

EDWARD GAYER ANDREWS

FRANCIS J. McCONNELL

**Boston University
College of Liberal Arts
Library**

From the library of William Fairfield
Warren, June 1930.

BX
8495
A64
F09

~~W. F. Warren~~
~~8495~~
~~A64~~
~~F09~~

Wm. J. Warren.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF LIBRARIES
1127



Edwin G. Andrews.

Edward Gayer Andrews

A BISHOP OF THE
METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH

By

FRANCIS J. McCONNELL



BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
LIBRARY

New York: EATON & MAINS
Cincinnati: JENNINGS & GRAHAM

Copyright, 1909, by
EATON & MAINS.

RX
8495
DL4
F-1

TO

MRS. EDWARD G. ANDREWS

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction.....	vii
I. The Years of Preparation.	
I. Early Life	3
II. College.....	9
III. Teacher and Preacher.....	20
II. The Episcopal Career.	
I. The Appointing Power.....	37
II. The Presiding Officer.....	54
III. The Judge.....	71
IV. The Resident Bishop.....	83
V. On the Administration Boards.....	102
VI. Traveling Through the Connection.....	115
VII. The Statesman.....	132
VIII. The Theological Counselor.....	145
IX. The Preacher.....	166
III. The Period of Retirement.	
I. Life in Brooklyn.....	179
II. Tributes.....	189
IV. Papers and Sermons.	
I. Address at Funeral Service of President William McKinley.....	223
II. Baccalaureate Sermon at Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa.....	231
III. The Pastor and His Bible.....	240
IV. The New Testament Method of Law.....	270

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

EDWARD GAYER ANDREWS was elected a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church in May, 1872. He was retired in May, 1904. In the thirty-two years of his general superintendency he attended over three hundred Annual Conferences and met the other demands customarily made on a Methodist Bishop. He suffered no periods of ill health, nor was he interrupted in his work by serious illness in his family. In the mere quantity of service rendered the Church he must be ranked in a high place with few, if any, peers.

During the thirty-two years from 1872 to 1904 the Methodist Episcopal Church underwent a great expansion. The nation passed out from the crisis of the Civil War to that movement westward which has been one of the marvels of our time. The rapid settlement of the great West has been of profound significance for the United States and for humanity. The transformation came almost wholly within the period of Bishop Andrews's official career. When the Bishop went to Iowa in 1872 to take up his residence there, the Union Pacific Railroad had been built only a little over three years. The Methodist Church shared in the general movement of the nation. Where the settler went the itinerant went. This phase of church advance is but one. The missionary enterprises since 1872 have reached almost every land. In

the mere extent of territory touched by the Church the period from 1872 on to the present has been unique. In 1872 there were 76 Annual Conferences; in 1904, 129; in 1872, 9,000 effective ministers; in 1904, 18,208; in 1872, 1,400,000 Church members; in 1904, 3,029,560; in 1872, less than 1,300,000 Sunday school scholars; in 1904, 2,774,820; in 1872, 13,000 churches, valued at \$57,000,000; in 1904, 28,213, valued at \$131,303,120. The total gifts of the Church for missions for the year closing with the General Conference of 1872 were \$661,000; for the year before the Conference of 1904, about \$1,500,000, exclusive of the contributions by the women's organizations. The total benevolent contributions of the Church in 1872 were about \$900,000; in 1903, nearly \$3,000,000.

The period from 1872 to 1904 witnessed the opening of missions in Mexico, in western South America, in western China, in Korea and in Japan. There were no hospitals in 1872; in 1904 there were at least twenty-five. The deaconess work, the Epworth League, the Woman's Home Missionary Society, the City Missionary Societies, the Board of Education—all these were begun during the period between 1872 and 1904.

The years of Bishop Andrews's service were those of transition for the Church. The Church became more democratic. The laymen were admitted to the General Conference in 1872 and advanced to increasing power through the years. The Church became, perhaps, more interested in intellectual problems. The increase of educational institutions and the general

attention given to religious problems led to critical examination and reëxamination of the foundations of the Christian faith. When Bishop Andrews was elected the doctrine of evolution was just beginning to be taken seriously. John Fiske, perhaps the foremost teacher of philosophical evolution of his time in America, did not publish his *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy* till 1874. The newer methods of biblical study had made no widespread impression this side of the Atlantic before the late seventies or early eighties. Bishop Andrews lived through a period of theological strain. Again, a vast swarm of social questions came upon the Church during the years after 1872. Insistent demands were made that the Church take a wider work upon itself. Salvation came to be insisted upon not merely as a matter of the saving of the individual in his private relationships. The social and industrial and political responsibilities of the church member were pushed up into a new prominence. Bishop Andrews came upon the scene at a time when many of the most urgent questions of to-day had not been heard of. He lived to see socialism, to mention a single instance, clamoring for a hearing as a competitor of the Church.

Through all these years Bishop Andrews was a leader in the Board of Bishops. The episcopacy of the Methodist Church does its work largely in supervision, and the changes taking place in the denomination have to be discussed in the Board in a practical way possible nowhere else. In the multifarious discussions that the changing problems of the time forced upon the Church Bishop Andrews wrought a work of

incalculable value. During his episcopal career his Church, like all others, was assailed by all sorts and conditions of criticism. The only conclusive answer to the criticism was the Church's justification of its own existence by the effectiveness with which it did its own work. In making the work of the Methodist Church effective Bishop Andrews was a leader.

Edward Gayer Andrews did his great work for the Church as a Bishop. He was a leader among the Bishops. He was never widely known as anything else than a Bishop. He was not elected for the sake of rewarding him for anything he had already done, though he had been a faithful and hard-working and efficient pastor at the time of his election; he was elected just because he gave promise of making a good Bishop. He did his work as a Bishop. He was not a preacher merely; certainly not a lecturer, or a writer of books, or an organizer of institutions. Other Bishops will be remembered for their oratory, or for their patriotic services, or for their books. Edward G. Andrews will be remembered as a Bishop—as useful a Bishop as the Church has had.

I

THE YEARS OF PREPARATION

I

EARLY LIFE

EDWARD GAYER ANDREWS was born at New Hartford, New York, on August 7, 1825. New Hartford is about four miles from Utica, on the line of the New York, Ontario and Western Railroad, though, of course, there was no railroad for many years after the above date. Conditions during the years following 1825 were primitive but not at all of the backwoods. Central New York was as truly then as to-day on a great highway, for the travel from New York and from New England to the West followed the line of the Mohawk. In the year 1825 the Erie Canal was finished and the opening of the thoroughfare immediately touched all central New York with new life. Feeder canals were built, reaching to the main line from every possible point of approach, and along the streams which would furnish water power mills sprang up in great numbers. Probably no industrial enterprise in our national career had more immediate effect than the opening of the Erie Canal; and during the time that the new industrial vigor was beginning to pulse in increasing power along the line which has since become one of the greatest highways that the world has ever known, Edward G. Andrews grew through boyhood to young manhood. There was something about the life of those stirring days which brought youth to maturity quickly. Bishop

Andrews never had the marks of the frontier upon him. His early life was not passed as was the early life of so many Methodist leaders, in a cruel and bitter struggle in pioneer conditions. His early surroundings, crude as they were, were suggestive of industrial and commercial leadership rather than of battle with the forests and struggle with crops in the "clearings." There was possibly less of the romantic about the early years of Edward G. Andrews than about the opening of the career of Matthew Simpson and of Randolph S. Foster, both of whom saw something of the frontier; but there seems a kind of fitness in the conditions in which young Andrews was born, as we think how closely his life was afterward connected with the business and practical side of church administration. Bishop Andrews had talent little short of positive genius for the practical handling of church enterprises. Quite likely the early surroundings had little to do with the development of this particular gift, but there is at least a sort of appropriateness in thinking of this leader of the Church's business coming out of an early life which was quick with the beginnings of industrial enterprises whose significance we are just now learning rightly to estimate.

Incidents of that early day in the life of Edward G. Andrews have not been chronicled for us in large number, but we know enough to see clearly the kind of home out of which he came. Judge Charles Andrews, of Syracuse, a brother of the Bishop, writes as follows:

"My brother Edward was the fifth in a family of

eleven children, all of whom except one (who died in infancy) lived to reach maturity. The father, George Andrews, died at the age of eighty and the mother, Polly Andrews, died in 1886 at the age of eighty-nine. My earliest recollections are connected with the family home at New York Mills, in Oneida County. My father for many years was superintendent of the Burrstone Mill at that place, and had a salary of one thousand dollars a year, and upon this the family was maintained and the children educated, until in 1839 my father, having purchased a farm, removed to Onondaga County. Both parents were members of the Methodist Episcopal Church. They took an active part in the affairs of the Church and were deeply interested in the religious training of their children. The household was emphatically a Christian household. In the earlier days there was a strictness which partook somewhat of Puritan austerity, and discipline was enforced, which, at a later time, yielded to what I think was a broader and wiser view of Christian liberty. But love ruled the hearts of our parents in dealing with their children, and the children were responsive to its touch and submitted without question to the parental discipline.

“My brother Edward was, from his earliest years, peculiarly susceptible to religious impressions. My mother had an unusual gift in prayer. She searched the Scriptures. She was familiar with their imagery and she accepted the Christian faith with a confidence never obscured by doubt or question. Her prayers were the outpouring of a deeply religious spirit. In them were commingled adoration, supplication, and

6 EDWARD GAYER ANDREWS

thanksgiving addressed with undoubting faith to Him who she believed was able and willing to hear and answer and guide.

“My brother had the same gift. I have always thought that his prayers in their adaptation to meet the needs and the aspirations of human souls, and in their uplifting power, have seldom been equaled. They greatly contributed, in my judgment, to the success of his ministry, and to the spiritual power which attended it. The influence of his early training, and especially of his mother’s character and life, was, I think, an abiding and prominent factor in his spiritual development. My brother entered upon his ministry with no theological training in schools. How early he came to the determination to devote his life to the Christian ministry I am not able to say. It was, doubtless, before he graduated from college. Soon after his graduation he came to the farm and in a short time received an appointment to a church in Morrisville, a small village in Madison County, New York. I remember but as yesterday the spring morning when, mounted upon ‘Selim,’ a horse which an uncle had given him, with his saddlebags behind him, he left the parental home to take up his work at Morrisville. It was not, humanly speaking, a brilliant opening of a career. But he saw no lion in his path. He believed that he was called to preach the gospel, and his buoyant and hopeful nature and his unwavering sense of duty enabled him to brush aside difficulties which might have discouraged a young man of another mold.”

Dr. J. B. Foote, of Syracuse, knew Mrs. Andrews

while she was living in Syracuse in the later years of her life and writes as follows:

“During the years that I was presiding elder I called frequently at the home of Mrs. Andrews, the mother of Judge Andrews and of Bishop Andrews.

“It was a home that interested me very much. The husband was at that time treasurer of the Syracuse Gas Company. The mother was the center and charm of the household circle, a woman of earnest, intelligent, religious character, thoroughly helping those within her influence. On one occasion when I was calling the conversation turned upon her children. I remarked upon the lives of usefulness of her two sons. She said: ‘I will tell you what I have never told to any but two or three in my life. When my two sons were little children they were lying on the bed with me one day. There came over me such a sense of responsibility in regard to their training and preparation for their life work that I was overwhelmed at the thought, and struggled long in prayer with God that he would give me wisdom to guide their young lives in such a way as to make them useful men. Assurance came to me with extraordinary force, and while I watched the development of their characters as they were growing up I was sure that my prayers had been answered. I am thankful that while my life is far spent my children may yet live to be useful and influential and of great good in the world.’ ”

In his later years Bishop Andrews spoke with ever-increasing tenderness and respect both of his father and his mother. Though there was a touch of austerity in the early training, the Bishop always spoke of his

early years as if they were a fond memory to him. There was one experience in his childhood of which he used in his later years to tell with amusement and yet with something of protest against the view of the child life which made the incident possible. Dr. Charles G. Finney, of Oberlin, married a sister of Mr. George Andrews and used to visit the home when young Edward G. was a boy. Dr. Finney, it will be remembered, used to make his public prayers occasions for the rebuke of those who seemed to the worthy Oberlin leader to need correction. It was reported of Dr. Finney that once in Oberlin he prayed for a member of his faculty in words substantially these: "Thou seest, O Lord, Professor ——. Thou knowest he knows more than all the rest of us, but, O Lord, he is so lazy!" Then followed a petition for the relief of the laziness. Dr. Finney's petitions at the Andrews home were marked by the same directness, or indirectness, whichever it may be called. Edward's sister Mary was once visiting at Dr. Finney's home in Oberlin. The next morning at prayers the good doctor prayed: "O Lord, bless Mary. Thou seest what a vain girl she is. Look at her hair, all in curls." Bishop Andrews never seemed to think that this was especially efficacious Christian nurture for a young child. In the same connection it may be said that with one part of John Wesley's career Bishop Andrews never had any patience, namely, his conduct of his Kingswood school for boys. The Bishop used to say that he found it very hard to be charitable with John Wesley for his total ignorance of the child nature.

II

COLLEGE

THE atmosphere of the Andrews home was that of deep and genuine culture. The parents knew the value of education and encouraged their children to get the most possible in the way of intellectual training. Edward was given an academic equipment at Cazenovia Seminary, and in 1844 started for Wesleyan University at Middletown, Connecticut. He was then nineteen years of age and the trip to Middletown was, perhaps, as long a journey as he had ever taken, though it seems that he had made a visit to New York city earlier in 1844, where, oddly enough, the sight which seems to have impressed him most was the meeting of the General Conference in that historic session, out of whose heated debates came the splitting of the Methodist Church into a northern and southern section.

One little incident which occurred on the way to Middletown is illuminating as showing the refinement of feeling of young Mr. Andrews. A part of the journey was made by canal boat, and on the boat the prospective matriculant fell in with two other youths bound likewise for Middletown. Young Andrews was somewhat shocked at the undignified conduct of these two boys, destined to be his friends throughout the college course and throughout after life. It seems that the boys would take advantage of every stop of the

boat to buy watermelons in great number, so that the entire trip became a sort of gorging with melons on the part of these two youngsters. Mr. Andrews seemed to think this constituted a very serious reflection on the breeding of the young men. We are not informed that he himself disliked watermelons, especially when they had been honestly bought and paid for, as might not have been the case with modern college youths, but there is an unanalyzable something about this story which makes it entirely credible to anyone who ever knew Bishop Andrews. Every time the names of either of these Wesleyan men were suggested to the Bishop in after years, though he admired the men very greatly, he could not help recalling the abandon and gusto of their enjoyment of the melons.

Wesleyan University was about fifteen years old when Edward G. Andrews entered its sophomore class. The material assets of the university consisted of two buildings, erected originally for the "American Literary, Scientific, and Military Academy," and turned over to the university when the academy was removed to Norwich, Vermont, and an endowment of little more than forty thousand dollars. Six per cent on forty thousand dollars is twenty-four hundred dollars, a sum probably in excess of the net return from the endowment fund in those early days, and the fees of the students were not high enough to make the position of professor in the new university one to be greatly desired for financial reasons. One asset Wesleyan had then, however, as she has now—one of the fairest sites for a college that can be found in America. Beautiful as was that central New York country from

which Edward Andrews came, the view of hill and valley and river at Middletown made an impression upon his sensitive mind which the years never effaced. In our later day we have come to see how much the natural surroundings of a college have to do with impressing the minds of college youth; and if nature has not been propitious, wise college officials seek the services of the landscape architect. Beautiful for situation was, and is, Wesleyan University, and the beauty is part of the force which binds the hearts of the alumni so loyally to the school.

The curriculum of Wesleyan in 1844 was not elaborate. The only way in which the elective principle came into play was in the fact that the student could elect whether he would come to college at all or not, but once at the scholastic table he had to take what was set before him. The elective system as we see it at work in American colleges to-day certainly has great advantages, but we must not forget the advantages which were to be found under the old system. As we look over the subjects of study in the Wesleyan of that day we are impressed by the stiffness and rigor of the course. There was not much, but what there was was hard. Even in those days of beginnings the training at Wesleyan was very likely as good as could be found in any college in the country; and if we are tempted to smile at the meagerness of the intellectual fare, we must remember that all the colleges of that day reflected the general ironlike sternness of the time. College courses did not give wide range of choice, but life itself in those days did not give wide range of choice. The colleges justified their existence by making men

hard thinkers in a time which demanded hard thinking. The sports, the social pleasures, the intellectual luxuries all came in a later day. They would have been out of place in that day. No doubt the elective system of our time makes it possible for some youths who are by nature intellectually averse to hard study to acquire quite a respectable degree of intellectual training through following their own bent. In those days intellectual training was not intended for those who were unwilling to do disagreeable tasks. The intellectual tasks of the time had to be faced by men who would go at them directly in spite of their disagreeableness. The country, new as it was, was already in the throes of a great conflict. Voices from the outside world which carried a prophecy of approaching strife reached the students in their classrooms. President Olin had been a foremost debater in that famous General Conference upon which young Andrews had looked in 1844, and had, in fact, delivered the most masterly address upon the differences between North and South which was made at that meeting. The students were impressed to a greater degree than to-day, perhaps, with the seriousness of the intellectual and moral struggle which lay before them in the world beyond graduation day. There was no attempt on the part of college leaders to make study appear as play. Study was study, and hard study at that. The elective system is, no doubt, a great factor in alluring students into the intellectual land of promise, and offers fine opportunities for the capture of the promised land by easy flank

marches without the need of much heavy fighting; but our admiration for the new system ought not to blind our eyes to the intellectual directness with which the students of the old Wesleyan days were taught to face even the toughest problems. To be sure, the old system was not good for some minds, but it was very good indeed for some others. The intellect of Bishop Andrews in mature life showed an astounding power of prolonged concentration on the most irksome and uninteresting problems. His ability to perform hard, disagreeable work hour after hour and day after day must in part, at least, be attributed to the training at Wesleyan.

Wesleyan, as we have said, was only about fifteen years old when Edward Andrews entered as a student, and yet even in his time the college had begun that long line of mighty traditions which have been so effective in molding the lives of her students. For example, the college still moved under the spell of the life of Wilbur Fisk, the first president, elected in 1831. When Edward Andrews reached Wesleyan, Wilbur Fisk had been dead five years, but the power of the departed leader was still upon the school. Wilbur Fisk seems to have been one of the rare spirits of Methodism. A graduate of Brown University, he added the graces of the saint to the accomplishments of the scholar, and the self-sacrificing spirit of the true Christian to a charm of manner naturally captivating. Dr. Fisk was elected a Bishop in 1836, but declined to serve on the ground that his duty lay with Wesleyan. Edward Andrews heard much during his college days of the power of Wilbur Fisk and

of the very "atmosphere of heaven" which pervaded his sermons. That the influence on the young collegian must have been marked and abiding would appear from the reference to Wilbur Fisk in Bishop Andrews's address at the Wesley Bicentennial at Wesleyan in 1903.

Another mighty personal force which touched the life of the students at Wesleyan during the days from 1844 to 1847 was Stephen Olin. From all accounts it must have been somewhat of a liberal education just to look at Stephen Olin. He must have been a veritable giant in personal appearance, and his dignity of bearing suggested the constant quantities. He had a frame like a "Hercules," one admirer writes, and yet his bodily vigor, massive as it was, had been impaired by the intensity of his intellectual labors, though he seems to have been more of a thinker than a scholar. His power in public address must have been remarkable even in that day when forceful public speakers were quite common. There was a peculiar intensity about the public speech of the forties which produced emotional effects in the hearers the like of which we seldom see to-day. The fact that the audiences were composed of persons who had less opportunity for reading and for the development of the critical faculty than we have to-day may have had something to do with the production of these effects, but quite likely the personality of the speakers had more. We are told in the published life of Dr. Olin that on one occasion he spoke at a public meeting called in Middletown to create sentiment in favor of building what was afterward known as the Air-Line

Railroad. His theme was, "The Moral and Social Influence of Modern Facilities of Locomotion." The biographer states that before he had been speaking many minutes many of his hearers were in tears! All this seems very strange to us. We do not see anything to weep about in a public meeting in favor of a railroad, but we must not misunderstand the significance of this incident. It did not mean that Stephen Olin was given to telling pathetic stories. When we read of audiences "melted to tears" in those days we can make no greater mistake than to imagine that the emotion came out of pathos, as we ordinarily think of pathos in public speech. Dr. Olin produced these effects through his own sense of the sublime and magnificent and through his ability to arouse others to a like sense. There was something in the very momentum of his thought, something in its sheer immensity, which had the same effect on his hearers that the sight of a glorious landscape or the rendering of a splendid oratorio always has upon fine-grained natures. His noted address before the General Conference in 1844 was the utterance of a statesman, and yet its immediate effect was to move the Conference with the surges of irresistible emotion. It would be hard to overestimate the sweep of Olin's mental power, or his ability to compress into a single statement a summation of a line of argument. There are scattered throughout the journals which he kept on his tours to Europe passages like that on "Hungary the shield of Europe," which show great economic and political insight. In the realm of religious thinking he was at his best. He at times complained

that he had so little definite training in theological thinking, but very possibly his lack of formal theological discipline made him more effective, in that it forced him to bring into play for religious purposes the great resources of his general knowledge and observation. When the mass of his thought was fired by religious fervor he was irresistible. Bishop Andrews used to refer especially to a baccalaureate sermon preached before the class of 1845 on the text: "But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof." Bishop Andrews said of this "most impressive sermon": "Few that heard it would attempt to describe the lofty passion, the wide vision, the force, the majesty, the divine inspiration of that deliverance. Few that heard it could evade the sweep and authority of some of its later sentences."

We can get some idea of the enterprise of men like Fisk and Olin when we think of their journeys to Europe. Fisk was in Europe at the time of his election to the episcopacy and Olin went abroad at least twice, once going as far as the Holy Land. On the second tour the trip home from England occupied thirty-six days, a rather satisfactory passage for those times. The dangers, uncertainties, and hardships of travel in the thirties and forties give us some hint of the enterprise of these men in their eagerness to see and know the world.

The students were brought into close contact with the faculty members. The college government was distinctly paternal. The college catalogue of that day informs parents that the pocket money for their sons

should be limited in amount in any case, and that it should be sent to some member of the faculty who would pay it over to the boy according to his legitimate needs. "For this service," the catalogue goes on to say, "the professor will charge a small commission." The government of the school moved according to high principles, with at times personal reënforcement from the president which brought the principles altogether out of the realm of the abstract. Bishop Andrews used to tell of a moving appeal which Stephen Olin once made to the boys for better behavior. "The Almighty is grieved by this misconduct," said the Doctor in a tone of deep pathos. And then he added with tremendous emphasis: "*And I won't have it.*"

That was the day when students derived most of their inspiration from close contact with men who might fittingly have been called educational monarchs. In a later day the inspiration of college life comes more especially from the democratic influence which works where hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of young minds are met together supposedly with a common educational aim, and there is less opportunity for direct intercourse with professors. Something of the kingly power of Bishop Andrews must have come from association with the intellectual royal minds of early Wesleyan days.

The beneficial influences were not wholly from the faculty, however. The class of 1847 was not large but it contained men of force, like Professor Alexander Winchell, afterward noted as a geologist. There were some close friendships formed also which

lasted through the years. Dr. Joseph E. King, now of Fort Edward Institute, Fort Edward, New York, came to be an intimate friend and companion, as did also Dr. A. B. Hyde, now of Denver. Dr. Hyde says: "Bishop Andrews and I came from the same region. His noble father did business with my own father. Our contact came in 1844 at Wesleyan. His personality charmed me, and having many traditions in common, we blended like drops of water. Together we strolled, swam, debated, and even went out preaching." Dr. Daniel Steele was a member of the class of 1848, but he, too, was thrown in contact with Edward Andrews. "In 1844 when I entered Wesleyan University I first saw E. G. Andrews. We were not classmates, his class being that of 1847 and mine of 1848. We were members of the same public debating society, for at that time the two public societies were flourishing, though there were signs of dissolution through the competition of the Greek letter secret fraternities. This President Olin deprecated. These numerous sodalities each aimed at some special excellence. Two of them aimed at high scholarship and were rivals in the endeavor to count the larger number of valedictorians wearing their badges. Both of them 'cultivated' Andrews as a member who would do them honor. But the society which regarded literary superiority, rhetorical and oratorical ability, as the most worthy object succeeded in enrolling Andrews in its 'Mystical Seven' where afterward was the name of Henry W. Warren and that of William F. Warren. Andrews was beloved both by faculty and students. He was manly and amiable,

worthy and wise, and, above all, had a cheerful and attractive piety. In his senior year he was the college class leader at whose feet we all delighted to sit.”

It was at Middletown also that Edward Andrews met Gilbert Haven. Theodore L. Cuyler dated his acquaintance with Edward Andrews from a chance visit to Wesleyan in 1845.

III

TEACHER AND PREACHER

IT is the primary aim of this volume to treat of the career of Edward G. Andrews as a Bishop. We may be pardoned then for not going far into detail in our treatment of the years from 1847 to 1872. We give only enough space to these years to show how the various experiences played a part in leading up to the election of 1872, and to suggest the part these years played in fitting Edward G. Andrews for his after work.

The class of 1847 was graduated in August. It seems that in the fall of that year Edward Andrews called on his friend A. B. Hyde, at Cazenovia, and showed him an Oneida Conference set of appointments with Morrisville Circuit marked "to be supplied," and remarked that he himself was to be the supply. It was to this circuit that he rode away from home on horseback, imprinting upon the mind of his brother Charles that picture of which the Judge writes in a previous chapter. The date at which the future Bishop had reached his decision to enter the ministry we do not know. Under the deeply religious influences of his boyhood home he had joined the church at the age of ten, and quite likely the conviction that he ought to preach came naturally as a sort of flowering out of his religious experience. At any rate, he was graduated in August and was on his

way to the Morrisville Circuit within a few weeks. In the following July he was regularly admitted into the Oneida Conference at Owego, ordained deacon by Bishop Janes and appointed to Hamilton and Leesville. He must have shown from the very beginning the qualities which were so marked in after years—the singular charm of manner and the perfect sincerity which won all hearts—for when John P. Newman followed Edward G. Andrews in this appointment the impression left by Andrews upon the community after his two years' service was so strong that Newman heard nothing for some weeks except the superior graces of his predecessor. Newman took a characteristically original step in dealing with the praise of his predecessor. He himself in the course of a sermon delivered a eulogy on the work of Edward G. Andrews so complete that nothing further was left to be said.

In 1850-51, the young preacher was sent to Cooperstown, where the success at Hamilton was repeated. James Fenimore Cooper was living at Cooperstown when young Andrews went there. The new minister called on the novelist one day and the latter's reception revealed a trait in the life of the future Bishop which those who knew him best will appreciate. It was characteristic of Edward G. Andrews that he was seldom deceived as to the spirit of the man who happened to be talking to him, though the man himself might not always realize the completeness of the Andrews insight. On this occasion Cooper evidently took the new minister for an unsophisticated youth of necessarily limited knowledge. A large picture of

the forum at Rome hung on the wall of Cooper's study. Cooper called the young minister to his side and gave him a well-meant but patronizing discourse on the picture and on Rome. Andrews enjoyed the lecture, but for reasons which the lecturer did not suspect. In after years the Bishop said: "From Mr. Cooper's remarks it soon became clear to me that I knew more about Rome than he did."

While living at Cooperstown Edward Andrews was married to Miss Susan Hotchkiss, of Cheshire, Connecticut. Shortly after marriage the young couple were removed to Stockbridge for another pastorate of two years. It will be remembered that in the fifties the pastoral term in the Methodist Church was limited to two years. We are interested to note that all the Andrews pastorates except two were for the full pastoral term, and in those two the desire of the people was that the minister should stay for the full term. The work always went on quietly but effectively. There does not seem to have been anything spectacular or striking in these early pastorates. The churches grew legitimately and normally. Cooperstown had sixty-one members when Edward Andrews went there and eighty-seven when he left. This record seems to show about the usual rate of increase under his ministrations.

One thing the young minister did not know—he did not understand the proper use of his voice. He preached very energetically, so energetically, in fact, that his voice gave out under the strain. This does not mean that he took to screaming in the pulpit; perhaps if he had screamed, the strain on the throat

would have been easier. The trouble seems to have been an overtension which the preacher had not yet learned to control. The difficulty was so serious that Bishops Simpson and Janes advised the acceptance of a position as teacher in the Oneida Conference Seminary, and thither Andrews went in 1854. An opening in the presidency of the Mansfield Female College took him to Ohio a few months later, but after an absence of only a year he was called back to the seminary at Cazenovia to be the successor of Dr. Henry Bannister. This was in 1856. Andrews had left the pastorate in 1854 and did not return to it again until 1864.

