people marry who have violent differences in their religious convictions and affiliations, it often ends in disaster. Paul's advice as to marrying outside of the Christian faith needs to be studied (1 Corinthians 7). (4) Ingrained selfishness. John was the only child and was spoiled to death by his parents. So was Mary. They get married and then!!! Back of every niggardly husband or nagging wife is a selfish heart. (5) Modern living conditions. Little, crowded apartments that can not be called homes—no yard for the children, no privacy for the family, no room where all the family can get together—no home and nobody ever at home. (6) Extravagance. High wages and high prices and higher living. Everybody trying to outdo everybody else, and nobody living within his income. Credit and bills pile up and disaster results. (7) The pleasure craze. Old folks and children stepping on the gas for more speed and wilder excitement; dances, dirty movies and theaters and a round of reckless pleasure that soon rots out the foundations of the home. (8) Lack of religion. The fire

has died out on the family altar. The wintry frosts of sin and selfishness blast the beautiful flowers of love and self-sacrificing devotion.

The question is often asked: Is not the flapper the greatest peril the American home faces? The answer depends on what you mean by flapper. Flapper may mean anything or nothing. A jolly little schoolgirl with short hair and skirts and clumsy goloshes, or a dangerous somebody who brazenly makes a show of her contempt for elemental modesty of dress and behavior. Flapperism is not so much a cause as a symptom of a condition in society. And it is a very dangerous condition. France should be a good witness here. France has gone further than most nations in sowing the seeds of licentiousness and should be able to testify as to the harvest. A recent French writer laments the fact that the old-fashioned girl with her coy modesty has been supplanted by the ultra-modern girl with her bold frankness about herself and the deep secrets of life. He says the greatest loss has been the alluring mystery which woman has always maintained about herself and which has given to life its saving romance. The old-fashioned girl used to be a wondrously mysterious collection of frills, frizzles and furbelows. But no young woman, he avers, who appears in public in a modern one-piece bathing-suit can lay claim to any further mystery about her person. The courtship used to be an alluring, romantic game of hide and seek that lasted for months and years, but in this age of utter and matter-of-fact frankness it is accomplished in a day or so, or a few hours. Thus marriage and the home lose the halo of romance. Whenever such a comparison of the old-fashioned and the ultra-modern girl is made, the usual rejoinder cries out, "Unsanitary! Unhy-

gienic! Unscientific!" But neither sanitation, hygiene nor science is a satisfactory substitute for morals. If we surrender our individual self-respect, society must inevitably collapse.

For all of these problems there is one single solution—Jesus Christ—His love, His life, His ideals, His self-sacrifice and His gospel. The only salvation for the modern home is to be had from the Saviour of the world.

Briefly summarizing the elements of a Christian home outlined in Ephesians, we find:

1. It must be founded on love, single-hearted, unselfish and undefiled.
2. The husband and wife must be of earnest Christian character.
3. The man should be the devoted leader and protector of the home.
4. The woman should be the faithful companion and helpmeet.
5. Children should be loving and obedient and eager to learn and develop.
6. Parents should be kind and patient, willing to give themselves to the work of equipping their children for life's tasks.
7. The home and the church should be in intimate and constant communion.
8. The one great rule of home life is wonderfully summed up and applied in our text, the Golden Rule. "Even so ought husbands to love their own wives even as their own bodies ... no man ever hated his own flesh."

If in all our relations with one another in the home we will apply the Golden Rule in the midst of our tyranny and intolerance, our jealousy and suspicion,

our unkind criticism and faultfinding, our selfishness or infidelity, pausing to ask the question, "Is this the way I would like to be treated?" then abuse, betrayals and misunderstandings would disappear like the misty clouds that wrap themselves about the mountain peaks, shutting out the gorgeous sunshine and concealing entrancing vistas. The home is the most critical battleground between the forces of darkness and light. If we can Christianize the home, all our political, social, economic, moral and religious problems will be solved. If we fail in the home, we shall fail everywhere.

XVI.

THE MESSAGE OF TWO ANCIENT TOMBS

FROM time immemorial men have been accustomed to bury their dead. The dumb beasts might be left with their bones to bleach in the sun, but men always have exercised more or less care over the dead bodies of their own families and friends. The practice of burning the dead upon a funeral pile prevailed to a certain extent among the ancient Greeks and Romans, and very largely among the Hindus. There have been spasmodic attempts to introduce cremation generally, such as the effort made during the French Revolution and that led by Dr. Henry Thompson in England in 1873. But these movements have not met with any general response.

The manner of burial has varied from age to age. The religious ideas of many nations and tribes have found expression in the mode of burial. Security from wild beasts might be had in a cave or solid masonry constructed by man, but everywhere there has been reflected the hopelessness of keeping the body from the gnawing tooth of time. No people ever succeeded better in this than did the ancient Egyptians, but even here are evident the same solemnity, sorrow and mystery surrounding death.

Abraham expressed in classic language the universal desire when he said to the children of Heth: "If

it be your mind that I should bury my dead out of my sight, hear me, and entreat for me to Ephron the son of Zohar, that he may give me the cave of Machpelah, which he hath, which is in the end of his field; for the full price let him give it to me in the midst of you for a possession of a burying-place." Ephron urged Abraham to take both the field and the cave as a gift, but Abraham insisted on paying the full price—four hundred shekels. "By faith he became a sojourner in the land of promise, as in a land not his own, dwelling in tents," yet he did yield to the instinctive desire of all men and bought for his very own a burial plot.

Renewed interest in the ancient customs of burial has been stirred by the excavation of the tomb of Tut-ankh-amen at Luxor, with its unexampled splendor. This young king, who was eighteen years old at his death, having reigned but two years and accomplished nothing worthy of note, was surrounded in his tomb by treasures which exceeded the wildest dreams of the archaeologists. If the grave-robbers had not despoiled the tombs of the Nile Valley, the treasures in the tombs of the really great Pharaohs like Rameses II. would have baffled description.

Contrast with this the tomb of Jesus. Isaiah predicted: "And they made his grave with the wicked, and with a rich man in his death." It was in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathaea—an unusual tomb newly hewn out of the solid rock—attended by Joseph, Nicodemus, a little group of disciples and a train of sorrowing women, that the Lord was buried. The simplicity of this burial stands in striking contrast with that of the Egyptian king. The student of Egyptology is always impressed with the fact that the preponderance of Egypt's ancient faith dealt with the dead body, burial

ceremonies, etc. No people ever spent so much thought and expense, such unceasing toil to preserve the body and provide things conceived to be necessary for the body after death. The pyramids have always stirred the curiosity and amazement of modern engineers as to how a people could ever have moved such enormous masses of solid rock, as are builded into these structures, without the aid of modern machinery. G. P. Moore, of Harvard, the world's greatest authority on the history of religions, remarked one day in the classroom that it was very plain how the Egyptians managed to move these enormous stones—they did it "by main strength and awkwardness." The number of men employed must have been prodigious, and the cost in human life well-nigh surpassing belief. Did not each of those great pyramids cost the lives of enough slaves to make a monument equal in size out of their dead bodies? Herodotus states that the erection of the pyramid of Cheops employed one hundred thousand men for twenty years. And these pyramids were built as tombs of the kings. Nothing could emphasize more clearly that the ancient Egyptian felt it would not profit a man if he gained the whole world and did not have his body buried in exactly the proper manner.

The simplicity of all the burials recorded in the New Testament stands in striking contrast. John the Baptist was buried in utter simplicity. "And his disciples came, and took up the corpse, and buried him; and they went and told Jesus." "And devout men buried Stephen, and made great lamentation over him." The burials of Ananias and Sapphira are not otherwise. "And the young men arose and wrapped him round, and they carried him out and buried him." "And they carried her out and buried her by her hus-

band." "The rich man also died, and was buried." Jesus stopped a funeral procession to raise a young man from the dead and give him back to his mother. Are there any other burials even mentioned in the New Testament save that of Jesus Himself? James, the brother of John, was killed by Herod "with the sword" (Acts 12:2), but the inspired record does not refer to any burial, or trouble to state what became of his body.

The very fact that a book on religion that so largely concerns itself with the future life as the New Testament could be so silent as to burials, emphasizes in signal fashion the scorn of the physical body. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul," sums up the attitude of Jesus. The physical body must return to dust, whence it came, and the soul shall put on immortality, shall be clothed with a new and spiritual body. The presumptuous doubts of some of the Corinthians as to the details of the resurrection, as to just how God was going to raise the dead, "and with what manner of body do they come," led Paul to write at length of this mystery of the heavenly body as contrasted with the earthly. "God giveth it a body even as it pleased him" is evident of all things about us, and this led Paul to the thrilling declaration: "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body: it is raised a spiritual body." There is not the slightest suggestion in the New Testament that the burial of the physical body should follow any certain fashion or is of any particular importance except that burial in the waters of baptism. There is no suggested ritual, nor can one even find precedent in the New Testament for any particular

method of procedure. The whole matter is ignored as of no importance.

The question arises: Are we not imitating Egypt rather than Jerusalem in our increasingly extravagant expenditures and lavish displays at funerals? I would not suggest selfish indifference and disregard for our dead, I would not add a feather's weight to the hearts bowed down with unutterable grief, I would not decrease in any way our loving devotion to our dear ones as we part from them—I merely ask: Are we showing our regard and devotion in the Christian manner? I have seen a poverty-stricken man spend his last cent for a superb casket and a still more expensive, waterproof, steel container, while those of the family that remain are in need, or while hundreds of lost souls in the community perish without the gospel, not to mention the millions of heathen who have never heard. Do we not seem to place an unchristian emphasis on the physical—making the body of one person of more importance than the souls of many lost men and women— instead of saying that the whole world of physical, material things can not outweigh a single soul? The growing brevity and simplicity of the funeral service is an encouraging indication. What finer or more fitting thing could be done than for a man's life to speak for itself, since it will inevitably outweigh the most fulsome eulogy of a preacher? What service could be more completely Christian than the simple, unadorned word of God as He Himself speaks His consolation to the breaking heart of mankind and the outpouring of the overburdened soul in prayer?

The tombs of Jesus and Tut-ankh-amen place in direct contrast the earthly poverty of the Son of God and the wealth and splendor of the ancient Pharaoh.

The descriptions and pictures of the furnishings of the tomb at Luxor—the fabulous treasures, even gold couches and gold chariots—have excited the whole world. It is not surprising in the presence of such treasures that the grave-robbers have rifled most of the tombs up and down the Nile Valley. What a flood of light this discovery throws on the superb self-sacrifice and devotion of Moses when he chose "rather to share ill treatment with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; accounting the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt." How many millions must have suffered a terrible, grinding poverty that one man might have such luxury and pomp! How many homes must have been despoiled in war and how many helpless people crushed in unspeakable slavery in order that the Pharaoh should surround himself with such dazzling displays and such glittering frippery.

The extreme poverty of the earthly life of Jesus is one of the startling features of the gospel. He was born in a manger instead of a palace. His mother and her husband were of the common people, instead of the nobility. "The Son of man hath not where to lay his head" sheds light upon an obscure side of His life. How did He live? Whence came the money that supported the little group? Did Peter, Andrew, James and John, and especially men of some means like Matthew, invest what they had in financing the evangelistic tours? They were doubtless received generally with true Eastern hospitality by some one whose heart was open to the truth. Was the conduct of the Samaritan village which was so inhospitable an isolated case, or was the instruction "to shake off the dust of your feet" in the streets of a village that would not receive the

message a word that was significant in the evangelistic tours of the Twelve? It seems a group of notable women of Galilee—women of means—ministered to Him of their substance. "Joanna the wife of Chuzas Herod's steward, Susanna, and many others," were in this group who assisted in furnishing the material things necessary for the earthly life of Jesus. These gifts became so plentiful later that a treasury was kept and the money redistributed to the poor. But it was a common treasury. Jesus amassed no earthly treasures. He scorned them as of only momentary importance. When He came to die, the only material possession He had of any worth was a garment for which the soldiers gambled. Yet how obscure has been the memory of Tut-ankh-amen through all these centuries, and how imperishable the memory of Christ, in spite of the riches of the one and the poverty of the other. The very poverty of Jesus reveals His dignity. It would have been pre-eminently true of Him that "the laborer is worthy of his hire" had He cared to accept it. What countless treasures would have poured into His hands from those who had been cured, raised from the dead or redeemed from the clutches of sin! Is there a single instance in the Gospels where any one even offered to pay Him in gold? There was that indefinable atmosphere radiating from His personality which lifted Him above all this. Some one has pointed out that He was like certain Greek philosophers who despised earthly possessions and lived in poverty and simplicity. But He was not like these philosophers, because He had the power to create for Himself uncounted treasures. The hands that could feed five thousand people from five loaves and two fishes could have heaped together treasures of which Tut-ankh-amen

had never dreamed. But He surrendered the heavenly glories when He came into the world, "not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many." "Though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might become rich."

So great was the poverty of Jesus that He was buried in a borrowed tomb. Not even in death did He have a place to lay His head. Yet how great is the contrast in the power of these tombs—for the occupant and for the world! The tomb of Jesus was found empty on the third day, even though the might of Rome had been summoned to the sealed sepulcher. The bonds of death within and the Roman soldiers without were alike powerless to hold Him. Peter's most tremendous word at Pentecost was this: "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto you. . . . Whom God raised up, having loosed the pangs of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it. ... This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses."

But the tomb of Tut-ankh-amen was found full after three thousand years. Death still held him in fatal grip. The bonds of death were unbroken. All his gold and silver—his gorgeous apparel, his food, his vases, utensils, couches and chariots of gold—all were there, untouched and unused. His marvelous display of wealth had not availed to break the bonds of death. The tomb held fast all that had been placed in it thousands of years before. Poor, ignorant soul—he had imagined he could feed on bread and wine and use gold and silver in the other world. Christ represents the rich fool as saying his soul might rest at ease, since he had great possessions stored in crowded barns and storehouses. He talked as if his soul could find nour-

ishment from such material possessions. How many are there who are still as foolish!

These two tombs represent the height of achievement of man and God. Here is the petrified and lifeless body of a king so marvelously embalmed that it lies in state surrounded by gorgeous trappings after thirty centuries. Yonder is the empty tomb of Jesus, irrefutable proof of the risen Son of God—of God's invincible power and of Christ's divine sonship. Standing by the empty tomb, well may we give thanks for the "unsearchable riches of Christ."

The excavations at Luxor promise to revolutionize current ideas about Egyptian art, and to disclose further achievement of that ancient civilization. The tomb of Tut-ankh-amen has power for the world to enrich our knowledge of ancient art, science and religion, but it is absolutely powerless in regard to the great beyond. It brings back no message from eternity, or, if it does, that message is only negative. The only message it can bring to the world from the land of mystery is that the ancient Egyptians were mistaken in their ideas. They had not solved the problem of death or of the needs and character of the other world. Pharaoh's amazing treasures provided with such infinite care have but excited the cupidity of ancient grave-robbers, or stirred the interest of modern archaeologists thirsting for knowledge of the past. The king himself has found it impossible to use all these riches. He returns a negative answer from the other world, warning men to halt in the mad scramble for gold and search for treasures that shall have eternal value.

Lord Carnorvan's untimely death and the illness of Mr. Carter gave the stage momentarily to the witchcraft-mongers with their dire tales of the "curse of

Pharaoh's tomb." We were told that the ancient witchcraft of Egypt had sealed the tomb with a terrible curse upon one who would break within. But the real curse of Tut-ankh-amen's tomb is the curse of gold which made it the inevitable prey of the grave-robbers, or which forces the modern archaeologist to move the treasures to safe-keeping in museums, lest they shall now be destroyed by grave-robbers. What a forceful token of the impotence and vanity of earthly treasures! But the tomb of Christ has power to reveal the secrets of death and eternity, and to save all men from hopelessness and despair. "It is finished," He cried on the cross, and the veil of the temple was rent in twain. The veil which has shrouded eternity in mystery was rent when He died for a lost world and broke the bars of death and came forth again from the tomb "alive for evermore." Jesus Himself pointed repeatedly to the empty tomb that should give visible proof of the truth of His teaching and His claims to infinite power and authority. In the presence of the risen Christ a lost world can lay aside its fear and despair, and cry: "Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

XVII.

PAUL'S MISSIONARY METHODS

PART I.

THE apostle Paul is at once the greatest single figure in human history, excepting Jesus Himself, and the greatest missionary of all time. The missionary methods of Paul, since they represent the maximum of achievement, are the ideal missionary methods. Before attempting to uncover the missionary methods of Paul, it is necessary to consider several preliminary questions in order to determine the practical value of such a study. Are we obligated to pursue the same missionary methods as Paul? How important is our theme? Is it possible for us to use the same methods Paul used? How practical is this study? Do the missionary methods of Paul furnish a complete example for modern missions? How far do the missionary problems of the first century duplicate those of the twentieth century?

Method is a matter of secondary importance. What we preach supersedes how we preach, and what we do overtops how we do it. But the method of speech and conduct is so intertwined with the act itself that it is inseparable and of elemental importance. The method used often changes completely the nature of the act. Success or failure is often largely due to method. We often hear it said: "I must be myself. I must follow

my own methods. I can not imitate the methods of another." There is some truth in this, but we will do well to study and follow the apostolic example as to method. The same line of demarcation obtains as to method which is seen in separating faith and opinion. The method used may be a matter of faith and absolutely obligatory. The express command of Jesus as to method leaves us no choice. Modernists often attempt to excuse their disloyalty by saying they are only pursuing a different method. Pedobaptists often talk of methods or modes of baptism. But where there is a clear-cut command and example, we must not attempt to cloak our disobedience in camouflaged robes of "method." The prophet who was devoured by the lion because of his disobedience was not disobedient as to the message he delivered, but the method of travel by which he returned home. He exchanged his divine orders for the "inner-conscience" instructions of another. Method may, then, be absolutely a matter of faith. Jesus gave two commissions to His apostles. The final command given at the time of the ascension holds the primacy and is rightly called the "great commission." But the first commission recorded in the tenth chapter of Matthew is much more detailed and of great importance. Few passages deserve more painstaking and persistent study. The final commission revoked the first as to message and field. "The kingdom of heaven is at hand" gave place to the full gospel of Pentecost. "Go not into any way of the Gentiles" was swept aside by "Go ye into all the world." But the first commission dealt mainly with methods, and this was not revoked, but rather reaffirmed in the final words of Jesus. It is an interesting study to lay Acts and the Epistles alongside the tenth chapter of Matthew

and see how closely the apostles pursued the methods ordered by Jesus.

The teaching and the approved precedent of the apostles are binding upon us, since Jesus gave to them the miraculous guidance and the power to speak for Him in the establishment of the church. What precedent has been left us in the matter of missionary methods? The methods of Paul and Barnabas, Peter and John or Philip differ in certain respects, but there are certain common denominators for which we should seek. When we find a method common to all, we approach a matter of faith. It is dangerous to be dogmatic about the details of Paul's missionary methods, but they deserve more study than they have received, and we should strive to follow them as far as possible.

Is it possible for us to use the missionary methods of Paul? Is this study practical? Can a pigmy use the same methods as a giant? In general, yes. The same laws of the universe resist the activities of both; the same principles control. The difference in size and strength will naturally cause many variations of method. We approach here the question of the temporal and the permanent in the early church. The miraculous element was strong in the early church and in the work of Paul. This is absent today. Follow Paul in his missionary tours and see the profound emphasis upon the miraculous. The sorcerer of Cyprus, Elymas or Bar-Jesus, confronts Paul before Sergius Paulus, the governor, and is stricken blind with a terrific word. At Iconium a "long time therefore they tarried there speaking boldly in the Lord, who bare witness unto the word of his grace, granting signs and wonders to be done by their hands." At Lystra the lame man was healed. At the conference in Jerusalem

"they hearkened unto Barnabas and Paul rehearsing what signs and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles through them." The demon was cast out of the soothsaying maid at Philippi, and a young man raised from the dead at Troas. The miraculous forms the very basis of Paul's evangelistic work throughout his tours. All this lies outside of our capacities and is not practical for us to-day.

Moreover, Paul had the direct, miraculous guidance of the Holy Spirit. Often Paul the man wanted to pursue a different course, but Paul the inspired apostle had to follow the course directed. He tried to preach in Mysia and Bithynia, but the Spirit would not permit. He wanted to preach in Jerusalem among the Jews, but again the divine command sent him "far hence unto the Gentiles." Now, we can not expect such direct guidance to-day, and we should watch out for this element in the methods of Paul, but in the main it should cause us to scrutinize even more closely his methods, for, if he was directly guided, we are more than likely to find here a permanent example of the type and method of work to pursue.