As a teacher Edward G. Andrews belonged to the good, old-fashioned school of personal inspirers. His career does something to justify the theory of that wise principal who said in the course of his search for a new instructor, "I am looking for a man first and a scholar afterward." We are not concerned to ask what Principal Andrews taught. We know that his training had been accurate and thorough for his time, and that the time was happily free from the overemphasis on specialization which we see to-day, a specialization which does not always discern the difference between true university method and true college method, and sometimes not even the difference between university method and secondary-school method. The professors in those days could teach any one of half a dozen branches, or teach all half dozen, for that matter, so that not much can be said for their special knowledge of any one field, but it must be remembered that they were teachers and not

specialists. The curriculum at Oneida fifty years ago would, no doubt, look rather meager to the youth at preparatory school to-day, but youngsters were taught to think in those days as truly as now; they were as certainly put on the path to right knowledge then as now; and as certainly caught the fine spirit of enthusiasm for the best things which should be the chief asset that any boy or girl carries away from a secondary school. The young people who came in contact with Principal Andrews never escaped the inspiration which naturally came from him. There were, moreover, a directness of method and a largeness of view of educational matters which made the principal of Oneida Seminary rank high as a leader among the educators of the central part of New York. We hear of Principal Andrews as a very frequent speaker at gatherings of teachers.

There was another phase of the work of Principal Andrews which brought him to prominence. We refer to his success in getting the money for his seminary. Dr. A. B. Hyde says of those days: "His was a double task—the order of the school and its outward support. He bowed between the burdens, oiling his task with cheer and even humor." We can well imagine how difficult a task it was to carry on the financial work of the seminary, but the work was done with absolute dignity and with complete success. The channels of confidence in the school were kept open. The fundamental element in the success of Principal Andrews was the confidence throughout central New York that, as Dr. Hyde puts it, the pupils of Principal Andrews were "under the dew of Hermon."

The eight or more years at Cazenovia passed away as quickly and yet as uneventfully as years of successful school administration usually do. The principal had so grown in the confidence of the members of the Oneida Conference that in 1864 they elected him a delegate to the General Conference, which met at Philadelphia on May 2. The Conference at that time was composed of only two hundred and sixteen delegates, but his presence in the body gave Edward G. Andrews an acquaintance with the Methodist Church which he could have acquired in no other way. He was thrown into contact with such men as John Lanahan, Jesse T. Peck, William L. Harris, William Nast, Lorenzo D. McCabe, Granville Moody, Elijah H. Pilcher, Calvin Kingsley, Isaac W. Wiley, David Sherman, Joseph Cummings, Miner Raymond, Randolph S. Foster, Davis W. Clark, John W. Lindsay, Daniel Curry, John Miley, Robert M. Hatfield, George W. Woodruff, Edward Thomson, Joseph M. Trimble, Frederick Merrick, John P. Durbin, Luke Hitchcock, Thomas M. Eddy, Thomas H. Lynch, A. J. Kynett, George Peck. The Conference was not too large to prevent every man from coming at least to slight acquaintance with every other.

The name of Edward G. Andrews appears but few times on the records of that Conference, but the few appearances are significant. He voted No on a motion to lay on the table the following resolution: "*Resolved*, that the presiding elders be elected by ballot, without debate in the Annual Conference, on the nomination of the presiding Bishop." He tried, without success, to introduce into the report of the pastor to the

Quarterly Conference a better plan for keeping track of discontinued probationers. As secretary of the Committee on Lay Delegation he signed, perhaps drafted, the report which approved lay representation in the General Conference as soon as the Church might approve. Of more interest is the fact that the name of Edward G. Andrews appears as a member of the Committee on Slavery. The report of the committee is uncompromising. The causes of slavery, its effect on the entire life of the nation, the part of the Church in its removal, the approval of the national policy—all these considerations are set forth briefly and yet with telling effect. The temper of the committee and of the Committee on the State of the Church, though Dr. Andrews did not belong to this latter committee, no doubt well reflected the spirit of the principal of Oneida Seminary. An air of restrained fury breathes through the reports of the committees, fury which was that of an exalted patriotism. It was in response to a communication from this General Conference that Abraham Lincoln wrote back:

“In response to your address allow me to attest the accuracy of its historical statements, indorse the sentiments it expresses, and thank you in the nation’s name for the sure promise it gives.

“Nobly sustained as the government has been by all the Churches, I would utter nothing which might in the least appear invidious against any. Yet without this it may fairly be said that the Methodist Episcopal Church, not less devoted than the best, is by its greater numbers the most important of all. It

is no fault in others that the Methodist Church sends more soldiers to the field, more nurses to the hospitals, and more prayers to heaven than any. God bless the Methodist Church! bless all the Churches! and blessed be God who, in this our great trial, giveth us the Churches!"

If Edward G. Andrews was in his place on the nineteenth of May, 1864, he heard the reading of the above letter, now become a classic.

This may be as appropriate a place as any to speak of the feeling of Bishop Andrews about the war. He shared the patriotic spirit of the North. He felt and spoke very intensely. In the pastorate at Stamford, to which he came in 1864, he once corrected in semi-public conversation some statements of a Southerner with a pungency that the Southerner quite likely never forgot. To the end of his life he was suspicious of attempts to justify the course of the South in 1861. Histories of the Civil War period written from the Southern standpoint never received more than scant praise from him. And yet he had none of the indiscriminating attitude toward the problems of the South which vitiated the thinking of some of his Northern brethren. It is no secret that he cherished very few illusions concerning the work of the Negroes, though he wrought as faithfully as any to help them upward. His rather doubtful attitude toward the white work of our Church in the South is also well known.

In 1864 Dr. Andrews felt that his voice had recovered sufficiently to allow him to return to the regular speaking of the ministry, and accepted a call to Middletown, Connecticut, in the New York East

Conference. By a turn in the tide of affairs in the Cabinet Dr. Andrews was sent to Stamford, Connecticut, instead. Stamford had no knowledge of Dr. Andrews, as Dr. Andrews had none of Stamford, and the appointment there was embarrassing to him. The work, however, proved as successful as those who put Dr. Andrews there felt that it would be. Stamford was a leading church in the New York East Conference, and had in its membership some of the foremost laymen of Methodism. Dr. Andrews was successful in winning and holding marked influence over these laymen. At the close of three years at Stamford he was sent to Sands Street, Brooklyn, and from there to Saint John's, Brooklyn. He was starting on his second year at Seventh Avenue, now Grace Church, Brooklyn, at the time of his election to the episcopacy.

Of all these pastorates in Brooklyn it must be said that they showed Dr. Andrews to be an unusual success as what was coming to be spoken of as an "all-around" minister. He was an attractive preacher in a city which boasted such preachers as Beecher and Storrs. He was a winsome pastor in a city and in a neighborhood which knew the work of Theodore L. Cuyler, one of the greatest pastors America has ever produced. It used to be said of Dr. Cuyler as a tribute and not as a disparagement that when a strange family arrived anywhere within his parish he went into the house "with the goods." And in addition to ability as preacher and pastor, Dr. Andrews was recognized as a wise administrator of church problems. He aimed at the solid upbuilding of his congregation. For example, he once found a new book which said

some things which he wished to say to his people. He took the book into the pulpit one Sunday morning and omitted the sermon for the sake of reading to the people from the book. Anything which would really build up his hearers was to him worth while. He was much more concerned in building his church than in adding to his own reputation.

Among the last to view the face of Bishop Andrews before his body was carried from the funeral services at the New York Avenue Church of Brooklyn to the resting place at Syracuse was a man eighty-three years of age, who up to the age of forty-five had been a Roman Catholic, utterly ignorant of the Scriptures. This man had in December of 1869 almost accidentally strayed within the doors of Saint John's Church. Dr. Andrews preached. The man came again. On the evening of January 12, 1870, Dr. Andrews asked if any would come forward to the altar for prayer. This man and his wife came. That night he consecrated himself to the cause of the Lord. Dr. Andrews provided for the new beginner's instruction and guidance, putting him in the way of solid upbuilding in the Christian life. When, thirty-eight years later, the man walked down the aisle of the church at that funeral service to view for the last time the face of the friend who had led him into the kingdom, he had been for thirty years one of the most effective church and Sunday school workers in Brooklyn, with a wide reputation for religious insight and sound knowledge of the problems of the spiritual life. There had been nothing spectacular about the beginning of his religious life. The advance had been uniform and lasting.

While this man claims not to have attained to anything extraordinary, his success has really been extraordinary. He gives the credit for his awakening and for his wise direction to the essentials of the Christian life to Edward G. Andrews. Others rise with similar testimony. The work of Dr. Andrews in the pastorate was quiet but effective and lasting.

Dr. Buckley, in an editorial in *The Christian Advocate*, writes as follows:

“To estimate fully the gifts of Dr. Andrews for the pastorate of a family church with a permanent congregation, it is necessary either to have been a member of one of his churches or congregations or to have succeeded him in the pastorate. The latter privilege was thoroughly enjoyed by the writer at Stamford, Connecticut. His sermons were carefully cogitated, written in large part, but not slavishly delivered. To the last he used marked divisions, but not too many. Something of the nature of a peroration was uttered at the end of the discussion of each division, and at the close he summed up like a lawyer before a jury. He was a highly oratorical preacher, having an unction, not wholly of feelings, nor of words, but chiefly of ideas. There was a total absence of slang. Having heard him many times, we never noticed an empty adjective, a tautological sentence, or a childish appeal to the sensibilities. All was clear, convincing, lofty, and moving. His preaching was quite independent of the number before him. On torrid summer nights, in Saint John’s Church, when many of his parishioners had removed to their country houses, and many others remained at home because of

the fervent heat, he would preach as earnestly and appealingly, making a plea for instant decision, as if in a winter service, surrounded by weeping inquirers.

“As the physical condition is essential to the highest public expression, though always animated, sometimes he was less so than at others. On not infrequent occasions it seemed as though his heart was struggling to manifest itself visibly to the hearers.

“In pastoral intercourse he performed social duties in a courtly and ingratiating manner. It was delightful to see him among his old parishioners. The business devolving upon a pastor is sometimes very trying. He was attentive to all, and those that came after him had no trouble with the records and found a guide to the houses of his parishioners.

“In the highest duty, that of leading souls out of the darkness of doubt and fear into the light of religious confidence, he united personal help with pastoral instruction. Many a time the prescription which would not have been noticed in the pulpit was given in private, and as often that which would not have been impressive in conversation became illuminated in the pulpit and powerful when the hearer, who had not been relieved in conversation, in the ‘beaten oil’ prepared afterward and distilled in the pulpit, recognized his need supplied. In bereavement his silence was frequently better than some men’s speech. He was a comforter, hence all his parishioners clung to him forever.”

The General Conference of 1872 met in Brooklyn, and though Dr. Andrews had been in the New York East Conference only eight years he was present as a

delegate. More important even than this, he was one of the Brooklyn Committee to provide for the entertainment of the Conference. It sounds almost like a reflection on Dr. Andrews to say that his work on this committee helped make him Bishop, but it is really a great compliment to believe that his work as a committeeman led the delegates to think so highly of him as to vote for him as one of their chief pastors. The delegates saw his tactfulness, his gentlemanliness, his amazing gift for detail in this work as they could have seen it nowhere else. If they had not known of him before, his work prompted them to ask questions; and if they were already asking questions about him, his kindness and tact in the performance of a difficult task were illuminating and suggestive. The committeeman who could deal so kindly with brethren who had crotchety peculiarities as to keep them in good humor seemed like a suitable choice for a position which would require illimitable patience and charity. And when, joined to this power to deal with details, the delegates found large knowledge of the Church, firm grasp on constitutional principles, and transparently sincere piety, the result was not long in doubt. In a Conference which had before it men like Randolph S. Foster and Gilbert Haven and the other leaders of that famous Conference of 1872, ministers like Dr. James M. Buckley and laymen like Judge Reynolds advocated the election of Edward G. Andrews as unmistakably wise. Dr. Andrews was elected on the third ballot.

Like his work before his election, the career of Edward G. Andrews as Bishop was without exciting

or spectacular incident. Edward G. Andrews, however, was a great Bishop. It is to his work as Bishop that we now turn. We make no attempt to follow his career chronologically, but take up one after another the features of his work which placed the Methodist Episcopal Church under lasting obligation to him. It is with some thought of at least faintly suggesting this debt that the succeeding chapters are written. Enough of chronological statement appears to keep the main current of events before us, but the emphasis is upon the character and quality of the episcopal work of Edward G. Andrews.



II

THE EPISCOPAL CAREER

I

THE APPOINTING POWER

PERHAPS the first duty of the Bishop, and the one most important in the eyes of the Church, is that of making the appointments. In discussing Bishop Andrews as a maker of appointments we ask the indulgence of the reader as we set forth some considerations which show the exceeding delicacy and intricacy of appointment-making. What we shall say is familiar and commonplace to the Methodist ministers and laymen, but the most devoted Methodists often forget some simple facts when brought face to face with the "appointing power" at work. There is no duty which renders the Bishop more liable to misunderstanding and criticism than this of assigning the preachers in the Conference to their "charges."

If we may be permitted to say so, the Methodist Conferences considered now merely in their internal organizations are a sort of approach on a small scale to the ideal which the Socialists urge upon us for all society. According to the Methodist theory, and also largely according to the practice, there is a place for every man and a man for every place. Theoretically, no man has a claim on any particular place. Theoretically, all the ministers are equal before the Bishop, who may send any minister to any place where the needs of the work seem to demand that particular

minister. Theoretically, and in fact, the ministers as a body are actuated in the main by the desire to bring in the kingdom of God, and the Methodist system could not hold together for a year if the fundamental desire on the part of the ministers and laymen were not to advance the cause of righteousness. Theoretically, the Bishop is not a monarch, or even a military leader—he is the instrument through whom the Church speaks, and in his selection even the ministers who receive appointment at his hands have had as much share as is possible in a democracy working through representative forms of government. Here are so many places and so many workers, the workers agreeing to be sent to their work by a power whom they have had a hand in allotting to his task. As we have said, the system is a sort of approximation in a limited way to the ideal which the Socialist stands for, though we call attention to the resemblance merely for the sake of making the system more intelligible to the ordinary reader.

All this is very clear on paper, but in actual practice many intricacies appear. One complexity comes out of the growth of the work. In the early days it was possible for a Bishop to know personally almost all the ministers of a Conference. In those days, too, the work was simple. The preaching, especially the preaching of strictly evangelistic sermons, was the main duty. The Church had not taken on many of the forms of activity which make the strain of modern pastoral life so heavy, and a preacher's success could be estimated largely by the number of conversions which he reported. In after years, however, it became

necessary for the Bishop to rely upon the reports of presiding elders, now called district superintendents, who, through their visits to the churches once every three months, were supposed to know more intimately than any Bishop could the demands of the work in the various places. The body of superintendents in any Conference came to be known as the "Cabinet," the name obviously coming from the body of advisers surrounding the President of the United States. Still later came into more and more prominence the committee from the particular church, which, though it had no legal voice in the selection of a minister, came more and more to insist upon its moral right to be heard when a change of pastors was contemplated.

The growth of the work also made for the modification of the system by increasing the number of years for which a minister could be appointed consecutively to any one church. In 1804 the time limit was made two years; in 1864, three years; in 1888, five years; in 1900 the limit was removed altogether, so that under the present rule a minister can be reappointed to a church indefinitely. These changes came, we repeat, as the result of the growth of the Church and of the country and were an attempt on the part of the Church to meet the changing demands of the time. For example, when the time limit was made five years, in 1888, there was hardly a trolley line in the United States. With the application of electricity to urban and suburban transportation a marked change was made in city church conditions. Population centers began to shift and congregations even in comparatively fixed centers lost their old-time stability. The ease of getting about,

and the consequent rapid flitting of real estate values from point to point introduced an almost incredible fluidity into conditions in city churches. In a metropolitan community, even where large numbers of persons own their own homes, a church has been known to receive over five hundred *bona fide* members in five years and yet experience a net growth during that time of only fifty. The enormous proportion of movement in and out of such a congregation can better be seen if we state the further fact that the growth was from a membership of seven hundred and fifty to a membership of eight hundred. Now in such situations after a period of five years the pastor is likely to be the only fixed point in the flow, if there is to be any fixed point at all.

With the increase of the length of pastoral term, however, there are brought out more and more clearly the differences between churches and the differences between men. Under any system of assigning men to tasks there is no chance of doing away with the fact that some appointments are undesirable. We cannot do away with the undesirabilities by calling the places equal or by calling the men equal. With the lengthening term it becomes clear that some men are fitted and some unfitted for long work in one place. The long-term men keep to the long-term churches and these churches are withdrawn somewhat from the general circulation among the ministers, so to speak. Under a system which moves a man at the end of three or five years, an undesirable man may be borne with through five years when he ought to have gone at the end of three, because the Church throws

upon the impersonal system the automatic discharge of a task which might otherwise be unpleasant. We hint at these things to show the enormous delicacy of making the appointments in an Annual Conference. When Bishop Andrews was elected the three-year system had been working for eight years. When he had been Bishop sixteen years the five-year rule came in. The last four years of his episcopal career were passed under the no-limit rule. We can see how with these complexities the work of Bishop Andrews as a maker of appointments must have been of high grade. The criticisms passed upon his appointments have been remarkably few. Perhaps we can discern something of the force of the Bishop in his making of appointments if we take up one after another the various factors which he had to meet and try to come to some understanding, at least, of his spirit in dealing with them.

Take first his dealing with the district superintendents, or the presiding elders, as they were called in his time. These men meet with the Bishop from the first day of Conference week, and advise him in the matter of appointment making. Now, these men are Methodist ministers, and very rarely is one found who comes into a Cabinet meeting with any consciously unfair spirit toward any of the men whose appointment he is to discuss. They are men, however. If John Wesley said that he saw no danger in one-man power in the Church so long as he was the one man into whose hands the power was committed, we charitably pass the remark by with the comment that John Wesley, great as he was, nevertheless lacked

a sense of humor. So often it has to be said of a district superintendent that, well-intentioned as he may be, he occasionally lacks a sense of humor, and in a perfectly naïve and ingenuous way shows too great a spirit of willingness to relieve the Bishop of the power which constitutionally belongs to the Bishop. The district superintendents have ample opportunity to discuss the making of appointments before the Conference meets; in fact, they are supposed to meet together for such discussion, but in their meetings together there sometimes result what to all practical purposes are combinations of which a higher wisdom might not altogether approve. This is not intended to be a caricature of the system, for we can hardly see how the Church could get along without the district superintendents so long as the general superintendents have to travel throughout the whole connection. There are to be found in Methodism to-day men who have served two and three terms as district superintendent, and through all the delicacy of repeated changes of appointment of ministers have kept and increased the love of their brethren. In general, however, there is always the possibility that the district superintendent will look upon the work from the standpoint of his own district rather than from that of the Church as a whole, and this tendency has to be watched. Bishop Andrews knew how to watch it.

On one occasion—indeed, on more than one occasion—a young man came as a supply into one of the more important pulpits during an interim and proved himself in that interim to be the man for the place. The urgent protests of presiding elders against the young

man's remaining where he was did not weigh much with Bishop Andrews, though no one was more careful than he not to be unjust to older men in his promotion of younger men. When, on another occasion, a presiding elder favored a radical change, and insistently urged it upon the Bishop without being willing himself to take the responsibility for the action which he advised, the Bishop found a way to commit the elder even though he himself willingly assumed his share of the responsibility. No Bishop was ever less ruled by presiding elders than was Bishop Andrews. In some cases it must be said that the only course is for the presiding elders to make the appointments, for the simple reason that the Bishop has not had time to study the cases or has had so much else to do that he dozes during Cabinet meeting, but we have not heard that such instances occurred in the administration of Bishop Andrews. He never had too much to do to look into the last detail of appointment-making which needed attention, and he never dozed in Cabinet meeting. No Bishop ever gained higher respect from presiding elders than did Edward G. Andrews. He was willing to let them help him as far as help was possible, but he did not submit to being hoodwinked even though the hoodwinker had the kindest and most charitable intentions.

Equally wise was Bishop Andrews in dealing with the church committees that came to him. The church committee has often been denounced as an innovation in Methodism, carrying Methodism away from her moorings off toward Congregationalism. If this is true, the innovation started in rather early, for the

late Aaron Hunt, in a paper quoted in Buckley's *Methodism*, vol. i, p. 367, declares that "Soon after the commencement of the present century [the nineteenth] two or three cases occurred which gave the Bishop great annoyance. Some preachers finding themselves in pleasant stations, and, by the aid of self-constituted committees, believing, of course, that they could do better in the place than anyone else, objected to removal, while the more pious part of the society would have preferred a change; but the officious committee prevailed." There can be no doubt from this quotation that there was a time when the church committee was looked upon as an innovation, but men began to speak of it as an innovation over a hundred years ago. An innovation which lasts a hundred years and over may be troublesome to Bishops, and may seem very officious to the "pious part of the society," but a hundred years' existence gives it a title to being called one of the institutions of the Church. There is no doubt that Bishop Andrews looked upon the committee from the church as one of the legitimate institutions of Methodism, at least in the later years of his career, and spoke of it as such. Of course the committee has no legal power, but neither has the Cabinet. It is an advisory body and as an advisory body the Bishop was always willing to respect it and listen to it. In the days of his own pastorates he had accepted churches in response to invitations from committees, and in his later years felt that it was the positive duty of the church committees to examine into the qualifications of any whom they might be seeking as pastors. He met com-

mittees from all over the country and did what he could to put them on the path of the right men, even when he himself was not holding their Conferences. The laymen felt perfectly free to come to him and to ask for suggestions as to where to look for a new man. He repeatedly expressed his confidence in the ability of the committee of this or that church to find the man who would do the kind of work which ought to be done. On one occasion in private conversation he vigorously defended a metropolitan church against the charge that the church was disregarding the welfare of the Conference and the rights of the Conference men in going outside the Conference bounds for ministers. In a word, Bishop Andrews believed in the church committee. There was no departure from anything truly Methodistic in this. The committee is advisory, and there is no Methodist principle which forbids a Bishop's getting advice from as many sources as possible. A properly chosen church committee is as good a source as any for the discovery of the needs of a particular church.

But Bishop Andrews kept the appointing power in his own hands. He was willing to consider the committee, but he considered other things also. He would listen patiently even to a layman who thought his own viewpoint the only viewpoint, but he did not allow the layman to make the appointment. He recognized the responsibility of churches to ministers and would not permit needless hardship if he could prevent it. He did not share the view of those who think that because the ministerial life is to be one of self-sacrifice, therefore opportunities of self-

sacrifice should be multiplied to suit the whims or the heedlessness of churches. In his own ministry he once accepted a call to a church which had a parsonage in poor repair. The Dr. Andrews of that time did not insist that the parsonage should be put in repair, but the committee promised to have it put in repair. As the first months of Dr. Andrews's ministry wore along nothing was said about the parsonage repairs, and the new minister said nothing; but he left the church at the end of the year. There was no ugliness or bitterness about his leave-taking, but those who were close to him knew why he left. In his dealing with churches he always kept the church as far as possible up to his thought of obligation toward the minister.

Again, Bishop Andrews in dealing with committees knew how in a skillful and tactful way to make the committees see the complexity of the church situation, especially when the calling of a minister involved going outside the Conference in which the calling church might be situated. For example, a church in New York, let us say, desires a man from Chicago. The church in Chicago does not desire the man from New York but desires one from New England. Under such circumstances as these the only possibility of getting the man from Chicago may lie in the New York committee's coöperating to find an opening for the New York man in New England, or elsewhere. And Bishop Andrews insisted upon such coöperation. Under his guidance the New York church (of course these names are simply for the sake of illustration) would be very careful not to say or do anything likely

to interfere with the future usefulness of the man leaving New York. Under such circumstances Bishop Andrews has been known to send word that the man leaving a particular pulpit was leaving through no lack of worthy effort on his own part, and has served notice that unless such a man could be cared for without having his usefulness impaired by a discount put upon his services the Bishop would not consent to any change. This was never done in an arbitrary or dictatorial way, but it was done very effectively, nevertheless. An outsider can hardly be brought to know the complexity of this system because, on the whole, it works with such efficiency. Of course the men who are working under the system work of their own free will, but the system is made to move smoothly, not only by the consecration of the men but by the willingness of leaders like Bishop Andrews to keep the whole field in mind.

We do not mean that events always worked out just as Bishop Andrews expected them to, but we do mean that his advice to committees and his dealing with them seldom showed any mistake on the basis of the facts as presented to him. It was once proposed to locate a church in New York in a district which was preponderantly non-Methodistic in sentiment and to call a young man from a neighboring Conference to the pulpit. The Bishop was much opposed to the project. The enterprise, however, was carried through, and under the leadership of the new minister proved an astonishing success. Bishop Andrews himself was among the heartiest admirers of the success in after years, though he had pre-

dicted failure. His advice, however, at the time was sound, for no one could have foreseen the success which the minister made through the sheer force of his own personal strength. In cases like the above the Bishop almost always gave conservative advice. If a young man was called to a city pulpit, he felt that it was part of his duty both to the young man and to the church to make both feel that the odds were against success. At one time he fairly appalled a young man thinking of coming to a metropolitan pulpit with a recital of what lay before him, concluding, however, with advice to the young man to come. Anyone who knows anything of the difficulty of having any sort of success with a metropolitan pulpit can appreciate the kindness of the Bishop's conversation. He understood the problems of the city church. During his life in New York he would often use his unoccupied Sundays in visiting the churches in the difficult fields, so that he knew from first-hand contact the difficulties.

Before we leave this topic of his relation to the church committees it may be just as well to state again the fact that he did not surrender his power to anyone, but always acted on his own judgment after the most patient search for all the facts. He would put committees off if he thought they were acting hastily. A committee from a church in a residence community where the sole opportunity was that of the family church, once came to him with a request for the appointment of a man whose success had almost wholly been in handling downtown problems by rather startling methods. The Bishop

refused to consider the appointment until the committee should have held it in abeyance for three months. "I am going to Europe," he said, "to be gone all summer. If you still want this man when I come back, I'll consider appointing him, but not before." If necessary he could refuse a committee. One of the "officious" committees waited on him once with simply negative requests. They did not want this man and they did not want that. The Bishop granted a long interview, trying to guide their rather aimless reasonings to some sort of conclusion. He mentioned at least six of the best men in the Conference to them, but met with repeated refusal. At last he said: "Brethren, I have mentioned to you six of the best men in the Conference and you are not satisfied. I shall send you whomsoever I please. Good afternoon."

We have laid stress on the fact that the Bishop guarded the welfare of his ministers. He did not, however, lose sight of the fact that, after all, the great aim was the good of the work. Of course he had his friends, and he would have had to be more than human, or less than human, if he did not see superior virtues in those friends; but in general, it must be said that the Bishop was wonderfully successful in keeping personal considerations out of his view. The problem before him was the problem of the kingdom, and he did not ask what was to be the effect on this or that particular minister as over against the great needs of the work. Years ago he picked up a young man in one of the central western Conferences and without consulting him made him a

presiding elder. The young man might have concluded that the Bishop had taken some personal fancy to him, but the Bishop was thinking only of the good of the work. Years later a pulpit in a prominent eastern city opened, and after consultation with the resident Bishop in that city the presiding elder telegraphed this western minister to come on and take the pulpit. There was protest in the church over the action of the presiding elder and the case was submitted to Bishop Andrews, into whose jurisdiction the Conference had just come. Bishop Andrews promptly nullified the work of the presiding elder, though doing so meant throwing the man in the west out of appointment for six months. In the elevation of this man there had been no consultation with him. In his casting aside there was no consultation with him. In each case the Bishop was acting with no personal considerations in mind whatsoever. He was thinking about what seemed to him the good of the work.

We venture a second instance of the way the Bishop refused to judge important matters on a personal basis. There is nothing extraordinary in the following incident, and we select it simply because it is ordinary, showing the Bishop's accustomed ways of dealing with some problems. In this case there is no harm in mentioning names and places. In the year 1898 the Rev. George H. Geyer finished three years of remarkably effective work in Spencer Church, Ironton, Ohio. When the Ohio Conference met in the fall of that year a movement was started by the King Avenue Church of Columbus, Ohio, to secure Geyer

for their pastorate. Geyer expressed a desire to remain at Ironton. The battle was fought out between the committees before the Bishop. Finally the Bishop said that he would probably send Geyer to Columbus. A presiding elder asked if it would not be best for the Bishop to see Brother Geyer. The Bishop declined, saying that while it would be a pleasure to meet Brother Geyer personally, he would not meet him for the discussion of the appointment. Geyer was sent to King Avenue, where in the few years that remained before an untimely death he accomplished an important and signally successful work. Now, all this seems arbitrary, but it was done out of regard for the work of the entire field. It was also done out of regard for Mr. Geyer. To have discussed the matter with the Bishop might have placed Geyer in an embarrassing position. All he could do was to protest, anyhow, and the Bishop wished to leave him in a position to say that the appointment had been made without his consent, especially since the appointment was a promotion.

After having announced a decision Bishop Andrews seldom reconsidered. In the early years of his episcopacy he found that the appointments kept debating themselves in his mind after the close of a Conference session, and he determined to do his work so thoroughly that further reflection by him would be useless. So he came to a power to do all that he could do on the basis of the facts before him and then to close the case. He would have been the last to deny that sometimes mistakes crept in, but they left no bitterness in the minds of those who were dis-

appointed. The writer of these lines has talked with men who at one time and another had suffered disappointment at the hands of Bishop Andrews, but in every case the final verdict even from these men has been that the Bishop acted throughout as a real Bishop and did the best he could under the circumstances.

What was the secret of the power of the Bishop in thus moving through the intricacies of the Methodist system and keeping the respect of all whose lives he had to touch? The system of Methodism is, indeed, intricate, but it brings bitterness only when it is in the hands of incompetent or careless men. The ordinary changes of lot the minister is apt to take as a matter of course because the system is one under which he is voluntarily working. There are inevitable disappointments, as there would be under any plan, but these are, for the most part, put up with uncomplainingly. In the unusual cases Bishops have triumphed by different gifts. Bishop Simpson would preach so eloquently that a man could go cheerfully to the hardest field after hearing the sermon. Bishop Foster would discourse so profoundly upon the foundations of the kingdom that a minister would feel it an honor to accept any kind of appointment from him. Other Bishops have shown such kindness and brotherliness that the men have been willing to overlook blunders in the appointments. Bishop Andrews did not explain or apologize for his appointments, but every man went to his work, even if with disappointment, feeling that the Bishop had gone to the bottom of his case and had done all that he could do in the particular situation. In other words,

Bishop Andrews held the confidence of the ministers because he was a Bishop in the truest sense. He gave himself to the work of a Bishop and to that alone. When we think of his services to the Church we must not be disappointed because we cannot connect his name with any great institutional creation. Bishop Andrews wrought a service to the Methodist Church in showing how finely the Methodist system would work if the ministers could be brought to perfect confidence in their presiding officers. Without that confidence no improvements in mere machinery can be of much avail. The firm working of the machinery of our Church from 1872 to 1904 is in no small part due to Edward G. Andrews. As an appointment-maker he did much to justify the Methodist system.

II

THE PRESIDING OFFICER

WHEN we think of Edward G. Andrews as a Bishop, our minds soon run to pictures of his dignity and power as presiding officer. Even the Methodist minister may not stop often enough to think how much of the success of his Annual Conference meeting is due to the power of the presiding officer. Imagine a gathering of anywhere from fifty to three hundred ministers met to transact business having to do directly and indirectly with as many churches. There are reports of district superintendents to be heard, committees to be appointed and to be heard, new members to be elected to the ministry, general Church officials to be heard. To expedite this business the Bishops move in order through the consideration of some thirty questions called Minute Questions, but even these questions give no idea of the amount of the work done. The New York East Conference, for example, begins its sessions on Wednesday morning and adjourns usually on the next Tuesday evening. It requires a printed volume of some one hundred thousand words to record merely the business done in a week's session.

The Conferences presided over by Bishop Andrews seldom presented any dramatic features. The work went on in an orderly and businesslike way. Some who look at this chapter may wonder what there can

possibly be to say of Bishop Andrews as a presiding officer, since his presidencies afforded so little in the way of departure from the methodical. It is this very fact of the absence of the unusual that we wish to mention and emphasize. A visitor dropping in upon a Conference held by Bishop Andrews would find little that was exciting, unless a perfectly legitimate debate upon some important topic might have aroused the excitement. Confusions in Conferences are usually the fault of the presiding officer. To the credit of the Bishops it must be said that the vast amount of work transacted in the Methodist Conferences in the course of a year is due to the skill with which the Conferences are held to their legitimate tasks by the presidents. There are now and then exceptions. It is possible for a Conference to lash itself into a perfect frenzy of debate over inconsequential matters if the president does not keep the main point in the main place. Or a very intelligent Bishop, from the standpoint of his general knowledge, may through weariness or momentary confusion allow the body to slip from the straight line of parliamentary procedure. One of the profoundest thinkers and best-loved leaders the Church has ever known always had noisy Conferences. The mind that was at home in the depths of theology, and which beamed in kindness in personal dealing with the brethren, was not nimble enough in handling the points in parliamentary practice. Nor has the business type of mind always fared much better. Even such a mind may misread a situation through contact with the Cabinet alone, it may be, or through conversations with the kindly

layman who entertains the presiding officer. Then there is always the possibility of the presiding officer's losing his command of himself, and allowing a motion, an amendment to a motion, an amendment to an amendment, a substitute for all before the house, and the previous question, to get before him in inextricable confusion—this, too, on a motion which an adequate understanding of the law of the Church would rule out as improper.

The Bishops seem to have different ways of handling difficult parliamentary tangles, or over-excitement in Conferences. One will make a direct appeal to the men to have regard to all the proprieties of the situation; another, it may be, will shut off the debate by forcibly putting the question; another will whisper to one of the secretaries to go upon the floor and move the previous question. It is at times absolutely necessary that something be done, or the Conference will transform itself into a debating society for the discussion of minute particular and wide-ranging general problems. This is a common danger in all parliamentary bodies. It is perfectly astonishing to note how the most intelligent bodies of men will in a parliamentary discussion get quickly away from the main point and never come back to it of their own accord. What might be called the group mind of a parliamentary body works largely under the law of association. One thing suggests another as remote as if it came out of dreamland, and men who in their private thinking move straight from point to point by the laws of reason will add to the confusion by other side-fancies. The Methodist

preachers have constant practice in presumably logical thinking. They are yearly practiced in parliamentary procedure in a better training ground than any other ecclesiastical body in the country, but they have to be held to the line by capable Bishops. Now, the method of Bishop Andrews in dealing with the Conferences was, first of all, to find out as far ahead as possible the kind of problem he would have to meet in a particular situation. If he knew that a knotty case was to be discussed, he would master anew all points in Methodist law having the slightest bearing on that case. He would then post himself on the rules of the particular Conference. Of course added to all this was a superb acquaintance with parliamentary procedure. Above all, however, was a determination to keep all discussion to the main point. He believed that if the debates of a Conference could be kept to the main issue there would be little chance of confusion. So in the procedure of Bishop Andrews the Conference could be sure of two things: first, that no motion would be put which did not have a right to be put; and, second, that the discussion would have to stick to the point. Bishop Andrews always listened to the debates and kept the debates from becoming exhortations or lectures or reminiscences or sermons.

So it came about that the Conferences presided over by Bishop Andrews were from the standpoint of the lover of excitement rather tame affairs. Only when the question was inherently exciting could there be much scope for the dramatic. At other times the Conference moved along rapidly and yet with perfect ease. Bishop Andrews was a Bishop at his Confer-

ences. He presided over three hundred times. This bare statement that he held three hundred orderly, businesslike Conferences is an indication of the faithfulness with which he did his work. Of course there was something in his very presence which made for the orderly conduct of the business. It would have seemed almost like parliamentary blasphemy to offer an obviously trifling or irrelevant or bad-tempered motion to Bishop Andrews, but anyone who knew the working of his mind could see that, after all, his power lay in his comprehensive grasp of a Conference situation, his patient mastery of all the details, and, above all, his irresistible movement to the one essential point. In his Conference administrations he was literally death and destruction to all side issues. He was present at the Conference sessions to attend to the work of the Conference and for no other purpose. The indebtedness of the Church to him for this service cannot be very definitely stated, but the indebtedness is very real, nevertheless. There was a very general recognition of this fact before the Bishop passed away. Edward G. Andrews came to be looked upon as one of the great Church forces. To the eye of the discerning no small part of his usefulness lay in the fact that he worked so easily and quietly that men did not realize, until they stopped to count up, the enormous total of service which the Bishop was rendering the Church. The meeting of the Annual Conferences of Methodism is really a great ecclesiastical marvel. The work goes on quietly, with no great attention from the public. Yet the results achieved in the way of bringing the work of the Church year definitely to an

end, the increased clearness of understanding which comes into all the work from careful statistical reportings, the enforced consideration of great Church and social and political questions through debates of committee reports, the consideration of local church situations—all this makes the meeting of the Annual Conferences of great importance for the ecclesiastical world. The largest single factor in carrying on this multifarious work successfully is the presence in the president's chair of a real Bishop. Nobody ever questioned that Bishop Andrews was such a Bishop.

The presidency of the Bishop over the Annual Conference, however, is not the only place where power as presiding officer is called for. The General Conference presidency is more taxing still. Readers of this book will hardly need to be informed that the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church is a delegated body numbering now nearly eight hundred members, ministers and laymen in equal proportions, into whose control are committed the supreme lawmaking and judicial functions of the Church. To this body the Bishops themselves are amenable. The Bishops are created by the body and can be retired from active service by the body.

The position of the Bishops at the General Conference is a very delicate one. A Bishop rather given to suggestive speech once remarked that the episcopacy was a fine work for forty-seven months out of forty-eight. The other month, of course, is the month of the meeting of the General Conference. The Conference is very careful of its own rights as over against the possible encroachments of any other body of officials

whatever. The Bishops are not allowed to take part in the debates. At the opening of the session they address to the Conference their thought concerning the progress of the work and the state of the Church, together with any recommendations they may see fit to make for legislation. But these recommendations are recommendations only. The Bishops meet every afternoon during the Conference session, and confer with the representatives of the Conference on any matters which the Conference chooses, but during the four weeks of the session the Conference is master. This does not mean that there is any lack of respect shown the Bishops, for the Conference would silence at once any man who might venture upon needless criticism of the Bishops, but the supremacy of the Conference itself to anybody and anything else is a part of the atmosphere of General Conference sessions.

The Bishops take their turn in presiding over the sessions of the Conference. In addition to the general delicacy of the situation which arises over the sensitiveness of the Conference to its own rights—a sensitiveness which the Conference rightly feels is necessary if the Methodist Church is to remain a democratic body—there are considerations which make the task of the presiding officer very trying. First of all is the size of the body. There are very few halls in this country which would furnish ideal meeting places for the deliberations of an assembly as large as the General Conference. So that the presiding officer has to face a difficult problem because of the very physical proportions of his task. Almost all large halls have dead spots, so far as acoustic proper-

ties are concerned, and the dead spots are the horror both of presiding officers and members on the floor. The writer of these lines once heard a man in the rear seats of a General Conference move that when the body adjourn it be to meet on the next morning at half-past eight. The motion was put by the presiding Bishop as if it were that when the body adjourn the next day—which would be Saturday—it be at half-past ten, and the motion was voted on in this form, of course with the member who made the motion shouting that he had been misunderstood. The difficulty was with the hall. Out of the size of the hall, too, comes something of nervous strain on the speakers who are addressing the Conference. William Pitt once said that a prime minister never could get on in discussing affairs of state so long as he had to kneel before his sovereign. The position is not conducive to the discussion of the finer points. So it may be said of the General Conference debate that it is not possible for a speaker to argue the finer points at the top of his voice. It is true that the very size of the General Conference acts a good deal as a process of natural selection is supposed to act, and keeps out of the discussion many things which are not clear and not relatively simple; but the survival is not always of the fittest. There comes after a while a feeling on the part of many members that the battle is to the noisiest, so that the nervous irritability of a Conference is often very marked. The presiding officer can very easily add to the strain. Anyone who has at all carefully observed a General Conference can tell how inevitably the Conference will take its

nervous tone from that of the presiding officer. If the Bishop is nervous the Conference becomes nervous. If the Bishop talks too fast the members stir about, and if he talks too low they call out that they cannot hear. The size of the room, the heat of the season—and warm days come in May—the cramped quarters of the delegates' seats, and the irritability which arises from the causes which we have mentioned, make the task of presiding over a General Conference one of the most trying which fall to the lot of the Bishops, more trying, perhaps, than that of presiding over any other parliamentary body on earth; for while the conventions of the great political bodies are, perhaps, the only bodies which rival a General Conference in size, the work of a political convention is ordinarily so thoroughly cut and dried that the president does nothing but carry out along the prearranged lines a carefully prepared program. The House of Representatives is not nearly so large as the General Conference, and, moreover, long ago ceased to be a deliberative body. The business is in the hands of the Speaker in an unusual and preëminent degree.

Now, with the presidencies of Bishop Andrews over the General Conference the same thing must be said which was said about his presidency over an Annual Conference, and must be said as a high compliment. From the standpoint of the newsmonger or the sensation-lover the Conferences of Bishop Andrews were apt to be very tame. At least there was no excitement which came out of the manner of the presiding officer. Bishop Andrews, perhaps all unconsciously to himself, had the power to keep the

Conference in a businesslike temper. He never forgot that there were hardly more than twenty-eight working days in the session, that in those days an enormous amount of work must be gone through, that it was incumbent on him to keep the Conference to the main point. It was a constant marvel to all beholders to see how unerringly and quickly the mind of the Bishop seized the gist of every discussion, and in his puttings of motions for vote got every point in its proper place. He knew how to keep the business moving. Moreover, he was fair in his recognition of members. It was not the loudest voice which attracted his attention. His long familiarity with the Church enabled him to catch the names of the delegates easily, and he was careful not to let the merely noisy men get too much recognition when others were desirous of being heard. And, more than all this, the Conference took its temper from the dignity and calm self-confidence of the Bishop. Inasmuch as there was no danger of the Bishop's being "rattled," the Conference did not become "rattled." There is a leader in our Church who has many times come to the relief of annoyed and flurried presiding officers by getting the floor and then moving with great deliberation down the aisle to the speaker's platform, taking as much time as possible. The interval thus secured gives the Bishop and the Conference time to catch breath. We never heard of the necessity of rendering this service to Bishop Andrews or to any Conference over which he was presiding. His Conferences took their poise from him, and moved quietly and effectively through the business.

Another duty of a Bishop at a General Conference is to serve as a check upon movements which arise out of mass enthusiasm. He is a part of the system of checks which the Church has devised to prevent unwise and foolish action on the part of the supreme body in moments of great excitement. The object of all parliamentary restriction is, of course, to keep an organized body from becoming a mob. Hence the need of making motions in proper form, of having them seconded, of limiting the time of speakers, of not allowing some motions to be put. If the Bishops existed for no other purpose than to preside over the sessions of the General Conference, and did that well, the office would be worth while. As a matter of actual fact, very few unwise radical propositions ever get very far with a legislative body if the president knows his business, for in its cooler moments the body has adopted carefully prepared systems of rules which prevent hasty action. It is absolutely imperative that these rules be part of the very breath of the officer as he stands before the body. Especially is this true in our General Conference, where important legislative matters can go through on one reading after coming from a committee. If, now, there be in the chair a man whose temperament is predominantly emotional or oratorical, almost anything can take place. A very whirlwind of enthusiasm might commit the Church to extreme ecclesiastical folly through a period of at least four years. There are some men, however, under whom whirlwinds are not likely to break out, and Edward G. Andrews was one of them.

In any case a president is needed who knows the law and history of the Church, who knows what is in harmony with the fundamentals and what is not, who knows what motions are revolutionary and is able, at least, to let the Conference see the direction in which it is moving. No Bishop in our history has been better able to tell on hearing a motion as it came up from the floor of the Conference what part of it was in order and what not in order than Edward G. Andrews; and no matter how loud the applause which greeted a motion he would not put it if he had any thought that it was out of order. If appeals to the floor were ever carried against him under such circumstances we have not heard of them.

After these phases have been dwelt upon which show the General Conference on its side of least advantage, and the necessity of having strong men to act as checks upon its activity, another fact must also be dwelt upon, namely, that Bishop Andrews had a very profound respect for the General Conference. It will be seen in later chapters that he very seriously questioned the wisdom of some particular points of General Conference enactment, but he believed in the General Conference. He was not among those who sneer at it. He recognized the fact that the vast mass of the men are well-meaning and devout, with no thought but the welfare of the Church. He saw, too, that the General Conference is, in the main, composed of men who are themselves leaders. Without casting any reflections upon any other form of Church government, he saw in the General Conference a democratic Church working

out its will through democratic forms. He saw all the dangers of such a body and did his part to stand against and counteract the dangers. He, indeed, had a feeling that much important work failed of accomplishment at the hands of the Conference, but he believed it the best and most democratic instrument attainable under the present ecclesiastical conditions. He was not even much disturbed at the charges of wire-pulling brought against the General Conference. He knew well enough that while the General Conference might be a bungling instrument for the choice of men to ecclesiastical positions, its very size made it reasonably proof against dishonesty in wire-pulling. For himself he had misgivings as to whether the present method of electing Bishops might not be improved upon by having the election take place through some carefully selected council, but he did not base his arguments upon any liability to unworthy work in the present system. With all the disadvantages of the present system he was, nevertheless, profoundly respectful toward it. He was not one of those who see in a desire of delegates to elect this or that man to an office anything necessarily unworthy, and he approved all efforts to make the fitness of worthy men be known. Upon occasion he himself would speak and speak freely to all whom he met about the need of putting this or that man in a prominent position. He was not alarmed by cries of corruption. With his shrewd sense of humor he recognized the fact that the men who fail in carrying out self-seeking plans of their own are always first to cry out that the victor has gone in by un-

worthy methods. He recognized the fact that it is possible for self-seekers to capture the prize they seek, but he saw large room for legitimate work to serve the Church by letting men know of the leaders who can really serve. There was one man especially whom he ardently desired to see elected a Bishop, and he never lost an opportunity to point out the fitness of that man for the place. He would have as soon thought that another man was wire-pulling in doing a similar work for the Church as he would have thought that he himself was wire-pulling. For men who themselves head campaigns for themselves he had great contempt, and for men who combine with others like themselves in unholy compacts he had unspeakable scorn; but he knew that a General Conference running up into the hundreds in number could not well be controlled by any such men, though occasionally one such might succeed. No, Bishop Andrews had respect for the General Conference. He did not take a lofty attitude toward it and he did not fear it. He respected it. He had a clear head and a firm hand in dealing with the Conference as its presiding officer, but deeper than all this was a fundamental respect, which those who saw him with the gavel in his hand could not but feel. He respected his brethren and they respected him. Out of the mutual respect came those marvelously successful presidencies which go far toward making his career as General Conference president an authoritative standard.

In closing this section we refer for a moment to the records of the General Conference for the session

of May 11, 1900. Our selection is made almost at random. The session opened with devotions at 8:30 A.M. The first action was to limit all speeches in debate to five minutes, thus putting on the presiding officer the responsibility for keeping track of the time. The order of the day was consideration of the removal of the time limit. The Bishop had first to rule out a motion to allow five speakers to appear "on the other side" after Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, who was to have the floor on the call for the order of the day, should have finished. Before Dr. Cadman began to speak the Conference insisted on taking another vote for Bishop, the Conference being in the midst of the election. Then a member arose and protested against the report that the word "bitterly" had been used in a speech of the day before. Next the Bishop stated the general order and the special order under which the Conference was acting and gave the floor to Dr. Cadman. Four other speakers followed, some of them being interrupted by questions from the floor. In the midst of the debate a member rose to a question of privilege, asking that a certain venerable minister be invited to a seat on the platform. The question was ruled not to be one of privilege. Another ballot for Bishop was taken. Then a motion was made to begin balloting on the election of Missionary Bishops. The mover withdrew his motion in order that Dr. Buckley might state a "matter of importance." Then the rules were suspended, and a rapid fire followed as to whether a certain member was in order. Finally it was decided to vote on Missionary Bishops. Three or four rather nice parlia-

mentary points arose here. The vote was taken, with the floor still technically in possession of a member who had been recognized to speak on the time limit. After the recess three incidental resolutions were introduced and then a fraternal delegate appeared to be heard. After the address the report of the tellers on the ballot for Bishops came in. Dr. J. F. Berry, high up on the list of those voted for, withdrew his name, amid protests from his friends. Charles B. Lore moved to postpone indefinitely further balloting for Bishops. On a count vote the motion was lost. The report of election for Missionary Bishops came in and Dr. Parker and Dr. Warne were declared elected. Then there was an address from another fraternal delegate. Then the delegate who had the floor all this time for the time-limit debate got a chance to be heard. Then another delegate tried to work in a "substitute for a substitute" when only an "amendment to the substitute" seemed to the chair to be in order. Two men who thought they were misunderstood arose and explained. In the midst of numerous voices calling for a vote on the time limit the Bishop declared the result of the ballot for Bishop. Another motion, this time from Dr. John Lanahan, was made to postpone the voting for Bishops indefinitely, and after debate was voted down. Then came adjournment.

This selection, we repeat, is made almost at random. The question before the Conference happened to be delicate. The body had voted for six days for Bishops with no election. Through the strain of a time when the situation as to the election

was critical this debate on the time limit was going on. There was, on the whole, abundant opportunity for the presiding Bishop to make mistakes which would have thrown the Conference into uproar. The opportunities were not embraced. Bishop Andrews presided throughout.

III

THE JUDGE

ANOTHER very important function of the Bishop is his acting as law judge for the Church during the intervals between the sessions of the General Conference. It is true that the Bishop acts as Judge only while he is actually in the chair of an Annual Conference, but when we remember that, to quote the words of Bishop Andrews himself, in the Annual Conferences "the chief administrative work of the Church is reviewed, and either in the first instance or on appeal all charges against ministers and local preachers are heard, all appeals from decisions of law made in Quarterly Conferences, and all complaints of maladministration by pastors and presiding elders also heard," we can see how large scope the Bishop has to aid the Church by whatever judicial ability he may possess.

Bishop Andrews was by temperament a judge, and association with some very close and dear companions increased his proficiency in dealing with legal questions. His brother, Charles Andrews, has been for years one of the chief figures in the legal circles of the state of New York, if not of the entire country. Judge Andrews was elected associate judge of the New York Court of Appeals in 1870, was appointed chief judge in 1881, reelected associate judge in 1884, elected chief judge in 1893, nominated by both

parties in 1884 and 1893, and was retired by the age limit in 1897. This is a record seldom equaled in the annals of the legal profession, and when lawyers like Mr. Joseph H. Choate and Governor Charles E. Hughes speak of Judge Andrews with profoundest respect we can form some idea of the quality of the work done by Judge Andrews in his profession. Judge George G. Reynolds, for twenty years judge in courts sitting in Brooklyn, now the dean and Nestor of the Brooklyn bar, held in highest esteem as one of the clearest legal minds in New York, was an intimate companion and counselor of Bishop Andrews throughout the entire term of the latter's career as Bishop. Moreover, Bishop Andrews' son-in-law Mr. Henry C. M. Ingraham, of Brooklyn, has been for thirty years one of the leaders of the Brooklyn bar, and has always been especially interested in any aspect of law which bears upon ecclesiastical procedure. In the case of Baxter versus McDonnell, Mr. Ingraham won especial legal distinction by conducting a successful defense of the position that the judgment of a Church court in any matter within its jurisdiction is final and cannot be reviewed by any civil court. Out of the Bishop's intimacy with such men as Judge Andrews and Judge Reynolds and Mr. Ingraham came a sympathetic approach to Church problems on their legal side.

Bishop Andrews was interested not in legal technicalities but in the use of the law as an instrument of justice and righteousness. He had no patience with pettifogging anywhere and scorned the introduction of legal sharp practice into any Church

procedure. And yet he was always insistent upon securing for an accused member or minister the last and the least of his legal rights. If we study the rulings of Bishop Andrews upon law questions, we are struck more and more by the directness with which a mind naturally straightforward in its dealing with legal principles always refused to allow legal technicalities to stand in the way of substantial justice, and by the sureness also with which the Bishop saw the bearing of certain principles of common law upon the protection of accused men.

We have been able to find only two cases of any importance in which appeals against legal decisions of Bishop Andrews were carried up to the General Conference. The first was in 1880. The following question had been put to Bishop Andrews in the examination of a case in a Conference over which the Bishop was presiding:

“Question: Is an expelled member entitled to be heard in an Annual Conference, on complaint against the administration of the pastor and of the presiding elder in his case?”

To which the Bishop answered:

“Answer: Such a complaint is of the nature of an appeal to the Annual Conference on the question of law concerned in the case, and a hearing cannot be denied on the ground that the complainant is not in the Church. But, inasmuch as the Discipline also provides other and milder remedies for errors in law, both of a pastor presiding in the trial and presiding elder presiding in the appeal of a member, it is obvious that the complaint of maladministration

ought to refer only to serious errors deeply affecting the rights of the complainant.

“Failures to observe rules of proceeding laid down, not in the law but in commentaries on the law, must be weighed by their effect upon the administration of justice in the case; not every such failure can be justly characterized as maladministration.

“Where complaint is made against the administration in the case of an expelled member, as in all other charges made against preachers, the Conference may consider whether the nature of the complaint is such as to require a trial thereon.” (General Conference Journal, 1880, page 355.)

The very evident aim in this ruling is to preserve the rights of all concerned. On the one hand, the expelled member must not be denied any of the legal rights due him. On the other hand, there should not be resort to extreme measures against a presiding church officer, in guarding the rights of the accused, until the milder remedies have been tried. It will be seen on a moment's glance that the writer of the above decision was a man thoroughly in possession of the legal principles in the case and yet able so to distinguish between the essential and non-essential as to keep the course of justice clear. The General Conference sustained the ruling of Bishop Andrews.

The other case carried up on appeal is discussed in the General Conference Journal of 1892, pages 489 and 490. A minister had been brought to trial for slander, the charges of slander being brought by persons other than the ones slandered. Bishop Andrews, on the objection of the accused, ruled out

both the charges and the specifications, holding that charges of slander could be tried only when they were brought by persons claiming to have been slandered. When the counsel for the church offered to have the charges signed by the persons slandered, the Bishop ruled that this would constitute a new case, and he refused to allow the proceedings to go on. The ground of this decision also is clear. The accused may have been a slanderer, but even so, he was entitled to the protection which in common law is thrown around such accused persons. The evils which would follow any other line than the one insisted upon by Bishop Andrews are of course apparent. The General Conference sustained his decision.

It is to be seen from the above that Bishop Andrews was determined, in case men were accused before him, to have the proceedings carried through aright. He felt that this was due not only to the accused but to the church itself, for nothing is more of a scandal than for a church to use faulty methods in dealing with offenders. Better that hypocrites should remain in the ministry than that they should be expelled without due regard to their rights. Of course evil men can take advantage of this and presume upon the fears of their brethren lest trouble should arise through expelling a member, but some such risk has always to be taken.