Besides the miraculous element there are the methods peculiar to Paul's own temperament and personality. The controversy between Paul and Barnabas brings this to the forefront. A speaker at the Colorado Springs National Convention delivered an address on "Barnabas the Missionary." He devoted much time to the controversy between Barnabas and Paul over John Mark. He ended his address with the ringing declaration: "Paul was wrong. Barnabas was right." The proof adduced was that Mark finally became a good worker, and Paul wrote, gladly seeking his aid. But this is a superficial view of the matter. Both Bar-

nabas and Paul were right. "And there arose a sharp contention, so that they parted asunder one from the other, and Barnabas took Mark, . . . but Paul chose Silas." Barnabas said: "This man Mark has good stuff in him. He failed us before, but he deserves another chance. He will finally make a good man if we have patience with him and take him along." Paul said: "This man Mark has proved himself a broken stick. He may make good later, as you say, but I have neither the time nor the energy to spend in taking such a man in our missionary company." Both were right. Barnabas the patient could afford to work with Mark; Paul the heroic could not. It was affirmed that Barnabas saved Mark. Granted. But Paul also saved him. Doubtless Mark would have despaired and given up if Barnabas had not generously and patiently taken him and given him further training. But who knows but he would never have mastered his weaknesses and become a real man had it not been for the heroic challenge which Paul's stern rebuke and high standards kept ever before him? The method of Paul was as salient as that of Barnabas in the development of the young man. Many of the methods of Paul doubtless are bound up with his extraordinary personality and lie beyond us, although they may direct and tremendously inspire us.

Do the missionary methods of Paul furnish a complete example for us? How far do the missionary problems of the first century parallel those of the twentieth century? A recent speaker, in making a sidelong argument for a new gospel, argued at length on the changed conditions of the world in this new day. He illustrated by saying that the world was like two men living on opposite sides of a town—one raised a

garden and the other chickens successfully and peacefully without any fences, etc.; but the modern means of transportation and communication had produced a new world and moved the man raising chickens up against the man raising a garden. But what new element has modern transportation brought into the problems Christianity faces? What new intellectual problems in the field of philosophy? What difference in the despairing sinfulness of this selfish and wicked world? Were not the Canaanitish chickens forever scratching up the garden of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob? Was not the "old scratch" himself at work in the Garden of Eden in the beginning? The great elements of human life repeat themselves from one century to another. The world is still lost in sin that does not change its hue. Moreover, Paul's experience was world-wide. He handled all types of nationalities, localities, religions, customs, situations. There is, indeed, a remarkable parallel between the Roman world in Paul's day and our own world situation; a high type of civilization with ease, wealth, luxury and a fringe of barbarian nations taking on a veneer of civilization; great cities teeming with life of every description and reeking with moral filth; a crumbling social structure, increasing lawlessness and a large element defying all authority; decaying religious life; the home base in Judea, with its complex problems and furious theological controversies. Paul's career furnishes about as complete an example as can be found within the compass of a single life.

What are the missionary methods of Paul? The first thing which stands out is his careful and intensive preparation for his work. His whole early life is a story of painstaking scholarship and most conscientious

effort in the development of his tremendous personal gifts and the mastery of intellectual training. The cosmopolitan character of this training which gave him a grip on the philosophy of Greece, the great elements of Roman civilization and the psychological background of the great racial sections of the world of his day was a great asset. But we do not find Paul emphasizing this as if he considered it paramount. He talks of his thorough training in the word of God under the great Gamaliel and his devotion to God and the law. This towers above everything else in his equipment for missionary service. It is interesting to hear W. D. Cunningham outline his estimate of the qualifications of a missionary. He says that high intellectual equipment is a fine qualification, but by no means the primary one. He places first a passionate devotion to Jesus and His word. Advanced scholastic standing adds to power, other things being equal, but the life and the message come first. In an earlier age we often sent out missionaries with meager intellectual equipment. But they had a surpassing love for Christ and desire to tell the simple story of the cross. They found the philosophical problems offered by Buddhism, Confucianism, Shintoism, etc., staggering, but they were able to add to their divine message an understanding of the intellectual atmosphere in which they were working. To-day we are sending out too many missionaries who have high scholastic ranking in college and advanced training in our great atheistic universities, but who have no definite, heaven-revealed message for a lost world. They know more about Oriental philosophy than they do about the New Testament. They go out, not to do house-to-house personal evangelism of the burning type set forth in the tenth chapter of

Matthew, but to dabble in Oriental politics, build up institutions of learning that have so little of Christianity in them that large numbers of the graduates drift back into heathenism, construct all sorts of humanitarian enterprises, and substitute a social gospel for the message of personal salvation delivered by Christ and His apostles. The fault lies in the unbalanced training given, and the false supremacy of intellectualism over the religion of Jesus, in the colleges of America bound under the stultifying yoke of rationalism.

The mystery of Paul's three years in Arabia spent in direct communication with God, reassessing his life and establishing his profound grip on the great doctrines of Christianity, suggests Moses' years of solitary training with God in the wilderness after his mastery of the intellectual training from the scholars of Egypt. One of the methods commanded by Jesus in the first commission was: "Be not anxious how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father." Hear Paul in Galatians: "Paul, an apostle not from men, nor through man, but through Jesus Christ, and God the Father. . . . For I make known to you, brethren, as touching the gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ." But the miraculous method of receiving the message was temporary and was set aside in Paul's ringing command to Timothy: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." The divine origin and character of the message itself,

however, remains permanent, as is evidenced in the repeated injunctions of Paul that Timothy beware of the time predicted of the Holy Spirit when men "shall depart from the faith," and "if thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of the faith and of good doctrine." Modern missionary methods should include the most thorough training possible, with profound emphasis upon God's word and the divine message.

Another striking characteristic of Paul's missionary work was the immense amount of ground covered in his far-reaching evangelistic tours. Paul the man was at first inclined to limit his work to a smaller field, but the Spirit thrust him out into the Roman Empire. The missionary vision of Paul took in the whole world. "We must not forget this. We must not allow betrayals, disappointments, failures, controversies or any other experience to shorten our vision. Jesus said: "Go ye into all the world." So let it be. In our prayers, in our giving, sending and going, let us remember "the field is the world." Paul's first tour swept through the heart of Asia Minor, Pisidia and Galatia. The second covered this same territory, and on into Macedonia and Greece. The third took him from Ephesus over again into Greece, and the final trip to Jerusalem brought about the fulfillment of his dreams to go to Rome, though he went in chains. Twice in his Epistle to the Romans he speaks of his desire to go on by their help to Spain to preach the gospel out on the western edge of civilization. Did he go? Acts closes with Paul in prison at Rome at the end of two years. It was evidently published at this juncture. Clement of Rome,, in his letter to the church at Corinth, written about the

close of the first century, says: "By reason of jealousy and strife, Paul, by his example, pointed out the prize of patient endurance. After that he had been seven times in bonds, had been driven into exile, had been stoned, had preached in the east and in the west, had won the noble renown which was the reward of his faith, having taught righteousness unto the whole world, and having reached the farthest bounds of the west, and when he had borne his testimony before the rulers, so he departed this world and went unto the holy place, having been found a noble pattern of patient endurance." The Greek *epi to terma tes duseos* seems to mean the Pillars of Hercules, "the farthest bounds of the west." If this is the meaning, Paul doubtless was released and preached in Spain after the close of Acts, for Clement should be good authority on such a matter.

Paul's method parallels both the example and command of Jesus. In the early days of the Galilean ministry, Jesus left the excited multitudes, spent the night in prayer, and when Peter and others found Him in the morning out in the desert, Peter uttered the sharp protest: "All men seek for thee." "And he said unto them, Let us go into the next towns, that I may preach there also: for therefore came I forth." The first commission gave an emphatic command for haste—not to burden themselves with equipage, not to pause to salute any one, but to go in all haste. W. D. Cunningham's famous dictum is that "every man has a better right to hear the gospel once than any man has to hear it twice." Some one challenged Cunningham's maxim recently, saying that it not only would not save the most who do not accept at first hearing, but would not permit the building up of strong home-base

churches to support the far-reaching missionary enterprises. But Mr. Cunningham's wonderful life-work in the Tokyo Mission shows that he does not mean to push his adage to the extreme that was suggested. Paul kept breaking out into new territory, but he also revisited again and again the churches already established, and kept them in order by his famous Epistles and his corps of young evangelists he trained up in the gospel. Thomas Kalane's work in South Africa was criticized because he opened up so many more preaching-points than he could organize and consolidate. But he defended himself by saying he could not refuse the piteous invitations to "come over and help us." Payne and Titus have followed with a magnificent work of developing and solidifying the work opened in dashing and heroic fashion by Kalane.

It seems to us to-day well-nigh incredible that one man could have covered the ground and caused the world-wide religious upheavals which Paul did. He was at heart a "pioneer" daring the dangers of the untouched and unknown. "For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God, so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ. Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation. . . . But now having no more place in these parts, and having a great desire these many years to come unto you; whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you." Behold the heart of a pioneer! What a thrilling vista of fearsome mountain passes, flanked

by scrawny pines; swollen, angry rivers offering continual hazards; far-flung reaches of desert and ocean travel. And yet Paul cried: "More room, more room." Some may express timidity and dismay at the scarcity of neighbors and the perpetual jeopardy of frontier life, but the pioneer continually cries for more elbow room. Some preachers find themselves utterly unwilling to build except on some one's foundation already firmly established. They do not dare the sturdy tasks of the frontier. What if every preacher would attempt to establish one church in some needy and forsaken field? Some preachers find themselves cramped in a county-seat and reach out to encompass a great city with their influence, but behold this mighty colossus bestriding the greater part of the Roman Empire and crying out: "I have no more room in these parts. I must go on to Rome and Spain, to the uttermost parts."

"Fling out the banner! let it float
 Skyward and seaward, high and wide;
The sun, that lights its shining folds;
 The cross, on which the Saviour died.

"Fling out the banner! sin-sick souls
 That sink and perish in the strife
Shall touch in faith its radiant hem,
 And spring immortal into life."

XVIII.

PAUL'S MISSIONARY METHODS

PART II.

SOMETHING of the intellectual and spiritual background of the great apostle to the Gentiles and a survey of the far-reaching character of his campaigns have been set forth in a preceding essay. A further characteristic of Paul's missionary work is his careful choice of the most promising fields. He had but one life to live. It must count for the most. He is like a farmer choosing the most fertile soil. We do not find Paul out in the rural backwoods districts, but in the great centers of civilization. The sections with scanty populations must be reached, and they will be if the centers are Christianized. In other words, group evangelism is as old as Paul. He attempted to establish a strong church in the capital of the province, and left this church to evangelize its own territory. Call the roll of the great cities where his life was spent: Antioch of Syria, Antioch of Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, Troas, Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, Corinth, Ephesus, Jerusalem, Rome.

In these cities he went first to the synagogue, the most promising field. The divine order was the Jew first, and then the Gentile. But this was also the order of common sense and efficiency—the order of their preparation to hear the message. Paul's method

at Corinth was characteristics "And he reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath, and persuaded Jews and Greeks" (Acts 18:4). What? Greeks in a synagogue? Yes, proselytes of the gate. They are called continually in Acts *sebomenoi* or "pious ones." They were the most fertile field of all. They had accepted monotheism under the Jewish influence, but were not encrusted with centuries of Jewish tradition and prejudice. They formed the great nucleus of the string of churches Paul founded over the Roman world. Sometimes Paul found the largest cities not the most fruitful; for example, Athens. Sometimes it was profitable to remain for a long siege of a city, as in Corinth, Ephesus and Rome.

Paul followed up his sweeping campaigns with constant watch-care over the churches established. He did not attempt to make the churches subservient to any central church or organization, but tried to make them self-supporting and to develop a sturdy independence in each. We have to-day the spectacle of missionaries, working a quarter of a century and establishing a number of churches, but none of them self-supporting or independent of the superorganization. We have about us churches which have been independent for years, and some preacher becomes the leader who persuades the congregation that they are not able to support themselves, and that they must seek paltry support from a missionary organization, and then persuades the church to give to the organization more money than they have received. The purposes and results of this policy are too obvious to need comment.

The churches Paul established were beset with dangers. They were little groups surrounded by the vilest of heathen customs and atmosphere, and beset within

by false teachers. Like a circuit-rider, whose circuit was the civilized world, Paul ranged over the Roman Empire, renewing the faith and courage of these young churches. In spite of all the difficulties of writing and posting letters, in prison cell or amid prodigious revival campaigns, Paul wrote the great documents which were the beginnings of the New Testament—his letters to the churches. How slow we are to use printers' ink to-day. How many a little band of isolated Christians have been held together by the encouragement which came from reading the *Christian Standard* until a Restoration Association evangelist came to build here a church.

The heart and center of Paul's missionary work was his training-school for evangelists which went on wherever Paul was. His extended campaigns and his constant influence over widely separated churches would have been impossible without this. Moreover, like a wise statesman, he must plan for the future, when he will yield up his earthly tasks and dreams to those who follow after. This feature of his missionary program assured its permanence. It would be useless to establish churches if leaders could not be provided to carry on the work. How many brilliant young preachers Paul won and trained. Silas, Timothy, Apollos, Titus, Luke, Mark, Aquila and Priscilla, Tertius, Tychicus and Epaphras are some of the names we meet in the Epistles of Paul. How many unnamed helpers he had we know not. This was also the method of Jesus—training the twelve and the seventy and sending them forth. They prepared the way before Him and organized and maintained His work after His ascension. Wolfe's great program in the Philippines for establishing a Bible institute where young Tagalog

preachers can be trained is sure to be the most strategic enterprise possible. Like Paul of old, he will find these young natives, filled with the understanding of the gospel and with the passionate determination to proclaim and defend it, the most powerful asset in combating false teaching, maintaining the faith of the Tagalog churches and extending the lines of New Testament Christianity out into the untouched fields.

Paul's financial methods were as heroic as his plan of campaigns. Early and late he worked at his tent-making, while he used the most propitious hours for public proclamation of his message. The same thrill comes to us to-day as we read of the early struggles of Cunningham, "Westrup and Madden. There is something very challenging about Madden's simple invitation: "If you have missionary funds to be used to preach the gospel of Jesus to the Japanese and care to entrust them to me, I promise to use them as wisely and as economically as possible. But, whether you care to give or not, I intend to keep on preaching to the Japanese, for I can support myself teaching English." Paul set forth the principle that the laborer was worthy of his hire, and he attempted to develop the generosity and sturdy independence of the churches. He told the church at Corinth that he really "robbed" other churches by accepting gifts from them during his ministry in Corinth, when they themselves should have supported him. The church at Philippi followed Paul all over the Roman Empire with offerings and gifts, and his gratitude and love for them shine out in his Epistles. The offering for the poor saints at Jerusalem furnished the opportunity for effective appeals to prosperous Gentile churches.

The first and last commissions urged bold and uncompromising proclamation of the message. "What ye hear in the ear, proclaim upon the housetops." This was Paul's method. He did not enter in by stealth, dodge the question asked as to his belief and present his ideas in homeopathic doses. There was never any doubt where Paul stood. Even when persecution or death seemed likely to follow, Paul boldly preached the divine message. "Fear them not, therefore," was written high on his banner.

Paul preached exactly the same gospel wherever he went. To the Jews he became as a Jew, and to the Gentiles as a Gentile, but not when it came to a matter of principle. He could quote the Greek poets to the Athenians, but he preached the same gospel at Jerusalem, Antioch, Berea or Athens. "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand, by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you," was his ringing word to the Corinthians. The crucial test was at Athens, when he faced the skeptical intellectualists of the Greek world. How they scorned his message about the resurrection! Yet he did not say: "The psychology of the Greek mind in this new age will not permit them to accept the resurrection gospel; I must trim that part and soft pedal here at Athens." No. He preached the same gospel with the same driving emphasis upon the resurrection. And it was so much wasted thunder? Not much. He refused to compromise his message. He threw out a challenging message for his Christ. The crowd scorned it, but succeeding Christian messengers kept on proclaiming the same story, and the day came it toppled the pagan idols of Athens from their pedes-

tals. Paul was not responsible for the effect produced by his preaching, but only for faithful proclamation. "And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet" (Matt. 10:14). At Antioch they "stirred up a persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and cast them out of their borders. But they shook off the dust of their feet against them, and came unto Iconium" (Acts 13:50, 51). In such fashion did Paul carry out the instructions of his Master.

Paul's method was controversial. He was eternally engaged in discussion. He went first to the synagogue, and his sermon nearly always ended in an argument. The controversy waxed hotter and hotter until he was put out of the synagogue. He then went to the marketplace, where he could get the largest hearing, and began to preach. Discussion followed which increased in intensity until Paul was thrust out of the city, usually with all kinds of persecution and violence. The people who talk about the day of public discussion being past need to read their New Testament. But Paul did not seek discussion or deliberately court opposition. He simply preached the message. Jesus had predicted that persecution would always follow. It did. Some preachers to-day boast that everything is peaceful and absolutely harmonious in their church and community, and everybody pleased with their preaching. This means merely that the preacher has ceased to preach the gospel, and is so lost to shame as to brag of the popularity that has resulted. If we preach Christ's gospel, the devil will see that we get persecuted. If we are not being persecuted in any sort of sense, we should get on our knees to contemplate the word of Christ: "Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you."

The flashing sword of the Spirit is never wielded by the preacher who has decided to acquire the kingdoms of this world by bowing down and worshiping Satan.

The course pursued by Paul in regard to controversies within the church is another subject worthy the keenest investigation to-day. Paul was trailed all over the Roman Empire by the self-appointed hierarchy of Judaistic propagandists from "headquarters" at Jerusalem. They attempted to mislead the churches back to circumcision and the yoke of the Old Testament law. They did not hesitate to disrupt the churches with their false teaching. The account of the circumcision conference at Jerusalem in Acts, the Epistle to the Galatians, and scattered bits of furious discussion throughout Paul's Epistles, reveal this distressing situation.

The method of the Judaizers was to avoid open discussion with Paul, to wait until he left a church, then slip right in and begin a slimy campaign of slander against Paul, mixed with their false teaching. They ridiculed Paul's personal appearance and capacity, raked over his past when he persecuted Christianity, pointed out he was not one of the original twelve followers of Jesus, and argued that he was not an apostle and was without authority. They harped on the fact that Paul was not married. Epiphanius says that the Ebionites peddled around the slander that the reason Paul turned against the Old Testament law was that he had been in love with the daughter of the high priest and had been rejected by her, and now pursued this policy to get revenge.

Paul met all this unscrupulous and scurrilous slander with straightforward, public defense of his apostleship and message. How his heart burned over

the corrupted faith of the churches. "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ." "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?" He did not hesitate to publicly uncover the character and purposes of his opponents: "False brethren privily brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty in Christ;" "of whom I told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ." "Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the concision: for we are the circumcision." He struck out boldly in defense of his own apostleship: "Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ." "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." The biting sarcasm of his rebuke to the Corinthians for being so easily deluded into false doctrine mingles with his stirring review of his amazing career of triumph and persecution and suffering: "For ye bear with the foolish gladly, being wise yourselves. For ye bear with a man, if he bringeth you into bondage, if he devoureth you, if he taketh you captive, if he exalteth himself, if he smiteth you on the face. . . . Yet whereinsoever any is bold (I speak in foolishness) I am bold also. Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? So am I. Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as one beside himself) I more." Then follows the wonder-

ful survey of his sufferings for Christ. It is doubtful if Paul ever wrote any more stinging sarcasm than when he prodded the Corinthians on their boasted intellectualism and their easy conquest by false teachers, nor a more stirring presentation of his own prodigious life-work. How much does he leave unsaid: "I am become foolish: ye compelled me; for I ought to have been commended of you." But how little he tells of himself. How our records of the life of Paul shrink in the light of these few verses. Beaten eight times? Five times of the Jews and thrice with rods? When was all this? We know of mobs seeking his life in Damascus, Jerusalem, Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Corinth and Ephesus. But the only record of scourging is at Philippi. Where were the other seven times? At Lystra he was stoned and suffered shipwreck on the voyage to Rome, but when were the other three shipwrecks? And when was he a "day and a night in the deep"? The voyage to Rome was years after the writing of this second letter to Corinth. What of all these sea voyages and terrible experiences in his earlier work? And all of this in the life of a man who struggled desperately with some physical ailment which he describes as a "thorn in the flesh," something grinding, twisting, torturing until he prayed repeatedly for relief, but found instead that God increased his strength and patience to bear it all. Can we forget that the great apostle who accomplished so much also suffered so much? Can the two be separated? Christianity which costs nothing is a counterfeit. O Paul, Paul, how you put to shame our easy-going, comfortable, effete Christianity of to-day! We seek respectability, and unconsciously lose self-respect. We seek popularity and avoid

making trouble for ourselves, and betray Jesus into the hands of His enemies. "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it." "What things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ." These are keywords of Master and disciple. Towering as one of Paul's great declarations is the word: "Henceforth let no man trouble me: for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus."