This matter of regularity in dealing with accused men was much on the mind of Bishop Andrews in the later years of his life. He was impressed with the difficulties of getting fair treatment for an

accused man if the case did not start aright in the beginning. This does not mean that anyone intentionally would be unfair, but it does mean that the machinery of any large body like the Methodist Church is necessarily cumbrous in dealing with the finer aspects of judicial treatment, and that with a case once started it may be practically impossible to correct errors. To be sure, there is the possibility of appeal to the highest court, even the General Conference, but the General Conference acts through a Judiciary Committee. The members of this committee belong to the General Conference. They have to attend the regular sessions of the Conference; they belong also on other committees; they have at the most just one month in which to do their work. More and more the Conference refers to the Judiciary Committee important questions for determination as to their constitutional bearings. If we said that the Judiciary Committee sat altogether through a General Conference for a sum total in time of sixty hours, we should probably not be understating the fact. Now, it is very easy to say that the humblest minister in our Church has the right of appeal through the Judicial Conference clear on up to the General Conference; but suppose the minister's case is passed on in the fall of the year just following the meeting of the General Conference in May. After the hearing by the Judicial Conference the minister has to wait nearly three years for the final hearing. That final hearing takes place in the rush and roar of great ecclesiastical excitement, where the chances for judicial calm are not altogether favorable. More-

over, the "humblest minister in our denomination" is not apt to have a salary of large proportions. He must go to the Conference himself if he wants to make sure that his case will be rightly handled. No statement on paper can take the place of actually being present to answer whatever questions may come up. The Conference may meet on the other side of the continent from the field of the minister; and even if the minister or his counsel goes to the Conference, he may just as well count on staying the whole month, for there is no telling when his particular case will be reached. Now, no one who has read the correspondence of Bishop Andrews, when questions by ministers or other Bishops have been put to him for advice, can fail to discern how careful he was that all legal proceedings should start aright. So far as he himself was concerned, he would not let a case get a start at all unless there were absolutely correct methods of procedure in the very drawing of the charges. If the charges were correctly drawn, and there seemed any other way of dealing with the case except formal trial, Bishop Andrews would throw all his personal influence in favor of that other way. This does not mean that Bishop Andrews was lenient with ministerial offenders. He would not tolerate any falling short of the highest moral standards for the minister, but he deprecated a formal trial except as a last resort. It is true that in many an instance he carried in the depths of his own heart knowledge of ministerial transgression even when the transgressor himself did not know that the Bishop knew, and that in such instances he gave the minister the benefit of the doubt

and credited him with every good that could be set over against the evil. It is true that he was willing to do all he could to give a disgraced minister a new start in another part of the country than the place of his offense if the guilty man showed through a period of years the proper spirit of repentance. But it is also true that Bishop Andrews could be indignant to the point of righteous fury with an offender. A hot-tempered minister in the anteroom of an Annual Conference once lost himself in a sudden moment of anger and broke forth with a curse. Either the Bishop himself was near enough to hear the outburst, or the incident was so public that he heard of it from the general conversation almost at once. Now, here was a chance for a summary church procedure. The minister could have been justly brought to trial at once for immoral conduct, and there could hardly have been more than one outcome. Quite likely, the sentence in such a case would have been a reprimand from the Bishop, if the minister showed an apologetic and repentant spirit. As it was, Bishop Andrews went to the offender privately. What followed we do not know in detail, but the offender's statement indicated that the rebuke which he had met with had been fearful. In this instance the offender received the same penalty he would have likely received if he had been formally tried, and as it was he received it under circumstances which made it ten-fold more effective. The incident is a very fair illustration of the method of Bishop Andrews. He felt that except in extreme cases it was not wise to resort to formal trial, and he felt that where correction

was the object aimed at it could be attained in much more effective ways. When it was necessary to have a trial he felt that the Bishop was culpable if he did not make sure that the start at least was right.

There was another point, on which the Bishop had strong feelings, which may as well be mentioned in this connection. It happens occasionally that when a minister has been before the public in a way which has aroused criticism of his conduct, some leader will think that a resolution expressing the opinion of the Conference on the conduct of the member is in order for the purpose of rebuking the member or of setting the Conference right before the public. This is, of course, most likely to happen when the member's theological utterances have become questionable, but it occasionally happens also in connection with other matters. Bishop Andrews used to insist that no motion could be put to vote before a Conference which in any way reflected upon the moral or doctrinal soundness of a member of the Conference unless the member had first been tried in the regular way. To be sure, the legal mind is likely to take offense at this position. It seems to many inherent in the rights of a Conference as a parliamentary body that the Conference should be able to pass any resolution of this kind it sees fit. Bishop Andrews did not think so. He felt that the rights of the ministers ought to be most carefully guarded from the possibility of attacks of this kind, and in repeated discussions of the point declared his belief that the General Conference ought to sustain

to the utmost any Bishop who would rule out such condemnatory motions.

We pass from the discussion of these rather uninteresting points to other considerations which showed the Bishop's absolute fidelity to what he considered the legal requirements in a given situation. We have spoken of the utter loyalty of Bishop Andrews to the General Conference. He respected the decisions of the supreme legislative body as if they were final and binding in the spheres where the Conference had a right to speak. He understood the liability of the Conference, however, to overlook some considerations which careful scrutiny might reveal as altogether decisive. Moreover, he felt that the General Conference must always move within the legal restrictions placed upon it by the very nature of the case. He knew how prone a Conference is to reflect the temper which may prevail in the country at any particular moment. The Conference which met at Los Angeles in 1904 and the Conference which met at Baltimore in 1908, for example, were as far apart in temper as any two Conferences could well be. It may not be amiss to suggest that the difference came in large part from the difference in the spirit of the country at the two different times. The air in 1904 was full of radicalism. The air in 1908 had cooled down quite perceptibly. In spite of the fact that the General Conference of 1908 was composed of men in hundreds who had never been to a General Conference before, the General Conference of 1908 was very conservative.

Now, Bishop Andrews felt that when a General

Conference became radical it must not become so radical as to overlook the legal limitations in the midst of which it must move, just as he would have insisted that a Conference must not become so conservative as to forbid legitimate advance. The General Conference of 1904 insisted upon the consolidation of certain benevolent societies in the Methodist Episcopal Church. Bishop Andrews was a member of the governing board of one of these societies—the Board of Education, incorporated under the laws of the State of New York. After repeated conferences with Mr. Ingraham, also a member of the board, the Bishop became convinced that various plans for the consolidation were incompatible with the legal requirements of the State of New York governing the Board of Education, and he would not yield to any appeals to the authority of the General Conference until he had found a plan which satisfied his advisers that all the legal conditions could be met. This seems very mild and proper when thus put, but the bare statement gives no idea of the tenacity with which Bishop Andrews held to his contention as against those who claimed to represent the General Conference. He would have been willing to see the wish of the General Conference as expressed in formal vote disregarded if he had to make any slightest deviation from what he conceived to be his legal duty as a member of the Board of Education. If his contention as to the strict fulfilment of the legal requirements had not been met, he would have had nothing to do with the movement toward consolidation. One of the forces which blocked the complete carrying

out of the will of the General Conference of 1904 as to consolidation was the obstinate resistance of Bishop Andrews to a movement which he considered in some of its details out of harmony with the legal provisions under which he worked as trustee of the Board of Education. How determined Bishop Andrews could be under such circumstances, and how far he was willing to go in his opposition, will appear from the fact that he was willing to vote to take the Board out from under the control of the organization authorized by the General Conference. We do not pretend to say whether the reasoning of Bishop Andrews in this argument was correct or not. We do say that his spirit was the spirit of a true servant of the Church when he insisted that the Church activities should flawlessly keep all legal requirements which trustees are pledged to observe. Bishop Andrews was no stickler for legal refinements, but he would never allow any organizations over which he had control to move along at loose ends or with dubious patchwork compromises.

In all this discussion of the legal services of Bishop Andrews to the Church we must be careful to remember that the influence of the Bishop reached out beyond anything which he himself did as a judge sitting in Conference sessions. His weight as a legal authority on the Board of Bishops is conceded by all other members of the board. He was written to almost daily by presiding elders and pastors as to how to deal with legal situations. It would be hard to overestimate his power in keeping the Church to the straight path of the legally proper.

IV

THE RESIDENT BISHOP

THE first episcopal residence which Bishop Andrews held was in Des Moines, Iowa. The General Conference of 1872 had provided for an episcopal residence at Omaha, Council Bluffs, or vicinity. On reaching his new field the Bishop was impelled by a variety of considerations to settle upon Des Moines. He remained in Des Moines until 1880, serving faithfully all the interests of the Church which he could find time to touch. The following letters will show the impression he made upon the community:

Dr. A. L. Frisbie, pastor emeritus of Plymouth Congregational Church, Des Moines, writes:

“Bishop Andrews was a near neighbor of mine while his official home was in Des Moines. He was a near friend as well. He had that sincere urbanity which made approach to him and acquaintance with him easy and delightful. He was the incarnation of courtesy.

“If the personality of any man could have won an old-line dyed-in-the-wool independent to an acceptance of episcopal authority, that of Bishop Andrews would have won our own.

“I admired the man very much. He seemed to me tactful, discriminating, and catholic. He did not, because he was a Bishop, ‘think of himself more

highly than he ought to think,' but was of simple and unaffected manners, whom any poor brother working under him could approach with a comfortable assurance of sympathetic treatment and wise counsel. If there were iron fingers under the velvet gloves, an outsider, like myself, would never have suspected it.

"His relations here with Christians not Methodist were as much ideal as could well be while the reality of difference existed. Doubtless he would have been willing to take us into the fold of which he was an *overseer*, but he made no impression by work or manner that he regarded his system of church life as superior to ours.

"He was a rare man in the pulpit. His beautiful presence, his illuminated countenance, his eloquence of expression, his spiritual grasp, charmed my people when, at my invitation, he gave a sermon in Plymouth Church."

Mr. L. H. Bush, of Des Moines, writes:

"Des Moines was an episcopal residence for eight years. During that time Bishop Andrews went abroad once and presided over Conferences in almost every State in the Union. He lectured in many cities and preached in many pulpits outside of Des Moines. The Bishop was in his prime, was very active, was popular with all classes, with all denominations, and with our public men. During the sessions of the Legislature he entertained socially and was the recipient of many favors from the best the State afforded.

"Bishop Andrews's membership was with the First Methodist Episcopal Church, the oldest organization

in the city. Des Moines was then a small town. The congregation worshiped in an old brick church, surrounded by business. It was finally resolved to sell the property, move up town, and build a new church. A location was selected, Bishop Andrews made a member of the Building Committee, and he took great interest in the enterprise and finally dedicated a very handsome church that cost \$40,000, free of debt.

“Bishop Andrews was extremely popular. His bearing, personal appearance, courteous manner, and great sermons were attractive to all classes, and when it was announced that he was to leave Des Moines for Washington remonstrances from all over Iowa, from all denominations, and especially from our own people, were sent in, but powers that made him a Bishop and resident of Des Moines removed him to the East.”

In 1880 Bishop Andrews took up his episcopal residence in Washington. He reached Washington just before the close of the administration of President Hayes, and during the closing months of the President's administration was a frequent visitor at the White House. From that time on to 1888, when he removed to New York, Bishop Andrews was an alert and interested observer at the capital of all large political events. He became acquainted with most of the public leaders through that period, and his advice was sought for by national leaders on many public questions. It is in New York, however, in the period from 1888 to 1904, that his influence as a resident Bishop can best be studied.

As every Methodist knows, a resident Bishop is not a diocesan Bishop. There are no diocesan Bishops as such in the Methodist Church, though the work of the presiding elder, now called district superintendent (as previously observed), is practically the work of the diocesan Bishop. Writing in 1897, Bishop Andrews said: "In the State of New York are five dioceses of the Protestant Episcopal Church, but the State comprises thirty presiding elders' districts, each receiving the continuous visitation of an experienced, and usually an able, ecclesiastical administrator." The resident Bishop has less control over the churches of his particular place of residence than has the district superintendent of that particular field, except in the occasional years when the Bishop is presiding over the Conference of his home city. There is little that the Bishop can do, as a resident Bishop, by the exertion of direct authority, for he has but little authority to exert. There is much, however, which he can do through his personal influence. His knowledge of the field ordinarily counts much with the Bishop who does preside, and he can influence the appointments that are made. And, again, the resident Bishop can have great influence with the churches. It is hardly likely, for example, that a church in a city like New York will call a minister, especially one from a distance, without saying something about the intention to the resident Bishop. On all other church questions also the advice of the Bishop is sought. The resident Bishop thus becomes as great a local force as we may expect considering the fact that the Methodist Church does not and cannot lay stress

on the factor of residence in a Bishop's work, for there is no effective way of combining general superintendency with minute supervision of a particular field. The Church as a whole can hardly be said to interest itself much even in the kind of material surroundings which the Bishop meets as he goes to his new home. There are episcopal residences here and there, but these are ordinarily the property of some local organization. In New York, with house rents at a fabulous figure, the Bishop is left to provide accommodations for himself as best he may.

The work of a Bishop as a resident Bishop is almost wholly the result of personal influence. With Bishop Andrews in New York this reached great effectiveness. To begin with, he knew New York on the ecclesiastical side. He saw the difficulties of the field as few men have ever seen them. He lived through a period of great change in the city. When Bishop Andrews was assigned to New York in 1888 there was hardly a trolley line in the country. The application of electricity to urban and interurban railroads has wrought a transformation in the church problems of New York. The practical result has been to equalize many suburban places so far as their accessibility from the city is concerned, and this makes for a very shifting and unstable church population. The moving from church to church is almost incredible, so that, as has already been said, the pastor may soon become almost the only fixity in a church community except the building itself. Bishop Andrews appreciated this elemental difficulty. He appreciated, too, the newness of the problems raised by city con-

ditions. In the days of the early itinerants the frontier was in the west. The students of sociology point out to us the vast social consequences that followed the fact that out yonder upon the frontier there was land enough and to spare, that if a man felt crowded or annoyed by his neighbors he could move on. This brought a problem new to the world, and out of it all came a growth of individualistic democracy. In our day the frontier is in a sense in the city, and the world is facing new problems from the fact that people are being forced to live closer and closer together whether they like it or not. The problems thus raised are new problems and open up vast advances for social democracy, if not of socialism. In any case the pioneer work is to-day done quite largely in city appointments.

Bishop Andrews saw this. He discerned the passion for novelty that is part of modern city life. In repeated conversations he told how many men he had seen come and "take" for a while and then drop out of view. He was constantly on the alert for the qualities in city pastors that would wear. A young minister making an altogether extraordinary success in a small city sought the Bishop's advice as to taking a New York appointment. The Bishop urgently advised the young man to remain where he was except upon absolutely unmistakable indications that his duty lay toward the metropolis. The Bishop distrusted the effectiveness of the more brilliant qualities in city ministers, and felt that only the solidest abilities would long stand the strain of city work. He felt, too, that the best work was really being done by the

men who were attracting no great amount of public attention.

Bishop Andrews knew New York. Whenever he was in the city and was not preaching himself, he usually attended the church of his family, Madison Avenue, in the morning, and in the evening often went about inspecting the methods of the various other congregations. After years of such observation he came to clearly defined opinions about the Church situation in New York, though he was careful not to hold his opinions so tightly that they admitted of no modification. First of all, he grew to the belief that the city of New York has its own problems in a sense true of no other city where Methodism has established itself. He did not think that observation in any other city or experience gained in any other city would be of much help in solving New York problems. The enormous growth of the city, the physical configuration which forces extremes of fashion and of poverty into such close proximity, the migration hither of the peoples from beyond the seas who naturally gravitate toward the separate race quarters, the vast movement of Americans also to New York—these and a hundred other factors made the Bishop feel that the problem was altogether unique. When a celebrated London worker came to this country a few years ago and told the churches of the ease with which the problems of New York could be solved, the Bishop in conversation about the Englishman's address went on to show the utter differences between New York and London from the standpoint of the Church problem. The Bishop felt

that even the spirit of the New York population is different from that of any other city. An evangelistic procession at midnight through the slums of London for the sake of reaching the outcast, the procession composed of hundreds of church people from the more well-to-do classes, will be taken very seriously by the slums of London, but may be taken with anything but seriousness by the slums of New York. The total difference between New York and anything else on earth Bishop Andrews very thoroughly understood.

Out of the familiarity with New York the Bishop came to admire some special features of the plans of other denominations for the work in the metropolis. He had profound respect for one aspect of the policy of the Roman Catholic Church. No one, of course, could ever charge him with any sympathy with the Roman Catholic Church as a system, but some features of their handling of the New York problem impressed him very much. He found from his personal observation that even in the more obscure metropolitan parishes the Roman Church stations men of very high character. Instead of finding that the Catholic Church stamps out individual ability on the part of its clergy, the Bishop found that the Church develops priests of a very high order of intellectual and moral strength. He used to tell about going once to a Catholic church in an East Side section to learn if something could not be done by the church for a servant girl in the Bishop's employ who had taken to drink. The Bishop said that he went expecting to meet a priest of the kind that

he had ordinarily supposed priests to be—a good man, no doubt, but just one of a class with all the class marks upon him. To his vast astonishment the Bishop met, in this parish which could hardly have had any preëminence among the Roman Catholic parishes of New York, a young man of obvious intellectual strength and of dominating forcefulness. The Bishop seemed to feel that this experience had a significance beyond the mere chance encounter with an extraordinary man. He used to say that so far as he could see the Roman Church owed a large part of its effectiveness in dealing with the city problem to the kind of men it placed in the metropolitan parishes.

For “institutional” work as such the Bishop had sympathy, but insisted upon the tendency of such work to run into the merely “showy.” He had watched closely the development of the largest enterprises in New York which lay stress upon this method of attacking the city problem and was never quite convinced that such work was an adequate solution. This does not mean that he had the slightest hostility to the work. With his belief that the problem of New York was like no other, he was willing to sanction anything which gave any promise of legitimate success. Only he did feel that the so-called “institutional” method had to be handled very carefully to bring about substantial and really religious results.

Perhaps the closest official connection which Bishop Andrews sustained with specific New York city work came through his relation to the New York City Church Extension and Missionary Society, an organ-

ization which for years has labored to apply the power of Methodism to the parts of the New York field most essentially strategic. While in the work of this society emphasis is laid upon binding a particular strong church in coöperation with a particular weak one, so that the strong church can make a specialty of and be responsible for the weak one, yet the general method is to touch the needy portions of the city from the plans of the central office. This type of centralized work is one in which Bishop Andrews was very strong. His mind came more and more to marked ability to gather up in one grasp an entire field and to keep the needs of several fields in their right proportion to one another. In deliberations of a board like that which controls the New York City Church Extension and Missionary Society the difficulty is to keep the aid, meager in any case as it must be, rightly adjusted to all parts of the field. The need is for men who can see all the field. The service which Bishop Andrews rendered was largely of this rather intangible and yet very real kind.

When it seemed necessary to impress the New York community with the importance of a Methodist cause through a public meeting, there was but one man for whom to send to preside, and that man was Bishop Andrews. A resident Bishop has much of this representative work to do. Sometimes the importance of such work is minimized, or even sneered at, but no one felt inclined to belittle such service as it was rendered by Bishop Andrews. The Thank Offering Movement in New York in 1901 to 1903 for the raising of a million dollars in New York city held a great

meeting in Carnegie Hall in connection with the enterprise in February, 1903. It was fitting that Bishop Andrews should speak at this meeting. He had taken part in the discussions of the New York City Church Extension and Missionary Society, out of which the movement had come. He had been especially concerned in the selection of the efficient secretary of the movement, Dr. Ezra Squier Tipple. He had written the statement on which the movement had gone before the people. It was proper that he should be on the program to lend dignity to the meeting, if for no other reason. President Roosevelt came from Washington to deliver an address on Methodism, but it is just to say that Mr. Roosevelt himself lent no more importance to the occasion than did Bishop Andrews. The Bishop did more than lend dignity. It was after ten o'clock before he began to speak, but his address was a cogent supplement to what Mr. Roosevelt had said. Mr. Roosevelt, with a knowledge of the westward movements of national life in our country perhaps unsurpassed by any historian who has ever written of them, was qualified to speak of the part played by the saddlebags Methodist preacher in the civilization and moral upbuilding of the West. Bishop Andrews, with a comprehensiveness of view the result of years of experience in looking at movements from their world-wide significance, in a few strokes set before the audience the significance of Methodism for the whole world. The bearing of the Bishop, his physical power, the grasp of his mind, made him on this trying occasion a figure of which universal Methodism might well have been proud.

His position on the program lifted the occasion into an importance which made the meeting more than an enthusiastic jubilee occasion. And the Bishop always did this in his presidencies over the great Church meetings in the metropolis.

Bishop Andrews came very quickly after his removal to New York in 1888 to have great personal influence with the leading laymen of New York city. They valued him because of what he was and of what he brought to them. It was no small power that could influence as graciously and yet as decisively as he did men some of whom were business leaders in New York. Men like Mr. Anderson Fowler and Mr. Bowles Colgate and Mr. Walter C. Carter, to mention only some who have passed away, believed profoundly in Bishop Andrews. These were not men who would give such honor as they gave to Bishop Andrews merely because he held the office of Bishop. They gave the honor because Edward G. Andrews was Bishop in every sense of the word.

Whether with laymen or ministers it was as adviser and counselor that Bishop Andrews did his most important work while in New York. As we have already indicated, the position as resident Bishop does not give any large scope for origination of policies, but it does furnish opportunity for sound counselings. When we consider the vast number of projects submitted to Bishop Andrews in the nearly twenty years of his episcopal residence in New York and Brooklyn—and we must remember that the advice of Bishop Andrews was sought no less after his retirement than before—we can form some notion of the service

which he rendered both by encouragement and restraint.

The Bishop was a good listener. The humblest minister in the denomination might come with the confidence that Bishop Andrews would hear patiently what he had to say. With those whom the Bishop knew well there was one characteristic in his dealing which might occasionally pass for impatience. He would now and then hurry along the one talking with him by an expression which showed that he was anxious to get at the point. If one did not know the Bishop this was apt to be disconcerting, but the impatience did not come from irritability so much as from the workings of a mind which, while it was listening, was running on ahead of the speaker. The Bishop had trained himself to speak very directly and to the point, and if he felt that he knew the one with whom he was talking he might by sharp, incisive question keep the conversation more closely to the track than the talker could alone. The only criticisms which we have ever heard on the bearing of Bishop Andrews with men came out of this characteristic. The characteristic was most marked when the conversation embraced matters with which the Bishop had carefully familiarized himself. The peculiarity was one of the mind rather than of the heart; and, as we have said, was shown more to those who knew the Bishop well than to strangers.

A second quality which made Bishop Andrews invaluable as a counselor was his absolute fidelity to the confidences reposed in him by those who sought his advice. The outside world does not know the

extent to which the Protestant ministers are repositories of all manner of secret communications, for it has been ordinarily supposed that the Roman Catholic priests stand alone in the extent to which they are compelled to know and bear secrets in silence. At least four cases where the Bishop kept confidences when almost every consideration, except simply the fact that the communication of the secret had been made in confidence, would have led the Bishop to speak out, have come to the knowledge of the writer of these pages. In each case it happened that not only an individual but an institution was seriously involved. If in any one of the cases the Bishop had declared that the gravity of the revelation forbade his longer holding silence, there would have been almost unanimous approval of his speaking. As it happened, however, the crisis in every one of the situations was happily passed without the Bishop's saying anything. In one of the matters especially the Bishop was time and again thrown into positions where it was almost inevitable that he would have to show in some way that he had been admitted to a knowledge of a terrible inner secret, but no word escaped his lips, nor any tell-tale change of expression crossed his countenance. The Bishop himself was so refined that confession of wrongdoing made to him by the wrongdoer was apt to be revolting, but he never acted the brother more truly than in the part of confessor and confidant. His knowledge of facts more than once placed him in situations of great strain, but he gave no sign of the strain. When we think of the Bishop's own uprightness we have to feel more and more admiration

for the patience and tenderness he showed toward those who fell into evils which he from the very mold of his nature could never have understood. His sympathy was not the sympathy of one who had himself learned charity through being overtaken in a fault, but the sympathy of one who saw the value of the lives, guilty though they might be, and of one who hoped that a single failure might possibly, with the help of kind counsel, save from further fall. A young man who in the opening years of his ministry had been guilty of misdoing and had been compelled to leave the ministry, in after years applied to Bishop Andrews for another chance, or, rather, came to the Bishop for his help in getting a start. The Bishop was familiar with the facts as to the early lapse. After patient consideration of the whole case he urged the reception of the man into the ministry again in another part of the country from that where the mistake had been made. The man was received and his after career was full of honor. He never would have been received if it had not been for Bishop Andrews.

Once more we have to say of the Bishop that he made a great counselor through his keen insight and his sturdy common sense. A prominent representative of a sister denomination, a man whose name would probably be recognized as that of one of the most famous church leaders in America if it should be printed on this page, appeared one day in the Bishop's office at 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, seeking to interest the Methodist authorities in propositions for coöperation in church work which had secured the sanction of the Roman Catholic Church.

The Bishop read the propositions through and pointed out to the caller the fact that hidden away in the careful sanction of the Roman authorities were implications and reservations to which no representative of a Protestant body could accede. The Bishop did not mean that the Roman authorities had intentionally sought to blind the eyes of a too-trusting Protestant. He, rather, took it that the couching of the proposition in the particular terms had been a delicate way of declining to act with Protestant bodies, and so stated his thought to the Protestant leader who had called upon him. The leader retired very much discomfited. It would have been incredible that anyone could have deceived the direct mind of Bishop Andrews by roundabout phrasings or could have confused his logical sense by keeping implications out of sight. President McKinley was once engaged on a document which required the utmost delicacy in diplomatic statement. It was necessary that the paper suggest much and yet say little. The President handed a tentative draft of the paper to the Bishop with the question: "What do you make of it?" The Bishop handed the paper back with the remark: "Most of it is between the lines." Whoever handed papers to Bishop Andrews speedily learned that the Bishop could understand what was between the lines.

The Bishop was seldom deceived by the man who was talking to him. He was especially keen in seeing through the men who came to enlist his help in carrying out their own personal ecclesiastical ambitions. He was full of the kindest charity for the men who sought positions for themselves, though he never

could see how men could bring themselves to take active part in, if not control of, their own "campaigns." This problem never ceased to be mysterious to him, though he recognized the worth and goodness of some men who did think themselves called of God to help themselves to high position. He felt that some men could have acted more creditably in such affairs if they had been possessed of a sense of humor. Some of us can hear yet the Bishop's laughter at the urgency of some good men who naïvely supposed themselves chosen of the Lord for every influential position that might open. On one occasion one of these serious aspirants came to the Bishop with a formal statement drawn up in thirteen enumerated propositions as to why the Bishop should support him for a particular place. "This is a reason why he should not be advanced," said the Bishop as he looked at reason number one. And so on with two, three, four and five, clear down to the foot of the list. One of the reasons was that in the new position the aspirant would have more time for occupations outside the direct line of his work! This man did afterward, without the sanction of Bishop Andrews, come to a position of prominence and for a time made a great stir. The enthusiastic applause of the people was looked upon by some as an indication that the Bishop had for once been mistaken. "While the people are applauding," the Bishop quietly remarked, "thoughtful men are anxious for the success of the enterprise of which our brother has obtained control"—an anxiety which was justified by the after events.

Underneath all the Bishop's advice was this sturdy

common sense which served the Church in many difficult situations. He had an unerring ability, for example, to see just how far a rule in any case could be disregarded. He was a master in dealing with proposals that have wrapped up in a regular form of ecclesiastical procedure an inner heart of folly. He well knew that no ecclesiastical system could be made proof against the willing trouble-maker. No small weariness and disgust was caused him in the closing years of his life by the seriousness with which many of the Church officials treated complaints of one kind and another which, however correctly drawn in form, ought to have been cast into the fire. A single instance will illustrate his own temper in matters of this nature. A minister in charge of an important church near New York was thrown into a quandary by the performances of one of his zealous members, who insisted that paragraph 248, prescribing trial for indulgence in specified forms of amusement, ought to be carried out to the letter. This member was not willing to leave the matter in the hands of the minister, but went throughout the parish collecting what he was pleased to call "evidence." Then he filed charges with the minister against certain members of the church. The charges were regularly drawn, for in spite of this eccentricity the man was a person of some intelligence and of some leadership in the church. The minister went to 150 Fifth Avenue to talk the matter over with the resident Bishop. Bishop Andrews looked the charges through. "Throw them into the wastebasket," he said. "But they are regularly drawn, Bishop," replied the minister, "and

he offers to make them good by his evidence." "No matter," said Bishop Andrews, with that short decisiveness which those who knew him will remember, "throw them into the wastebasket. If he sends you any more, throw those into the wastebasket too. If he files complaint against you for maladministration in refusing to act on these charges, come to me and I'll take care of you." Then he added: "The Methodist Church is opposed to worldliness, but that does not mean that she will allow individuals to set themselves up as censors and detectives after the fashion of this man." Bishop Andrews went on the principle that regularity in formal charges against ministers and laymen should not save the charges from the wastebasket if they are not the expression of regularity in the mental and moral processes of the men who formulate them.

V

ON THE ADMINISTRATIVE BOARDS

AT the funeral of Mr. John Bentley, held in the New York Avenue Church of Brooklyn in February, 1906, Bishop Andrews was one of the speakers. Mr. Bentley was a prominent Brooklyn Methodist, of rare serviceableness on the various Church boards which meet in and about New York. Bishop Andrews delivered a brief but impressive tribute to the worth of Mr. Bentley. The one idea which the Bishop brought out was that whenever he, the Bishop, attended a meeting of the Missionary Board in New York he found John Bentley present; that Mr. Bentley remained to the end of the session no matter how long the session might be; that when he attended a meeting of the trustees of the John Street Trust Fund he found Mr. Bentley, who never left till the work had been completed; that when the Bishop met with the trustees of the Methodist Hospital he found Mr. Bentley there, determined to remain to the end. And so on through a long list of Methodist organizations. By the time Bishop Andrews had reached the end of the list it was seen by everyone in the house how completely Mr. Bentley's works themselves spoke of the faithfulness of the many years of service. The tribute to Mr. Bentley was entirely deserved, but in paying it the Bishop was unconsciously making a revelation of his own faith-

fulness. Bishop Andrews would never have spoken of Mr. Bentley as he did if he had for a moment thought that the tribute to Mr. Bentley would in the very nature of the case be seen as a revelation of the Bishop's own faithfulness. It is well, however, that the Bishop all unconsciously to himself turned the thought of the people toward the thoroughness with which he himself was serving the Church through her various administrative boards.