Paul's entire missionary career finds its source in his passionate devotion to Jesus. The thing which corrupts our missionary methods today is the yielding to false motives. Petty blunders and occasional failures are always swallowed up in the greatness of the self-sacrificing devotion of a real Christian. But the life that lacks this moving passion is like the watch without the mainspring. There is no substitute for it. Paul's life swung out in a circle about Christ as the center. The radius of many modern missionary efforts swings out from self as the center. Self as the basis of authority and the real objective. Bishop Quayle has a great chapter in his "Pastor-preacher" on Paul and Cicero. He compares Cicero's letters with those of Paul; Cicero as orator and Paul the teacher; Cicero and Paul as world travelers crossing the same territory and touching the same cities. Cicero, the greatest figure in the Roman world next to Caesar, came to Asia Minor as a Roman to win a triumph for himself. He went out and mercilessly crushed the little mountain tribes to be called "imperator," and to win a triumphal reception. Paul, the greatest figure in the New Testament, except Jesus, came as a Christian, and as he crossed these same wild mountain trails he "has on his breast, his arms hugged around it, and the blood

streaming down it, a cross," and as he boldly plunges into "perils in the wilderness, in perils of rivers, in perils of robbers," he cries ceaselessly: "Behold the cross of our blessed Lord Jesus Christ." Because he lived for Christ, and not for self, not death, but life, sprang up in his path. The death of Cicero contrasts as sharply with that of Paul—Cicero overtaken by his foes as he is fleeing for his life, and Paul fearlessly giving his life for his Christ. "What mean ye to weep and to break mine heart? for I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus." The secret of Paul's heroic, tremendous life and his unparalleled achievements is summed up in a single sentence by himself: "For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain."

XIX.

CHRISTIANIZING HIGHER EDUCATION

I. THE CONSERVATION OF FAITH.

THE topic seems to assume that the institutions of higher learning in America are, in their vital character and influence, unchristian. This is rather a large assumption for one man to make. It would seem to overlook the magnificent contribution which these institutions are making to modern civilization and to set aside myriads of attractive and valuable features of the American college. Moreover, how dare a man, on the basis of a personal study of no more than ten or twelve colleges and universities, attempt to generalize and pass judgment on the whole field of higher education?

But is this theme any different from the oft-discussed topic: "Is America a Christian Country?" We all know the legal answer to this question, and yet as individuals we undertake to point out that there are certain sections, strata of society, institutions, tendencies and conditions that are decidedly unchristian in character. Eagerly and anxiously we seek for underlying causes and for remedies. Is not the same course advisable in regard to our collegiate system?

Without presuming, at one fell swoop, to indict all of our colleges and universities, it is plain to the close

observer that our colleges are sorely in need of a larger measure of Christian teaching and influence, and that it is nothing short of suicide to neglect the perilous influences that seek to pollute the sources from whence springs our leadership for the future. The American college overshadows the country, as some lofty mountain peak the fertile valleys. It has been slowly erected by centuries of titanic labor on the part of scholar, financier, patriot and parent. The forces that threaten to ravage like a forest fire must be studied and conquered. The American college must be kept the beacon-light of hope, and not left at the mercy of those tendencies that threaten to make barren and desolate. And what are the chief sources of peril?

Foremost among all the insidious and destructive tendencies that entwine themselves about the life of the American college, until it is writhing like Laocoon in the deadly embrace of the monster serpent, is German rationalism. It was customary, before the war, to hear the theological review of the Yale Divinity School say: "Well, as usual the only real contributions to the field of theology and Biblical research this year come from Germany." The pun invented by some students of the Harvard Philosophical Department, expressing their intense admiration for Harvard's famous philosopher, Munsterberg, is rather suggestive of a widespread tendency. In reciting the fine, old German hymn, "*Eine feste burg ist unser Gott*" ("A Mighty Fortress Is Our God"), they rendered it, "*Munster-berg IST unser Gott.*" Has not the radical scholar, by his arrogant proclamation of the infinite rights and prerogatives of "the inner conscience," usurped God's throne? Since the war has come to tear away the gorgeous trappings of German civilization and reveal its loathsome reality,

the American radical has scratched off the label "Made in Germany," for it doesn't sell so fast and doesn't taste nearly as good as it did. However, the formula has been mastered, and innumerable collegiate "stills" continue to debauch the American colleges with theological "moonshine."

To what extent has our college system suffered from this inundation? Who could answer such a question with accuracy and without unfairness to some college that still clings to the teachings and ideals of Jesus? That the most of our great institutions are suffering from it in varying degrees is apparent. The general tendencies of the scientific instruction in our State universities and professional schools such as medical and dental colleges are notorious, and even our schools dedicated to the training of ministers have, in many cases, their private burying-ground, where are quietly laid to rest the hundreds who are slain by the destructive critic, while an "underground railway" ceaselessly operates to send other thousands out into pulpits to slay whole congregations. If its leadership be corrupted, how shall the church itself escape destruction?

A man does not have to be a theologian in order to prove this charge. Where is the community that has not sent out boys and girls to college, only to receive them back with faith in the Christ broken and all interest in the church paralyzed? Is it not time for the father and mother to investigate conditions before they send their children into surroundings that almost inevitably make or ruin the life? Is it not time for the church to undertake to give more careful and scholarly instructions, instead of its present feeble effort in the Bible school, so that young people of high-school age will not be helpless when they hear for the

first time at the feet of radical teachers things with which they are not prepared to grapple?

It has been repeatedly charged by men who have carried on nation-wide investigations that the great majority of teachers of science in American colleges are atheists. A cursory examination of the text-books in use—for instance, in the field of psychology—will reveal the fact that the American college student is constantly studying books which are atheistic, denying the existence of the soul and God. Some psychologists defend themselves for the use of such books by saying that no text-books are to be found in the field of psychology which are not atheistic. While this is an exaggerated estimate, it shows that, even among professors who are not themselves outright atheists, the tendency is to drift with the atheistic current and use the atheistic texts. The fact that so many college professors are atheists and attempting to force their atheism upon the untrained youth who sit at their feet has been repeatedly denied, but the recent rise all over the nation of vigorous atheistic societies among the students is self-evident proof. In June, 1921, the *World's Work* published the results of a most careful investigation under the title "Atheism Rampant in Our Schools." The author uncovers the workings in college and high school of the "American Association for the Advancement of Atheism," with its various local chapters: "The Devil's Angels" (Los Angeles), "The Damned Souls" (Rochester University), "The Circle of the Godless" (University of Wisconsin), "God's Black Sheep" (Philadelphia H. S.), "The Legion of the Damned" (University of North Dakota), etc. Freeman Hopwood, secretary of the national organization, has been especially active in carrying forward its work

through the magazines of the organization and the daily newspapers. Princeton University has always been considered one of the most conservative of Eastern schools, standing out against rationalism in contrast with Yale and Harvard, but Mr. Hopwood reports that, in reply to a questionnaire as to whether they believed in a personal God, 56 per cent, of the students voted "No," and 154 students stated their work in the university had caused them to give up faith in God. In Dartmouth the questionnaire showed that 763 voted "Yes" and 138 voted "No" on the question of belief in God. The vote was overwhelming against the divinity of Christ (two to one), and the great majority (548 to 380) voted against belief in immortality. Mr. Hopwood estimates that one American college student out of three is an atheist, and he hails as the most encouraging feature of the situation the fact that so many of the college professors are atheists, although he admits that many of them are so situated that they have to work under cover in giving aid to the student atheistic organizations. He points out, however, that in many State universities (the University of Indiana, for example) the atmosphere of the school is so completely atheistic that the student magazines freely ridicule Christianity and attack religion.

A study of the literature published by these atheistic college organizations shows that the attacks upon the Bible are but a rehash of the insulting line of teaching which the "modernists" who still claim to believe in God have been presenting in the college classroom for decades. The "modernists" copied most of their attacks from Robert Ingersoll and earlier infidels with sidelights from the theory of evolution. The second generation seems swinging back again to outright athe-

ism, which is the logical result of the modernistic teaching and program.

How may we hope to Christianize higher education in the face of such a tremendous movement? The only way the Master has taught us to Christianize is by preaching the gospel. The Holy Spirit works through the Word and through the life and teaching of the Christian. And how may one preach the gospel to the college? The task seems hopeless, but it is not. It would not be even if German rationalism controlled the entire college system, which it certainly does not. The great movements for the transformation of society seem to work from the masses up. But, says one, masses merely follow their leaders. Aye, but God in His own good time produces their leadership. In the most unexpected times and places, and in defiance of all worldly precedents, an Elisha comes from the farm, a John the Baptist from the desert, or in our own land a rail-splitter takes precedence over all the college-trained men and breaks slavery's shackles and rescues the nation.

I do not mean to underestimate the value and necessity of higher education, but only to emphasize the fact that *God's word shall not fail*, no matter what the odds may be. And let no church, however weak and obscure, neglect the opportunity to *preach the gospel* and give to their young people the clearest conceptions, the cleanest lives and the noblest ideals that are possible. For a college is bound to react to its own student body. Boys and girls are pliable and tend to be molded by the traditions, associations and instructions that come at college. But the college also tends, in a surprising measure, to be molded by the standards, early training and ambitions of its students.

Of course, the most sensible thing, in the case of a college that is committed to rationalism, is to transform the college by direct measures. The law of self-preservation for Christianity demands the widest publicity be given to the teaching, the moral and social conditions in every college. The people have a right to know. The institution does not exist that is able to withstand indefinitely the weight of aroused and concentrated publicity. Many church schools have been captured by stealth and their guns deliberately turned against the citadel of God's word. We must with zeal and generosity support the schools among us that are true to teachings of our Master, and the sinews of war and new recruits must be withheld from the training-camps where the order of the day is doubt instead of faith.

But what of the State university supported by the Government and bound by its traditions, the professional school with its absolute divorcement from the church and religion, and the great university with its almost unlimited endowment? What if they become as the rich fool who, swept away from God by the immensity of his earthly possessions, said: "Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink and be merry"? Except they repent, they, too, must hear the tragic words: "Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee." And if a university shall forfeit its soul, what shall its wonderful traditions, its endowment and scholarship avail? If it debauch its students instead of ennobling them? If it sow the seeds of doubt instead of faith? If it produce selfishness rather than service? Can it be that a university shall not also reap the harvest of its own sowing? Its children must go back into the world

from whence they came up to the college, and there they must meet in mortal combat the children of the soil. If its progeny shall during those four years, plunge into doubt and come forth without a guide or spiritual leader, if they plunge into sin and come forth with diseased bodies, if they yield to selfishness and sink into the depths of stupid egotism—then, in their conflict with the children of the soil, they must lose the battle for all their boasted training! For the world wants faith, not doubt. Its leadership must be clean and virile, not devoured by leprosy. And Jesus of Nazareth, Himself, said: "He that exalteth himself shall be abased."

The university that casts aside its vital faith and dies spiritually faces another dilemma. We speak of destructive criticism as if it were a unified system of thought. But there is no warfare so keen as that which exists among the critics themselves. Churchill, in his "Inside the Cup," represents the hero as halting in his troubled ministry to master the teachings of destructive criticism. He goes to the library and brings home a stack of books by famous critics. He proceeds to devour them and weed out of his Bible the miraculous absurdities, and then, having purged himself of all error, he returns the books. This only shows the superficial character of Mr. Churchill's acquaintance with destructive criticism. For which one of the authors did the hero follow in purging his convictions of all error? If he followed the first, the second would deny, *in Mo*, the theories of the first, and the third would be not less unkind to the second. One of the most amazing experiences of the new student in a great, radical university is to hear one professor tear some famous miracle to bits and build his specious theory as

to "what actually happened," and assure the class that no one with any intelligence could possibly hold any other view, and then pass into the next classroom and hear the next professor tear the last teacher's theory Tip and pronounce it ridiculous and utterly absurd, and then proceed to offer another theory, which becomes equally untenable when the first professor pays his respects to it. The effect on the new student as he leaves the first classroom is often like the shock that comes when one sees a great light, but by the time he has completed the rounds of the classrooms he is ready to sink into a chair for a period of deep meditation, while he contemplates the peculiar aptness of the ancient conundrum: "Where was Moses when the light went out?"

In other words, what is going on in many of the great universities is very much like what happened to the Midianites when they were attacked by Gideon. Every man's hand in the darkness is lifted against his neighbor. The great university with its vast endowment seems so firm and immovable and so far removed from the influence of the church and the common people that the deliberate plan to bring the university back again to the fundamental faith in the Christ and His message seems a task colossal and hopeless. But a terrific struggle is going on inside. It is war to the hilt. Theory against theory, system of philosophy against system of philosophy. Here the same struggle is being fought over again that drenched the fields of Flanders and France. Meanwhile let us preach the gospel. It is God's power for the salvation of the world, and His power is irresistible. If we but obey His command, He will grant ultimate victory in His own time and way.

The task is not merely one of striving to regenerate the college that is antichristian in its instruction and influence, but of reaching the college that is indifferent and uninterested—the college that has no place for the Bible in the curriculum. We complain because the Bible is not taught in the public schools, but is it not even more deplorable that so many of our institutions of higher learning which train our leadership so often ignore the Book which has been the inspiration of civilization for nearly two thousand years? Can a lawyer afford to graduate from a college that has given him no training in the Bible? Can any statesman but feel the handicap of ignorance concerning the world's greatest book? Champ Clark continually confounded his opponents in Congress by his striking use of Scripture. His knowledge of the Bible came largely from a painstaking study at the feet of the great scholar J. W. McGarvey, at Lexington, Ky. Roosevelt was famous for his telling quotations from the Bible, and once laughingly remarked to a group of correspondents, who had spent a good many fruitless hours trying to run down one of his historical allusions, that he believed he had done more to stimulate Bible study than any other man on the American continent. His allusion came from the Old Testament, and if any one of the group of reporters had possessed even a smattering of the Bible, he would have recognized it. They could readily identify Shakespearean allusions, or references to classical Greek or Roman authors, but they were completely humiliated by an apt reference from the Old Testament.

Can a doctor afford to lack a working knowledge of the Bible? Does he not minister to the mind as well as the body? And are not his opportunities to minister

to the soul of surpassing greatness? The poor leech might well be nonplused when Macbeth asked:

"Canst thou not minister to a mind diseased,
Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow,
Raze out the written troubles of the brain,
And with some sweet oblivious antidote
Cleanse the stuffed bosom of that perilous stuff
Which weighs upon the heart?"

But dare the Christian physician be so helpless? It is true some of his patients might say of the ministration of faith, "Throw" this kind of "physic to the dogs; I'll none of it," but this would be the rare exception. The rapid growth of Christian Science, in spite of its monstrosities, is evidence of the failure of the church and the doctor to call up the teaching of Christ to aid the scientist in the common warfare against disease and sin. In an age when overwhelming burdens and ever-increasing nervous disorders render optimism, moral courage and mental poise the fundamental assets in recovery from disease, how tragic is the failure of the modern doctor to draw upon the divine source for these essentials. To know and to be able to use the teaching of Jesus would be infinite power and helpfulness to the work of the physician.

And the scientist, has he no place for Bible study or knowledge of the teaching of our Master? In my early college days a professor of science and one of the ministerial students—a man of unusual natural ability, but of limited training—had a lengthy discussion in which both learned much. The professor at the close summed the matter up thus: "I will have to admit I don't know much about the Bible, and you certainly don't know much about science." Is this incident unique? There is but little excuse for the minister to

be ignorant of the general course of scientific investigation and the conclusions and theories based thereon, but there is still less excuse for a scientist to refuse to study the Bible.

Entirely apart from the destiny of the soul, the very course of a man's every-day life must needs be barren without a knowledge of the Bible. If one should follow the college man into any one of the many lines of activity, you would find the need for an accurate knowledge of the Bible the same in the life of the cultured business man, farmer or mechanic.

But the most difficult question is this: By what means are we to get the Bible into the curriculum of the college? The first step should be to arouse the general public to a realization of its need and to focus attention on the college to secure a reformation of its curriculum. The nearest and most sympathetic point of contact is through the alumni of an institution. If alumni associations or individual alumni, men of faith, and courage, who feel this great lack in the professional training afforded by their *alma mater*, will take this matter up with the college, surprising results may be obtained. For the college professors and executives are, for the most part, devout idealists seeking earnestly to serve their day and generation.

And if a college here and there respond to the needs of the hour in regard to careful instruction in the Bible, how are the other schools that are not naturally responsive to the public demand to be reached? The suggestion is offered that the solution here lies in the standardization movement among the colleges. If the amount and quality of training in the Bible required for graduation shall be standardized, then a sweeping reformation may be brought about in the curriculum

of American colleges. And would there not be general rejoicing if the standardization movement would give a little evidence of possessing a soul instead of stalking about like a Goliath shouting his challenges of dollars and cents? Overwhelmed from its birth by personalities and influences that were distinctly unchristian, if the standardization movement could overcome this handicap and lend a helping hand in Christianizing higher education in America, its position would become commanding and its help most timely.

Harvard University leads the way in this movement for our great universities by her recent pronouncement in which she decrees that hereafter no man may receive his A.B. from Harvard without first passing an examination in the Bible; and when one recalls that Prof. G. F. Moore is the guiding spirit of the university, one can be certain that this examination will be no farce, but a rather strenuous affair. The *Brooklyn Eagle* notes that "in recent decades the impression has prevailed that the undergraduate's judgment, though distinctly unripened, should prevail as to the value of the word of God to his ambitions and aspirations in life," and adds that this new requirement "does not spring out of any renaissance of devotionism and is in strict accord with the views of unbiased critics on cultural education." What a tribute to the broad spirit of tolerance and scholarship at Harvard, and what a scorching rebuke to hundreds of smaller schools under the guidance of men of faith and devotion to the Christ, is it that the great *Unitarian* university of America has to lead the way to careful and systematic study of the Bible in the college classroom; And how long will other colleges wait before they accept the challenge? If not merely the theological students, but

the rank and file of the academic departments, are to receive advanced training in the Bible from the extreme radical viewpoint, and our colleges that are still wholesome in their atmosphere of faith drift along with their present neglect of the Bible in the academic departments, then our peril is increased rather than diminished.

The church must play a decisive part in overcoming this great lack in the training of the college man. The two great institutions, the church and the college, must effect a closer co-operation to this end. The great missionary organizations of the religious bodies of America have in recent years been applying their energies to this task, and numerous Bible chairs in State universities and like institutions have been established. But if the experience of other religious bodies has been as unfortunate as our own, then there has been little to encourage and much to discourage. One of the most astounding revelations of the last few years has been the deliberate choice and the stubborn defense by missionary organizations of radical professors for these Bible chairs. And the response on the part of the students in many such cases has been exceedingly meager. Again we realize that the college and the church stand or fall together. They can not be separated into water-tight compartments. If the church shall turn away from its age-old belief in a supernatural religion and in a divine Saviour, then the college of necessity will do likewise. And if the college shall cast aside the belief in the inspiration and authority of God's word and the unique character of Jesus, then the church must either redeem the college from its skepticism or else fall into the ditch together with its blind guide.

Atheistic teachers, who have taken possession of colleges established by men and women of faith, and who are using the classrooms to destroy that for which they were established, should be forced out. They ought to be permitted to teach as much atheism as they please—in schools established for that purpose and supported by the money of unbelievers. Our money and our young people should be sent only to those schools which are true to Christ and His word. Swift suicide for Christianity will result from our present policy.

The church and the college can not very long work at cross-purposes with one another. Their lives are too intimately related. Too long has the church neglected the college. Separation of church and state has been carried to an extreme—it has too often meant separation of higher education and religion. Moreover, the church has established colleges and allowed them to drift into skeptical hands where they have reacted to destroy the very faith that gave them birth. Within the last few decades a flood of rationalistic teaching has swept out of the college and threatened to overwhelm the church, and now, if Christianity is to survive, a great tidal wave *of faith, idealism and consecration must sweep back from the church into the college. And it must come NOW!* Already the church is beginning to feel the thrill of a great revival of a proclamation of the gospel and of evangelistic effort. Attention is being turned to the young men and women, and more adequate training given in order that they may not be mere dumb, driven cattle, but upstanding in their faith, able to give a reason for their convictions and determined to seek the facts in the case before they surrender their faith for a skeptical theory. And now the church must concentrate

upon the college the attention of the public in a way that shall make plain its virtues and achievements and its faults and needs. The church college must be led to serve the church, else it can no longer be supported by the church. The great university must be touched with the divine spark of the spirit and message of the Christ. Let the church, vigorous in faith and deeply consecrated, reach out a guiding, helping hand to the college and the tide will swing back, for "the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea."

XX.

CHRISTIANIZING HIGHER EDUCATION

PART II.—MAINTAINING A SPIRITUAL ATMOSPHERE.

HOW are we to Christianize higher education—to preach the gospel to the college and to help the college to preach the gospel to the world? The problem is not merely one of securing instruction in the classroom that will engender faith, but of assisting the student in maintaining a vital religious life through this most difficult period. Harvard has laid down a regulation requiring all A.B. graduates to pass an examination in the Bible, but this "does not spring out of any renaissance of devotionalism and is in strict accord with the views of unbiased critics on cultural education." Nevertheless, if higher education is to be Christianized, there must by some means be brought about a "renaissance of devotionalism" in the American college. The study of the Bible in the classroom, "in strict accord with the views of unbiased critics on cultural education," will not produce such a revival of vigorous religious life on the part of the student. Such a cold, analytical study will give a wonderful stimulus to the intellect, but the heart will soon die of starvation on such a diet. To put the Bible in the college curriculum, and men of faith in the Bible chairs, is

the first great step to be taken, but the life of the student outside of the classroom must be touched.

Realizing the tremendous peril of training the head and neglecting the heart, many American colleges have set themselves to solve this very problem. How help the student to preserve a strong religious life during his college course? The efforts of some of our institutions toward this end are most encouraging and the apathy of many is appalling. Here we meet one of the most startling paradoxes in the educational world. Every one admits that the college has the prerogative of dictating the courses of study to be pursued in its classrooms. And practically every one will admit that no one has any right at all to dictate to a man concerning his personal devotions. Yet how many colleges are there who persistently refuse to place courses in Bible study in the curriculum, and yet force every student, on pain of expulsion, to attend the daily devotions in the chapel! Is this latter course justifiable? What are its general results?

The colleges that are really striving to exert a strong religious influence over the student body follow, in general, two courses. Some arrange the most attractive daily chapel service and Sunday morning services possible, and depend on the charm of special music and the reputation of famous speakers to attract the students who lack the strong religious motive. Others make attendance on the daily chapel and Sunday morning services compulsory, with the penalty of expulsion attached. They have evidently been driven to this course by the collapse of the voluntary chapel service. They have found that the students in too great numbers have succumbed to the call of study through the week and the temptation of sloth on Sunday. Which

is the proper course for a college to pursue? Ought a college to force its students to lay aside work for a brief period every day and turn to God for a season of worship? Do not many come to church from ulterior motives who are vastly benefitted in spite of themselves? On the other hand, is it ever right to force a person to worship God? Can such a thing be done? How far ought parents to go in trying to get their children to attend church? Is it right to drive them to church with the rod when they have come to the age of understanding? Then, is this course justifiable at college? Does it not deny the very genius of Christianity? One of the most interesting studies in psychology a man can attempt is to sit in a college chapel on Sunday morning where the students have been forced to attend. Here and there is the devout student keenly alive to the opportunities of the hour. Others are not slow to show their fierce resentment at being forced to come to church, while the majority sit about in the most extraordinary physical attitudes indicative of their mental indifference or resignation to an unkind fate. What odd measures they adopt to inform a speaker that he is an insufferable bore and that it is long past time for him to sit down! How quickly the wireless messages fly to and fro, and produce concerted action! But what a delight to see the entire student body captivated, in spite of themselves, by some man on fire with his message, and carried about wherever he would lead them! Is compulsory chapel attendance justifiable? My natural religious instincts cry out against such an attempt to force a man's devotions, and common sense argues for its futility. But such are the peculiar difficulties of maintaining any sort of religious life in the modern college that a dogmatic generaliza-

tion on this subject seems unwise. A certain State university has, in recent years, tried both plans. The compulsory system was abandoned because of the deep-set resentment of the students, and because it was patent that, instead of developing a devotional spirit, the compulsory system was the prolific cause of lying and hypocrisy in order to get excused from the service. The voluntary system was then adopted, and the attendance, when some speaker of note was present, filled the chapel, while on ordinary days from about 7 per cent, to 10 per cent, of the student body attended. In some smaller schools, however, where the religious spirit is stronger, and the school more of a unit, the compulsory system is accepted with but little resentment. In such cases the unifying effect of the system makes it hard to condemn it, but one can not but wonder if even here the general tone of the chapel exercise is not lowered, and if the student, who comes because he is forced to, is really much benefitted thereby. The experience of colleges with the voluntary system thrusts forward the realization that the college man demands and deserves that the best talent available lead in the chapel. Perfunctory and second-rate leadership means death to the chapel exercise and to the religious life of the school. We are just awakening to the importance of the religious side of college life, and the demand is that the university pastor or the occasional leader be picked with a keen sense of responsibility.

The great number of State universities and professional schools that have imposed a Chapel Service Center in the past few years. The attendance is so large that a single chapel

service is a practical impossibility, and here often none at all is attempted. Thus the responsibility that rests upon the churches located in the college town is staggering. The very ends of the earth are gathered before their doors. Each hour of the day and each service of the church are golden with opportunities. Here are the pulpits that need men of commanding personality and intellectual training, but, above all else, men of faith, keen sympathy and consecration. Here are the churches that need to be organized to the minute in Bible school, Christian Endeavor and prayer-meeting to meet the twofold task of serving the masses and the college man, and in helping enlist the college man in the service of the people. Night schools in such churches, offering courses to students in our great universities and smaller colleges, need to be tried out all over the country. They offer large possibilities. The rise of churches under the shadow of the great university, built and equipped to serve the college students, is a forward step. The membership is transient, but able to support the work, and, leaving, they straightway become missionaries of the teachings and ideals they have received. The church in the college town has the equipment to aid the college both in offering courses in the study of the Bible and special services for the upbuilding of the devotional life of the student. If the college can be brought to recognize the critical weakness of the modern college life in this direction, and can be led to co-operate with the churches which have the vital interest and the equipment for rendering decisive service to the college student, a great awakening and transformation may be brought about among college students. Take a great State institution like the University of Minnesota, where it is reported about

twenty thousand students enroll during the course of twelve months. The university has no chapel service of any kind. A service for all the students is a manifest impossibility because of their numbers. But churches built in strategic locations could serve the students of their own faith and order with a daily chapel service that might transform the college life, if the university and the churches could be brought to co-operate in this great undertaking. This, too, would develop strong bonds of fellowship between the student and some live church, and would help many students who would not go to church because of the lack of such ties. A strong anchor would hold the student who wanders about idly from one church to another, like a fish out of water, always receiving and never giving, always desiring to be entertained, instead of seeking to worship before the throne of God, continually barren and unfruitful amid unlimited opportunities for service, confirming engrossing selfishness and gradually drifting out into the world.

The *Literary Digest*, under the caption "The College Student a Church-goer," assures its readers that all is well with the soul of the American student. It quotes, at length, statistics reported by the *Central Christian Advocate* (Methodist) as to how many students of Chicago University go to church. The logic of the *Digest* in this paragraph is fearfully and wonderfully made. It states that "certain observers have been alarmed at what they thought to be an atheistic trend among student bodies, and sundry warnings have been sounded against materialism, said to be fostered in the classroom." It does not openly say that Chicago University is charged with being one of the most radical of American universities, but this is evidently

beneath the surface. Now, the *Digest* argues that "a condition quite to the contrary is shown by the survey of the student body," which reveals the fact that 92 per cent, of the students were accustomed to go to church as often as once a month, and 45 per cent, as often as once a week. In other words, if a radical student drifts around to church as often as once a month to hear some radical preacher knock the resurrection of Jesus into a cocked hat, or take his audience into his confidence as to "what actually happened" about some other supposed miracle of the New Testament, then this proves that the student in question is not radical at all! The *Digest* deliberately ignores the fact that church attendance is not an accurate gauge as to the convictions. The unbelief of this age is not bold and outspoken against the church and all religion, as was Bob Ingersoll, but it is a movement which seeks to revolutionize the church and the teachings of Jesus from the inside. It revises the Bible, alters the teachings and institutions of the church, even reconstructs the Christ Himself at liberty, and then boasts a most persevering devotion to this new scientific (?) religion it has produced. It does not separate itself from the congregations of worshipers who still believe in the Christ of the New Testament, but rather glories in its determination to remain in the midst, and in its persistent attempt to "compass land and sea" in order to change whole congregations, or even mission stations in far-away heathen lands, from the teachings of the Christ and from the primitive practices of His church. The argument of the *Digest* misses the mark completely. The actual statistics of the survey reported by the *Advocate* are very interesting: 88 per cent, of the 2,065 students of Chicago University are members of

some religious body—67 per cent. Protestant, 12 per cent. Jewish, 8 per cent. Catholic, 1 per cent, miscellaneous; 92 per cent, go to church as often as once a month, 45 per cent, attend every Sunday, and 13 per cent, are engaged in some form of religious work in the Bible school, Christian Endeavor, etc.; 229 out of the 2,065 attend Bible school or Christian Endeavor each Sunday. The *Advocate* draws several conclusions. "It shows where our students come from; namely, the American home. This is quite evident. It is the Christian home that furnishes the students to the university, where nine out of ten are church-members, and in such a case it is evident that the credit for the attitude of such college students toward church attendance rests with the home that gave him his life habits." The magnificent attractions which the college town can usually offer in the way of famous speakers also figure in the high proportion of casual attendance at church services. The real effect of modern college life on the regularity of church attendance can best be tested by a survey of attendance "before and after taking."

The *Advocate* is rather startling in its optimism when it says: "It is questionable whether any other group of two thousand persons in the United States would present a more satisfactory condition." "After all, our colleges show a higher percentage of religious interest and alignment than the community as a whole." These conclusions, if justifiable, would answer the topic, "Christianizing Higher Education," with the retort, "Physician, heal thyself." This study by the *Advocate* was made several years ago, and needs to be balanced against the more recent study which the American atheistic student organization has made through questionnaires. The fallacy of the whole investigation

of the *Advocate* is the emphasis upon the mere fact of church attendance. Does chance attendance at churches whose teaching and atmosphere are thoroughly anti-Christian prove a "satisfactory condition"?

While we should be devoutly thankful that so many college students come from Christian homes, and that many colleges encourage students in church attendance, yet we can not hide the fact that the above statistics are superficial. Does it really prove anything definite about a man's religious life to say that he attends church once a month in a town where some speaker of national fame appears practically every Sunday in college chapel or local pulpits? Where can any other such group of two thousand persons be found? Not in any place outside of a college. Where is the community that registers nine-tenths of its entire population as members of some church? Where is the group of church-members, two thousand strong, that can get only 229 out to Bible school or Christian Endeavor? The survey shows that the college man, even though strong on occasional church attendance, is extremely weak on active religious work. And just here we strike the vital problem. I would not be interpreted as being unfriendly in my attitude toward the great student body of America. They are a magnificent lot of young people. They are our hope for the future. We have spent our all for them. We commit our all to their keeping. It is even this that compels us to go further than the mere fact of occasional church attendance and inquire: What are they learning? What religious views are proclaimed to their impressionable minds? What convictions developed? We can not be satisfied that they still have some sort of religious instinct, but we must desire to test the pulse in some other ways.

These statistics show, then, that one of the great needs in Christianizing higher education is on the side of expression. Attending a preaching service gives considerable chance for impression, but the college student is one big bundle of energy—he must express his newfound ideals and try out his newly acquired information. When the college man is such a tremendous live-wire in every conceivable field of activity, is it not tragic that in the field of religion he should be merely passive? Could anything be more perilous?

No man can long maintain a passive devotional attitude. He will sooner or later awake to action or lapse into indifference. One of the paramount needs of modern college life is to lead the student to express his religious devotions and ideals. The inner passion for such expression must be developed, and the ways and means provided for its fulfillment.

How can we help our college students to keep warm and strong their devotional life during this trying period? The greatest dependence is in the home that developed the early habits of prayer and Bible study. No substitute for a Christian home ever has been or ever will be found. And during college days the connection between the home and the college dormitory should be constant. All the influence of a godly father and mother is needed at this time. And their example counts heavily. A young college student knelt by his bedside that first lonely night to ask God's guidance and help, as he had always done. Two roommates perceived what was happening, with amazement and then with derision. A storm of pillows and other articles was hurled at the kneeling Stephen. He arose and calmly turned on the light, drew a chalk-line across his side of the room, and then said with fearless tones:

"There is going to be praying on this side of the room, or there will be fighting on both sides." His courageous devotions proved contagious, but how many boys are able to stand pressure like that? When the college hikers finally camped on the summit of the mountain, was it not Garfield alone who produced a New Testament and explained that he never failed to read the blessed Book each night and invited the rest to listen? Father and mother ought to realize the terrific fires of temptation to give up the old ways and walk in new ones that come to the boy at college. How carefully they should choose the college where he is sent! How frequently should they visit or write him and *keep the "home ties binding!"*

Another great source of influence is the *home church*. How many preachers, superintendents or Bible-school teachers write their young people away at college with any sort of regularity? Yet here are wide-open doors of opportunity, and they lead out into the circle of world leadership. If the Bible class and the Endeavor society of the home church are wide awake, they will find here a great field of endeavor and new information, and spiritual power will come to them from the college boy or girl who is given a part in their weekly program by reading the letters written for this purpose.

In my early college days the little, quiet prayer-meetings held by the students in the dormitories just after breakfast had a profound spiritual influence. Not merely ministerial students, but many academic students, attended these inspiring meetings. Practically all of the great spiritual movements of modern college life have been born in such quiet prayer services. But it seems that such meetings have very generally been

abandoned, even as the family altar has disappeared in the home. Of one thing we may be certain, the spiritual life of the college can never, in the long run, rise higher than its source—the Christian home. The problem of Christianizing higher education thrusts us back to the church and the home. We must fight out the battle on all three sectors.

The custom of some of our colleges of having a room or chapel always open, where students are encouraged to go occasionally for a season of devotion in the midst of the terrific rush of college life, is to be commended, and the response on the part of students in some of our ministerial schools is most encouraging.

One available institution for enabling the student to give expression to the religious side of his college life is the Y. M. C. A. (and of course Y. W. C. A.). One can not but wonder just how efficient and far-reaching is the work of this organization in our great State institutions where religious influence is so sadly lacking. A recent report of the work of the college Y. M. C. A. at the University of Kentucky at Lexington may serve as an illustration. The Y. M. C. A. work in this State institution had been prosecuted vigorously for a number of years. The university had, at the time of this report, more than twelve hundred students. The report shows that, out of this number, an average of thirty-five attended the Sunday evening religious meetings held by the Y. M. C. A. Of the speakers who addressed these meetings during the year, the names of seven prominent individuals are specifically mentioned. Nineteen Bible-study groups had a combined average weekly attendance of 205 through the twelve weeks. At the final banquet of all these classes fifty were present. One student volunteered for Foreign Missions. Nine

students have been engaged in some kind of social-service work during the year.

This report shows the possibilities of this work. Every such effort is to be commended and supported. But it also shows the great need of extension, when only thirty-five attend the Sunday evening service out of more than twelve hundred students, and only 205 attempt to study the Bible once a week in the Bible-study groups, and only nine have the vision to attempt to give as well as receive during their college course. Is this report representative of the condition that obtains in the rest of our State institutions? A brief survey made of the work done by the Y. M. C. A. in the largest State university in America would indicate that the success of the work there is about parallel to the report given in detail above. The strong trend of the Y. M. C. A. toward modernism adds greatly to our distress in trying to win the college students for Christ. But independent summer conferences and training-camps under the leadership of men of faith are springing up over the nation and are full of promise.

It will be impossible to make the American college thoroughly Christian without developing devotional habits, periods and organizations amid the mad rush of study. This is a hard task, but it is not impossible. Let us encourage to the utmost the colleges which are setting themselves to this task. Let us awaken the ones indifferent to this supreme obligation, and challenge and bring all possible pressure to bear upon any that may be antagonistic to such a program. Let the home church join hands with the college church in a vigilant, aggressive program. May college chapels increase in number, and intensify and deepen their spiritual atmosphere. Above all, may we strive for such a close

co-operation between the church and the college so that the equipment and resources of the church shall be at the disposal of the college for the purpose of developing the soul, as the classroom seeks to develop the mind.

It is absurd to expect the devotional atmosphere of the college to rise higher than that of the home or of the church itself. If the church shall set its own house in order and catch the vision of its larger task, the example will be contagious. From no other source can be secured the vital spark of consecration that will purify and ennoble.

XXI.

CHRISTIANIZING HIGHER EDUCATION

PART III.—THE COLLEGE MAN AND THE SOCIAL CRISIS.

WITH the whole world in the throes of social revolution, incipient or active, the need of concentrating our attention on Christianizing higher education becomes compelling. On the day after the signing of the armistice marking the close of the World War, Col. C. L. Jewett, former Governor-general of the Philippine Islands, pointing dramatically to a group of ministers seated in the midst of a vast throng, exclaimed: "Gentlemen, in your hands rests the fate of the world." The same thought—that Christianity alone has the idealism and the inner power that can steady the world in its present crisis—has been repeated a thousand times during the tempestuous years since the war. And we are coming to realize that all our religious faith and fervor must be focused on the modern college, from whence comes our future leadership.

The problem is twofold. The life of the student offers its own peculiar social problems. The college can not be made thoroughly Christian until these problems are solved. Again, the age has its most urgent social needs and perils. The student must be equipped to serve his age. If world-wide catastrophe is to be

avoided, then our young men must be given the broad, democratic spirit, the moral stamina and the religious and social vision that will enable them to lead the world back to the cross.

The social life of the student involves his relations to the college, the Faculty, the student body and the world. Each of these four relationships is vital to the social life, and plays an important part in the life and destiny of the college and the student.

It may seem rather fantastic to represent the attitude of the student toward the college itself as a concrete social relationship. But the college is more than its president and officers, its Faculty and students. Verily, it has a body and a soul, a life and a destiny. Its very buildings come to be a mysterious incarnation of a wonderful soul that thrills the student with a love unspeakable. The young student does not, at first, catch the importance of this social relationship amid the mad rush of study and tests, athletics and social functions. But soon his soul begins to relate these facts and experiences to his own life. He begins to feel that he is one of the representatives—an adopted son—of the old college. Her honor is in his hands and it must not be defiled, but carried on to new glory. She is his mighty benefactress, and all his days must he industriously and courageously seek to fulfill an unlimited debt of gratitude. "Hoops of steel" soon bind him to the dear old school, and he begins to feel that "nothing can ever dissever my soul from the soul" of my old *alma mater*.

The graduate who returns after long years and stands again on spots made sacred by ten thousand precious memories needs no proof that his relation to the old college is something social, real and vital. Per-

chance it is on a glorious moonlit night that he walks again about the old campus after an absence of many years. How his heart leaps with joy at the sight of each rock, tree and stretch of green, and every nook and cranny of the college halls! With what unreasoning jealousy he views each innovation that jars upon ancient memories! But if the signs of progress be evident, sentiment soon succumbs to reason. Though the body be greatly changed with passing years, if he finds the soul of the college unsullied and enriched, how eagerly, yea, how passionately, the old love thrills his being! But if the old banner of faith in the Christ and humble devotion to His gospel be shamelessly stripped from its lofty place; if a demon of doubt and egotistical skepticism has taken possession of the college; if, as the moonlight falls on ancient college halls, one's soul be crushed with the realization that these are but "whited sepulchers full of dead men's bones"— then the tragedy is indeed like the death of "mother." But if a college "to its own self be true," if it keep faith with its own glorious heritage, then generation after generation pass through these halls and add their full measure of devotion to its high and lofty idealism.

The dangers of devotion to one's *alma, mater* are the same that beset the patriotism that binds one to his native land. Sentiment is apt to overwhelm practical common sense. If it makes him exclusive in vision and understanding, so that he is blind to the worth of other schools, or if it makes it hard for him to look beyond the college to the needs of the wide world, then such devotion is a hindrance, instead of an asset. If he say, "Here's to my college; may she always be right; but I'll stand by her whether right or wrong," then college loyalty grovels in the mire of blind fetish-

ism. The college is not an end in itself and a law unto itself. It, too, "must answer unto God for the deeds done in the body." By this high and lofty standard must the life of the college be measured. If those in control of a college at any time become traitors to the soul of the school—the principles for which it was established—there is but one course open to the graduate who really loves the old school. Some will denounce him as "an enemy of the college" if he dares to criticize an administration. But true college loyalty ties a man to the soul of the college, rather than a passing administration. He is its best friend who seeks to redeem that soul, if it be enslaved. He must ever measure the life and works of the college by the eternal teachings of the Christ.

The relation of the student to the Faculty is not limited merely to the classroom, although too many colleges make no effort to establish any sort of effective contact on the campus. The president and deans feel the burden and the rest of the Faculty may or may not. The plan of many universities to divide off the students among the professors, giving the student the privilege of expressing preference as to his adviser, and making each professor responsible for certain students, is most admirable. In case a student is sick, discouraged or in trouble, he has a definite adviser and friend. But if the instructor be only interested in books, then the student fails to find the personal sympathy that is so much needed. Worse still, if the professor himself lacks ideals or common morals, the result is deplorable. I have in mind a certain famous law school where a professor of this type was tolerated because he was a brilliant lecturer. Time after time, during the period in which I was in close touch

with the school, he would come into the classroom so drunk that he was unable to teach, and would "shoo" the students out, warning them to walk softly so that the other members of the Faculty would not hear their exit. At the opening session of school he was accustomed to tell the students that some of them would be such fools that they would be hitting the line every night, and some would be such fools that they would not go at all, but whenever any of them got arrested—as he was sure they would—all they would have to do was to telephone him, and he would come at any hour of the night and see about bailing them out. Now, when such conditions are existing in American colleges, the church must either attempt to Christianize the college or else perish.