Much of the work of the Methodist Episcopal Church is carried on through the work of boards or committees which meet at stated intervals. The Bishops meet twice a year. Following their autumn meeting the General Missionary Committee—we speak now of the days before the reorganization of the benevolences—met in some nearby city, and the Bishops attended the sessions as *ex officio* members. After that the Board of Church Extension would meet and the meeting of the Freedmen's Aid and Southern Education would perhaps come at about the same time. So that, beginning with the meeting of the Bishops, there might be three or more weeks of almost continuous service on boards into whose power had been committed the enterprises of the Church. And this was not all. The Missionary Board, into whose control came the work in the fields between the meetings of that Annual Missionary Committee whose duty was largely money-appropriation, assembled in New York once a month. The Bishop, as we have already seen, was on the controlling Boards of the New York City Church Extension and Missionary Society, the Methodist Episcopal Hospital,

the John Street Trust Fund, and other boards really too numerous to mention here. He attended these boards whenever he could reach them. Of the larger committee meetings he missed but one except during the time when he was out of the country on episcopal supervision.

It would be enlightening to the Church to realize at what a cost of time and effort these meetings are carried on, and how willingly the service is rendered by ministers and laymen. If a minister in or near New York attains to anything of reputation for sound judgment in administrative matters, he is very apt sooner or later to be called to the service of the administrative boards which center at New York. The more prominent laymen also are called upon. All manner of questions come before the boards, some of them of apparently no significance. Yet for the sake of economy the men whose time is too valuable to give to like considerations in their own work will listen patiently to these discussions in the committees. Some details of an insignificant kind have to be considered. One of the boards now doing effective work in New York is composed in part of men whose own business transactions annually run into large figures. The details of their own work are managed by subordinates. Yet these men will sit for three hours once every month trying to save money for an important interest by devising minute economies in janitor hire and telephone service and electric or gas supplies. What in their own business they would not consider for three minutes they will in this board consider for three hours, simply because the Church

has placed upon them the responsibility for the right expenditure of the benevolent funds. The sum total of such service which simply must be attended to in this way reaches every year into incredible proportions.

Among the most faithful in the patient attention even to details of this kind Bishop Andrews must be given a leading place. He had no patience with the men who shirk these things and talk in large terms of their interest only in the "greater issues." He would wade through ream after ream of minute report just to be sure that he understood. Under his expressed opinion there was a basis of hard work. A member of the Missionary Committee, who for years astonished the Committee and the Church with his minute and detailed knowledge of every question which came before the board, was for a long time thought to succeed simply by the easy and natural operation of a mind extraordinarily alert. The fact was that this particular committeeman always took with him to the meetings a trunk full of missionary documents, and while the other members were attending receptions in the evening he was at work on the documents. But Bishop Andrews as a Bishop had to attend the receptions, and he knew the business as well as the committeeman. How in the multitude of social engagements he found time to learn the minutiae of the board business is one of the mysteries, for the details had to be learned. They were not matters to be discovered by processes of reflection or imagination.

In one way the imagination of the Bishop served

the Church through this attention to details. We have already spoken of the power of the Bishop to gather into one whole all the field of the Church activities. He knew how to fit part to part and keep the necessary proportion. When he was sitting on the Missionary Board he did not forget that he was a Bishop of the Church, a member of the Board of Church Extension, and of all the other boards. The needs of the field were uppermost in his mind. When the afternoon of the session of the Missionary Board at 150 Fifth Avenue wore along, and the approach of dinner hour tempted some away from the tedium of the routine, he gathered his thought even more intently upon the business before the body. He saw the wants of the missionaries beyond the seas, and if others forgot those wants in their own weariness, and allowed the meeting to shrink more and more toward the dimensions of bare quorum, the importance of the duty left upon Bishop Andrews seemed to him to increase. Many a time his heart was heavy at the thought of deciding questions affecting the welfare of vast bodies of men in foreign lands by the votes of just a quorum of the Missionary Board. This is no reflection on the board, for the amount of sacrifice in the transactions of all assemblies of the kind both by ministers and laymen is very great. It does mean, however, that the fact that others felt forced to leave before the sessions were finished made the Bishop feel that he was forced to remain until the last item was completed.

Space forbids more than brief mention of the relation of the Bishop to particular administrative

boards. If we think first of the Board of Bishops itself we must remember that Bishop Andrews was for years secretary of the board. The papers which he left behind at his death showing the treatment of some special cases by the Bishops are models of secretarial efficiency. Documents were all folded in one form, the name of the subject-matter and the date so entered upon the outside that even one who knew nothing of the business concerned could tell at a glance the general character of the paper. The papers and correspondence of the Bishop needed no especial rearrangement and assortment after he had gone. The episcopal correspondence which, of course, could not be published in a book of this kind, shows how clearly the other members of the board relied upon the judgment of Bishop Andrews in all matters affecting their administration. An editorial in the *Christian Advocate* for January 9, 1908, speaks as follows:

“In 1880 a commission was appointed to revise the whole ecclesiastical code of the Methodist Episcopal Church and report the changes to the General Conference for discussion and approval. It consisted of three Bishops, three ministers, and three laymen. The Board of Bishops selected as their representatives Harris, Merrill, and Andrews. In the committee Harris proved to be the authority on past legislation; Merrill the discussor of possible consequences of alterations and additions; Andrews the weigher of all statements, and the estimator of their fitness to be incorporated with our system.”

Bishop Thoburn writes as follows:

“At our General Missionary Committee meetings

he always took an intelligent view of our interests in India. I have never known him to be rash, on the one hand, nor have I, on the other hand, ever known him to take a position of unreasonable opposition to forward movements. He was always able to appreciate a change in the line of march or in the rate of progress. If he was sometimes very cautious he was never, on the other hand, rash. During our long and I think I may say intimate friendship no incident, however light or slight, ever occurred which I could wish to recall. In missionary matters at home and abroad he was progressive in his views, vigorous in the measures which he advocated, prudent in finance, and supremely trustful in the Divine Leader at whose command we had taken up the great missionary enterprise and were striving to carry it to a victorious consummation."

Dr. F. D. Gamewell writes:

"The Open Door Commission was organized in Saint Andrew's Methodist Episcopal Church, New York, on January 2, 1902, and Bishop Edward G. Andrews was elected chairman. From that date until his death, December 31, 1907, he continued in this position, and some of the largest service rendered to the Church and the extension of the kingdom of God throughout the world in his exceptionally long and preëminently useful life was given in these last years in the work of the commission. He presided at the Cleveland Convention—the first and up to this date the only national missionary convention ever held by our Church. His intimate knowledge of the plans of the commission, the result of the time

he had given to the work by his attendance at the regular meetings and at the special meetings called for by the consideration of the many important questions to be determined in connection with the convention, gave him a mastery of the situation that exerted a large influence on that remarkable gathering at which three hundred thousand dollars was subscribed for missions.

“At the meeting in New York referred to, as the little group gathered about a table in one of the smaller rooms in Saint Andrew’s Church and considered the many important and perplexing questions of its organization and of carrying forward the aggressive work committed to it, again and again Bishop Andrews called for a pause in the proceedings, and in prayer uttered by himself or at his request, sought divine guidance in the work which was being projected. One who traveled a thousand miles to be present at the meeting said to the writer at the close of the session of two days that when he started East he thought the organization of yet another agency was a mistake; but the Spirit of God, in answer to prayer, had been so manifestly present, and had so directed in the organization and plans formulated that he was sure no mistake had been made.”

Bishop Andrews worked on many special commissions appointed by the Church. Dr. W. F. Warren writes:

“In the year 1888 the General Conference provided for the appointment of three commissioners who during the ensuing quadrennium should ‘hold themselves ready to enter into brotherly conference with all and

any Christian bodies seeking the restoration of the organic unity of the Church, or the increase of Christian and Church fraternity.' This 'Commission on Interecclesiastical Relations,' as it was called, reported in 1892, and was reappointed for a second quadrennium. As Bishop Andrews served as its president, and I as its secretary the eight years, we came through correspondence and otherwise into closer personal relations than ever before. Our interchanges of thought and sentiment touching the one legitimate Church of Jesus Christ and touching the manifoldness of its legitimate ramifications, revealed and strengthened our unity of view and congeniality of spirit. Little of the work of the commission ever reached the public eye, but its influence was all the greater in the circles most concerned."

As we hasten through the review of this phase of the Bishop's service to the Church we should not forget his relation to the various educational boards. He was a trustee of Wesleyan University, and as an alumnus took a very especial interest in the welfare of his alma mater, being at the time of his death on the committee which was intrusted with the responsibility of selecting a successor to President Raymond.

President King, of Cornell, the dean of all Methodist college presidents, writes:

"He became a member of the Board of Trustees of Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa, in 1872 and continued until 1880, and for a considerable portion of this time he was president of the board. Also for a part of the time he lived in Mount Vernon, his children being in college here. As a member of

our Board of Trustees his counsels were always wise, and his interest in the institution could not have been greater if it had been his own property. We greatly regretted losing his influence when he removed from Iowa to the east, but his friendship and coöperation continued with almost increasing interest until the close of his life.

“It was my privilege to serve for many years on the Board of Education of the Church, he being president of that board most of the time. And notwithstanding his other many cares and responsibilities, I found him always promptly present with the business well in hand, and broadly and accurately informed in regard to the varied work and problems that came before us. He took a deep interest not only in the general educational matters of the Church but in her several institutions, their faculties and their students. He was a tower of strength in all educational councils, as he was in the Church at large.

“His interest was not confined to mere perfunctory routine, but was individual, personal, and deeply sympathetic. He had a wide and far-reaching grasp of all educational problems, and his interest was never selfish but always benevolent.”

Dr. W. H. Crawford, of Allegheny College, writes of Bishop Andrews's ability to keep always in mind the primary aim for which a college exists. Dr. Crawford mentions “his keen appreciation of what a college means and what a college ought to stand for. The first item under this is the definition of a college he gave in an address at my inauguration fourteen years ago last fall. It was not only a defini-

tion of a college but a brilliant description of the changed condition and ideals for American colleges as illustrated in the history of Wesleyan from the time of his student days to 1893. His appreciation of the Christian college was beautifully set forth at the close of his sermon on the occasion of the dedication of our Ford Memorial Chapel on June the seventeenth, 1902. The sermon was on the text, 'God is a spirit.' In closing he said:

"We who come as comparative strangers to-day, and are permitted to look around on this beautiful hilltop dotted with majestic buildings, each with its especial purpose, say God has blessed this institution. But it is in this chapel, to be set apart and dedicated to the worship of Almighty God, that all the glory and all the work of this hilltop concentrates. To know God, that is the chief knowledge.

"To the students I would say, study in this observatory if you will, study the stars and moon, but enter this chapel and give yourself to the God who guides them. Study in your laboratory the secret processes of life and geological formation, but rise in this temple and learn of Him who presides constantly and unseen over all these as well as yet undiscovered mysteries—the Lord of life. Read the volumes in your splendid new library by men of fame now and in times past, but come to this chapel to find out how He, who is the author of yet unheard-of volumes written ages ago, still continues to inspire works of art and literature and humanity. Here knowledge culminates. Gathered into one great volume—a rare one—are mysteries and truths well

worth the student's time and effort. Here let him study, and the whole of nature's book is thrown open to his inquiring mind. Here shall students from week to week, from day to day, come into an understanding of the realities of life, enter into communion with the best of books, containing the highest possible law, open to us an entrance to the highest forms of thought. So may it be during the years that are to come. God comes here. Can we doubt it for a moment, that into this community God has come—that he is here as elsewhere seeking souls that shall commit themselves to his authority and that shall love him? He seeketh such to worship in spirit and in truth.

“I have heard of a great bandmaster of the musical art who was interested to gather together a great orchestra which he could take across the ocean to play. He traveled from city to city in Europe, testing noted performers and listening to first one musician of fame and then another, rejecting many and selecting one here and another there, until at last he had the required number. He brought them to America to do the work he had desired. As he sought some singers and players in each of various cities, so God bends over us, testing us; true is he; pure is he; generous is he; and so dealing with the successive generations of men, he will gather to himself in that great hereafter a company that no man can number, who shall stand before him in adoring love and faithful service, singing to him, “Thou hast redeemed us by thy own precious blood.” To him be the glory and honor forever. May it please God to make us of that number. May it please God to

make this temple sacred for his worship in spirit and in truth forever.' ”

Enough has been said to show the Bishop's faithful attention to the educational interests of the Church. Perhaps a word ought also to be added here setting forth his fidelity to the interests of Drew Theological Seminary during the years of his trusteeship. Bishop Andrews was the intimate friend of Dr. H. A. Buttz, for whom he cherished a profound regard, and in the intimate relation between the two much that was of great influence on the welfare of Drew was wrought out, though here again it is true, as in so much of the Bishop's work, that it is hard to put the finger on the specific good that he did. The good was of that pervasive and intangible kind of which we have had so much occasion to speak.

Before we close the chapter we must also mention another special service which Bishop Andrews rendered the Church. In the year 1896 he was appointed by the General Conference editor of the Discipline and was reappointed in 1900 and 1904. He was given the authority to make verbal changes without altering the sense of the legislation. The task was exacting. Not only did the work entail a vast amount of careful detail but it also threw upon the editor the responsibility of determining what the intent of the Conference was when the phraseology was ambiguous. The work had to be done under pressure, for the Church is always clamorous for the quick appearance of the new volume, but by general consent the edition by Bishop Andrews was practically flawless.

VI

TRAVELING THROUGH THE CONNECTION

ACCORDING to the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, one of the duties of the Bishop is to travel throughout the connection. Thus it happens that the list of assignments to Bishops for supervision at the semiannual meeting of the Board of Bishops is so made that in the course of every few years each Bishop appears in practically all parts of the country. In addition to this official visitation the meetings of the various boards and calls for various special services give each Bishop a yearly itinerary which brings him in touch with every important section of the United States at least. The traveling of the Bishops might be called almost incessant.

In a sermon preached in Metropolitan Temple on May 23, 1897, upon the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his election to the episcopacy, Bishop Andrews took opportunity to refer to this feature of the work of a Bishop, declaring, "It is not too much to say that the itinerant general superintendency and the itinerancy itself stand and fall together." If this is true, or if the Bishop thought it to be true, it is important that we try to form some idea of the service rendered by Bishop Andrews to the Church in traveling through the connection. Inasmuch as

we have already discussed the work of the Bishop as a maker of appointments we need only treat this phase of his work as it may come up incidentally. We call attention to some more general aspects of Bishop Andrews's influence upon the wide body of the Church.

In the old days there was a very frequent cry from different parts of the Church that "our people have a great desire to see a Bishop." The Bishop was the outward and visible sign of the Church's authority, and his speech was likely to give something of an impression of the wide extent of the Church's progress and power. Except in the more remote parts of the country the desire "to see a Bishop," save in so far as the Bishop may be worth seeing on his own account, has greatly diminished. With the main body of the Church the mere title itself does not awe as it once did. The country has become too accustomed to dignitaries to be much moved by them unless there is something moving in the very personality of the dignitary himself. The mere fact that a Bishop is announced to preach before the ordinary Methodist audience will not of itself draw the attention that it once did.

We have, however, yet to learn of any instance in which the appearance of Bishop Andrews in a neighborhood did not make for the exaltation of Methodism. There were some marks of superiority and of impressiveness which were apparent at once. He was a gentleman throughout, and gentlemanliness passes current at full value everywhere. There was a certain courtliness as of what we rather indef-

initely name "the old school" which filled out the ideal of the true Bishop. We all know that, whereas a certain hale-and-hearted bluntness of demeanor, a certain willingness to "mix," are in some quarters looked upon as winning qualities even in church leadership, the unmistakable marks of gentlemanliness are the best introduction to the vast majority. There are thousands upon thousands of Methodists who never think of Bishop Andrews without recalling his gracious dignity and without remembering the pride they took even in his bearing before individuals, or social groups, or vast audiences. In the fall of 1907 one of the most beautiful churches in Methodism was dedicated in Glens Falls, New York. The congregation had for years been working along advanced lines in church endeavor aiming at qualitative as well as quantitative results. At the dedication the committee sought for a man who might by his very bearing impress it upon the community that the Church stands for fineness of life as a product of Christian influences. Bishop Andrews was sent for to preach the dedicatory sermon. The pastor, the Rev. C. O. Judkins, is authority for the statement that just the impression most helpful came out of the presence of Bishop Andrews. The charm of manner and dignity of bearing of the Bishop, then past eighty years of age, his kindness and yet the loftiness of his personal standards, were the features of dedicatory week. This incident is but one of hundreds, and is chosen simply because this was one of the last occasions of the kind which Bishop Andrews attended.

In this connection, too, we may say a word about the preaching of the Bishop without anticipating what may be said in a later chapter. Bishop Andrews had a manner of preaching which was likely to be effective with a very wide range of hearers. There are some men of great oratorical abilities who produce, after all, a very limited impression. The type of oratory, intense as it is, may be somewhat provincial. It may be effective in some parts of the country and the reverse of effective in another. A foremost Methodist orator, famous for the emotional effects which his preaching produced in some parts of the land, once delivered what he considered his most effective sermon before a New England audience. The failure was complete. The figures of speech were altogether too tropical to bear transporting. Now there is a type of effective preaching which is good anywhere, and the preaching of Bishop Andrews was of that type—the simple, straightforward putting of the truth with the earnestness born of complete sincerity. This does not rise to the heights which the more oratorical style sometimes reaches, but, on the other hand, it is never likely to fall so low. If a speaker is to have a wide-spread influence throughout a country as great as the United States, he could not do better than to cultivate the directness and force which marked the utterances of Bishop Andrews. If we are to estimate aright the influence of the Bishop on the country, we have to give much weight to the fact that the speech of the Bishop was in that common coin of good sense and thorough genuineness which circulates at par everywhere.

Bishop Andrews, however, rendered his service to the denomination not merely by the impression which he made upon those whom he met. He was a good observer, and his observations bore fruit in the advice which he gave at all meetings of the large Church boards. The characteristics of his observation were two: ability to see accurately what was before him, and ability also to keep in mind the whole to which a particular field had to be related. The Bishop had the power to be absorbed in his immediate task, and to concentrate his attention upon the matters which he was set to observe to the exclusion of all other matters. As a representative of the Church he was not given to much philosophizing over the problems before him. He was preëminently practical, and came quickly to what seemed to him the best practical adjustments under the circumstances. To bring out this fact we may point to a contrast between the way that a visit to the missions of India impressed Bishop Andrews and the way a similar visit impressed Bishop Foster. Bishop Foster, philosopher that he was, could never shake from his mind the weight with which a first-hand knowledge of heathenism burdened him. The squalor, the abject darkness, the wretched superstitions, impressed Bishop Foster so heavily that he could not get away from their gloom. Those who stood close to the Bishop declare that his acquaintance with heathenism came, in the end, quite seriously to modify his theological thinking and to open some problems, especially in eschatology, which a great many people consider forever closed. Bishop Foster served the Church by letting the Church of his day see something

of the awfulness of the condition of the nations who sit in darkness. Bishop Andrews was asked if the trip to India had produced the same impression upon his mind that it had produced upon the mind of Bishop Foster. He replied that it had not, adding, however, that the reason probably was that he was so busy with the practical problems before him for solution that he had not time to think about anything else. It can be seen at once that the Church needs both types of men in her Board of General Superintendents. Bishop Andrews could throw himself into the solution of the details of missionary administration with a complete forgetfulness of everything else.

As a further illustration of this same trait in the character of Bishop Andrews we may instance the fact that he was present at Delhi in January of 1877, when Queen Victoria was proclaimed empress of India. He preached to a tent full of British officers on the day before the proclamation, and through the courtesy of the officers was, on the day of the proclamation, given a seat at the ceremonies from which he could see everything. The scene was a gorgeous one. If in his ordinary routine of duties he saw heathenism at its worst, on this day he saw heathenism on its most dazzling side. The vast plain was filled by the retinues of the native princes. The princes themselves were arrayed with jewels in profusion past belief—wearing “ropes” of pearls and diamonds. The impressiveness of the great troops of dignitaries mounted on camels, the orderliness of the native soldiery, the general dramatic effect, made an impression upon the mind of the Bishop which he never forgot. Yet it

was very seldom that he would speak of this scene. The writer of these lines once prevailed on him to tell the story before an audience of Sunday school children, but the Bishop consented with very great reluctance. His attitude toward the whole matter was that it was entirely incidental, and should be kept in the secondary place. He had no patience with the thought that tours of episcopal visitation were to be used as occasions for sight-seeing. We adduce these incidents simply to show that when Bishop Andrews was sent upon the work of episcopal visitation he busied himself with that work.

Before we leave this trip to India we call the reader's attention to a letter from Bishop Thoburn about the visit of Bishop Andrews. The visit came about through the inability of another Bishop to make the tour, and the motion of Bishop Ames that Bishop Andrews be sent started Bishop Andrews to India on rather short notice. He sailed from Philadelphia with his family in the early summer of 1876 and left them in Europe during his six months' absence. After holding the Conferences of Germany, Switzerland, Sweden, and Norway the Bishop started for India. Bishop Thoburn writes:

"I first met Bishop Andrews in March, 1864, when he was a member of the old Oneida Conference, and principal of Cazenovia Seminary. I had just returned from India on my first visit to this country, and had an appointment to give a missionary address at the above Conference, then in session at Norwich, New York. Bishop Scott, who presided, asked me to carry the certificate of transfer of Dr. E. G. Andrews to

Bishop Simpson, at New York, and when, a few months later, I attended the General Conference at Philadelphia, I had the pleasure of renewing my acquaintance with Dr. Andrews, as he was then called, who was a delegate in attendance at the above body. In the course of the session, at his request I spent a Sabbath with his people, preaching morning and evening in the church to which he had been transferred, and heard much in praise of the new pastor from his people during my brief stay among them.

“During General Conference of 1872, some of the missionaries in India were discussing the probabilities of election to the episcopal office of various candidates. I ventured to say that among all the prominent men with whom I was acquainted none of them struck me as better adapted to such a position than a rising young man named Andrews, whom I had met during my visit in the homeland; and it was very gratifying to me to learn soon afterward that my surmise concerning him had not been amiss. It was quickly realized as the young Bishop began to move about among the churches that he was evidently called both by God and the Church to the distinguished position in which he was placed.

“In 1876 I was a delegate to the General Conference which met in Baltimore, and while there was pleased to learn that Bishop Andrews had been assigned to the episcopal charge of India, and would visit our missions in that country during the ensuing cold season. As I was expecting to return in the early autumn, we very naturally arranged to travel together, and I thus enjoyed the privilege, which I

highly prized, of having him as my traveling companion on the outward journey, and looked forward with pleasure to his administration in India after reaching that field. A little later in the season we made arrangements to meet at Alexandria. I knew the hour and place where the railway train which then carried the mails from Alexandria to Suez would start on its short journey, and named a date and hour for us to meet at the place of the steamer's landing. It seemed like a far cry from Baltimore to Alexandria in Egypt, but when I went ashore from the steamer and entered one of the railway cars I heard my name called, and turning saw the good Bishop standing near by. I need not say that we had a delightful voyage together down the historic Red Sea and across the Indian Ocean to Bombay. The sea was smooth, the heat very moderate, and the weather ideal, and our voyage was pleasant in every way. Among other books we read together Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish Church, then comparatively new. Day by day we discussed the bearings of various questions raised in these lectures, and I need not say that it was worth very much to me to have not only the writings of a man so richly endowed for such work, but also to have a critic or commentator by my side who could help me with his suggestions, and in some cases his criticisms, and at the same time enrich our conversation with information from many points of the literary compass. The Bishop preached twice and made a very favorable impression on our fellow passengers.

“On arriving at Bombay we found our missionaries connected with what used to be called the Bombay

and Bengal Mission awaiting the Bishop's arrival, and here on the very threshold of his great field the good Bishop found a task which, if not extremely difficult, yet called for great caution and mature wisdom. Bishop Taylor at that period occupied a somewhat anomalous position in our Church. He had the confidence of vast multitudes of people, and his fame had spread around the globe. He had preached in many parts of India, had organized churches, and had been formally appointed superintendent of a large mission field known as the Bombay and Bengal Mission, but he was not at this time in India, and it did not seem by any means certain that he would ever return. He had multitudes of friends on both sides of the globe, and the course pursued by Bishop Andrews would certainly be regarded with careful scrutiny, if not, indeed, with a fear that he might concede too much or too little to the claims of the great evangelist. It was evident at a glance that it would be impossible to follow strictly the lines of administration usually marked out for such work in the United States. In this emergency Bishop Andrews showed great wisdom and exercised much tact in his administration. He made no abrupt change of any kind, and yet so arranged matters as to strengthen our situation, increase the general confidence of our workers and people, and open the way for an early and complete union of organization and effort for our Church throughout not only India proper but as far as it might extend in Southern Asia.

“While attending our Conferences, examining our schools, and visiting our churches Bishop Andrews

showed under all circumstances that he fully appreciated the fact that he was in a mission field and not in the homeland. He made no effort to impose absolute uniformity upon churches or schools, and was able to bear in mind all the time that although in one country he was moving in the midst of different peoples speaking different languages, and in many things following ideals of their own. On one point, however, he was always insistent, and never allowed us to be forgetful. He feared that the widely scattered churches which had been organized among the English-speaking people might so absorb the thought and energy of our people as to make them forget that as a people we were in India for the ultimate purpose of reaching the non-Christian multitudes of that land. Again and again he would appeal in his sermons and addresses to his hearers, not to forget 'the millions,' the 'untold millions,' the 'great multitudes'—in short, the mighty host in whose name and for whose sake we had been sent to India in the first place, and but for whom we could have no calling now.

"Our Conference met in the city of Bombay soon after our arrival. A number of our brethren from North India came down to be present at the session of this body, and the occasion became one of very great interest. Bishop Andrews preached on Sunday with great acceptance not only to the missionaries but to the people of the city. A public hall had been secured for this purpose and it was filled to its utmost capacity. Other meetings were held at the same time, and the occasion became one of interest to the whole missionary community. The Conference proved to

be an occasion which inspired all those who attended it with new hope and a new zeal. The brethren from North India who appeared in Bombay for the first time were made to realize that God was truly giving us an imperial field in which to build up a great Church to the Master's name and to the glory of the Most High. Enough of these good brethren were present to make all realize that God's plan for us was to organize a mighty work in India, and on an imperial scale. Karachee, a great city at the mouth of the Indus; Calcutta, at the mouth of the Ganges; Bombay, representing West India; and even Rangoon, from still more distant Burma, were represented here. Perhaps this was the first time when our leaders generally realized in a practical way that God was actually leading us forth into a work which was to assume imperial dimensions. Bishop Andrews did not encourage a dream of this kind, nor did he discourage it, but he manifestly was concerned lest in attempting so much we might not sufficiently realize what our immediate duty was. He wished us fully to appreciate the fact that any work of the kind would carry with it unspeakable responsibility. He wished us to do solid work, not to forget our educational responsibilities, and not to overlook the importance of training some men with practical qualifications for the work of leadership.

"Some time later, after the Bishop had visited other parts of India, I had the pleasure of entertaining him for about a week in Calcutta. We were at that time just completing a church for our English congregation. It was a large building, holding fully twice as

large an audience as any other Protestant church in the city, and its erection seemed at the time to be a hazardous undertaking, especially as we had not enough money in hand to pay for the site at the time the building was commenced. We urged the Bishop to remain with us about ten days longer so as to be able to dedicate the building, but this he was not able to do. Many were predicting that the dedication would prove a failure, that the house would not be half filled, that everybody would see that it could not be paid for, and that the enterprise would prove a mortifying failure. It was with extreme gratitude that I telegraphed to him, then at the session of the North India Conference, on the evening of the dedication: 'Church dedicated; crowded; 36,000 rupees subscribed; twenty seekers.' The dear, good man was so full of gratitude to God that he called on the Conference to suspend work and offer a prayer of thanksgiving to God for his help in this time of need. Suffice it to say that no difficulty was encountered in filling the church or in paying its debt."