In the classroom the relations of professor and student, as far as this discussion is concerned, center about the exercise of sincerity and honesty on the part of the student, especially at examination-time. In this age the world is tempted to repeat the sneer of Pilate: "What is truth?" The current question is: "Can the Golden Rule be recalled amid merciless modern competition?" It is, then, all the more necessary that our colleges be thoroughly Christian in their standards and atmosphere. If they tolerate cheating on examination, then they encourage falsehood and dishonesty in the world. If our leadership be trained in such an atmosphere, then our social situation must grow steadily worse.

There are three classes of colleges in regard to this problem. One class winks at widespread cribbing, or is absurdly half-hearted and inefficient in attempting to prevent it. The second class has a highly developed system of policing the examinations. The professors

are reinforced at examination season by a large number of marshals ("monitors" is the polite title conferred). These students help supervise the work in the classroom, and whenever a student secures permission to leave the examination-room a monitor immediately places him under arrest (so to speak), follows him wherever he goes, and delivers him safely back to the classroom. The third class is the college which has adopted the honor system. The professors have nothing to do with the problem. The students elect their honor council. Each student goes in on his honor not to cheat, and agrees to report any case of cheating which comes under his observation. The student who is found cheating is tried by the honor council, and, if convicted, is dismissed from college. (Some colleges offer a lighter penalty for the first offense.) This is the ideal system. But the practical difficulties of working this system in a school that has not been educated up to it are apparent. The large university doubtless offers many more difficulties in the way of practical operation than the small college.

A certain State university once attempted the wild leap from the first class to the third. I took an examination one day in this institution when it was in Class No. 1. A number of students slyly left the room to confer on some of the problems in college algebra. The professor finally went out over the building in search of the recreants. He was absent for some time. As soon as he stepped out of the room the text-books flew open for a wild scramble of copying on every desk in the room except two, and those two had been trained in another institution under the honor system. Some years later this university undertook to operate the honor system, and the attempt was an abject failure.

The high moral atmosphere necessary for the life of such a system was lacking. When the students finally came to vote on the continuance of the honor system, all the upright students voted against it, and those without conscience in regard to cheating voted for it. The students with high moral ideals felt the whole burden of the system fell upon them. They could not enforce it, because they were too greatly in the minority. They faced ostracism if they attempted to enforce it. The other group voted for the system because they had found it "easy money." In such a case, a period of growth in Class No. 2, and a careful and insistent campaign of education, is necessary before the school can hope to enter the third class. It is to be hoped that the honor system will soon be the rule, and not the exception, in American colleges.

The relation of the college student to his fellow-students is, first of all, the problem of democracy. The only real offset to the fearful excesses of radical socialism in this age is a spirit of Christian democracy. Our critical social situation demands that this spirit be fostered among our future leaders in the college. The college that cultivates, or even tolerates, snobbery is not true to Christian ideals or its mission. It becomes a menace to society that deserves to be compared to the radical socialist who stands on the other extreme.

The growth of real democracy in the college is a most encouraging omen, but there is still great room for improvement. In many institutions the students who come from the wealthy homes will not even deign to speak to a fellow-student they meet on the street if that student is working his way through school. A brilliant boy of the latter type defeated all rivals in the college oratorical contests, won the Kentucky State

Oratorical Contest, and finally the All-Southern. The latter contest was held at his home school, and some of the students were heard to remark they hoped this boy would not win, because he "carried papers" to make his way through school. (What a horrible disgrace for a student to earn his way, instead of "spending dad's money"!)

In this case, college loyalty succumbed to class prejudice and outrageous snobbery. This is the sort of atmosphere that breeds Sovietism.

Two opposing movements are at work in the college molding its social ideals and atmosphere. The first is the attempt of many larger institutions to strike at snobbery and exclusiveness by building enormous dormitories in which the student must live during his earlier years at college. I visited Princeton the year after "Woodrow Wilson resigned as president of the university. The school was still thrilled with the force of his personality. The gist of the difference between him and the trustees of the university that brought about his resignation seemed to be his stubborn determination to break up exclusiveness and make the student body more democratic in the fashion mentioned above. It can not but have a wholesome influence for students to rub elbows in dormitory life. Under this system, it is no longer a question of securing *entree* into the fashionable drawing-room of the wealthy college student. Wealthy parents need not worry about the contaminating influence of such associations. The chances are about one thousand to one that the poor boy has higher moral standards than the son of the millionaire.

The second movement is the tremendous growth of the fraternity system in the American college. Few subjects could be introduced that would raise a more

decided difference of opinion than the question of fraternities. The system has some good features, but certain weaknesses and intolerable conditions prevail in it. Can it be doubted that the fraternity system has worked against the building up of a spirit of real Christian democracy in the modern college? It breaks up the student body into exclusive groups, and the general tendency is to militate against the free competition of merit and to cause the honors to go by way of wire-pulling or "influence." Before the day of fraternities a man stood or fell on his own merits, but, as soon as a name is proposed in the modern college, the first question asked is: "Of what 'frat' is he a member?"

Here arises, also, not merely the question of democracy, but also of efficiency and Christian ideals for daily living and service to the world. The rise of the fraternity has meant the decadence of the literary society. The two could not live together and breathe the same atmosphere. One or the other must perish. Their purposes and ideals are contrary, and every year makes this plainer. The literary societies broke the school up into competing groups, but it did this along democratic lines, and not in the exclusive way that fraternities do. Any one could join any literary society he chose, but the student must be elected by the select fraternity set, or be left out in the cold altogether.

The literary society had as its aim the increase of a man's efficiency, and hence, in the very nature of things, it could not consistently be guilty of the elevation of "influence" above merit. The literary society undertook to give the student definite training for service. It gave vent to his desire for expression. It was the most common thing to hear the college student of

a decade ago say: "I would not exchange my literary society training for any single course I am carrying this year." When I was a student at Transylvania, there were six big, wide-awake literary societies. Nearly every student in the institution was a member of one of them, eagerly striving to develop himself, to train himself to express his ideas and make some use of his college work. Now there is one pitiful group of students in the sole surviving society. There is, besides, an association of ministerial students for the discussion of theological problems that is supposed to aid the new student in adjusting himself to the "new theology." The literary societies have been overwhelmed by the large number of prosperous fraternities that have grown up. And this is the story to be heard in most of our colleges. Instead of the idea of training for efficient service, the fraternity is built about the social demands of the students. These are legitimate, but when they are exercised at the cost of the wonderful training the literary society offered, the loss is apparent. Between social enjoyment and training for service, the Christian should not find it hard to choose.

Another transformation that fraternity life has brought to the college is the decided increase in extravagance and the general cost of higher education. This is a very significant feature. From a careful study from the inside of the college itself and from the home of the student, it is evident that the increase in cost of a college education is appalling. The poor boy naturally does not appreciate being left out of the social circle. He often goes into a fraternity when his parents can not afford it. Frequently his college course is cut short because he has outrun the means of

the family. Other boys are discouraged in their plans to go to college. As a sample of the kind of expenditures many fraternities foster, a certain fraternity, that is not made up of wealthy boys altogether, and is located in a well-known church college, recently gave a dance and presented each of the guests with an expensive bit of jewelry as a token of the occasion. Such conduct naturally spurs on the other fraternities of the school to keep up, or even exceed, the pace that has been set. Financial bankruptcy of college life threatens.

Has the rise of the fraternities had anything to do with the rapid decline of moral standards in many colleges? It would not be fair to condemn fraternities in wholesale fashion as immoral, although one Southern State has recently taken the bull by the horns and abolished them altogether by act of Legislature. The inside conditions of modern fraternity life offer a large enough number of specific instances to fill one with a sense of dread for the future if some great reform movement does not sweep through the American college fraternity.

The evil genius of the fraternity is the modern dance. Verily, the devotees of this polite revival of the "ancient Bacchanalian orgies" seem bent on imitating the conduct of the Gadarene herd into which Jesus cast the legion of demons. This is another phase of the peculiar social tendencies of the age. One of the after-war effects has been the wave of crime and the mad plunge of society into all sorts of excesses in search of exciting pleasures. Have we not the right to expect that the college man shall have enough idealism to lead the way to something better, rather than become the chief offender in such excesses? Many col-

leges realize the tremendous peril that confronts the present-day social life of the college. Many girls' colleges have become especially rigid in their restrictions in regard to the dance. Even some State universities have awakened to the situation that threatens to shake the social structure of the college to its very foundations. The recent sensational discussion of the question whether the younger generation is in peril, presented by the *Literary Digest*, while it did not touch the problem of fraternity life, revealed the fact that the great mass of sober-minded students are themselves becoming alarmed at conditions of which they have first-hand knowledge.

In the days of the literary society, the annual debate and the oratorical contest, with their exaltation of all that is noblest and best in college life, were the great events of the year. To-day, under the lead of the fraternity, the great events of the college calendar are the Thanksgiving, the Christmas and the Easter dances. And the influence of this change of emphasis is all too plain. "When ministerial students in one of our own colleges seek recreation on Sunday afternoons in the most notorious vaudeville show of their city, and join, with abandon, in the modern dances, it is surely time for the church to consider the topic: "Christianizing Higher Education." These evils are deeply rooted in modern social life. It is not proper to blame all this on the college, for the home from which the student comes is often unchristian or is at ebb-tide spiritually, and the college life itself succumbs to an inundation of students from such homes.

Meanwhile a little mother sits at home peering out the window into the encroaching darkness. Tears fall upon the pages of a letter from her boy off at college.

He has decided to give up his old ambition to become a minister. He is no longer interested in the church. Her soul bows before the storm of disappointment and anguish. Little does she understand the giants who live in the strange land where her only boy has been slain—the insidious foes of doubt and skepticism that inhabit the classroom; the merciless driver who, in the guise of the thousand and one excellent activities of college life, crushes under towering burdens the vital breath of prayer and inner devotions, and the treacherous sirens who smile and sing and play but to lure on to the abyss through social excesses. Was it for this—all her sufferings, her prayers, her dreams, for her boy? How long shall we industriously strive in home, Bible school, church and Christian Endeavor to fill a basket that has a faulty bottom—to send our boys and girls, with their hearts burning with devotion to the Christ and determined to proclaim His gospel, off to a college whose skeptical teaching and unchristian atmosphere send them back to us minus the faith and zeal that was our pride and hope? If higher education fails in this direction, then the springs of Christianity will dry up. We tear our hair over vacant pulpits and challenge young people to "follow Him," but can we hope to produce an adequate leadership so long as we sit idly by and refuse to make the college more thoroughly Christian in teaching and atmosphere?

The relation of the college man to the outside world is another tremendous problem. In a very fine way the college is working along vocational lines to help the student to find his place in the world and to train him for it. But the vocational work is still in its infancy. Too long the college has undertaken to give the student a stereotyped amount of information, and has passed

him out into the world with his diploma and with the idea that the world was at his feet imploring the opportunity to give him whatever he desired, now that he had "graduated." Specialization has its perils, and the immensely valuable classical training is threatened by the encroachment of the elective system. But there is still room for development of the vocational training, and the attempt to relate the student to the great world and his particular task.

The increased study in sociology and related subjects is promising. The agricultural student, who is playing an increasingly important part in community life in America, is an expert on the strata of soils, but how many are as well trained in the strata of society? The study of the world as it is certainly ought to have its place along with the study of ancient history. Especially in the present distressing social condition of the world there is particular need for the college to turn more of its attention toward the general field of sociology.

The college life usually means isolation. The student goes to college to "get." Hence the peril of insufferable egotism, of fatal selfishness. Must he not be led to halt long enough in the "getting" process to learn to "give"? How else shall he maintain his idealism? Will he not otherwise succumb to pride of intellect? Knowledge for knowledge's sake is no adequate foundation for a college. It must emblazon on its banner: "To develop and train for world-wide service." The chapel speaker who created the most discussion at Yale during the year of 1911-12 was a sociologist from the middle West who preached one Sunday morning in Battel Chapel. He chose as his text: "God is able of these stones to raise up children

unto Abraham." He delivered the most furious assault imaginable on the famous "Yale spirit." The whole school was horrified. The president (it was rumored) accepted the address as a personal affront. The speaker asserted that the average Yale man had no more of the true Christian spirit than the Aborigines of North America. When one Indian met another, if he bore the same tattoo, he embraced him and if he bore a different mark, he knifed him. So with the Yale man and the world-famous Yale spirit. A Yale man was always ready to fight for a Yale man and help him to the limit, but he had but little vision, compassion or strength for the humble, suffering toiler of the street or field. And, in a wonderful climax of oratory, he predicted that, if they did not break down their selfishness and exclusiveness and widen their vision to take in all the world, God would, out of the stones of the humble, untrained toilers, raise up the leaders for the future. Many rebuttals to the charge of the speaker were offered on the campus; as, for instance, the work of "Yale in China"—the mission work of the university. But there can be no doubt but that the speaker put his finger on the sore spot of many American colleges.

Professor Peabody, of Harvard, says: "The real temptation of academic life is not flagrant sin, but indifference, neutrality, irresponsibility and self-defensive morality. A parent writes to his son: 'You are going into a dangerous place; be on your guard; keep yourself free from its temptations; be a good boy.' This is precisely the youth who is in danger here. He conceives himself to be in peril, and he becomes self-considering, introspective and easily misled. What is it that a parent ought to write to his son? He should

say: 'My dear boy, you are going into a world of intense activity and great diversity, with all sorts of people in it, but with a strong central movement toward goodness. Get into the middle of the stream. Take your part in it; share the joy, glow and happiness of it. Make yourself a factor for wholesome living. Remember the great words of Jesus, "For their sakes I sanctify myself," and sanctify yourself, not for your own sake, but for others. You can not save your own soul alone. You can save it only by making it of use. The only safe goodness is a serviceable goodness. Think each day, not of what the world can do for you, but what you can do for the world, and be sure that the best that can ever be said of any man is that which was said of Jesus: 'He saved others; himself he cannot save.'"

The student who plunges boldly into the middle of the stream in some American colleges is in too great peril. He ought to pick a school where he can throw himself with zest and abandon into all its activities, for this is the joy of college life and the way of escape from selfishness.

The Christian people of all the land should set themselves to the task of transforming the college life in order that in every college the middle of the stream shall be such a vast current of faith, noble ambitions and ideals that our social fabric shall in turn be transformed. College life will always be a season of terrific temptations as it is of unparalleled opportunities, but we must strive and pray that the "strong central movement" shall not be a whirling vortex of skepticism, but a steady onward march toward triumphant faith, and that whirlpools of sin shall be driven into the fringes of college life. Then, indeed, the tempta-

tion to selfishness will be the chief peril. When the Bible shall have its proper place in the college curriculum, when the instructor shall speak the words of faith and soberness, when the college chapel and dormitory shall vibrate with the spirit of Christian democracy and true devotion, and when the campus shall bear evidence of the intensity of purpose to serve the world, to such a college may the student go with unspeakable joy and freedom. And when the American colleges begin to approach this ideal, the church will attempt its colossal task with renewed power, and the deadly peril of a world torn by social revolution shall have passed.

XXII.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

THE value of historical testimony is always dependent upon the character of the witness. "When a man sits on the jury in one of our courts of justice he is compelled to weigh the souls of the witnesses, and not merely to hear their testimony. In the case of contradictory testimony, he is forced to deliberate on the personality and character of the witnesses as well as their testimony, and decide who has been lying and who has told the truth. In any case, the questions arise: Who is this witness? What is his character? What opportunities for knowing the facts, and how much intelligence and honesty in apprehending and setting forth the facts? You can not avoid a discriminating study of the witness himself in weighing his testimony.

While we acknowledge God as the Author of the Bible when we call it "the word of God," yet we find ourselves compelled to study the witnesses who become His mouthpiece in recording the testimony and messages of the Bible. We must weigh these very witnesses in determining the validity of their claims that they speak by divine inspiration. In the light of the specific claims of unique inspiration on the part of certain New Testament books, such as the Epistles of Paul and the Book of Revelation, the complete silence of the four

Gospels as to such claims and the absence of any effort in the text to make known the identity of the author is most extraordinary. The unity of these Gospels with the books which do make specific claims of inspiration, together with the unique character of these biographies and the promises of Jesus which they record that His apostles should be endowed with divine inspiration, have produced the conviction through the ages that God is the ultimate Author of these Gospels. Nevertheless, our interest has always been keen in the particular personalities of these messengers who tell the "good news." Were they eye-witnesses? Are they trustworthy? We can not avoid these questions.

Of the four Gospels, two are attributed to apostles. The other two, Mark and Luke, do not appear to offer first-hand testimony, although early Christian writers insist that Mark recorded the gospel as proclaimed by Peter, and that Luke presents the viewpoint and emphasis of Paul. The problem of authorship in the hands of modern critics has resolved itself into the Synoptic problem and the question of the author of the fourth Gospel. Time forbids any consideration of the famous two-source theory by which critics make the imaginary "Logia" of Matthew and the Ur-Mark the sources from which the first three Gospels arose by a process of interdependence. But, in passing, it may be said that, if the authors of the first three Gospels copied from one another like stupid schoolboys, as the current critical theory suggests, then the divine inspiration and the ultimate accuracy of the records are impugned. An unbiased study of the records themselves, and of the testimony of early Christian literature, leads directly to the conclusion that all four of the Gospels are independent contributions.

Although the text of the Gospels offers no direct identification of authorship, each Gospel bears a heading making such claim. Two questions arise here. Does "The Gospel According to John" mean to affirm that John is actually the author, or does it imply a more distant relationship—the Gospel not as written by John, but according to his ideas and preaching set forth by some one else. This question has been disputed, but sufficient evidence has been produced from classical Greek writings ("the Memorabilia According to [*kata*] Xenophon," for example) to prove that this was a customary way of declaring the authorship of a book, and therefore "The Gospel According to John" means to affirm that John is the actual author. The second question is: Was this heading attached to the original autograph copy of the fourth Gospel, or was it added at some later date, when tradition and uncertainty as to authorship had succeeded immediate knowledge? Of course this question can not be answered dogmatically, since we do not possess the autograph copy of the Gospel, but the early manuscripts still extant afford *prima-facie* evidence that this heading was attached to the Gospel in the very beginning, or at a very early date when the first copies were being made and first-hand knowledge of authorship was available.

For several decades the critical problems centering in the fourth Gospel have been an absorbing subject of investigation for New Testament scholars. Previous to this recent period of discussion the testimony of tradition to the authenticity and genuineness of the Gospel had received almost universal acceptance. The universal conviction of the Christian world that the fourth Gospel was written by the apostle John was never

seriously questioned until something like a century ago. Recently, however, every item of evidence as to the unity, date, place, purpose and authorship of the book has undergone the most rigid examination. The results of this discussion have been a growing unanimity of opinion concerning the date, place and purpose of writing and a very wide divergence of opinion as to the unity and authorship of the Gospel. Naturally the controversy has been rather heated, since the positive character of the teaching of the Gospel concerning the person of Christ and the wonderful spiritual power of the book have given it a place second to none in the regard of the Christian world, while its emphasis upon the divinity of Christ as evidenced by His miraculous works and other distinctive features of the book have aroused an antagonistic attitude on the part of those imbued with the dictums of modern science. The controversy has raged on both sides of the Atlantic. Perhaps no other critical problem of authorship under discussion to-day has such far-reaching importance.

The external evidence for the Johannine authorship of the fourth Gospel runs in unbroken line from Eusebius, the master of early Christian literature, who wrote his "Ecclesiastical History" in the first half of the fourth century, back to Justin Martyr, near the beginning of the second century. Eusebius, in giving the history of the canon, gives an account of the publication of each of the four Gospels. He lived within two hundred years of the time when the fourth Gospel was written, and had access to an immense collection of early Christian literature which has since perished. In his summary of the books of the New Testament, he says: "Here, among the first, must be placed the Holy Quaternion of the Gospels. These are followed by the

Book of Acts." Three writers of the third century add their testimony. Hippolytus makes many direct references to John as the author of the fourth Gospel. Origen wrote a commentary on John's Gospel consisting of twenty-two books, two of which survive. Cyprian makes more than two hundred references to the Gospel of John. The dates of the death of these scholars are respectively 240, 250 and 257 A. D. Irenaeus, Tertullian and Clement of Alexander are separated by less than a century from John. Their citations are voluminous. A single illustration from Irenaeus must suffice here: "That Gospel, according to John, relates His original, effectual and glorious generation from the Father, thus declaring: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.'" Irenaeus wrote about the year 180 A. D. He had been associated in his youth with Polycarp, who had lived a contemporary to John and had known him personally. Justin Martyr and Papias, both contemporary to the generation who had seen and conversed with the apostles, complete the list of more important witnesses to the Johannine authorship. With such a mass of external evidence as this, why should there be any question as to the authorship of the fourth Gospel? "At various periods in the history of the church—as, for instance, at the time of the Arian controversy in the fourth century, and at the time of the Reformation—men arose who denied, more or less explicitly, the true and proper Godhead of our Lord, of which Christian doctrine the Gospel of St. John seems to afford the most decisive proofs; and yet neither the followers of Arius in the fourth century, nor of Socinus in the sixteenth, seem ever to have thought of questioning the apostolic authorship of this Gospel, but contented them-

selves with, explaining away the obvious meaning of some of its most prominent passages relating to our Lord's person. The authenticity of this Gospel was first seriously questioned at the end of the last century, and since that time a host of writers, mostly German, rationalists and English Socinians, have on the most opposite and often mutually destructive ground denied it to be the work of St. John. This means that men, living eighteen hundred years after the publication of a certain text-book, question the testimony to its authorship of men who flourished within one hundred years after the publication of that book, and who were born within fifty years after the death of the author and who had access to a considerable Christian literature which existed between their day and that of the author of the book in question, which literature has since perished."

How, then, can a modernist deny the Johannine authorship of the fourth Gospel, no matter how eager he may be to set aside its testimony to the deity of Christ? Necessity is the mother of invention. The current attempt to prove that the fourth Gospel is a late production which somehow worked its way into the New Testament canon and hence does not give a first-hand, dependable representation of the life of Jesus, is based on one of the cleverest inventions of modern Biblical criticism.

In the face of such a mass of testimony from early Christian writers, it seems impossible to deny that John wrote the fourth Gospel. But the line of attack runs like this: We are bound to admit that the fourth Gospel was written by a man named John. But what John? May there not have been more than one John prominent in the first centuries? Suppose there was

also a John the disciple who lived much later than John the apostle, might not he be the author of the Gospel? The radicals have discovered two lines of evidence to support this theory—external and internal. A certain conflict in the testimony of early Christian writers has appeared as to the career and death of John the apostle. Sanday divides his life into three periods: (1) Period covered by the Gospel when he was the associate of Jesus; (2) period in which he appears at Ephesus— an old man and revered leader among the churches of Asia Minor; (3) period of some forty years between, concerning which we know but little, except for a few glimpses in Acts. The early Christian writers give a very distinct and detailed picture of John at Ephesus—years of ministry and leadership, feeble old age and general reverence by the churches, publication of the fourth Gospel and death in peace.

Now, two bits of evidence have been unearthed which seem to quote Papias (the companion of Polycarp) as saying both the sons of Zebedee were "slain by the Jews": DeBoor's Fragment Cod. Baroco, 142, and a single manuscript of the ninth-century writer Georgius Hamartolus. The manuscript of Hamartolus is in direct contradiction to all the other manuscripts, which state John died in peace. The DeBoor Fragment states "John the theolog and James his brother were killed by the Jews." Zahn offers the most satisfactory explanation of this conflicting evidence. He holds that the manuscript of Georgius is interpolated at this point, and, while there must have been something in Papias which served as a basis for this statement, the second excerptor confused John the apostle with John the Baptist. The title "John the theolog" is conclusive evidence he could not have been quoting the words of

Papias. Herod Antipas beheaded John the Baptist. "Herod the king [nephew of Antipas] slew James the brother of John with the sword." Out of this tangle probably arose the confused statement of Hamartolus. The prediction of Jesus (Mark 10:38, 39) would seem to suggest martyrdom for both James and John, but one may have suffered "red martyrdom" and the other "white," and the last chapter of John suggests the opposite of a tragic end for John. Certainly it is more likely that Hamartolus was confused on this statement of John being killed by the Jews than that the whole host of earlier writers, of whom Irenaeus is the clearest, should have been astray in their declarations that John died in peace at Ephesus. If the theory of two Johns be correct, and John the apostle was an early martyr, and John the disciple, a much younger man, wrote the Gospel and died in peace at Ephesus, how can you fit such a martyrdom into the Book of Acts or the twenty-first chapter of John? How explain the silence of Acts or the internal evidence of the Gospel?

Much stress is also laid upon the fact that Irenaeus, and Papias refer to John as "the disciple of the Lord," but the effort to create out of this title a fictitious John different from the apostle runs counter to the whole internal evidence of the Gospel. If there were two Johns, who is this "John the disciple"? What is his life history? When the critics attempt to paint his portrait, it turns out to be that of John the apostle, only they have written another name under it. The utter failure to re-create such a figure apart from the apostle John causes the collapse of the whole case.

The current critical theory has led to a most painstaking re-examination of the entire internal evidence of the Gospel. The concluding chapter of the Gospel

is the hub around which the problem of internal evidence revolves. The last verse of the twentieth chapter seems to afford a logical conclusion to the Gospel, and the twenty-first chapter appears to be a supplement to the Gospel. Thousands of pages of criticism have been written to show that chapter 21 was not originally a part of the Gospel. The critics reveal a hysterical difference of opinion as to the date, purpose and authorship of the twenty-first chapter. Renan held that it was added by the unknown and anonymous author of the Gospel to the work which he had already finished. It is the opinion of Schmiedel and Wendt that it is not an integral part of the book and is composed by a different and entirely unknown author. Bacon declares this chapter to be the product of revision by canon-makers at Rome in 150-170 A. D. Zahn holds that the chapter was written in the words of John by his disciples. But all efforts to show any real difference in style between the twenty-first chapter and the rest of the book have met signal failure, and the view of Lightfoot still offers the best explanation: "The twenty-first chapter is an afterthought. This distinction is no refinement of modern theorists; it is old as Tertullian." He holds that John himself added this last chapter as a supplement.

Moffatt, Bacon and others argue strenuously that there is a difference in style and language in the twenty-first chapter which proves a different authorship. But Wernle speaks for another group of critics when he says: "In respect to style and manner, this supplement betrays with exactness and nicety the selfsame author who has penned the rest of the Gospel." Schmiedel and Bacon urge especially 21:14, which states: "This is now the third time that Jesus was

manifested to the disciples." The forger who wrote this last chapter slipped up in his count, they claim, and said "third time," when he should have said "fourth time." But the phrase "to the disciples" shows clearly that the author is merely counting the appearances to the apostles which he has recorded, and that this definite conception caused him to exclude the appearance to Mary (John 20:11-18). Would this ingenious forger of Ephesus conjured up by Schmiedel, or these learned canon-makers at Rome who occupy so large a place in the imagination of Bacon, have been so skillful as to imitate the minutia of the style of the Gospel and yet be unable to count up to ten? If the Gospel is a unit, then "this is now the third time" offers no great difficulty, but stands as the definite conception of the author in which the appearance to Mary is excluded. But if the Gospel is not a unit, then 21:14 stands an insuperable difficulty—for what forger with the presupposed skill could have possibly miscounted or would have dared to refuse to count the appearance to Mary?

Schmiedel, Moffatt and others argue that chapter 21 was written by a different author because it represents Peter as a fisherman, as in the Synoptics (Mark 1:16), whereas the fourth Gospel knows him only as a disciple of the Baptist. As if Peter could not have been both! Or that John, because he does not choose to retell the thrice-told story of the call of the fishermen by the lake, therefore knew nothing about it! The incidental way in which Peter figures as a fisherman in the twenty-first chapter is the most natural thing imaginable if the Gospel is a unit. A group of critics argue that the supplementary chapter is by a different author, who objected to the way that Peter is forced to

take second place to "the beloved disciple" in the fourth Gospel, and wrote this imaginary scene in order to exalt Peter to his rightful place. But Baur spoils this fine-spun theory by arguing strongly that the purpose of this very chapter is to exalt John above Peter. It is strange that scholars should insist on indulging in such childish criticism. Why try to conjure up artificial and sinister motives for this narrative when it is evident that it offers the record of a remarkable miracle that was not entirely in line with the plan of the preceding chapters of the book since "the present appearance no longer bore on the faith of the disciples, but was destined to assure them of their glorified Master's blessing and aid in the apostolic work which they were about to undertake"? The chapter, furthermore, confirms the apostles in their call to preach the gospel and Peter in his restoration to apostleship, and refutes erroneous notions that had become prevalent in the church at Ephesus that John would not die.

Why should the twenty-first chapter of John be covered with such a heap of eccentric critical theories? Because it is the key to the internal evidence for the Johannine authorship of the Gospel. It makes possible the identification of the "beloved disciple." The fourth Gospel, in common with the Synoptics, contains no direct assertion as to the identity of the author. Moreover, the name of John does not occur in the fourth Gospel, but we have instead the figure referred to by the title "the beloved disciple." With surpassing devotion the Gospel writers keep their own personalities out of the record as they tell the story of their Lord's ministry. The fourth Gospel opens a new vista to the life of Christ, and amid the mass of new material it presents there is this delightful and illuminating picture pre-

sented through occasional delicate touches of the intimate fellowship between Jesus and this "beloved disciple" who has written the book. Although his very devotion compels him to reveal this touching companionship with Jesus, he withholds his name from the entire record.

And who is this "beloved disciple"? He appears in the narrative (in the background, it is true, and yet he appears) in the very first chapter of John. The Synoptics present early in their narratives the record of the call of the first apostles. Most prominent among them are four men, two pairs of brothers. We should expect these four men to stand out early in the Gospel of John—if any record is offered of the early disciples of Jesus. This is just what is found in the first chapter of John, although in an entirely different setting from the Synoptics. Stirred by the pronouncement of John the Baptist, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," two disciples follow Jesus and spend the day in His home (John 1:35-42). The name of one of the disciples was Andrew (v. 40). What was the name of the other disciple? Why was it omitted? This is an amazing circumstance, if it were not for the mysterious silence of the whole Gospel concerning John, the son of Zebedee. "One of the two that heard John speak, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. He findeth first his own brother Simon and saith." The plain inference from this is that, while one of these two disciples finds his brother, the other also follows suit and brings *his* brother to Jesus. It is evident, when taken in connection with the strange silence throughout the book concerning the sons of Zebedee, that the other disciple is John or his brother James, and that Andrew first finds his brother

Peter, and John finds his brother James (or *vice versa*). This fits into the narrative of the Synoptics where the two pairs of brothers are comrades and are called by the lakeshore at the same time. It agrees with the fact that four were from Bethsaida, and that Philip also was from this town. Since the fourth Gospel gives such accurate information concerning the disciples of Jesus, we should expect some definite statement concerning this other disciple. Zahn sums up: "But our wonder is increased when we read verse 41. According to the correct reading which is to be accepted more because of its originality than because of strong external testimony, it is stated with marked emphasis that Andrew, the *first* of the two disciples, finds *his own brother*, which implies that after Andrew the other of the two disciples, whose name is not mentioned, also finds *his* brother, whose name is likewise unmentioned. To every one who can read Greek, it is perfectly clear between the lines that, in addition to the two brothers Andrew and Peter, there must have been two other brothers who left John and became disciples of Jesus" (Int. to N. T., III., p. 209).

But when we add to this the fact that in the four lists of the apostles two pairs of brothers always head the list—Peter and Andrew, John and James (the fact here given of the priority of their call gives a reason for the placing of their names at the head of the lists) —and that throughout the fourth Gospel the names of John and James are consistently omitted in spite of the fact that the Synoptics always represent these two and Peter as standing in a closer relation to Jesus than any of the other disciples; again, that even their father's name is mentioned but once (21:2), and their mother, Salome, is designated as the sister of Jesus'

mother—it becomes very plain that in 1:41 we have no mere "blank" caused by the dissecting knife of a forger, but a clear, though delicate, reference by the author to himself. There is here shown that attitude of reserve evidenced throughout the Gospel even in respect to the other members of the family of the author. All attempted forgeries of the period that remain to bear witness show that it was always the policy to make bold assertions of the authorship and to write the author's name as it were across the face of the document. If this be the work of a forger, what strange procedure to strike out from the entire record the name of the one to whom it was to be attributed! A procedure so suicidal and hyper-subtle as to be absurd! But as the work of the apostle John it stands as the natural expression of that aversion for the insertion of his own name and personality into the sacred narrative.

The author does not simply blot himself and his relations out, however, from the Gospel history. He had had a part in that history that could not be omitted, and, when it becomes necessary to mention himself, he does so using the designation of grateful humility as the friend of Jesus—"the disciple whom Jesus loved"—and at times, when the reference would not be ambiguous, he uses simply "the disciple." In 13:23 the disciple appears again in a way that verifies the conclusion from the delicate mention in chapter 1. Very clearly this disciple can not be Peter, because in 13:23 he is clearly differentiated from Peter. But this disciple, since he was present at the Supper, must have been one of the apostles, for, according to the unanimous testimony of the Synoptic Gospels, only the Twelve were present (Matt. 26:20; Mark 14:17, 20;

Luke 22:14, 30). We have already seen that 1:41 clearly points to either James or John as "the disciple," and that this conclusion is corroborated by the omission of the names of these two and of their parents' names throughout the Gospel. But of James and John, the latter is certainly the one to be identified with the disciple and the author of the Gospel, for James early died a martyr's death, and the Gospel was, according to the unanimous testimony of tradition, written at too late a period to have been written by James. Thus by the process of elimination we see that the results of our exegetical study of these passages force us to the position that the Gospel was written by the apostle John.

This conclusion is immediately verified by an otherwise very perplexing phenomenon in the way in which John the Baptist is spoken of. Whereas, the Synoptics speak of him as John the Baptist, the fourth Gospel consistently leaves off this latter title and calls him "John" (1:6, 15, 19, 26, 32, 35; 6:1, etc.). The distinctive title was evidently necessary in the Synoptics to avoid confusion between John the Baptist and John the apostle, but here the latter is bound by no such necessity, since his own figure is thrown into the background. Again we insist that this is another peculiarity of the fourth Gospel which fits most naturally into the narrative if John be the author, but is inconceivably subtle from the hands of a forger.

Not only does 13:23 cause us immediately to revert to 1:35 and point with startling distinctness to the apostle John, but later passages furnish proof of equal importance. The narrative 18:15ff. follows most naturally if "the disciple" is John, for from the Synoptics we learn that Peter and John had just been asso-

ciated in company with James in a close relation to Jesus while in the garden, and it is most natural that John should continue the companion of Peter to the house of the high priest. As at the Supper, so here in Gethsemane, only the apostles were present. It is hard to believe that this author, who mentions the names of persons who have but little importance in the story so consistently (18:10; 19:25, 38), would here omit the name of so prominent an actor in this scene unless it be for the same reason that has caused him to omit his own name and that of his family from the narrative. It is possible here that the disciple may be James, although it is not probable from the way the reference is made. Even if it be James, in this passage where there is not possible the elimination process used in the other passages, it does not weaken the conclusion upon the basis of the other passages. Nor is the fact that John was known at the high priest's house strange when we consider that, "as regards its prosperity and social position, the family of Zebedee is to be compared with that of Chuza (Luke 8:3), the financial officer of Herod, or even of Joseph of Arimathea," and that Salome, the mother of John and James, was of priestly origin.

Further testimony of the most positive kind is found in 19:35. Here the author affirms in very definite language that he was an eye-witness of things he here records. It is in vain that Moffatt tries to term this evidence "a foundation of sand," and to relegate the author to the position of a second-hand witness. The fact that in other passages the author lays especial emphasis upon his relation to the events recorded as an "eye-witness," that "the disciple" was present at the cross (19:26), that "the disciple" is identified

with the author of the Gospel (21:24), that a study of the rest of the book shows the apostle John to be the author, and finally the fact that, had he not seen these several incidents in connection with the crucifixion to which he adds this solemn testimony, it would have been the most natural thing to state what other man there was near the cross who was a trustworthy witness for Christ and upon whose authority he asked the church to depend with such assurance—all this points with an accumulative effect to the importance of this testimony in 19:35.

The early verses of the first Epistle of John, which was doubtless published with the Gospel, since it bears no salutation and since its subject-matter and especially the insistent use of the "we" fits so closely with the closing verses of the Gospel where a group of disciples testify to the fact that "the beloved disciple" is the author of the book, also set forth strong claims that the author is an eye-witness of the ministry of Jesus.

The cumulative evidence for the Johannine authorship which appears through the Gospel culminates in chapter 21. Here the character of "the disciple" is much more definitely portrayed. We are told that the sons of Zebedee are present at the scene by the lake (21:2). "The disciple" plays a prominent part in the scene, and of those present John alone can have been "the disciple." He is carefully distinguished from Peter, and we have already seen that James' early martyrdom necessarily excludes him. It can have been neither of the other two disciples named, for the change from such a definite and explicit mention and description of them to such a title as "the disciple whom Jesus loved" would then be inexplicable. It can be neither of the two disciples unnamed, for "the dis-

ciple" is explicitly said to be the same as the one to whom this title is applied in the record of the Supper (21:20), and on this hypothesis the omission of the names of James and John throughout the Gospel would then be without explanation. Again we are forced to conclude by a process of elimination that "the disciple" is the apostle John.

The theory propounded by Bacon and adopted by Moffatt that "the disciple" is not an actual historical personage, but a "Pauline ideal"—a figure clothed in the ideal attributes of the Pauline ideal of Christian character—fails to meet the manifest demands of the Gospel as the work of an eye-witness. "The disciple" is most certainly represented as a definite historical character, and, since we have proved that the Gospel is the work of any eye-witness—of one from within the apostolic circle—it is incredible that a record pretending to be historical, recording events already familiar to the church, should audaciously insert into the narrative a fictitious person or a person falsely represented in an ideal light. This theory is wrecked by this consideration alone, while it leaves unexplained the omission of the names of John and his family, the peculiar way in which John the Baptist is designated, and the other internal evidences of the Johannine authorship. The lines of testimony throughout the Gospel, while they do not depend upon 21:24, concentrate their evidence upon its simple declaration that "the disciple" is the author of the book. Luthardt says concerning this verse: "It would be an incredible heaping up of fictions to suppose that one who had no right to legitimate it [the Gospel] should assume the appearance of such a right, in order to give testimony for the apostle, as the author, when he had not been the author."

Those methods of criticism that deliberately amputate the twenty-first chapter, then arbitrarily remove all the passages in the Gospel that assert it to be the work of an eye-witness, and finally add to the record wherever desirable the names of John and his family, and then triumphantly assert that the fourth Gospel contains not a trace of internal evidence as to its authorship, are not methods that commend themselves as sane, fair and unprejudiced, nor do they give promise of grappling with the real problems in exegesis and historical criticism connected with the fourth Gospel. Concerning such methods of summarily denying the testimony of 21:24, Sanday says: "Those critics who assert that the Gospel is not the work of an eye-witness, and even those who say that the last chapter was not written by the author of the whole, wantonly accuse these last words of untruth."

We are forced to conclude, then, upon the basis of an exegetical study of the twenty-first chapter in its relation to the rest of the book and in particular with certain delicate intimations and definite statements of the Gospel itself, that the author was none other than he to whom ancient tradition bears witness—John of Ephesus, the son of Zebedee.

XXIII.

THE DEITY OF JESUS

A STUDY IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

THE Epistle to the Hebrews is one of the most thrilling and powerful documents in the Bible. It might almost be called the fifth Gospel. It offers practically no new facts concerning the earthly ministry of Jesus, but it is from start to finish a tremendous discussion of His personality and saving mission. Matthew, Mark, Luke and John present the detailed evidence before the court, and the Epistle to the Hebrews proceeds to argue the case on the basis of the facts already submitted. He sets forth the Lordship of Jesus in the challenging sentence with which he opens his Epistle, and then proceeds to devote the entire work to the development of the propositions he has submitted. He attempts to reveal the supreme personality of Jesus, the Son of God; the absolute uniqueness of Jesus, the Saviour of men; the final authority of Jesus, Prophet, Priest and King. He argues the supremacy of Jesus to the Old Testament—to the law and the temple, to angels, to Moses, to Joshua, to Satan, to sin and death. He builds a wonderful structure of argument and adorns it with blazing exhortations to the Hebrews to yield themselves completely to Jesus our King.

The Epistle does not declare who the author is, or where the people live to whom it is written. But the Christian world has generally held that the book is the product of the mighty apostle to the Gentiles, or one of the brilliant group of young preachers he trained. The group of Christians to whom he writes evidently live in Jerusalem, under the shadow of the temple. They face the deadly peril of disloyalty to Jesus—of compromise with Judaism. They have suffered persecution, but a new storm is threatening to break about them, and the author is fearful lest after starting out in great faith they shall "shrink back to perdition." They have been reared in the temple and have loved every nook and corner of it with surpassing devotion, and now they have been driven forth from it and deprived of the privileges of worship so precious in the past. The teachers of their youth, the scribes and Pharisees they had been taught to heed and reverence, continue to denounce them and their faith. The whole weight of current learning is against these Hebrew Christians. The intellectual aristocracy at Jerusalem—"the gentlemen of light and leading" in Israel—still reject Jesus as Messiah, and continue to weave the finespun theology of Phariseeism and Sadduceeism. The friends and comrades of their former life, their own kinspeople, have disowned and opposed them. They are despised, hunted, persecuted, discouraged, faltering and doubtful. And for all their losses and distress the author offers this towering presentation of Jesus as Lord and Saviour. What matters broken friendships, exile and persecution, for Jesus has said: "Lo, I am with you always. Go, preach my gospel"?