Dr. Julius Soper writes as follows concerning the visit of Bishop Andrews to Japan:

"Bishop Andrews held the Japan Annual Conference in the old Tsukiji Church (the first Methodist Episcopal church ever erected in the city of Tokyo) in August of 1889. He deeply impressed all the members of the Conference, Japanese as well as American. He was suave and gentlemanly in all his bearing, and yet firm and decided in his views and convictions. He gave strict and careful attention to the business of the Conference and to all the interests of our Mis-

sion in Japan. The preparation of a constitution for the new Anglo-Japanese College (established in 1882) was the great burden of that Conference. He held several long conferences with the brethren on this work. His patience and painstaking were marked. He in a large measure worked out that constitution—he put his impress upon it. This constitution was later approved by the Board of Managers of the Missionary Society. The institution was conducted harmoniously and successfully under its provisions for years; and when it was incorporated under the laws of Japan some three years ago, this constitution was the basis of the new organization, much of the phraseology being preserved.

“The most interesting event of that Conference was Bishop Andrews’ sermon on Sunday. The church being too small for the anticipated gathering, the old Meiji Kwaido (*Meiji*, the name of the present imperial reign, meaning ‘enlightened era’; *Kwaido* meaning ‘hall’), an assembly hall near by, now no longer used as such, was rented. There were not far from a thousand present. It was a great occasion. The sermon was a fine one—well adapted to the people present. His text was, ‘Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap.’ The treatment was able and logical, yet simple and direct in delivery. The Rev. S. Ogata was the interpreter, and right well he performed his duty. It was wonderful how the speaker and interpreter dove-tailed into each other. Each one seemed to forget the other. The sentences were short. Hardly had the interpreter finished his last word before the Bishop would begin, and vice versa.

Mr. Ogata caught the Bishop's earnest spirit, and before the end—the whole occupying over an hour—both were in a holy glow. The impression made was deep and abiding. I was on the platform. I never saw in Japan a speaker and his interpreter so much *en rapport*.

“The Bishop riveted the attention of the audience from beginning to end. It was a magnificent sight—to see nearly a thousand Japanese intent on listening to the gospel message from so effective and eloquent a preacher. While all our visiting Bishops have done well, none have quite equaled Bishop Andrews in the impression made by that sermon. His general outline—so far as I recall, after nearly twenty years—was about as follows: Every seed has the power of reproduction, for it contains life; every seed produces after its kind; and every seed brings forth a large increase—some thirty, some sixty and some an hundred-fold. His application was fine: Bad seed produces as abundantly as good seed. So, while a life with good seed sown in the heart brings forth abundantly after its kind, so a life with bad seed sown in the heart brings forth abundantly after its kind. Concluding, he said: ‘My friends, how is it with your lives and hearts, and what kind of seed are you sowing day by day? “He that soweth unto his own flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap eternal life.”’

“There was another matter in which he was deeply interested. The General Conference of 1888 had made provision for a union of Methodism in Japan. It was not consummated that year, nor the next, nor

the next; but Bishop Andrews gave it his sympathy and offered valuable suggestions as to the form and content of the proposed new Discipline. He said: 'The proposed new Discipline differs considerably from that of the Methodist Episcopal Church; but I do not say that for this reason it may not be suitable—perhaps the best—for the work in Japan. Methodism has grown and prospered under different forms, and doubtless will for years to come.' He lived to see the day of the achievement of this union, the proposed form of which in 1889 gave him much concern and anxiety. The new Methodist Church of Japan, organized in 1907, is much more 'episcopal' than that talked of in those days."

It is not necessary that we should mention in detail the trip to Mexico in 1882 or the trip to China and Korea in 1889. Mrs. Andrews accompanied him both to China and to Mexico, making these journeys delightful to him. There had been some hardship in connection with the trip to India owing to the fact that his son Edward was just recovering from a serious attack of typhoid fever at the time Bishop Andrews left the family in Europe, and the long absence in India was fraught with anxiety both to the Bishop and to the family. Of the ordinary inconveniences of travel the Bishop made nothing. He found rising for five o'clock morning trains no burden, and did not see anything of hardship in reaching a destination at two o'clock in the morning. For some years he declined to travel in Pullman cars, in order to save the expense to the Church. That was, of course, before the episcopal travel had become as con-

tinuous as to-day, and before the Pullman had come into such common use as at present. The Church would rightly protest against a Bishop's declining to use Pullman cars to-day, but Bishop Andrews never seemed to feel that his refusal to use them in those early days meant any great self-denial. In fact, the Bishop had a gift for traveling and seemed not to feel annoyances which would worry another into desperation.

The following letter, written to his wife from Hamburg, gives a glimpse of his inner thought during the long weeks of travel:

"I find myself more and more reluctant to have my dear daughter so far from us. But I must trust her with God.

"I hope to hear from you when I reach Copenhagen—that you have reached London safely, that you are comfortably settled, that the children are making their mother happy by ready, cheerful obedience and considerate effort to please her, that all of you are in good health, and that you are diligently using the great privilege of prayer to obtain grace for every time of need. I was almost startled last Sunday on perceiving anew (indeed, almost for the first time) somewhat of the deep meaning of these words in Hebrews: 'Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, . . . and having an high priest . . . let us draw near . . . in full assurance of faith.' May we all use this wonderful provision. So prays your affectionate husband and father,

"E. G. ANDREWS."

VII

THE STATESMAN

THIS sketch would be incomplete without some reference to the statesmanlike qualities of Bishop Andrews. The Church has come to speak of him as a statesman. It may be well to think of this aspect of his usefulness, even at the risk of repeating in substance some things said elsewhere.

There is no sense in which the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church can be called monarchical. The Bishops have little power to originate policies. They can recommend, but the recommendation is considered on its merits. The seat of authority is in the General Conference. Bishop Andrews was very careful to recognize the power of the General Conference and to keep within the limits prescribed for episcopal action. He saw that in a democratic Church the Church itself is the real leader, and he rather allowed movements to arise within the body of the Church and then sought to do what he could to give the progressive impulse proper legal and ecclesiastical connections. In one sense he did not pretend to be a leader. There are many who seem to think that a Bishop, with his wide sweep of view over the whole field, is the very man to inaugurate and set in motion progressive policies, but Bishop Andrews did not seem to take this view of leadership. The real leaders in

the Methodist Church are the pastors and laymen, the men in actual connection with the needs of particular fields. From the contact of such men with the actual problems the movements arise which affect General Conference legislation. The leadership of the Bishop is that of inspiration and guidance and supervision rather than of origination. There are very few instances in which the Bishops run ahead of the Church.

It has been said of Bishop Andrews that his mind was not that of a pioneer. This judgment is to be taken with considerable qualification. When we come to discuss the relation of the Bishop to modern theological movements within the Church we shall see that he was far and away ahead of most men in the Church, and those who came close to the Bishop's personal views knew that on many other questions he had gone ahead of the thinking of his fellow ministers. The attitude of Bishop Andrews, the attitude of guidance and counsel, came out of his thought of Church authority. He did not think of himself as set to originate policies. He was willing to admit that he could not get the consent of his mind to step one foot outside what he conceived to be the limits marked by the real authority, namely by the General Conference.

The problems of leadership and statesmanship, then, for a Methodist Bishop are, in general, those of any sort of leadership in a democracy. The only way a Bishop can carry through a statesmanlike plan of action is to influence votes enough. Of course the Bishop can show a grasp of far-reaching principles in Church administration by providing that the right

preachers get into the right pulpits, but if the pulpit be of any size this has to be done by persuasion rather than by autocratic decree. Again, the Bishop has the right to rearrange districts according to his wisdom, but in reality the scope here is not very large. The leadership of the Bishop is that of persuasion. If he should fall from a high conception of duty and try to advance his plans by what the worldly politician would call patronage he could not get very far. Of course a Bishop's genuine prejudices may count, and count mightily, in the situations where the Bishop has the deciding voice, but in the large movements which affect the life of the Church the Church must be convinced. The mere fact that a Bishop desires thus and so does not count to any great extent apart from the reasons which may be given for the desire. Even the recommendations of the Board of Bishops to the General Conference, made by the board acting together, carry no weight beyond that of recommendation and have to be considered on their merits by the various committees. The leadership of the Bishop is the leadership of mastery of ideas clearly stated.

Now, while Bishop Andrews respected the authority of the General Conference he used his influence within reasonable and respectful bounds to influence General Conference legislation or, at least, to make his views known where he thought they would be influential. Some of these views were far-reaching and very interesting. The Bishop had decided opinions concerning the wisdom, or, rather, the unwisdom, of the famous paragraph in the Discipline concerning questionable

amusements. In an article in the *Methodist Review* for July-August, 1907 (the article is published in this volume), he openly pronounces against the wisdom of legislation on questionable amusements, holding that the Church can only pronounce definitely on such matters as are clearly of right and wrong, that in cases at all doubtful the Church can only state a general principle and leave the individual free to make the application for himself. Bishop Andrews felt that the legislation on questionable amusements by the Methodist Church had been productive of harm, not so much by the members whom it had kept out, or by the inexpediency of putting on the statute books laws which were not expected to be enforced and which could in any case with difficulty be enforced, but by the radically wrong policy of departing from New Testament procedure and establishing minute rules instead of enunciating general principles. The Bishop's view rested on this broad ground. The failure of the Church to occupy this theoretical ground has resulted in some futility in practical attack upon harmful indulgences. The outcome illustrates Bishop Andrews' soundness of view as to the confusion resulting from lack of fidelity to correct general principles. His leadership of the Church was of this kind—a true understanding of the outcome and implication of general principles.

The first thought of the Bishop for the larger questions of General Conference activity, then, was that the activity should base itself on correct general principles. His second anxiety was that the Church should lay stress on the right kind of leadership. We have

seen in a previous connection that he did not worry overmuch as to charges of wire-pulling brought against the General Conference. He was willing himself to speak to his friends about the excellences of this or that particular man. He could see as far ahead as the next as to the possibilities for future promotion in this or that apparently minor appointment, and would try to influence such minor appointments. His anxiety was not so much over the possibility of political combination as over the kind of man who often comes to the front in great popular assemblies. It would, perhaps, have been too much to expect of one of Bishop Andrews's temperament that he should have cared greatly for the type of man who sways assemblies by popular oratory. In any case, he was always afraid of the Church's rallying around the mere talker. Without casting any reflection on the men who had attained high position in the Church he was apt in his later years to confess himself alarmed at the type of leader who every now and again would come forward and who, if not actually successful in reaching high position, would come near success. He seemed to feel that the ideal of leader had changed somewhat since the days of his earlier manhood, and in moments of discouragement would express his misgivings as to the future. Over against this must be put the fact that after men whose election he deprecated had been successful in the work intrusted to them he was the first to acknowledge the mistake of his own first impression. One type of man he found it especially hard to adjust himself to—the man who coolly announces his own fitness for this or

that position; yet the Bishop admitted that more than one such man had achieved very worthy results after coming to office.

Because, however, the leadership of the Church must more and more depend upon intellectual and spiritual fitness, and because of the progressive decline of submissiveness to office merely as such, Bishop Andrews felt more and more the need of reducing to a minimum the chances of electing inferior and commonplace men to prominent position. He felt that the General Conference ought to provide for election of Bishops by some board or commission. He used to say that there were large numbers of men scattered throughout the Church who would make just as good Bishops as any who had ever been elected, but that these stood very little chance of becoming known to a General Conference, or of making much impression on a General Conference if they were known. His point was that the finer types of spiritual forcefulness are not always the types of forcefulness which win in a General Conference. He was distressed at the fact that some men win election to prominent place simply because they are the only ones who happen to be known throughout the Church at large. The Bishop was old-fashioned enough to believe that some qualities for high office are not in the nature of the case likely to prompt their possessor to make much self-display. Whether the thought of Bishop Andrews that the Bishops ought to be elected by a board or commission is itself sound or not, we may be sure that the observation which prompted the reflection is true enough. This difficulty, he knew, is inherent

in democracy and can only be finally eliminated by improving the general mass of the people.

In 1900, at the General Conference at Chicago, the Episcopal Address was read by Bishop Andrews. That address was, of course, the deliverance of the entire Board of Bishops, but it had been prepared by Bishop Andrews and can fairly be taken as setting forth his own thought. It was in this address that the recommendation was made which led to the removal of the time limit for appointments to pastorates. In matters of this kind, involving just the problems of Church machinery, the mind of the Bishop was concerned chiefly with the practical question as to how to get the best results. The address simply stated that the Bishops had found the five-year limit unsatisfactory and that they recommended either a return to the three-year limit, with provisions for exceptional cases, or the removal of the limit altogether. The limit was removed. In a case like this the Bishop never argued from abstract or theoretical grounds. He waited for the practical consequences to develop themselves before making suggestions as to improvement. It cannot be said that the Bishop had the spirit of a pioneer in Church legislation so far as details of the machinery were concerned. Any recommendations which might come from him came not from abstract reflection but from the pressure of actual experience. In all such matters he gave himself to the working of the system as he found it, and waited for practical needs to declare themselves. He, as has been said, was the author of the recommendation upon which the General Conference had acted

in removing the time limit, but with the time limit once removed he did not concern himself much as to the impression which the new system was making on the Church. A year or two before he died he was asked what he found the sentiment of the Church to be in regard to the working of the itinerant system without the time limit, and what were the prospects of a restoration of the limit by the General Conference of 1908. He replied that he did not know, and added that he gave himself but little time to consider such matters, that he was busy with the practical questions which devolved upon him and that he waited for defects in the system, if there were any, to report themselves. The reply was somewhat significant. Bishop Andrews had nothing of the constitution-tinker in his nature. In practical spheres, where the sole question was one of expediency, he did not concern himself with any but practical considerations. Quite likely, however, the intimate knowledge of all this class of questions which came out of his constant and painfully minute attention to the details of administration made him a more capable suggester of improvements, when improvements became necessary, than were those who discussed simply from the standpoint of logical implications and imaginary consequences.

There were thus two sides to the Bishop's view of the Church. In problems having to do with moral and spiritual interests predominantly the view was of that broad general nature which seized simple and fundamental principles to the exclusion of minor details. On the other hand, when the problem was

simply one of improving the machinery his mind busied itself with the details and allowed the general considerations to arise out of the pressure of the practical necessities. In one field especially both these qualities came clearly to the front. One problem which lay heavily on the mind of the Bishop was as to the most efficient way of handling the missionary enterprises of the Methodist Church, and if the Bishop is to be looked upon as statesmanlike, the statesmanship shows very especially in this field. He knew the details and he knew the general world-situation. Even the large geographical features of the missionary problem appealed to him. There was no man who could turn more quickly from one field to another with an intimate understanding of particular and general needs than could he. Some of his views on missionary management were quite radical. A man interested in missionary problems once went to Bishop Andrews with a proposition that the Churches allow missionary fields which show no approach of crisis in their outlook to get along with just enough appropriation to hold the organization together and keep the work going, for the sake of pouring in money and men to the fields where, as in Japan and China, everything is seething with the stirrings of change. To the surprise of the Bishop's interviewer, the Bishop conceded the correctness of this view, and while he showed that the withdrawal from any fields already occupied would involve losses which might not appear on the surface he went on to declare that the Churches were missing a great opportunity in the face of present-day changes in the Far East in not rushing men

from every available quarter to the critical points. This, of course, seems obviously the part of wisdom when thus put, but it very often happens that missionary authorities meet, hear the needs of different fields presented, and then vote to leave the situations relatively just about what they were before.

Bishop Andrews's view over the field of Methodism as a whole and his understanding of its problems and difficulties made impressive his confidence in the future of the Church. His optimism was not based on trust in Church machinery but in the spirit of the Church. He had no doctrine of manifest destiny which was to carry the Church on to perpetual success, but he did have a simple trust that the members who might come into the Church would catch the spirit of Methodism and that they through loyalty to the spiritual ideals of the Church would continue in the future the conquests of the past. Of course this faith had its ups and downs: there were moments now and then when the Bishop would give way to half-gloomy forebodings, but the forebodings were just those which one feels when contemplating the possibilities of any democratic forward movement's getting astray. The discouragement would be but momentary, and never reached the stage of scolding or of strained fault-finding. The contrast between Edward G. Andrews and some others at this point was instructive. For example, the Bishop never was especially disturbed over the change in evangelistic method in situations where the old-time revival seemed impossible of success. He saw very clearly that with the increas-

ing intensity and variety of modern life it is sometimes simply impossible to get the outsiders within reach of the older type of special service. Many times the Bishop went out of his way to encourage and compliment younger ministers whose success showed itself in accessions at each Communion service. To one such young minister, discouraged over the failure of the special-service plan, the Bishop spoke with kindly praise, pointing out that the ability of this young man himself to build up his church along all lines by steady and persistent effort was bringing success of a high grade. The mere form of the effort did not seem to be of consequence to the Bishop. He felt that success would be won increasingly by patience in seeking men one at a time and by faithfulness in instructing the children in the home. He believed that the success of Methodism depended on evangelism, but he knew that the form of evangelism effective at one time in the history of the Church could not necessarily be taken as the standard method for all time.

There were many symptoms of the evil in the heart of much of modern society which bore heavily upon the mind of Bishop Andrews. His desire for the Church was that something should come out of her life that would dissipate the unbelief of society. The apparent lack of confidence in noble ideals which prevails in much modern life distressed the Bishop very much. As an illustration of his method of thinking along this line we may say that the most alarming single fact which he saw in modern life was the spread of suicide. Suicide seemed to Bishop Andrews such

a horrible indication of the departure of that faith in good which holds minds in sanity that he could not refrain from speaking of it as an appalling indication of lack of spiritual vitality in our modern life.

A fact about Methodism which seemed to be much in the mind of Bishop Andrews in the closing years, which did not especially discourage him and yet which presented a problem which he felt must be reckoned with, was the failure of Methodism to produce or to hold rich men of the highest rank of wealth. This does not mean that there was the slightest subserviency to wealth on the Bishop's part, but it shows how clearly he understood the needs of the day. He saw immense philanthropic schemes to which the Church might give herself if she only had the money, but the money would be needed in immense quantities. The Bishop had considerable experience in trying to raise money for large projects, and while he had unbounded faith in the Church as a whole he felt that the lack of any considerable number of men of great wealth in our Church was a hindrance which would have to be taken account of. The Bishop felt that the Church had a message to men of wealth and that the rich men who had come of Methodist parentage owed a responsibility to the Church for the advance of the Church's enterprises. The falling away of some rich men from the Church he recognized, the inclination of the children of some rich men away from the Church he deplored. He saw that the Church must recognize the situation and meet it by a larger giving on the part of those in ordinary circumstances. We do not mean that the Bishop was at all pessimistic

over the situation. He had, however, faced the problem and he felt that others should likewise face it. He knew the need of very large sums of money for Christian work and did not see that these were to be found in the purses of any small number of persons.

VIII

THE THEOLOGICAL COUNSELOR

WE come now to think of the most distinctive influence which Bishop Andrews exerted on the Church in the later years of his life—his work as counselor and guide during the troublous years when the Churches of this land were adjusting themselves to the changing views of the Scriptures which have been a foremost part of theological thinking in the last twenty-five years. In the last five or ten years of his life Bishop Andrews was regarded as possibly the most progressive man in theological thinking on the Board of Bishops. It is well that we try to come to some understanding of this part of his work.

In his earlier years Bishop Andrews had learned two lessons which he never forgot. One came through the reading of the works of William Ellery Channing. The reading of the works of Channing and contact with their lofty spirituality taught Edward G. Andrews this lesson from which he never escaped, namely, that the man whose views were diametrically opposed to his might be a man of loftiest Christian character. Most sincere men learn this lesson before they get through life, but Bishop Andrews had the advantage of having mastered the lesson early. The second lesson was learned from the reading of Neander's Church History. Very early in the

Bishop's ministry he came upon a copy of Neander's History of the Church. Though one could hardly claim to-day that the work of Neander is to be placed in the first rank, yet the reading of the book made upon the mind of the young Andrews the impression of the divineness of the forces which are too often thought of as merely natural. He took from Neander the realization of the part which the natural movement according to law plays in the unfolding of a divine plan. Of course Neander in his day could not have had the wealth of material for setting this conception forth which the modern historian possesses, but the youthful pastor in central New York caught the idea clearly enough to see its implications.

These two conceptions were as seed sown in good ground. There was a long period, however, in which the Bishop had no great opportunity to think closely about theological matters, and, indeed, there was no pressing theological problem up for a long time. In the eighties, when the first rumors of the results of latter-day biblical study began to reach the Bishop, he was very much disturbed by them. When one of his brethren on the Episcopal Board began to speak in charitable tones of the new movement and to point out that great good might be expected from it in the end, Bishop Andrews was as greatly agitated in mind as it was possible for a man of his equable temperament to be. The two lessons which he had learned in early life stood him in good stead through this period, however, and he kept his mind open for whatever light might come.

According to the Bishop's own statement, the turn-

ing of a new corner in his thinking came with the publication of Professor William Newton Clarke's *Outline of Christian Theology*, in 1898. Bishop Andrews had had some acquaintance with Professor Clarke in early days at Cazenovia, and the personal interest in the Professor led to the reading of the book. Perhaps a knowledge of the character of the author predisposed the Bishop to a favorable attitude. In any case the book, by the symmetry of its method and the charm of its spirit, influenced the Bishop profoundly. The following are extracts from correspondence which passed between the Bishop and Professor Clarke:

"NEW YORK, March 27, 1899.

"Professor W. N. Clarke.

"MY DEAR BROTHER: Though holding through many past years a very pleasant remembrance of yourself and of your most estimable father, mother, and sister, I had in my many movements through the country lost sight of yourself and your work.

"But last summer, being in the study of a young minister, I found that he had read with great pleasure and profit *An Outline of Christian Theology*, by Professor W. N. Clarke, of Colgate University. . . . I bought the volume and during the summer vacation read and reread it with great interest and with thankfulness for this new and most admirable setting of Christian truth.

"My wife also has read it with equal pleasure and also my daughter, Mrs. Ingraham. . . . And I have often recommended it to ministers who seemed

to be in a posture and of a quality of mind likely to be profited by it.

"I may be permitted to say, without fear of suspicion that I attempt flattery, that a nobler combination of freedom and conservatism, of clear intellectual processes with the sweetness and fervor of devoutness, of strength of material with grace of form, has rarely or never come to my library.

"I am greatly pleased to think that I knew in his early years the author, and among other things to note in this case how the godly home of a pastor has yielded such admirable fruit.

"Sincerely yours,

"EDWARD G. ANDREWS."

Professor Clarke replied in a letter largely personal, from which the following excerpts are made:

"HAMILTON, N. Y., March 30, 1899.

"MY DEAR BISHOP ANDREWS: Your letter was equally surprising and delightful. That you should enjoy and approve my book could not fail to gladden me, and that you should take time to tell me of it, and welcome me so warmly to your circle of thought and friendly feeling—how can I fail to thank you lovingly for this? You have always been a fixed point for admiration and approval in my mind, and I have thought with constant pleasure of your strong and honorable service in a laborious office for the good of the Church. . . .

"I have been preaching most of my life, and in 1890, most unexpectedly, I found myself teaching theology—the last thing I had ever looked forward

to doing. But it has been a perpetual delight and an unspeakable privilege. The book is the outcome. I printed it privately in 1894 and in 1898 I revised it and published it, as you know. It seems to be doing good, for I am constantly hearing of it in unexpected quarters as welcome. Bishop Vincent became interested in it in the earlier form and commended it here and there. . . . I seem to have spoken somehow to the unuttered thoughts of many, and that is the surest way to get a hearing. . . .

“Sincerely yours,
“WILLIAM N. CLARKE.”

The charm of Dr. Clarke's book is in the freshness with which the old, old truths are seized and in the conviction of reality with which they are stated—together with the modernness of the outlook upon biblical and scientific and philosophical problems. The originality of the treatment and the frankness of the changed line of approach toward some questions made the book seem quite radical to those who thought there ought to be only one standard and conventional putting of theological truth. Professor Clarke's distinction between the life of Christian experience and the interpretation of Christian experience in theology, familiar as this has become in the past few years, struck Bishop Andrews with great force. It helped him to see the dividing line between what is essential and what incidental and secondary.

From 1898 on to the end of his life Bishop Andrews read theology with new avidity. His mind was not of the speculative type. In fact, he never could quite

understand the part of the more purely speculative thinkers, and he turned aside from metaphysics. For vital puttings of theological truth, apart from its more speculative phases, he had, however, the keenest attention. He was impressed by the suggestiveness of books like Dr. Henry Churchill King's *Reconstruction in Theology* and by the fine religious spirit of Dr. Henry C. Sheldon's *Systematic Theology*. Out of all his reading came an openness of mind unusual in a Church official busy as was Bishop Andrews, and astonishing in one whose theological reflection had taken a new start after he had reached the age of three score years and ten. In the light of Bishop Andrews's example it is no longer possible to say that Church officials must necessarily be inflexible in their conservatism, or that theological leadership cannot be looked for in the older men.

Bishop Andrews was very anxious that in all theological discussion within the Church the emphasis should be right. He did not desire that theological discussion should so emphasize minor points as to make these points more than minor. For himself he held fast to certain conceptions as altogether central. We cannot do better than quote his own words in the Episcopal Address of 1900:

"Inasmuch as the permanence and growth of the Christian Church, and of any part of it, are inseparable from fidelity to the truth as it is in Jesus, we rejoice to report our belief that the theological convictions and teachings of our Church are, in the main, unchanged, that through its entire extent, at home and abroad, the essential Christian verities, as re-

ceived from our fathers and by which we have hitherto ministered successfully to the kingdom of God, are firmly held and positively proclaimed. We believe in one living and personal God, the Father Almighty, who in perfect wisdom, holiness, and love pervades, sustains, and rules the worlds which he has made. We believe in Jesus Christ, his only Son our Lord, in whom dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, who was in glory with the Father before all worlds, who became flesh and dwelt among us the brightness of the glory of God and the express image of his person, who died for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring man to God, who rose from the dead, who ascended on high, having received all power in heaven and earth for the completion, by grace and judgment, of the kingdom of God. We believe in the Holy Ghost, very and eternal God, the Lord and Giver of life, by whose operation on men dead in trespasses and sins they are quickened to repentance, faith and loving obedience, are made aware of their sonship with God, and are empowered to rise into the full stature of men in Christ Jesus. We believe in the impartial love of God to the whole human family, so that none are excluded from the benefits thereof except as they exclude themselves by willful unbelief and sin. We believe that faith in Christ, the self-surrender of the soul to his government and grace, is the one condition upon which man is reconciled to God, is born again, becomes partaker of the divine nature, and attains sanctification through the Spirit. We accept the moral law confirmed and perfected by the divine Teacher, and set forth authoritatively in the

Holy Scripture; and we believe in eternal consequences of good and evil, inherent in the constitution of the human soul, and declared with utmost solemnity by him, the final Judge of human life. These central truths of the Christian system we think were never more positively held and declared among us than they now are. They were so clearly apprehended and stated by our founders that the progress of theological study has not forced us to hold them either by excision from, or by additions to, our former creed. They are part of our inalienable inheritance. By this sign we conquer.

“Beyond the limits of these central and constitutive verities of the Christian faith, Methodism has never insisted on uniformity of thought or statement. It has allowed freedom of reverent inquiry. It adopts Mr. Wesley’s words: ‘As to all opinions which do not strike at the root of Christianity, we think and let think.’ In its Christocentric theology and in its spirit of aggressive evangelism it has found sufficient safeguards against individual eccentricities of thought. On the one hand, the reverent spirit of the Methodist theology has nothing in common with the destructive spirit of much recent criticism. To overthrow, and not to conserve, the faith once delivered to the saints seems to be the tendency, if not the aim, of such criticism. But on the other hand, serious, conservative, patient, and practical study of the many undetermined questions of theology, questions which chiefly concern, not the facts, but the methods of divine revelation and government—this study the Church allows and approves. It believes in scholarship honestly

directed to learn more than has hitherto been known of the divine word and the divine works. It believes that more light is yet to break forth from both. It contemns sciolism, self-sufficiency, love of novelty, the iconoclastic spirit in biblical studies; it welcomes truth, even new truths, if duly tested, confirmed, and found serviceable to the life of the soul."

It will be seen from this that the Bishop desired that the ministers should not lose their sense of the relative importance of different phases of the truth. He sometimes felt that the very discussion of some of the more minute points of theological debate was of doubtful value in that it tended to raise these points to an importance which they did not intrinsically possess. He also desired that the theological debate should be free from bitterness of spirit, and still again he desired that the debaters should as far as possible make themselves understood. This last point, he was sure, was of much greater importance than many debaters imagined. Bishop Andrews was aware of the fact that many a man needlessly arouses criticism and brings his cause into suspicion because of his own failure to make himself understood. The Bishop saw that in some cases this misunderstanding is inevitable because of the inherent difficulty of the subject-matter, or because of the temperamental differences of the disputants. In other cases, however, he saw that if the writers had been at the pains to labor honestly and earnestly to make themselves understood much difficulty might have been avoided. The Bishop was not greatly impressed with that type of boldness which rushes into speech or print with imperfectly

thought-out conclusions. He insisted that if we are to make high appeals to honesty in such situations we must first do all that we can to make ourselves understood. The type of honesty which simply blurts out a half-thought regardless of the possible misunderstanding did not impress the Bishop as overvaluable.

In his own utterances Bishop Andrews was careful to observe all the official proprieties. He knew that there is a valid distinction to be drawn between the utterances of a minister as an individual and the utterances of the same individual as an official, as a Bishop of the Church for example; and he felt that he must not so overdo the emphasis on his own views as to allow men to get the impression that he was trying to put upon them the sanction of official authority. In a letter to a friend he wrote:

“The individual thinker has his right of way among us. Let him utter his views freely and without censure. It is often, doubtless, a matter of courage for him to do this; but he is likely to strengthen himself by emphasizing the ultimate value and outcome of truth, whatever may be the present disasters incident to the breaking up of hereditary faiths. But he ought not to forget that these disasters are real, numerous, and far-reaching; and he must not think of the pastor and the religious publisher, who are set over souls now living, as if they were cowardly if they hesitate to accept and exploit new views of the Bible and its contents. . . .

“Questions are opened with me which I formerly thought closed. In common with most men who may, perhaps, by courtesy be called thoughtful, there

is going on with me a process of reconstruction on many subjects in theology. But for you and for me the foundation standeth sure. God is in Christ reconciling the world to himself. . . .”

The view of official duty as expressed above did not mean that he had any sympathy with those large silences in the Church press as to modern biblical and theological conceptions which sometimes lead the casual reader to assume that the Church paper is the last to take notice of world-wide movements in theology. He favored the opening of the columns of the Church press for ample discussion of biblical criticism especially. And he had no sort of sympathy with the wholesale onslaught upon Methodist theological schools which had a run of popularity with a certain class in the years from 1900 to 1906. When he learned that one such reckless assailant was to appear before a meeting of preachers with a promise of “making the fur fly,” he advised a man of the opposite point of view to attend the meeting and make reply if opportunity should be given. “Moreover,” he said, “be sure to sit on the front seat, where the presiding officer will not fail to see you when you rise to speak.” The years from about 1895 on for a decade were the years when the Methodist Church was coming to its adjustment on the matter of biblical criticism. In those years many positions of the newer school were seen to be helpful, others worthless, and others harmful, but the Church, apart from individuals here and there, is learning to deal with the problem by the right methods—allowing the scholar his part, the saint his part, and the great mass of sensible, earnest

believers their part. In the years of approach to this outcome the example of Bishop Andrews, holding fast to what he conceived to be good and reaching forth to what he felt might be better, was of great service to the Church. Mistakes on both sides would have been fewer if the Bishop's example could have been more closely followed. The temptation in all such conflicts is to forget that the weapons of intellectual and religious warfare are not carnal, and the Methodist Church, in company with other Protestant bodies, suffered from this oversight in both camps of debaters.

We cannot do justice to this phase of the influence of Bishop Andrews if we do not mention his relation to the case of Professor Mitchell, of Boston University School of Theology. Professor Mitchell was at the head of the department of Old Testament exegesis, and for nearly twenty years had been teaching the views for which in 1900 he was called to account. The charter of the Boston School gave the Bishops the right of confirmation of professors and in 1900 Professor Mitchell was reëlected for another customary term, namely, five years. There was protest against his confirmation, but the Bishops finally confirmed him. In 1905 the protest was renewed and through a change in the General Conference law concerning the investigation of charges against professors the Bishops declared themselves unable to vote on the question of Professor Mitchell's confirmation. The protest against Professor Mitchell continued, and at the meeting of Professor Mitchell's Conference in 1906 charges of heresy were filed against the Professor. The charges

were found to be in improper legal form and were thrown out.

Bishop Andrews had voted for the confirmation of Professor Mitchell in 1900. He was not on the effective list in 1905 and so had no vote. When the charges were brought against Professor Mitchell for a Church trial he placed in the hands of the counsel of Professor Mitchell a paper prepared by himself on the main question as to whether the *World Before Abraham*, the book for which Professor Mitchell had been called in question, was sufficiently at variance with Methodist belief to warrant the condemnation of its author for heresy. We publish the paper as showing the character of the Bishop's mind and the nature of his thinking during the discussion of higher criticism in the Methodist Church. Taken with the paper delivered at Garrett Biblical Institute this paper is worthy of being preserved as a model of judicial method, no matter what opinion we may hold as to its conclusions. This paper was not prepared in connection with the charges before the Central New York Conference but was given for what it might be worth on the main point. The paper was prepared in connection with certain charges submitted to Bishop Andrews in 1905.

THE CASE OF PROFESSOR MITCHELL

Discriminating between the allegations of fact made in the paper before us against Professor Mitchell and the accompanying theological inferences drawn by the complainants, we find the allegations to be these four:

1. Professor Mitchell teaches that Moses is not the author

of the Pentateuch as we now have it, it being a composite work, the growth of the entire period from Moses to Ezra.

2. Professor Mitchell declares his opinion that Jesus in his humiliation was not omniscient.

3. Professor Mitchell teaches that the first eleven chapters of Genesis are not strictly historical, this statement applying to the account of the creation, of the temptation and fall of Adam and Eve, of the succession and length of life of the antediluvians, of the universality of the deluge, and of some of the genealogical tables from Adam to Noah.

4. Professor Mitchell, in denying the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, denies that God gave to Moses some of the laws and statutes as recorded in the Pentateuch, and that he gave them at the times and under the circumstances under which these laws and statutes are said to have been given.

It will be observed that Professor Mitchell is not accused in the paper referred to of teachings contrary to our standards of doctrine, as to the central and vital articles of our creed, namely, the being, character, and government of God; the deity of Christ (except by implications hereinafter to be examined); the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit; man's sinfulness and lost condition; atonement by the death of Christ; regeneration, the witness of adoption, and sanctification by the Holy Spirit; faith as the one condition of salvation; the church and the sacraments; and future and final rewards and punishments. He is supposed to be ready to affirm in the usual certificate his conformity to the doctrines and polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The questions seem to be these two:

1. Are the allegations of fact sustained by adequate evidences?

2. If sustained, in whole or in part, do they sustain the charge of "misteaching"? of teaching contrary to our doctrinal standards? Let us examine the allegations and evidence in the order given above.

I. Does Professor Mitchell teach that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch, as we now have it? *Unquestion-*

ably. The W. B. A. repeatedly and unmistakably avows this opinion. Let, however, a more particular statement be made.

1. In W. B. A. Professor Mitchell distinctly recognizes Moses as the "inspired" founder, lawgiver, and hero of Israel.

2. He distinctly recognizes some portions of the Pentateuch as having, by divine command, been committed to writing by Moses.

3. In W. B. A. he expresses no doubt that other portions of the Pentateuch, in which it is recorded that "the Lord spake unto Moses," and in which are narrated passages of the early history of Israel, under the leadership of Moses, are true records of fact, whensoever and by whomsoever they were first committed to writing.

4. The opinion that Moses did not write the Pentateuch as we now have it, though contrary to the opinion prevalent in our Church, cannot be shown to be contrary to our standards of doctrine, namely, the articles of religion, the catechism, and (so far as the present writer knows) Mr. Wesley's first fifty-three sermons.

5. Nor is this opinion incompatible, as very many personal instances show, with a genuine and hearty faith in the divine origin, authority, and truth of the Christian religion according to the evangelical interpretation thereof.

6. The opinion of the Jewish Church contemporaneous with Christ is not conclusive on the question before us; *nor even* that of the sacred writers except upon the theory that *inspiration* made all of them *infallible* not in theological truth only but also in all matters, historical, genealogical, scientific, to which they may allude—a theory which seems to be less largely and less firmly held than in years gone by.

7. The question of the sources, authorship, and authority of the Pentateuch is of very great moment to Christian thought and life. It should therefore be dealt with reverently, cautiously, even with great solicitude, lest vital truths in any way be obscured. But the question is under most critical study by many men, some of them doubtless indifferent or hostile to revealed religion, but many of them devout, reverent, believing, as well as scholarly. It is an open question.

But it will be finally settled in the forum of Christian reason.

Meantime the advice of Neander to the Prussian government that the Life of Christ, by Strauss the skeptic, should not be put under the ban of authority, but should be met only by argument, should have place with us. The truth is mighty and will prevail.

II. Does Professor Mitchell teach that, in his opinion, Jesus in his humiliation was not omniscient? (See W. B. A., pp. 16, 17.) Unquestionably. Yet he declares that he leaves his pupils free to choose between this and another theory in explaining the allusions of Christ to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch as found in the New Testament. In the bill of charges, by many and emphatic statements, it is set forth that the holding of this opinion as to the possible limitation of knowledge in the humiliation of Jesus is tantamount to a denial of his deity and of all doctrines framed thereon. Must this position be admitted? It is a sufficient answer to this question to cite the names, and in some cases the words, of men of unquestioned orthodoxy, of piety and learning, who have held or treated with deference the opinion which Professor Mitchell avows. (In its full and dogmatic form this theory is called the *Kenosis*, "the emptying himself" of Phil. 2. I have not noticed that Professor Mitchell has avowed any general theory of the *Kenosis*; he seems only to have spoken of particular cases of limitation of knowledge in Jesus. While, therefore, the theory of the *Kenosis* may include his view, he cannot be held responsible for the theory as a whole.)

CITATIONS:

1. Dr. Whedon in *Methodist Review*, 1861, p. 148 (abridged): "A highly important contribution to the history of modern theology has been furnished by J. Bodenmeyer's *Doctrine of the Kenosis*, a doctrine which has gained a number of adherents among the Lutheran theologians of Germany. According to it, the Logos at his incarnation voluntarily divested himself of his divine self-consciousness in order to develop himself in purely human form. On ac-

count of the importance which is attributed to it by a large number of theologians it well deserved to be made the subject of a special thorough work."

2. Dr. Whedon in *Methodist Review*, 1870, p. 291 (abridged): "The first article (in *Bibliotheca Sacra*) by Professor Reubelt is learned and able. In favor of what is called the *Kenosis*. . . . We are not disposed to dogmatize on such a subject. We must speak with respect of a dogma held by Dorner, Pressense, and by Dr. Nast." Dr. Whedon then proceeded to controvert the dogma.

3. In *Methodist Review* for 1897, pp. 229-246, Dr. M. J. Cramer argues at length the limitation of knowledge in Jesus during his humiliation; and in *Methodist Review* for 1904, pp. 234-236, G. P. Eckman, D.D., pastor of Saint Paul's Church, New York, affirms with copious argument the same position.

4. McClintock and Strong's *Encyclopedia* article *Kenosis* admits the difficulty, in its own language, of adjusting "the God to the man," argues against the *Kenosis*, but adds: "The theory of a somewhat double consciousness, if we may so express it, or, at least, an occasional (and in early life a prolonged) withdrawal of the divine cognitions from the human intellect . . . seems to be required in order to meet the varying aspects under which the compound life of Jesus presents itself in the Gospels."

5. Dr. William Nast, founder of German Methodism, cited by Dr. Mitchell from Vol. I of *Commentary on Mark 13. 32*: "To say that Christ as a man knoweth it not, but as God knoweth it, is self-contradictory. To know, and at the same time not to know, a thing, would destroy the unity of the personality of the God-man. . . . It was proper for him who became like unto us to be our pattern in his walking by faith, that, in the state of his humiliation, he should not know the completion of the æon."

6. Three unquestionably orthodox commentaries in my library, in commenting on Luke 2. 40-52, Matt. 24. 36, and Mark 13. 32, distinctly and unequivocally affirm the real ignorance of Jesus in his childhood, and when he said in

Matthew and Mark, "Neither the Son." See (1) Alford, Vol. I, pp. 217-227; (2) Stier, Words of Jesus, Vol. I, p. 472; (3) Lange, Commentary on Mark, pp. 132-136.

7. Neander, *Life of Christ*, p. 368, on Mark 13. 32: "To know the time presupposes a knowledge of the hidden causes of events, of the actions and reactions of free agents—a prescience which none but the Father could have—unless we suppose, *what Christ expressly denies*, that he had received it by a special divine revelation."

8. Dr. Luke H. Wiseman, former President of the British Wesleyan Conference, is cited in *Homiletical Encyclopedia*, p. 148, as follows: "In his youth, at least, Jesus grew in wisdom. His attainment of knowledge at that period of his life was progressive. Nor can we reasonably suppose it was otherwise afterward. He learned obedience by the things which he suffered."

9. Canon Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 94: "We are forced to assent that, within the sphere and period of his incarnate and mortal life, he did—and, as it would appear, did habitually—. . . cease from the exercise of those divine functions and powers, including the divine omniscience, which would have been incompatible with a truly human experience."

10. Godet, *Commentary on John I. 14*, p. 362: "Jesus no longer possesses on earth the attributes which constitute the divine state. Omniscience he has not, for he asks questions, and himself declares his ignorance on one point (Mark 13. 32)."

11. Gore, *Dissertations*, pp. 190, 191, cites from Dr. Fairbairn, a passage too long to be here quoted, which asserts most unequivocally the same doctrine, in substance, which Godet asserts. On p. 192 Gore also cites Bishop Martensen, the distinguished Danish theologian, as holding a Kenotic theory.

12. Canon Gore also cites from eminent English theologians, passages which, without careful definition, admit the possible limitation of knowledge in Jesus.

13. Bruce, *Humiliation of Christ*, p. 392, cites from Delitzsch: "The incarnate Logos is not in possession of the

eternal *δοξα*, for he desires to resign it (John 17. 5). He is not omniscient, for he knows not, as he himself says, the day and hour of the end (Mark 13. 32). He is not omnipresent," etc.

14. Henry van Dyke, D.D., Ex-Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly, in *Gospel for an Age of Doubt*, argues at length and urgently for the doctrines of Kenosis.

15. He cites p. 155 from Howard Crosby, a full and strong passage which affirms the limitation of knowledge in Jesus from Bethlehem to Calvary.

16. In Dr. Terry's *Moses and the Prophets*, Appendix, pp. 181-194, Dr. C. J. Little, of Garrett Biblical Institute, Dr. Samuel Plantz, of Lawrence University, and Dr. B. P. Raymond, of Wesleyan University, distinctly avow their belief that the knowledge of Jesus in his humiliation was limited.

17. To these add opinion of Robert W. Dale, of Birmingham, England.

In closing these statements, attention is called to the fact that no German theologian but Delitzsch has been either quoted or referred to.

These citations of opinion are made with the single purpose of showing that men in high reputation for learning, piety, and orthodoxy have either held the opinion that the knowledge of Jesus during his humiliation was limited, or have held that such an opinion was not incompatible with faith in the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. Great is the mystery of the incarnation. It is a depth in which human thought is lost. Whether we adopt or reject the theory of limitation, we are equally unable to explain how the "Lord became flesh." And in view of the citations made, it cannot be thought a fatal error to hold and to teach this theory if it be done reverently and undogmatically.

III. Does Professor Mitchell teach that the first eleven chapters of Genesis are not to be considered strictly historical? Unquestionably. See W. B. A. *passim*. He does not seem to base this opinion on the doctrine of evolution, which the W. B. A. nowhere treats or even, so far as we

have noted, alludes to, nor on any theory of anti-supernaturalism. He rather finds support for it chiefly in (1) the variations found in the two accounts of the creation and also of the flood; (2) in the failure thus far to reconcile Genesis and geology, (3) in the peculiar incidents found in the accounts of the temptation and fall, and in the resemblance between it and the myths common with many ancient people, and (4) in the incredible length of life assigned to individual antediluvians. I suppose all thinking men have struggled to some degree with the difficulties existing in these eleven chapters. We have given up the literal *days*, and have substituted for them indefinite æons; we have questioned whether the serpent or, on the other hand, some infernal spirit in the guise of a serpent, or of a monkey as Adam Clarke supposes, was the tempter; we have wondered whether the history of long-lived individual antediluvians ought not to be considered as rather the history of tribes or dynasties, or whether the so-called *years* of their lives were meant for smaller subdivisions of time; and we no longer think of the Noachian Deluge as being universal, though it is said to have covered the "earth" and "all the high mountains under the heavens."

But in judging Professor Mitchell's teaching on this head it is sufficient to consider that in his opinion on the non-historicity of the eleven chapters he represents the opinions of by far the larger portion of the leading biblical scholars of this time. It would be difficult to name any large number of eminent and orthodox scholars, familiar with modern critical studies, whose views are not adverse to the strict historicity of the chapters. They find, as does Professor Mitchell, great religious truths concerning God, man, sin, judgment, preparation for redemption, put before us in forms more or less historical—but not to be treated as unerring history. I cite the names of some of these leaders of theological thought.

[Here follows a long list of scholars.]

IV. In denying the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, does Professor Mitchell deny the statement of the Pentateuch that God often gave laws to Moses, and that he did this at

the times and under the circumstances set forth in the narration? The answer should be Nay and Yea. He does not deny—and he does.

1. Professor Mitchell does not deny, but holds, that Moses received from God laws and statutes for Israel; that Moses wrote various parts of the Pentateuch, including these and certain historic matters; and he implies the belief that other laws and statutes were received by Moses from God, which were, perhaps, written down at a later date and by other hands.

2. But Professor Mitchell holds that some parts of the Pentateuch said to come from God through Moses were framed and incorporated with preceding divine laws by men much later than Moses.

How this supposed fact can be reconciled with a true ethical sense in those who thus in the name of Moses added to the laws of Moses, how the Jewish people came to accept the additions as from Moses, and how far and in what manner the Christ of the Pentateuch and of the Old Testament is affected thereby, are among the difficult problems of Mosaic scholarship. But here, as in the matters foregoing, Professor Mitchell is in harmony with very many eminent and orthodox scholars.

Undoubtedly there is unrest in the Church resulting from the higher criticism. Probably the faith of some in the Christian system is weakened thereby. In some cases the pulpit probably utters the Christian verities in a subdued tone. We lament it. We regret the simple and unquestioning confidence of former years in the literal truth of every word of the Scripture. But the remedy is not in suppressing inquiry. That must, that will go on. It makes this a time of transition, often of painful transition. But the aim, the spirit, the thoroughness of the inquiry, will bring us good. Never was Christian scholarship more devout, more single of eye, more positive in evangelical consistency, than now. Patience, prayer, Christian work, will make the Church safe.

IX

THE PREACHER

WHEN Phillips Brooks was elected Bishop of the diocese of Massachusetts an editorial comment in the *Christian Advocate* expressed the probability that the sermons of the new Bishop would in their quality fall below the average which they had maintained in the pastorate. Whether this prophecy as to Bishop Brooks was fulfilled or not we do not know, though the biographer of Brooks records the Bishop's own feeling that the round of episcopal functions was killing him. We can see, however, at a glance that there is, in general, enough ground for prophecies like that of the *Christian Advocate*, especially in the case of Methodist Bishops. For the traveling is practically incessant, the swarms of details to be attended to innumerable, and the general distractions multitudinous.

Suppose we take the experience of a Bishop through a Conference week, and think of what we can see from the outside. The Bishop arrives at the seat of the Conference on Tuesday evening. Very likely a young people's mass meeting demands his presence. The next morning the Conference begins its regular sessions, and these require three hours and a half or four hours of continuous attention every morning till the next Monday or Tuesday. In the afternoon the Cabinet of district superintendents meets at about

half-past two and remains in session till dinner time, to reassemble for a meeting of indefinite length after dinner. On Sunday morning the Bishop must preach; on Sunday afternoon he must conduct the ordination service. He must have hours when the ministers and laymen feel free to approach him. He must respond to urgent telegrams and letters from other Bishops. Moreover, he must find some few minutes to show himself an appreciative and agreeable guest in the home where he is being entertained, for it is not customary, except in unusual circumstances, to send a Bishop to a hotel when he is presiding over a Conference.

Of course this is a description of Conference week, and Conference weeks do not take more than perhaps three months out of the year. The other months are filled with committee meetings and Church dedications and private conferences too numerous to mention. It is not to be assumed that this work is in itself necessarily harder than the work of the pastorate, but it can be very readily seen that this work consumes the time, and the opportunities for creative reading and study are not large. There comes a temptation, no doubt, to use a sermon as a sermon and as a lecture, and as an address to a class, and as an after-dinner speech, as occasion may seem to require. There is something indescribably pathetic in the experience of Bishop Brooks as recorded in Allen's biography—the fight for leisure for meditation, the retreat to railroad stations out of the reach of the kindly host, that there might be some chance for reflection. And yet it is to be doubted if the demands on the time of a

Protestant Episcopal Bishop are as heavy as those on a Methodist Bishop.

The same editorial authority which we quoted above, in a memorial article upon the life of Bishop Andrews, declared that the preaching of Bishop Andrews constantly improved during his term of office as a Bishop. We think that this is the universal opinion of those qualified to speak. The reasons for this constant growth are not hard to find. First of all, while Bishop Andrews worked with amazing devotion to his work, he did not work needlessly. For example, he reduced his correspondence to a minimum. He seldom wrote except on occasions where only writing would do. We have called attention before to the fact that he cultivated the power of doing his work effectively on the first doing, and so was not under the necessity of reviewing himself. He would not reopen cases of appointment unless absolutely necessary, and he seldom found it necessary even to explain; so that his correspondence was kept in the secondary place. Furthermore, the Bishop always found his way to the libraries of the ministers with whom he stayed and he depended upon them to put him upon the track of the latest books. On one of the last journeys that he made he passed a long, long time in the study of a young minister going over the publications of the University of Chicago Press. He thus kept himself in the current of the newer publications, and stimulated his mind by contact with fresh problems. Again, the Bishop saw very clearly the dangers to preaching in a life like his own, and he kept himself on the lookout against those dangers. He was eager and in-

quisitive. He did not allow himself to become bored by life but kept always the attitude of an interested questioner and observer. It was said once of the Prince of Wales, now the King of England, that just by keeping his ears open he had become one of the best-educated men in England, simply because every distinguished specialist whom the Prince met was naturally anxious to tell the Prince the most and the best about the cause in which the specialist might be interested. Bishop Andrews was a good listener; and, moving much with men of leadership in various fields, and keeping his mind alert to what these leaders might say, he prevented his thought from moving in ruts. The long journeys, too, gave him opportunity for reflection.

Coming now to the preaching itself, we have to say, first, that it was clear. The preaching of Bishop Andrews could not by any possibility have been otherwise than clear. He would not speak until he understood. The preaching was orderly, so orderly that its very system made it easy to remember. And the preaching was genuine. There was one prominent American preacher whose preaching Bishop Andrews often discussed with intimate friends. While his comments were not critical they, nevertheless, suggested by contrast something of Bishop Andrews's own ideal in sermonizing. The peculiarities of this preacher were two: he cared more for the effect on the audience and for striking dramatic statement than for the substance of what he was saying. He seemed always to be asking himself what would be oratorically most effective rather than what would leave a true im-

pression upon the mind of the hearer. This was not the ideal of Bishop Andrews. He was even afraid of epigrams, lest they might turn the mind of the hearer by ever so little from getting the truth which he was trying to proclaim. The second peculiarity of the American preacher under discussion was the emphasis on passages written long before, when the imagination was more vivid, and repeated verbatim in the later sermons. This also was foreign to the style of Bishop Andrews. His sermons were extemporaneous and, apart perhaps from their central conception, were in constant process of change. They were genuine utterances from the life as the preacher happened to be living at the time of the delivery of the sermon. The other man's utterances were effective enough after a fashion, but there was a sort of lack of genuineness in this verbatim handling of sermons which belonged to a different period of his life. The sermons were his own, to be sure, but they belonged to an earlier vintage in his intellectual and spiritual fruit-bearing, and did not come out of the life with the directness of the utterances of Bishop Andrews. There was with Bishop Andrews no attempt at anything spectacular or striking, but the very sincerity and genuineness of his sermons made them impressive. There was one characteristic of the preaching which did come down from another day, but which came down not by the artificial preservation of a manuscript but by the warmth of a passion which marked the ministry of Bishop Andrews from the first, and which grew more and more pronounced with him as the years went by—the evan-

gical warmth and fervor of his appeals. He used to say that preachers had only a few themes after all, that they should preach on these in season and out of season, that the claims of the Lord Christ as the Saviour of men should at all times be kept in the foreground. Bishop Andrews lived through a period in which there came a change in the type of Methodist preaching. When he first went into the ministry the Methodist circuit riders were proclaiming the power of Christ to save with a directness and vigor which have seldom been surpassed. The preaching produced emotional effects which meant in many cases instant change from darkness to light. Through the years of the life of the Bishop the Church increased in the range and multiplicity of its activities and the type of preaching changed to a less intense tone. The Bishop saw the inevitability of this change, but while he held himself in the very front of all the activities, and while he kept his mind open to any new revelations which might come, he preserved the warmth of the early days. There was a pervasive something which came out of the very earnestness of his effort which gave power to his appeals. The Bishop desired first, last, and all the time to save men. He did not allow his preaching to be carried apart from this main aim by any other considerations whatsoever. To be sure, his idea of salvation broadened during the years; it meant more and more in the way of response to the will of God; but this very fact laid upon his conscience a greater responsibility. He came more and more to distrust artificial manifestations of determination to do the will of God, such as

raising of hands and signing of cards, but he seldom closed a sermon without an appeal to the man outside the kingdom to align himself with the forces of righteousness. Surrender to the will of God meant to him, first of all, something inner and vital, and he preached in the conviction that this surrender could be brought about by reasonable and kindly appeal in any religious service.

We have said that the preaching of Bishop Andrews was extemporaneous. The Bishop had from the early years of his life an aversion to writing sermons, though he did write and write much. In the later years his sermon preparation consisted largely in the writing of very careful outlines, and in thoroughly going over the points in his mind. One very unusual peculiarity of the Bishop's sermons is to be noted, in view of the fact that they were thus prepared. It very often happens that the best part of an extemporaneous address is the beginning and that the address deteriorates as it moves along—deteriorates, that is, from the standpoint of careful articulation of the outline, though the fervor may increase. The reason is clear. As the thinker goes over the sermon in his mind he naturally begins at the beginning, and before each successive advance to a new section goes through what he has already prepared. As a result, the beginning gets the most thorough preparation. The sermons of Bishop Andrews improved as they went along; in fact, the improvement was so marked as to lead to the surmise that possibly the last part of the sermon had been the one on which most of the attention had been focused from the first.

We publish elsewhere the abstract of a sermon delivered by Bishop Andrews at Cornell College, Iowa, in 1904. This sermon was received with great favor wherever it was delivered, and by the widest variety of hearers. The saint found in it the rule of life by which he walked, emphasis upon that practical obedience through which comes the knowledge of the will of God. The philosopher, on the other hand, found in it the separation of the province of faith from that of strict demonstration and paid tribute to the keenness with which this distinction was made. The sermon was delivered in one of the New Haven churches at the time of the Yale bicentennial services in 1901 and made a profound impression upon one of the most brilliant students who had come to Yale in years, so profound that the student preserves to this day the newspaper in which the sermon was reported. This power to impress hearers at opposite ends of the intellectual scale came through the simplicity and clearness of the Bishop's speech. The Bishop aimed to make the least trained hearer in the audience understand. If he could make him understand, the wiser man could understand. And what Bishop Andrews said was worth the wise man's hearing.

We publish also the address of Bishop Andrews at the funeral services of President William McKinley held in the Capitol at Washington. When Bishop Andrews was telegraphed for to preach at the McKinley service he was holding a Conference in the Central West, and on receipt of the message had only time to reach Washington in season for the service. There was no chance for formal preparation

whatever. The remarkable feature about the address under the circumstances was its moderation and restraint. It is proverbial that it is always easy to speak in extremes. Any man at all familiar with public speech knows that extemporaneous delivery is very apt to run to hyperbole. When we bear in mind the circumstances under which the speech was delivered, and the excited temper of the nation, we may well second the editorial utterance of the New York Times, that the oration of Bishop Andrews was a model of good taste and restraint.