The great English scholar, Westcott, in his master commentary on Hebrews, declares that the Epistle,

above all other books of the Bible, has the message for our day, offering a most urgent warning against the very dangers which confront us. He urges that we "listen to the voice which speaks to us to-day from its pages and bring to the doubts, the controversies and the apparent losses which distress us the spirit of absolute self-surrender to our King-Priest, the living and glorified Christ."

These words written a third of a century ago sound prophetic. If true then, how much truer now? If true for an English denominationalist, how much truer for a Christian only who has never known any creed but Christ, and has breathed the pure air of freedom from all ecclesiasticisms, and has been moved by the passionate devotion to the word of God and to the reunion of God's people by the restoration of the primitive church? We, too, understand the misery of being deprived of the privilege of labor with the great educational and missionary organizations which our own sacrifice and devotion helped to build. We, too, understand what it means to be thrust out of the fellowship of days gone by and to hear our former comrades assail Jesus and ridicule His word. We also face the trying refusal of those who claim intellectual leadership among us—in our colleges and universities—to yield allegiance to Christ and His word. It is enough to cause one to stop in dismay and consider: "Can it be possible that our fathers were all mistaken and that Christ is, after all, nothing more than a man, and Christianity but a hoax?" We, too, endure the afflictions which come to those marked for destruction by a vast, unscrupulous organization. Though we are marked men, thank God, we do not bear the mark of Cain—the mark of a murderer of the faith of his fellows—but the marks of the

Lord Jesus—of suffering as a Christian which knows no shame.

The Epistle to the Hebrews seems to have been written shortly before the siege of Jerusalem by the Romans. Added to their previous persecutions, they now saw "a storm gathering round the Holy City which to calm eyes boded utter desolation, without any prospect of relief." Before us also there is seen rising a terrible storm of controversy sweeping over the face of all Christendom—brother rising up against brother, and son against father, a man's foes become they of his own household—a storm that threatens to destroy all that we hold dear. If the "Hebrews" found in the presentation of the Lordship of Jesus "an anchor of the soul, a hope both sure and stedfast and entering into that which is within the veil," how much "more earnest heed" should we give "to the things that were heard, lest haply we drift away from them."

In the majestic opening sentence of the Epistle, the author summarizes his entire argument. There are 107 words in the sentence. One word is the center of the sentence. All that precedes leads up to this word, all that follows hinges directly upon it. It is the word "Son." Three great verbs set forth the Lordship of the Son: "hath spoken," "had made purification" and "sat down." Christ is revealed in his threefold office—Prophet, Priest and King. "God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom also he made the worlds; who being the effulgence of his glory, and the very image of his substance, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had made

purification of sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."

Jesus is presented first as the great Prophet. And what is a prophet? Not merely one who predicts the future, but a preacher of righteousness—the messenger of high heaven—he stands before the people and presents God's message to them. "God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners." In the light of this fascinating clause, what a panorama of ancient heroes arises! What outbursts of thundering eloquence! What courageous denunciation of sin! What fearless challenges to erring prince and peasant! What saving revelations of divine truth! What heroic martyrdoms for the truth they have proclaimed! What a great series of names—Moses, Samuel, Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, Jeremiah and a host of others!

But even as he thrills us with this review of the ancient heroes, with one sweep of his pen he sets them all aside. These are of the past, "of old time." God has spoken again and finally "at the end of these days." These received the revelation "by divers portions and in divers manners," but the diversity of the old is surmounted by the convincing unity of the new. The destination is likewise contrasted—"unto the fathers" gives place to "unto us." Finally, the supremacy of the new is absolutely established by the contrast of agents—"in the prophets" versus "in his Son." In the same gesture by which he sets aside the old, he establishes forever the new, setting the seal of absolute finality by his profound revelation of the unique and supreme personality of the "Son." A series of relative and participial clauses follows, hinging upon the word "Son" and revealing His glorious na-

ture and establishing His Lordship as the great Prophet.

"Whom he appointed heir of all things." In other words, Jesus is the great Prophet because He has complete authority to speak. Jesus is Son and therefore Heir. Being the Heir, He knows the will of the Father and is qualified to reveal it. Before issuing the great invitation and giving the great commandment, Jesus declared His authority. Before saying, "Come unto me, all ye that labor," He said, "All things are delivered unto me of my Father." Before giving the command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel," He declared, "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth." So, Hebrews affirms "God hath spoken in his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things." Behold the divine authority of the Christian message!

"Through whom he made the worlds." This clause reminds us of the profound introduction to John's Gospel. "In the beginning was the Word ... all things were made by him." God spoke "in his Son, . . . through whom also he made the worlds." Since Jesus is the Son and Heir, He understands the mind of the Father and is able to reveal His will; since He is the Creator of the world, He understands the needs of His creation and is able to reveal the way of life.

"Who being the effulgence of his glory and the very image of his substance." This is the third clause in support of his proposition that Jesus is the great Prophet. It reminds us of John 1:1-4, 14: "In the beginning was the Word. . . . And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us; and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth." So Hebrews declares "God hath

spoken in his Son . . . who being the effulgence of his glory and the very image of his substance." The prophets were the refulgence, the reflected glory of God, but Jesus the effulgence, the direct shining, the very light itself shining from heaven's gate. "I am the light of the world: he that followeth after me shall not walk in the darkness." He is the "effulgence of his glory." The Greek phrase "very image of his substance" is based on the die that stamps its exact and indelible impress. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." "I and the Father are one." By reason of His divine nature, His unity and identity with God, Jesus is qualified to deliver the message of heaven to earth.

"Upholding all things by the word of his power." This is his concluding stroke revealing Jesus as the great Prophet. Some scientists talk with such awe and reverence for the sacred and inviolable laws of nature that we begin to wonder if they do not bow before the theories and conceptions of their minds as the untutored pagan worships the wood or stone idol fashioned by his hands. What is a law of nature? An observed uniformity in the operation of nature. They tell us that all the world is under the control of the laws of nature. But a law has no power. A law can not control anything. Some imagined that if prohibition could be made a federal law—a part of the National Constitution—then all would be well. But they have been disillusioned. A law has no inherent power. The power inheres in the government, the sovereign people who must stand back of the law and enforce it.

We look through the astronomer's telescope at the whirling planets and worlds and systems, and listen with awe to his explanation of how each proceeds per-

petually in its exact course, and how the slightest variation by one of these planets would result in collision and universal catastrophe. We ask in haste: "What prevents it? What keeps each planet forever in its exact place?" "I do not know," he responds. "I trace the course of the planets, I see the rules that obtain. But the power that controls? That is the mystery of nature—the riddle of the universe." "I know the answer to your question," thunders the author of Hebrews: "Jesus upholding all things by the word of his power." What a conception! Not an Atlas crudely bearing the world on his back, but the grand conception of Genesis: "And God said, Let there be light: and there was light." Jesus upholds all things by the word of His power. In Him all things stand together. He has revealed God's final word. Jesus is the great Teacher by reason of His divine authority and nature. He created the world and still is in His world controlling and directing.

The great affirmation of the author of Hebrews sets forth the first decisive battle-ground between materialism and Christianity. "God hath spoken" affirms Hebrews. "God has not spoken" declares the materialist. Lemuel F. Parton, in an incisive series of articles on "What Is Evolution?" published in syndicated newspapers of America in 1925, ably expounded and defended evolution. He said concerning the struggle at Dalton, Tenn., in which W. J. Bryan gave his life: "It is the age-old struggle between those who hold to a revelation and those who exalt the human faculties as the only approach to truth." In other words, those who hold that God has spoken and the Bible is His word, and those who deny that God has spoken and that the Bible is inspired any more than Shake-

speare, and affirm that man knows and can know only what he learns for himself. Mr. Parton might well have said, "Those who hold to a God," for, if there be a God and He does not know of man's misery, or can not or will not speak to him and show him the way of life, what interest can man have in such a being? The only theism which is compatible with the theory of evolution is Pantheism. The personal God of infinite knowledge, power and love disappears and is replaced by "inherent force," intangible and unapproachable.

The Washington atheist who recently brought suit to revoke the law of the District of Columbia, providing that no public-school teacher supported by public taxation should attack the Bible in the classroom, raised again the issue which confronts the Christian people of America who are caught in the clutches of a godless educational system. This atheist said: "Why not let the public-school teachers attack the Bible? Why should we be bound by the ignorance of two thousand years ago?" This is the issue. Has God spoken or not? Is the Bible true or false? The citizen of Rhea County, Tenn., who petitioned for the repeal of the law prohibiting the teaching of evolution in tax-supported schools declared flatly that the Bible and evolution both can not be true, and that Genesis is false and evolution true. But he claimed to be a follower of Jesus— a member of the Methodist Church and a believer in the New Testament. "No!" thunders the author of Hebrews, "God having spoken in the prophets, hath spoken in the Son." The selfsame God revealed both the Old and the New. You can not repudiate the one and accept the other. The Old was limited in character because given in a primitive time, but it was

nevertheless inspired and divine. The Old prepared the way for the New, when in the fullness of time God spoke once and for all.

Modern unbelief in its various forms strikes squarely at the declaration, "God has spoken unto us in his Son." Open membership, destructive criticism and modernism, with all their vagaries, find their common foundation in the denial of the Lordship of Jesus. Jesus is not the great Prophet, therefore we will trim His teachings to suit our individual tastes. We will open the church door so wide that Jews, Mormons, atheists or Buddhists may enter; we will "exalt the human faculties as the sole approach to truth," and worship our own selves.

The Epistle to the Hebrews does not attempt to prove the existence of God or the fact that He has spoken or that Jesus is His Son. But with magnificent simplicity it is affirmed. The Gospels have already presented the detailed evidence. The reader must decide for himself whether he will accept Christ as Lord and follow the shining path of His teaching, or deny that God has spoken and be lost in mazes of conflicting human speculation. Will you build on the rock or the sand? "'We may well suppose' is not a sufficient substitute for 'Thus saith the Lord.' "

The second proposition of Hebrews is that Jesus is the great High Priest. The office of the priest was entirely distinct from that of the prophet. When Moses was chosen the first of the prophets, Aaron was made the first high priest. The prophet presents the revelation of God to men. The priest presents the sin-offering of men to God. The prophet represents God before men. The priest represents men in the presence of God. The priesthood is inevitably connected with

sin. It suggests the Passover lamb, the day of atonement, the solemn moment when the priest stood in the Holy of Holies. In one single clause, "when he had made purification of sins," Hebrews sets forth Jesus as the great High Priest.

The first three chapters of the Epistle elaborate the author's presentation of Jesus as the great Prophet. The next seven present Him as the great High Priest. "We have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are. . . . Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." Jesus our High Priest is tenderly sympathetic and willing to save. But though tempted in all points like as we are, yet He always conquered. Our great High Priest "hath passed through the heavens" and is "holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens." "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many."

Here is the second great battle-ground of modern Christianity. The modernist denies that Jesus is the great High Priest. He is willing to "give Jesus of Nazareth a niche in the hall of fame, to place Him alongside of Buddha, Confucius, Socrates and Mohammed." But when mention is made of the cross of Jesus, of His death for the sins of the world, he begins to sneer. And many a timid preacher has unconsciously cut off the keen edge of his preaching because of the presence of this unbelief. The cross of Christ has been from the beginning "unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ

the power of God, and the wisdom of God." Paul suffered endless persecution for the cross of Christ. He speaks in Galatians with contempt for the preachers who "desire to make a fair show in the flesh" and compromise their gospel, "*lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ.*" This same deadly peril of compromise threatens to destroy the modern church.

The world is suffering from a lost sense of God as is seen in its rejection of Jesus as Prophet, and from a lost sense of sin reflected in its denial of Jesus as High Priest. Back of both denials is the same atheistic philosophy. If man was created by God in His own image and received revelation from God which he disobeyed, then "sin coucheth at the door" in his present degradation. But if man is nothing but an animal evolved through long ages from a primary cell by inherent forces, then there can be no such thing as sin. This poisonous philosophy has dulled the conscience of this generation. Thomas Dixon, in his novel "The Love Complex," which is nothing but a bit of propaganda for evolution, presents the following plot: A young surgeon is about to be married to a young woman. She meets a stranger, becomes suddenly enamored, runs away with him, and, after a brief escapade, returns repentant to the young surgeon, who excuses her conduct by telling her that God created man in His own image, but it "took one hundred million years to do it"! He traces the evolutionary process when man was developed from lower forms of animal life. He says when we stand on the precipice and are tempted to throw ourselves off, we are not responsible, for this is a "left-over" from the primitive time when we were birds and flew through the air. So

the surgeon tells her she is not to be too severe on herself for what she has done, for it is merely the result of her former animal ancestry. On such a basis as this any crime may be excused. A more infamous or deadly doctrine could hardly be concocted. When Loeb and Leopold, two honor graduates, boastful of their atheism which they had imbibed at college, murdered a little boy to experience the thrill of seeing his death struggles, Clarence Darrow appealed for mercy on the ground that they were not responsible because their act was the result of instinctive reactions from their animal ancestry. Then Clarence Darrow, confessed agnostic, went to Tennessee to balk the reformation of the godless educational machine which produced Loeb and Leopold and is murdering the faith and morals of our young people.

Prof. E. G. Conklin, teacher of biology in Princeton University, said in his Commencement address at Western Reserve University, June 18, 1925: "The only remedy for decadence of conduct to-day is education and more education—not fundamentalism and super-naturalism." Notice the confession: decadence of conduct (*de+cado=fall* down), the downfall of conduct. There never was a time when education was so widespread and intensive, or so godless. Such education can not avail. Man can not save himself. We do not need the fundamental teachings of Jesus, nor even a God at all, says this atheistic evolutionist. We can save ourselves by education. This proposition reminds us of the desperate struggles of the young boy who has been tantalized into standing in a tub and taking hold of the handles and attempting to lilt himself. Man is lost. Only God can save him. Man must lay hold of a higher Being if he would lift himself. Jesus

has the actual power to exalt and ennoble the most depraved. "There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved" but Jesus our High Priest. "We must choose for ourselves whether we accept Jesus as High Priest and depend on Him for salvation, or make the hopeless attempt to walk the quicksands of sin alone.

One more clause completes the picture. "Sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." What a bold declaration is this! This is not the function of either prophet or priest. The prophet is to go among the people to reveal and exhort. The priest is to go into the temple and worship—into the Holy of Holies—but he does not tarry. He does not sit down. He stands rather in awe and reverence. Outside the people wait in fear, lest the high priest shall offend and not return. But Jesus "hath spoken," and, having achieved, "sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." This is the conduct of a King.

"All hail the power of Jesus' name,
Let angels prostrate fall;
Bring forth the royal diadem,
And crown Him Lord of all."

Again and again the writer of Hebrews drives home the kingship of Jesus. After calling the roll of the heroes of the faith in the magnificent eleventh chapter, he exclaims: "Seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." Here again Jesus stands

forth as the great Prophet ("author and finisher of our faith"), the great High Priest ("endured the cross") and King ("sat down").

The declaration "sat down" indicates the completion of His work. On the cross He cried, "It is finished." The task of giving His life for a lost world had been finished, but it was not until after the resurrection and ascension that He "sat down." Mark's Gospel in its closing words declares Jesus was received up into heaven and sat down at the right hand of God. Stephen in his dying moments saw heaven opened and Jesus standing at the right hand of God. Had He risen from His throne to greet the first martyr? In the wilderness Satan had offered Jesus the scepter if He would compromise His character and mission and make common cause with him. But Jesus refused to bow the knee. He "sat down" only "when he had made purification of sins." Jesus began His reign by right of conquest.

The actual beginning of His reign is indicated by the clause "sat down." When He came into this world He "emptied himself," humbled Himself to be born of a virgin, lived a life of humility and service, died the shameful death on the cross, but was raised and finally glorified. The cry, "Glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was," was answered at the ascension of Jesus when He "sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."

The permanence of the reign of Jesus is suggested by this statement. He died once for all. His suffering and shame are ended forever. He now has "passed through the heavens" and "sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." "Of the increase of his

government and of peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David."

This is the third battle-ground of Christianity. A lost sense of God and of sin is accompanied by a lost sense of authority. The world-wide rebellion against authority is another indication of the poison in the thought life of the generation.

The Eighteenth Amendment is blamed by the liberal element in America for the present wave of reckless disrespect of law and government and general lawlessness, but the Eighteenth Amendment does not obtain in Europe, and the same conditions prevail. Postwar conditions? Yes, but what caused the war? The same atheistic philosophy which argues that man's "inner conscience" is the final authority. "Those who exalt the human faculties as the only approach to truth" also exalt the same human faculties as the only savior from moral degradation and as the sole monarch of human conduct. God is ruled out. Self-worship is the popular type of idolatry. The human *is* substituted for the divine as the final source of authority. Human organizations, the products of human expediency, become the lord and master. Loyalty to a missionary hierarchy supersedes loyalty to Jesus. This is a final choice. Shall we make Christ King?

If we reject Christ, what? "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great a salvation?" If we will not hear the great Prophet, what then? To whom shall we go? He alone has the words of life. If we will not accept the sacrifice of the great High Priest, wherewith shall we be cleansed or find hope of forgiveness? If we repudiate the authority of the King of kings, who has opened the gates of Hades by His victory over the grave, where shall we find hope in the hour of death?

"How long go ye limping between the two sides! If Jehovah be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him." "Choose you this day whom ye will serve." "" Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people through his own blood, *suffered without the gate. Let us therefore go forth unto him, without the camp, bearing his reproach.*"

XXIV.

THE LORDSHIP OF JESUS

WHAT is the secret of the control which Jesus exercises over mankind? Is His leadership intellectual? Is it by virtue of a tremendous will-power? Or does His sympathy for mankind explain His influence?

The first type of leadership represents the rule of reason; the second, the reign of law; the last, the call of love. The leaders of the first class are the men who do the thinking for their fellows. They fix the compass of reason and sail boldly out on unknown seas and discover new worlds of thought. They plunge into the tangled wilderness, hew a path through its trackless waste, select a site, build a blockhouse, defend it against all foes, and a tardy civilization comes after and builds here a city. The following names, selected somewhat at random from the pages of history, illustrate this type of leadership: Plato, Aristotle, St. Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, Jefferson, Calhoun, "Webster, Tolstoi, Phillips Brooks.*

The second class of leadership possesses that driving, dominating will that lays hold of the masses with

* Dr. Home, of New York University, offers this suggestion about the three types of leadership, with the above names in illustration, in a little pamphlet on Y. M. C. A. work, in which he urges all young men to develop these qualities. I have turned his suggestion in an entirely different direction, and have used it as an outline for a study of the personality of Jesus.

a grip of steel and drives them on to tremendous goals. These are the great military leaders, statesmen, captains of finance and industry. The following names are typical: Moses, Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, Trajan, Constantine, Cromwell, Richelieu, Washington, Napoleon, Bismarck.

In the third class we find practically all the great religious leaders, those who have been oppressed by the sufferings of the great, overburdened heart of the world, and have sought some means of assuaging this misery. Some of the famous men of this type are: Confucius, Buddha, Zoroaster, Socrates, Mohammed, St. Francis of Assisi, Ignatius Loyola, Rousseau, Henry Clay, Mazzini.

In which of these lists shall we place the name of Jesus Christ? Does it stand first in any? Or is it supreme in all? Are all of these qualities to be found in the personality of Jesus? If so, in what proportions, and which predominates? Approach the personality of Jesus from the Unitarian standpoint. Begin with Him as a mere man among men. Can you explain Him on that basis? Can any combination of intellect, will-power and sympathy explain His leadership?

The intellectual leaders possess two qualities—originality and soundness of judgment. Without the one, they never command the attention of the world; without the other, they never retain public confidence. Solomon said: "There is nothing new under the sun." The brilliant Dean Swift exclaimed: "Confound these ancients, they have stolen all our best ideas." Some assert that the only originality is that of style; so much of truth has been discovered that practically all that remains for us is the fashion in which we present it.

Evidently, one of the primary tests of originality is that of style. Those who heard Jesus said: "Never man so spake." Every succeeding generation has repeated the verdict. Unique and profound as was the subject-matter of the Sermon on the Mount, it was the style of Jesus which amazed the people. He did not speak as the scribes. His style was original. The simplicity, beauty, dignity, conciseness and unique use of illustration seen in the style of Jesus have been at once the wonder and despair of the ages. But it was none of these qualities that astonished the multitudes, "for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes." Thus, at the very inception of our study of the personality of Jesus, we find ourselves thrust into the presence of the Infinite. For *authority in its ultimate phases is an attribute of Deity*. Jesus claimed authority in the superlative degree. "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth."

The final test of the originality of a thinker is to lay his ideas alongside the best that has preceded him. What, then, is the relation of Jesus to the Old Testament? Does He slavishly follow it? Or does He react against it, good or bad? The destructive critic undertakes to overthrow the originality of Jesus by claiming He was completely subservient to the Old Testament. They quote "not one jot or tittle of the law shall pass away." But they omit "till all be fulfilled" and "I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it." Thus, at the very opening of His ministry, He announced Himself as the fulfillment of the law. In thrilling terms He set forth His Lordship over the Old Testament: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time. . . . But *I say unto you.*" While

appreciating the truth and worth of the law, He towers above it, criticizing it or setting it aside at will on the ground that the primitive times in which it had been given had limited the revelations, or because the divine purpose had now been fulfilled. The food regulations of the Old Testament were swept aside at one stroke when He said: "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man, but that which cometh out." In saying this, "he made all meats clean." The Old Testament established two great institutions—the Sabbath day and the temple. He said concerning the former: "The Son of man is lord even of the sabbath." And of the temple he declared: "One greater than the temple is here." He came to establish a new religion that was to possess such unique power it could not be contained in the old wineskins of Old Testament formalism. "The law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ." He summed up the law in two great principles of life. The rabbis had praised the Scripture: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart . . . and thy neighbor as thyself." But no one had ever dared to say: "On this hang all the law and the prophets." He freely predicted the destruction of the temple. So had the prophets. But they also prophesied its restoration. He set it aside forever, declaring the true worshiper should no longer be limited by a geographical location, but "must worship the Father in spirit and truth." He repeated the commandments to the Jews during His ministry, but after His death, when the new will came into force, He sent His disciples to the ends of the earth, not to preach the law of Moses, but His universal gospel. Thus the message of Jesus is original. It is independent of the Old Testament.

Jesus claims this same Lordship over all truth. "I am the truth." All systems of philosophy and religion must bow in subjection to His gospel. Innumerable attempts have been made to break down this claim by digging through the moral and religious teaching of all the world preceding Him and attempting to parallel His ideas in the declarations of His predecessors, thus destroying His originality. It is pointed out that Confucius stated the Golden Rule before Christ came. But Confucius stated it in negative form, and there is a vast chasm which separates the two ideas: "Don't do unto others" and "Do unto others." This same chasm separates the Christian gospel from all other religious systems. The three little monkeys with hands placed over eyes, ears and lips represent the supreme revelation of Buddhism. "See no evil. Hear no evil. Speak no evil." All negative! The foundation of a hopeless pessimism. But Jesus tears the bandage from a man's eyes and says: "I gave you eyes with which to see. Stand upright and walk like a man. Control your eyes from within. Do not depend on an external bandage. Look! See the beautiful and the good." He wrests the bandage from man's ears and says: "Ears are for hearing. Use them to hear the call of suffering in a needy world." He breaks the seal on man's lips and exclaims: "Be not dumb. Silence is shame. Preach my gospel to a sinful and despairing world." The positive character of Christianity is sufficient to set it forth as supreme, but this is only one indication of the originality of Jesus' teaching. Its emphasis on great principles of life rather than petty regulations, its universality, optimism, liberty and inner power, all bear witness to the unique character of Christianity.

How seldom is originality united with soundness of judgment in the same personality! How few witty and brilliant people have the saving grace of common sense and sober judgment! Yet, after two thousand years of the severest testing, the teachings of Jesus stand firm amid challenge. History offers no parallel to the persistent and desperate attacks on Christianity.

The Pharisees dogged the footsteps of Jesus seeking for the slightest fault or slip, and laying endless traps for Him. They denied His claims, mocked at His teaching, repudiated His miracles and finally slew Him on the cross. But He rose from the dead, and the challenge of Judaism, which reached a second crisis in the career of Saul, ended at last with the fall of Jerusalem.

A second challenge came from the skeptical philosophy of the heathen world in the early centuries. Celsus was the first great rationalistic opponent of Christianity and the most brilliant critic it has known. But this second attack collapsed with the conversion of Constantine.

The third challenge was offered by the group of atheists who arose in the nineteenth century. They were ably represented in this country by Robert Ingersoll. But they, too, have failed to destroy Christianity. God's truth goes marching on.

We have now come to the most critical test Christianity has ever faced. The modern challengers of Christ do not stand on the outside of the church and curse it as Ingersoll did. They lack the common honesty of Ingersoll. They steal within the church and undertake to overthrow its divine message under cover of comradeship. They do not claim to be opponents of Christianity. They claim to be its only true exponents.

They scorn simple faith in the personality and message of Jesus. They attempt to create a Christ of their own, after the fancies of their evolution-stricken minds. They claim to know more about Jesus than did the eyewitnesses who wrote His biography. While denying the records of His miracles as superstitious myths and ridiculing much of His teaching as due to the ignorance of Jesus, they still claim to strengthen the "faith" of men by producing an improved brand of Christianity. They still claim to be followers of Jesus, and, in fact, members of the inner circle of the apostles. This last claim seems to be correct, but their first name is Judas, and their last Iscariot.

Christianity is as sure to survive this test as it has every other. Christ has said: "My word shall not pass away." Twenty centuries of history add to our confidence. The absurd and childish character of much of the criticism offered by this modern skeptical fad, and the unscrupulous and infamous methods by which it seeks propagation, are sufficient evidence of its early doom. Each age has made its challenge of Christianity and added its testimony to the permanence of the message of Jesus.

The teachings of Jesus may be divided into that which has been tested and that which remains to be tested; that which relates to this life and that which reveals the nature of the future life. Concerning the former, it may be asked: Where is the mistake in the ideas of Jesus? Do they conflict with certain theories of science? But these theories come and go. That which is affirmed to-day is denied to-morrow. His teaching still holds sway. What established fact controverts His teaching? Has the word of any other being proved infallible? Each succeeding age discovers

and discards the errors of the scientists, philosophers and teachers who had just been canonized. But the words of Jesus have stood firm all through the centuries.

The Christian message is not merely permanent, but exhaustive. Who has ever added one jot or tittle to the moral and religious teachings given us by Jesus and His inspired apostles? Who has ever improved upon His message either in content or form? Is there no significance to the fact that two thousand years have been unable to improve the teachings of Him who calmly said, "I am the truth"?

The teaching of Jesus concerning eternity can not be put to the test in this life, but the moral certainty with which He spoke brings conviction to the human heart. Confucius was once asked to explain the nature of God. He answered: "I can not explain the nature of man; how can I expect to explain the nature of God?" He was asked to explain the nature of the future life. He replied: "I can not explain this life; how can I expect to explain eternity?" And Confucius was one of the wisest men who ever lived, for he was wise enough to recognize his own ignorance. But compare with this the calm and clear declarations of Jesus concerning the unseen world. He did not say: "If you will permit me in my humble and apt-to-be-mistaken way, I would like to suggest—." But he said with tremendous moral conviction, "Verily, verily, I say unto you." His teaching has had the power to redeem and uplift and satisfy the souls of men. Following His leadership, the world has progressed. Forgetting Him in their self-sufficiency, men have drifted back into sin and darkness. While claiming to be the heaven-sent spiritual Guide of the world ("I am the

light of the world;" "I am the way and the truth and the life"), He also claimed Lordship over all eternity in the capacity of Judge of mankind ("For neither doth the Father judge any man, but he hath given all judgment unto the Son; that all may honor the Son even as they honor the Father"). His claims of divine and eternal wisdom rest on His claims of unity, equality and identity with God—His deity. In comparison with Jesus, all other intellectual leaders fade into insignificance. In the presence of all who went before, His originality stands unparalleled. In the presence of all who have succeeded Him, His words stand unshaken. Our earthly experience of Christ establishes our faith in His declarations concerning the infinite and unseen. His intellectual leadership has stood every test. He is Lord of the minds of men.

Men who lead their fellows by virtue of a driving will-power always reveal a clear and definite purpose, and the ability to concentrate all their energies on its fulfillment. Here is a Moses with the vision of redeeming Israel from bondage and leading them to Canaan. His wonderful life is completely given to this work. Here is an Alexander, a Caesar, a Napoleon, with dreams of world conquest. With passionate zeal and unswerving energy they devote their all to the task. By sheer force of will they attract the masses and drive them toward the goal.

Even at the age of twelve, Jesus had a striking conception of His mission. "Knew ye not that I must be in my Father's house?" From the day of His baptism the great task drew Him on, and, scorning even sleep, food and drink for long periods, He threw Himself with unflagging energy into the work of saving men. At times the physical demands of earthly ex-

istence forced a moment's relaxation as He sat on a well-curb or lay asleep in the rear of a boat, but the relentless driving power of His personality immediately thrust Him back to the task. "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me." "Have ye not yet faith?" The cross loomed over His pathway, but "he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem," and could not be turned back. Who can measure the will-power that is revealed in the dying words, "It is finished"?

The dominating will-power of great leaders of this class is also shown by the complete control they maintain over their followers. Ex-President Taft was continually involved with difficulties because he could not control his Cabinet or his immediate followers. He is a world-famous jurist, but not the driving type of a leader. Roosevelt is a strong example of such leadership, and his life teems with examples of his control. The struggle between Bryan and Wilson in the first Cabinet was inevitable. It was the struggle between two gigantic wills.

This quality of leadership was much in evidence among the immediate followers of Jesus. They were uncouth and rugged, but masterful. John the Baptist was a leader of this type. How his tremendous personality gripped the multitudes and drew them out into the wilderness! But his submission to Jesus was absolute. "Behold, the Lamb of God." "The latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose." "He must increase, but I must decrease." From the gloom of a prison cell, he sent messengers with a question of doubt. Jesus did not answer with any weak affirmation of His Messiahship, but sent that stirring word: "Tell John the things which ye hear and see." No more murmurs arose from the prison cell.

James and John sought the chief places in the kingdom. The rest of the group were filled with fury at this attempt to forestall them. A storm was brewing. But Jesus set a little child in the midst, and said: "You are disputing as to who shall be the greatest in my kingdom; if you don't change your proud and selfish attitude, and become as humble as this little child, you shall not even enter my kingdom." Thus His personality reached out and subdued the group in a moment.

Peter was the dominating figure among the Twelve. The exalted commendation bestowed by Jesus, when Peter confessed Him as Christ, had lifted the apostle into an ecstasy of joy. Jesus' prediction of His crucifixion came as a crushing blow. One can see Peter leap to his feet in excitement and attempt to dictate to the Master: "Lord, this shall never be to thee." And as Jesus slowly turned toward Peter a hush fell upon the Twelve, for it was a struggle between the two personalities. Peter received the terrific rebuke: "Get thee behind me, Satan." He was completely subdued and humbled. Again, in the upper room, he rebelled: "Thou shalt never wash my feet." But the stern reply, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me," recalled him immediately to childlike obedience.

Saul, the firebrand of Tarsus, threw the church into confusion and threatened to destroy it utterly. But when he met Jesus he became Paul the "apostle," "servant" and "bondslave" of Christ. And he shook the whole Roman world with the Christian message. What exalted homage he offers to Christ in the Spirit-breathed words: "Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God." "The Son of God, Jesus Christ." "Our Lord Jesus Christ ... to whom be the glory

for ever and ever." "Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and *he put all things in subjection under his feet*, and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." "His Son ... who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; for in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him, and unto him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; *that in all things he might have the pre-eminence.*"

Driving leading of this type always arouses furious opposition. Leaders who control entirely by sympathy and love do not make so many bitter foes. But the will of a rugged leader is shown by the respect and fear he commands among his enemies. Even Jesus had enemies. The hostility of some people is a huge compliment. How the Pharisees hated and feared Jesus! They quailed before His searching eye and relentless criticisms: "Ye scribes and Pharisees, ye hypocrites." They sought to injure Him in every conceivable way, but they worked in the dark, for they feared Him. In that thrilling clash of personalities in the final week in Jerusalem, the Pharisees and Sadducees departed crestfallen and full of fear, for "no man after that durst ask him any question." When the woman taken

in adultery was brought before Him, He imposed His will upon the hypocritical accusers, driving them away by the flash of a penetrating and indignant glance and the stinging words: "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her."

Herod was tortured by a guilty conscience after the murder of John the Baptist. He determined to forestall a repetition by ridding his kingdom of Jesus. He sent his sycophants to Jesus, ordering Him to leave Galilee. "Get thee out, and go hence: for Herod would fain kill thee." But Jesus hurled at them this reply: "Go and say to that fox, Behold, I cast out demons, and perform cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected." Herod did not press the matter further.

One of the most stirring paintings of Jesus represents Him driving the traders, scribes, Pharisees and the multitudes, together with the animals, out of the temple. They are all fleeing in confusion before that solitary form with uplifted whip. Why did they flee? How they hated Him and desired to kill Him! It was one against thousands. Why did they not stone Him to death on the spot? The painter who produced this masterpiece was master of his art, but he was not master of his New Testament, for he represents Jesus as lashing the backs of the men in driving them before Him. Jesus never had to apply force to any man. The whip was for the dumb animals. That face darkened with a storm-cloud of divine wrath, that mysterious personality electrifying the crowd with His fearful indignation, drove them headlong from His presence.

Jesus returned to preach in His old home town. The people of Nazareth became enraged at His message

and formed a swirling mob about Him, thrusting Him out of the synagogue and sweeping Him along the narrow street to the brow of that precipice at whose feet still lies the old Roman road. Just as they were about to cast Him from the dizzy height, He stood forth in majestic grandeur and walked straight through their midst. Not a man dared touch Him. Were they not caught helpless in the grip of an infinite will?

The chief priests and Pharisees sent officers to arrest Jesus as He was teaching the multitudes. They returned empty-handed. "Why did ye not bring him?" demanded the enraged plotters. "Never man so spake," was the awed reply. The soldiers sent to arrest Him in Gethsemane fell to the ground as if smitten by a stroke of lightning from heaven when He stood forth and said, "I am he," allowing them a glimpse of His inner self that overwhelmed them with fear.

The will of Jesus reveals itself in the Gospels in a way which transcends all human experience. In the wilderness He met the devil, and, piercing his sophistries and wiles, drove him away with that peremptory command, "Get thee hence." The demons saw His approach with terror and came forth from their victims at His command. Even the inanimate objects of nature obeyed His will. A showy, but barren, fig-tree became a symbol of the ungrateful Jewish nation as He turned" and cursed it. Who but a madman would curse a tree? "No man eat fruit from thee henceforward for ever." No one but God! The fig-tree perished at His spoken word, withering from the roots up. The storm on the sea threatened the little group with destruction. The boat was being filled by the dashing waves. They awakened Christ with the despairing cry: "Save, Lord.

We perish." And He "rebuked the winds and the sea; and there was a great calm." All the ages echo the question of the amazed disciples: "What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him?"

Self-control is a final test of will-power. Here is an Alexander weeping, as a lad, amid the military victories of his father, lest there shall be no more worlds to conquer, and dying in a drunken brawl at thirty-two years of age. "I have overcome the world," said Jesus. This was no empty military conquest. But He had always prevailed in that intimate and persistent conflict with temptation. The will of Jesus was sufficient for every test Satan could bring. His sinlessness is unique in human history. "Tempted in all points like as we, yet without sin." "But," says the critic, "you can not prove His sinlessness." Perhaps not to one who rejects the testimony of the inspired writers. But how else can one explain the facts? (1) No sin is recorded against Him in a book which is absolutely impartial and merciless in recording both the good and evil deeds of men. (2) His worst enemies could not convict Him of sin. (3) He had no consciousness of sin. He claimed to have lived a spotless life. (4) Prophets predicted His perfection and divinely inspired witnesses affirmed it. (5) His noble ideals and conduct are still unattainable for all others. If Jesus was merely the product of evolutionary development, surely twenty centuries of progress should have produced some one far better. Yet to-day the nobility of His example is our bright star shining in a dark, wicked world. Still floundering in the mire of sin, we strive after His perfection as one would reach up and touch the sky.

Death itself was unable to withstand the will of Jesus. His command, "Lazarus, come forth," opened the gates of Hades. Calmly He predicted His own triumph over death and His final return to judge the world. His empty tomb establishes the profound declaration: "I am the first and the last, and the Living one; and I was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore, and I have the keys of death and of Hades."

Intense sympathy is seldom united with great intellect or will. The phrase "cold intellect" reveals the lack of feeling that is common to most thinkers. Napoleon, building a vast empire at the cost of enormous bloodshed and suffering, shows how the driving type of leadership is usually a slave to selfish ambition. But the personality of Jesus reveals perfect love as well as infinite intellect and will. Love is the key to His personality. "God is love." Love governed the exercise of intellect and will. His teaching was not given to satisfy our curiosity or to rob us of the joy of the discovery of truth that lies within our reach, but to guide our steps in the way of nobility and peace. His miracles were never wrought for His own comfort or to satisfy those who merely sought to see a sign, but they answered the call of suffering and replaced doubt with faith.

There is an atmosphere about a leader of this type which defies analysis. The little children who are drawn by intuition to those who possess a loving heart were ever about the feet of Jesus. Even the blind, deaf and dumb, those who had been shut off from the world by leprosy, and the outcast sinner came to Him with confidence in His unfailing love.

Our love is narrow and limited by our crudities and selfishness. But the perfect heart of Jesus loved all

men. Not merely the afflicted and unfortunate gained His sympathy, but those for whom the world has but acorn. While we were yet in our sins He loved us and came to save us. The most hardened and degraded sinner excited His pity. We sympathize with one class or another, according to our station in life. But Jesus sympathized with all classes. Even a hardened old miser like Zacchaeus stirred the divine longing in the soul of Christ. Dr. Home has named Buddha as an example of the third type of leadership. It is a good choice. Buddha is one of the most beautiful characters of history. But behold how far he falls short of the Nazarene. Buddha despised women above all else. He at first denied that woman had a soul, and only when repeatedly urged by his followers did he grant to woman even a scant place in his way of salvation. Compare with this, Jesus sitting on the well-curb, probing the conscience of the woman of Sychar. He did not seem to reckon that she was a woman and of a despised race, but only that here was a soul lost in sin, and He stretched out His strong arm to save.

The critics undertake to find a flaw in the supreme sympathy of Jesus, as in His intellectual and masterful Lordship. They say He did not love the Pharisees. For them He had the most bitter denunciations and threats. This criticism presupposes that a person can not offer drastic criticisms against one he loves; that stern arraignment indicates a lack of sympathy. The shallow character of this criticism of Jesus and the theory on which it rests is revealed by the following: (1) It was inevitable that Christ should champion the cause of the neglected and oppressed. The Pharisee had kicked the publican and sinner out of the synagogue. His ministry to this neglected class naturally

meant warfare with the Pharisees. (2) It was necessary to break down the system of legalism before the kingdom of God could be established. (3) He was ever seeking, even by denunciation and terrific warnings, to break through the armor of the Pharisees—their self-righteousness, legalism, vanity, hypocrisy, cruelty and pride. (4) Whenever one of the Pharisees gave Him the slightest opportunity, He was eager to save a Simon with whom He dined, or an earnest seeker after truth who was "not far from the kingdom of God." (5) The touching scene where Jesus wept the tears of anguish and despair over Jerusalem is based upon the unspeakable ingratitude of the Pharisees. (6) The gentle words, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," show that His sympathy for the Pharisees moved Him even in the hour of death at their hands. (7) The salvation He offered did not exclude the Pharisee, but is for "all the nations" and "every creature."

The love of Christ was not merely universal in scope, but it measured up to the test of intensity that demanded the death on the cross. "Greater love hath no man than this." If Jesus as Teacher and Commander stands unique and supreme, what shall we say of Jesus as Saviour? This essay does not pretend to offer a mathematical demonstration of the deity and lordship of Jesus. Neither can one offer such a demonstration of the existence of God. But the array of facts is so convincing that only the fool can say in his heart, "There is no God," or that "Jesus is not the Son of God." In view of the facts, a reasonable being is bound to believe in the existence of God. And if he will but tarry in the presence of Jesus, he can not but say with Thomas: "My Lord and my God."

He is the intellectual King of the earth. He is Lord of our minds. Let us "bring every thought into captivity to him." Let us say with Paul, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ." The modernist may spin his fantastic theories and rail at the teachings of Jesus and those who still believe and proclaim them. Let us build on the Rock of ages. The scientific theories of each succeeding age shall beat in vain like the restless waves of the sea about its base, but the Rock shall endure forever.

He is Master as well as Teacher. He is our Leader and Commander. Let us bring our stubborn wills into subjection to Him. "Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, the firstborn of the dead, and the ruler of the kings of the earth ... to him be the glory and dominion for ever and ever," for it is "he that hath the key of David, he that openeth and none shall shut, and that shutteth and none openeth." Arrogant skeptics may attempt to revoke His decrees, but their puny rebellion shall collapse. Let us not merely call Him "Lord, Lord," but do His will, live His life and yield our souls to His guidance. Let us teach His commandments to the world that "every knee should bow . . . and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

He is the Saviour of the world. "The King of love my Shepherd is, His goodness faileth never." "O Love that wilt not let me go, I rest my weary soul in Thee." "Love for all, and can it be?" Let us sit at His feet and breathe His spirit of love. Clinging to the cross, shall we not stretch out the other hand to save lost men? With unfailing devotion let us dedicate our all to Him, and to the proclamation of His gospel to a lost world.

He is the King of kings and Lord of lords. He is the King of glory. "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in. ... Who is this King of glory? The Lord of hosts, he is the King of glory." "And he shall reign for ever and ever." To be with Him, to be like Him, shall be our chief joy ten thousand years hence.