If we were to dwell overmuch, however, on moderation and restraint we would fall short of doing justice to Bishop Andrews's fervor and oratorical impressiveness. At times he rose to heights of impassioned utterance that made the profoundest impression. At one of the Open Door Emergency conventions Bishop Andrews made an address which showed such grasp on missionary problems, and such force of exhortation, and such passion for the advancement of the kingdom of God, that the speaker who was to follow him on the program, himself an orator of no small emotional effectiveness, declined to speak, and dismissed the audience, that the effect of Bishop Andrews's utterance might not be lost.

We cannot do better in closing this chapter than to quote from a tribute published by Dr. George P. Eckman shortly after Bishop Andrews's death.

"A few days ago I saw in my mother's home a picture of Bishop Andrews, made thirty-five years ago, or shortly after his election to the episcopacy. That portrait differs in many respects from the ap-

pearance of the venerable man over whose departure we wept a few days ago. Yet, there is also much similarity. The well-chiseled face, with its look of wisdom and grace, the thoughtful brow, the kindly, intelligent eyes, the general aspect of firmness combined with benignity which made him such an attractive figure in his later years, appear in that old picture. You would recognize him as a man at the summit of his profession, though you were unaware of his actual position. He was born to be a Bishop. He had the true bearing of the church primate. He was apostolic in his manner and tone. In his latter days there was a saintliness in his very moving. But there was no mediævalism about him. He was a genuine man with good, red blood in his veins, practical wisdom in his brains, and fighting mettle in his spirit. He belonged to the twentieth century as soon as it dawned. He understood the age in which he lived. He was in sympathy with the intellectual ferment of the times. He believed that theology was a growing science. He hailed the development of human thought with sincere joy. He felt that criticism and investigation would hasten the triumph of truth. One sentence in his memorable address to the graduating class of Garrett Biblical Institute, in 1906, indicates his working philosophy regarding this matter: 'Any inevitable movement of the human understanding must be held as a part of the divine order for man and an element of human progress.'

"He was always a ready man, because he was a full man. His acquaintance with general literature was broad and accurate. It made one feel his own

insignificance when Bishop Andrews would ask him if he had read this or that recent book. The breadth and variety of his reading was shown by his familiarity with the best fiction of the day. The diversity of his acquirements made it possible for him to speak effectively in an emergency for which no opportunity for specific preparation had been given, and he often amazed his best friends by the power of his address on such occasions. The greatest sermon I ever heard him preach was delivered under circumstances which were little likely to provoke eloquence. It was a hot, steaming, midsummer night in New York. An audience of less than two hundred persons had been gathered in a tent. The air was stifling, the light was dim, the congregation was lethargic, the occasion was apparently without promise. His text was: 'Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap.' On these words he delivered one of the most masterly discourses any man ever uttered. Like all his sermons, it was a consummate piece of homiletic construction. It contained every element that a good sermon should possess. It was philosophic, hortatory, picturesque, and deeply evangelistic. It convinced the judgment, kindled emotion, and constrained the will. He discussed the psychology of habit profoundly, but so lucidly that a child could have understood him. His illustrations were dramatic to the last degree. His appeal to sinners could scarcely have been excelled in fervency and impressiveness. Altogether, the sermon was a most wonderful exhibition of intellectual and spiritual power. The inspiration of it was in the man and not in his audience."

III

THE PERIOD OF RETIREMENT

I

LIFE IN BROOKLYN

BISHOP ANDREWS was retired from active work in the episcopacy by the General Conference which met at Los Angeles in 1904. The vote for retirement did not mean that his services had been in any way unacceptable to the Church. When the Conference met the Bishop was in his seventy-ninth year. Inasmuch as a vote to keep him on the effective list would mean that he must be considered effective for a period of four years longer, it seemed wise to the majority of the members of the Conference to retire the Bishop while he was still in excellent health and strength rather than to ask him to continue a work which at any time might prove too heavy. There is no doubt that the vote for retirement came as something of a shock to Bishop Andrews. He felt strong and vigorous, he was able to do more than his share of the labor of the episcopacy, and felt that he could carry the burden through another period of four years. The shock, however, soon passed away. The Bishop accepted the judgment of the Conference with good grace. By the time he had reached New York on his return he felt that while there was some hardship about the method of episcopal superannuation, on the whole the Conference had acted wisely. As for the principle of retirement in itself, the Bishop conceded in private conversa-

tion that this was entirely correct. He felt that the Church must insist upon the right to retire the Bishops, and though he shrank somewhat from the method, he could not help feeling that in a Church in which the superannuation of ordinary ministers is every year a necessity, the superannuation of Bishops should not be resented by the Bishops themselves. Whether the action of the General Conference of 1904 was wise or not, that action certainly made possible a happy closing of Bishop Andrews's career.

After the General Conference of 1904 Bishop Andrews removed to Brooklyn and took up his residence at 47 Brevoort Place. It was especially delightful both to him and to his friends that he was able thus to remove to the scene of his old-time labors. The churches which he had once served were all greatly changed, but the associations of Brooklyn still kept their charm. To the Bishop's rooms—on the corner of Fulton Street and Bedford Avenue—there came through the next three years and more a never-ending stream of callers, some renewing old times, some seeking advice, some paying reverence to the man whose leadership in the Church meant more and more with every passing day. Bishop Andrews was a great friend. In the days of his active episcopacy he managed to find time to spend many an hour with such diverse characters as Dr. A. S. Hunt and Dr. Benjamin M. Adams. Dr. Hunt, for many years one of the secretaries of the American Bible Society, was a long-time acquaintance and comrade of the Bishop. Bishop Andrews was a lover of good books in the realm of general literature. Dr. Hunt

possessed a magnificent library which he had mastered so thoroughly that some of his admirers declared that he could give on an instant's notice the substance of any chapter in any book that he owned. The cozy hours passed in this library were even in the Bishop's active life among the most precious of his memories, and in frequent conversations the Bishop lived these hours over during the days of retirement. Dr. Benjamin M. Adams, a remarkable preacher in the New York East Conference, had an ability but little short of genius for rough and yet incisive statement of shrewd religious insight. To be sure, both these men were gone when Bishop Andrews came to Brooklyn in 1904, but he found others in whose society he took great satisfaction. Dr. Charles S. Wing, for many terms a presiding elder in the New York East Conference, lived in the same building, and the intimacy between these two increased to the end. Dr. S. Parkes Cadman lived just a few steps from the "Brevoort" and was a frequent caller upon the Bishop. Across the East River were the many, many friends whom the Bishop had learned to love in the years of his residence in New York—among them especially Dr. Frank Mason Nortli, between whom and the Bishop there existed a deepening intimacy.

In conversation with his closer friends Bishop Andrews showed at his best. He was indeed a gentleman of the old school, as Bishop McDowell has said. He did not believe that in conversation his speech should be allowed to drop into the cheap or the trivial. One explanation of his singularly pure diction as a public speaker was the constant practice in clean

speaking that came in his ordinary conversation. The charm about his purity in speech was its entire naturalness. There was nothing strained or stilted. He liked good stories and told many of them, and had a keen sense of humor devoid of malice or sarcasm. The chief mark of his conversation, however, was its extreme kindness, but his kindness did not interfere with his coming to a quick and sure understanding of the caliber of the men with whom he was talking. If any man had imagined that because Bishop Andrews was benign in appearance and courteous and sympathetic in conversation, he could, therefore, be easily duped, he would have made a prodigious mistake.

The Bishop's passion for details took the form many times of rendering little services of which no one else would have thought. If a visitor at his home was to take a train he would gladly give the most minute attention to time-tables and to rates of fare and to the checking of baggage. He could think of possible contingencies and anticipate details of pleasure or discomfort which would have occurred to no mind but his own. If he had been a general he would have excelled not only in the realm of grand strategy but also in the sphere of the supervision of the baggage train down to the last item. Though he was very severe with himself in demanding exactness in any kind of detail, he was very patient toward others. One hot July day the family were about to start for Minnewaska, where the Bishop had been for years such a favorite that he came to be known among the summer boarders as the Bishop of Minnewaska. On this par-

ticular occasion six trunks were to be checked through, and at the very last minute it was discovered that a member of the family had overlooked one of the trunks, thus causing embarrassment and delay in the program for the travel. This mistake was of the kind Bishop Andrews himself would never have made, but he had no word of criticism or annoyance for the one who had made the mistake.

The Bishop delighted in rendering services to the ministers of Brooklyn during this period of retirement. He loved to preach and was not quite happy if he had to pass a Sunday without preaching. He used to say that if he had no prearranged engagement he would go off to the outskirts of the city to some small church whose pastor's plans would not be seriously disarranged by the postponement of his own sermon to a later date in order that the Bishop might preach. If a minister was sick he would be unremittingly faithful in pastoral attentions to him and unwearied in any assistance that he might render. Just a few months before he died he took a long ride through Brooklyn to hold a Quarterly Conference for a presiding elder who happened to be ill.

It is hardly fitting that a sketch like this should intrude far into the sacredness of Bishop Andrews's family relations, but his delight in his home was known to all who knew him. It was given to him and Mrs. Andrews to live together for more than fifty years. It would be hard to find a more perfect companionship than that of Bishop and Mrs. Andrews. Though the tastes of both were for the highest and best, in

many ways they supplemented each other: The mind of Bishop Andrews was preëminently practical in its cast. He had little talent for speculative metaphysics, for example. Mrs. Andrews, on the other hand, had been for years a student of the profoundest books in philosophy. She read and reread the works of Professor Bowne with increasing satisfaction. It was from conversation with Mrs. Andrews that the Bishop received much of his knowledge of modern philosophical problems and much of his sympathy with the new currents of thought flowing through the theological world. Between such minds the conversation naturally took a wide range. Political events, the latest books, development in the world of art—these and countless other realms were explored in the family conversation. During these years the daughter, Miss Grace, was at home, bringing to the family circle a wealth of cultivated discernment and taste in which the father took great joy. The family of Mr. and Mrs. Ingraham were not far away, and the other children, Mr. Edward Andrews, at Birmingham, Alabama, and Mrs. Nixon, of Boston, made frequent pilgrimages to Brevoort Place.

About his own personal religious experience Bishop Andrews was inclined to be reticent except with friends whom he thoroughly knew. He came into the Church at a very early age, and there is no record anywhere to show that any sharp struggle attended the beginning of his Christian life. He believed in testimony services in prayer meeting but would not say anything about his own experience except what might be of value to all. His inner aspirations and

inspirations he regarded in the light of confidences between himself and the Divine Father. Occasionally he would reveal to a friend something of the struggle through which he had passed at this or that crisis, but only occasionally, as, for example, when at Los Angeles in connection with the vote of retirement he told Dr. E. S. Tipple that he had had a struggle. All who knew him, however, were aware that he was in a real sense a man of prayer. He did not look for startling or spectacular answers to his petitions but found in prayer a quickening exercise and discipline which stimulated his entire life.

If we were to speak of a growth in grace on the part of Bishop Andrews, we should probably have to say that the most notable line of religious development came in his increasing self-control over a temper naturally quick. When Bishop Andrews was a young minister he was somewhat given to sharp judgment of his brethren. His mother once said of him: "I am afraid that Edward is inclined to be censorious." We have spoken elsewhere of the extreme kindness of the Bishop and of his equable temperament. We do not wish to give the impression that this gentleness came of itself. Those who stood closest to the Bishop would be the first to declare that the charitableness of his mature life was really a triumph of grace over a nature which if left to itself might have been somewhat harsh.

Throughout all his life the Bishop kept the need for the personal salvation of all those with whom he came in contact uppermost in his mind. He dared speak to men personally about their religious condition with a directness which made his word the

word of a high priest. The writer of these lines once saw him draw a prominent politician in New York city to one side in a social gathering and engage him in deep and earnest conversation, the conversation being a direct appeal to the politician to bring a religious purpose into all his activities. In a fatherly way he more than once pointed out to his friends errors of which they were in peril. He once said to a friend: "I must go to So-and-So and tell him that he is in danger of falling into a certain ruinous habit. I have thought of this for a long, long time, and am afraid that my words will break the friendship between us. Nevertheless, I feel that it is my duty to speak to him."

It may seem strange to those who saw the serene countenance of Bishop Andrews to be told that he had his moments of deep discouragement. The discouragement had a double root. To begin with the Bishop was a sufferer through many years from insomnia. Many a time he would find relief from his restlessness only by rising from his bed and beginning work at his desk at two o'clock in the morning. Quite likely this lifelong insomnia was partly responsible for an occasional feeling of discouragement. The other factor in the discouragement, however, was the loftiness of his own personal ideals. He never could be satisfied with himself. In his early years he felt compelled to give up writing his sermons because he never could bear to read them after he had written them. At times he would be distressed over his own "inability to preach," as he called it. He was to preach one day for Dr. A. H. Tuttle, of

the Newark Conference. Just before he rose to preach he walked over to Dr. Tuttle in evident distress and requested him to leave the room. Dr. Tuttle desired to know why. "I can preach before the people but not before you." was the response. On another occasion he remarked to a dear friend that it seemed to him that his own life had been an abject failure, and seemed inexpressibly grateful for the friend's word of encouragement. As we think of these scenes we must not misunderstand them. They were really indications of the strength of Bishop Andrews. His ideals were so high that they kept him at all times genuinely humble and modest.

In kindly ministrations to his friends, in instructive and inspiring services of preaching, in almost continuous work upon church boards and committees, the closing months of Bishop Andrews's life passed away. In the fall of 1907 the Bishops were to meet at Spokane, and the Missionary Board was to meet at Seattle, Washington. A number of new questions were to come up at Seattle in view of the reorganization of the Missionary Society, and Bishop Andrews felt that he must be present. To go, however, meant considerable personal sacrifice. There was the long journey across the continent, and the absence from the friends at home, an absence which became more painful to him with every passing month. Still, the Bishop felt that he must go, and he made the journey, first to Spokane, thence to Seattle and Portland, thence to Minneapolis to a family reunion, thence to Little Falls, New York, where he preached what proved to be his last sermon. The intellectual

vigor of the Bishop was never more marked than on this trip. He took part in the discussions at Seattle with keen insight into the new situations created by the reorganization of the Society, and at Portland charmed all by quite an unusual display of wit. As soon as he reached his home, however, his friends saw that he had very seriously impaired his strength. What seemed to be an attack of the gripe came upon him while his vitality was lowered and resulting complications grew increasingly formidable. The Bishop had reached home on November 25, after an absence of one month and one day. His condition grew gradually worse from the time of his arrival, and he passed away peacefully on the last day of the year 1907. Throughout the sickness there was an occasional flash of the characteristic Andrews spirit, which showed that the disease had made no inroads upon his will power. One day as he lay upon his bed he remarked, "I think I will get up." The nurse replied, "The doctor's orders are that you must lie quiet." The Bishop responded in his short, decisive way, "Nevertheless, I will get up." His body, however, proved too weak to sustain his determination.

The first shock which followed the announcement of the death of the Bishop was very great, but after the shock had somewhat subsided there was a very general recognition of the fitness of the manner in which the good life had closed. Bishop Andrews had worked up to within a month of the end, his last services had been valuable to the Church, and he passed away without great suffering, with his mental and spiritual forces in full vigor.

II

TRIBUTES

THE funeral services of Bishop Andrews were held in the New York Avenue Church on the afternoon of Friday, January 3, 1908, with an immense audience present. Many things said at his funeral were so truly descriptive of the real man that we feel constrained to quote from each of the addresses.

Dr. W. V. Kelley said:

“Bishop Andrews as a preacher links himself in my mind by one peculiar achievement with Richard S. Storrs. Bishop Andrews’ sermons were architecture, as were those of Dr. Storrs. They were built up from broad foundations and symmetrically consolidated into unity. There was one intellectual feat that I noticed in both of them to such a degree as I have not noted in any other two men. That was the faculty of building up toward a climax by a succession of clauses, very likely toward the end of the discourse and in the nature of a summing up—a series of clauses that balanced on equal wings, each one discrete and discriminate from the other, no one a repetition in any degree of what went before, each one containing a point, and the whole constituting a progress and advance, steadily moving toward a great comprehensive conclusion. When Storrs reached that climax he always touched it with a flash of

imagination, but Bishop Andrews was not imaginative. The arts of the rhetorician were foreign to his mind as they would be to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. His clauses did not go up to the climax like a flight of birds; rather, he built his clauses up like the courses of stone that built the Great Pyramid; he carried them up in symmetrical and rising construction until the peak stood clear in the sunlight and the reared structure stood firm from foundation to pinnacle. As a master builder of sermons, of the sermon regarded as the noblest sacred architecture in thought and expression, he was not surpassed by Richard S. Storrs, which is saying pretty much all that can be said.

“By a certain event and certain resemblance Bishop Andrews stands in my mind linked with William McKinley. When the most famous and illustrious layman of the Methodist Episcopal Church lay dead by an assassin’s hand the nation planned to hold a great funeral under the dome of the Capitol at Washington. When the eyes of those who had the solemn services in charge swept the land for the most illustrious and distinguished minister of the Church to which McKinley belonged—if that man could be found—the man who would bring most prestige, most of dignity and solid worth, most of trustworthy wisdom of speech to that occasion, the call went out to the North Ohio Conference at Mount Gilead, Ohio, where Bishop Andrews was presiding. Well did the Christian Advocate say that when the word went forth over the land that Bishop Andrews would make the address over McKinley’s dead body the Methodist

Church dismissed from its mind all anxiety concerning the occasion. That address was written or, rather, composed in unfavorable circumstances, with but little time. Summoned in the midst of Conference business, he hurried it to its close, quickly boarded a train, sat down for a time in a parlor car to try to write out what he should say, presently gave up that effort, retired into himself for meditation, and, shutting the door of his mind, closeted it with its subject, and so rode on through the night. Reaching Washington in the morning, he had almost to hurry from the train to the place of the service under the dome of the Capitol. When the Chief Justice of the United States had listened to that address he turned at its close to the man next him and said, 'What a fine and fitting address!' Not only by that stately occasion but also by a certain resemblance is Bishop Andrews linked in my mind with William McKinley. When our martyred President died, in Buffalo, some one who knew him well said as he came out of the house where McKinley had breathed his last to the words, 'Nearer, my God, to thee,' 'The Almighty never breathed the breath of life into a more amiable nature.' Many here and elsewhere would apply those words to Bishop Andrews. Firm though he was, his was an amiable nature, and he was as tactful and gracious as McKinley. By that public funeral these two men stand linked together in the history of Church and state, as Bishop Simpson and Abraham Lincoln, by the funeral oration at Springfield. Simpson and Andrews were as illustrious in their sphere as were Lincoln and McKinley in theirs.

“How was this Bishop regarded inside the Church? A young man, twelve years in the ministry, said recently to one he was talking with about Bishop Andrews, ‘There is a man whose boots I would gladly black, or render to him any other menial service he would permit me to render.’ Who was it said he would have liked to be Shakespeare’s body-servant? Well, it was just as fit for this young minister to say, ‘I would willingly black the boots of Bishop Andrews,’ and that, I take it, was a fair expression of the veneration in which he was held by thousands and thousands of laymen and ministers.

“How was he regarded outside the Church? Go to Washington and go with him to a state reception at the White House; with the judges of the Supreme Court there, with the members of the Cabinet present, with the representatives of the army and the navy there, with the members of both houses of Congress there, with ambassadors from foreign lands there, with prominent citizens there from all over the land, visiting Washington. Go with him from room to room, watch the faces of men as they meet and greet him, and read in their faces and their manner the reverence with which they speak to this man, and you will see, as he passes on from chamber to chamber through the brilliant throng, the nation’s representatives unroll their respect and lay it down like a rich carpet before his feet, deep-piled and velvety and warm with love, for this man to walk upon. Always and everywhere he walked on such a carpet.”

Bishop D. A. Goodsell said:

“In the death of Edward G. Andrews the Church,

in the judgment of his colleagues, has lost one of the greatest Bishops it has ever had, great in every department of ministerial and episcopal labor. It is difficult to say where he was greatest, so rounded and so completed was he. As a preacher, strong, logical, ardent, noble. As an administrator, tender, tactful, firm, unsurpassed within the memory of any of his colleagues in his knowledge of the constitution and legal history of the Church of his love. He was a marvel of painstaking accuracy in any work committed to his hands. He was so judicial that his opinion upon any question of law was to his colleagues the final word, as he approached the consideration of such questions with perfect candor, with a deep sense of justice and without any idiosyncrasy of opinion that might lead him to depart from the strictest legal interpretation. He was cheerful, even joyous, and yet always maintained himself within the limits of Christian dignity. His platform work was as fine as his pulpit work. He was most unassuming in his bearing. He was distrustful of his ability, yet he put his great strength always to the utmost upon every task to which he was assigned. In the whole thirty-five years of his episcopate I think no one ever heard him say a word, and, assuredly, he never did a deed, that was unworthy of the office which he held. He was open and candid when he ought to be, and reticent when that was his duty. In our homes he was a most charming guest, in our travels a most delightful companion, and in his own home a most considerate host. He was as a friend at once inspiring by the quality of his ideas, the high plane upon

which he lived, and restful, also, in the calm which was his through a great trust in God and through the Christian philosophy to which he had attained."

Bishop McDowell said:

"It would be an utter impropriety for me to attempt an analysis of his qualities. We did not analyze him while he was with us. We did not make an inventory of his qualities, certainly not of his defects. We just loved him, admired him, trusted him and rejoiced in him. His total impression upon us was all we could desire. Those New Testament terms say it as well as we could say it. He was and, I venture to say, is, a man of God—not less a man of God than he is now a man *with* God. He had a personal understanding of the religious life. He knew for himself the doctrines of grace. He was deeply religious. He prayed like a saint or a mystic. Once in a while in prayer we were caught up in the sweep of his expression until we fairly saw things which it is not lawful to utter. No one could pray like that in public who did not do much praying in private. He defined piety in his life. That seems the key to it. His piety was both a rapture and a conviction; it ran through his feeling, his thought, and his conscience. He would have been as ashamed of a false emotion as of a false statement. His piety was like a heart of oak in the midst of his feelings, his thinking, and his conduct. His emotional life was as genuine as it was warm. Jesus Christ was at the center of it, making it both honest and vital. He would not assume, nor affect, an emotion he did not really feel. His emotions were like his perfect manners. He

would neither put them on nor put them off. He would have scorned an affectation not as a weakness but as a kind of impiety.

“This piety gave the same sort of integrity, reality, and genuineness to his thinking. He regarded thinking as a duty. It never occurred to him as a godly man that he could quit thinking. On the long journey to the Pacific Coast in October he carried his Greek Testament, and read it daily, and during that journey he made his traveling companion read him one of the latest books—the Cole lectures at Vanderbilt University by the late Ian Maclaren. His mental life had conscience in it. That made it active and made it honest. He read many books. No man read more. He kept up with modern thought. The Episcopal Address in 1900 was the work of a man alive at the top. A year and a half ago at Garrett’s Semicentennial he gave that profound address on the ‘Pastor and His Bible.’ It is probably the most notable utterance made in our Church that year. I cannot forget how as we walked together two days before its delivery he outlined it to me, and then said: ‘I am no longer young. I shall not have many more occasions equal to this in my life. The times are troubled. I suppose I owe it to the Church, to my brethren in the ministry, to leave my testimony.’ He left it. He knew the changes in thought that had come since he entered the ministry in 1848. He did not ignore them nor seek to belittle their meaning for thought and faith. That same piety of thinking shot through the address like light. It saved him from being either a reactionary or a radical. It was the event of a

lifetime to listen while he went on. He made an atmosphere in which men, modern men, could live and breathe. He made room in which many men could walk and work. The roof was lifted above our heads so that we saw the heavens open and new angels of faith and power ascending and descending. It was late afternoon when he closed, but it seemed to many that the sun was rising, not going down. To some men there that day and to many others elsewhere the address was a new working document for our Church, not unlike John Wesley's great paper on 'The Character of a Methodist.'

"It was of a piece with his summary of our fundamental doctrine in the address at Chicago in 1900. Indeed, his mental life was all of a piece. Piety gave integrity to his intellectual processes. It is worth much to our generation to have had such an illustrious example of one who studied with the diligence and candor of a scientist, reasoned with the accuracy of a logician, related truths with the grasp of a philosopher, and through it all prayed with the faith and vision of a saint and mystic."

Dr. S. Parkes Cadman said:

"He was content that lesser people should loom adventitious in the public eye, for he stood in his lot to the end of his days. He did not cry nor strive, nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets. But men learned to trust his words, and the wisdom and discretion in him were ripe and fruitful. I believe it no stroke of temerity to hold that he will be classed with the greatest of his predecessors. And this principally because the elements were so well mixed in

him: a sacred orator of chastened style and sober virility, guiltless of oratorical display awakening effusiveness; a scholar whose intrepid search for reality delivered him from the disfigurements of the vain traditions of men; a saint who never affected more than he felt nor trespassed beyond the boundaries of reverence in his confessions of the unspeakable glories, his very restraint became his armed might, and praise was none less praise because it sat silent on his tongue.

“He lived as a Bishop in the fierce light that searches the occupants of a demanding position. He saw the episcopacy pass beyond the glamour of earlier romance and enter an almost more arduous sphere. He knew the perils that attend a weakened leadership in the Church of God, and how that Christian democracy to-day will not be contented with the recital of proud and successful epochs that are gone. But for him it was a fitting and a long-held education, increasing in weight and meaning and gathering luster all the way along. And as he drew near to the heavenly country, where he was presently to put ashore, the spicy gales of that paradise began to break upon him. Time dealt very gently with this child of hers, before she yielded him to the eternities. To the last hour of mortal life he was quick with sympathy and vital with love. Robed in the venerable loveliness of age, stages of decay were scarcely evident, or if seen here and there they but increased his winsomeness. A light not of earth shone on his beloved form, and when he stood forth in the Church for teaching and exhortation she gave praise to her

Head for so precious a gift prolonged in unabated vigor."

Dr. J. M. Buckley said:

"Not one of the more than fifty bishops in the history of the Church resembled Bishop Andrews. He was industrious, but not more so than Bishop Janes. He was ever a gentleman. So was John Emory before him, and William X. Ninde after him. What, then, was there in Bishop Andrews which sets him forth as a figure unparalleled? Why is it, if it be so, that it is difficult to analyze him? The perfect man in moral and intellectual integrity never makes a full impression at any given period. Some such men are immovable and accomplish nothing. Others are sluggish and cannot be fully understood.

"The actual personality of Edward Gayer Andrews is to be found in his balance, with power over all his qualities. His mental, physical, and emotional susceptibilities and all his faculties were above those of the average of mankind and all of them worked, not obliquely, not in a slow and feeble manner, but always producing the exact amount of power to cover the situation. Who ever heard him speak in an illogical or unforceful way? Who ever saw him disturbed in presiding at an Annual Conference? Who ever, in the General Conference, saw him obliged to turn to a brother Bishop and ask for instruction before giving a decision? Who ever heard him preach a poor sermon? Who ever heard of his being unable to enter into any company without embarrassment, without assumption? Who ever saw anything of the nature of imperiousness in him? The utterances of some

bold or absurd person who might interrupt even the presiding officer, and be out of order in doing this, may have, for a moment, irritated him, but this master-balance with power caused him to stand as the man of self-control, the man who, having to say a disagreeable thing, said it in the most agreeable manner he could command.

“It would not be proper to apply to him the word ‘enthusiasm,’ for enthusiasm is liable to be radical, to send forth power beyond the necessities of the occasion, and, therefore, suggest flightiness, which means that the person was unduly excited, and raises a question whether judgment be sound. ‘Ardor’ is the word which describes his state at all times unless fatigue prevented its rise. His spirit could not fitly be compared to a mountain stream, nor to a sluggish stream running through a plain. Bishop Andrews must be compared, in his lifework, to a deep and wide, but clear stream with a steady movement to the ocean. Only one river in our whole land seems suited to symbolize his spirit and movement—the beautiful river that rises in the White Mountains and passes down through the States, the beautiful Merrimac. Once a friend reported to him that this simile had been applied to him; he received the compliment with a smile and said, ‘I am afraid there is low water sometimes.’ If he were living, and here, we would not dare to speak of him so. He might at least think we had some ulterior end. He could not imagine himself to be what we know he was.

“Officialism sometimes makes phonographs and automatic machines of men, but not so was it with

him. Once he said to a friend: 'I am worried with these troubles. Here there is a church that will be greatly grieved if I reappoint to it a certain man, and here is a man that will be practically ruined if I do not appoint him there.' In the silence of the night the Bishop arose, being careful not to awaken a brother who occupied the same room. He arose softly, knelt at a chair, and there remained whispering prayers to Almighty God to teach him how to compose this most serious difficulty. The Methodist Episcopal Church will never complain of 'officialism' if its administrators blend with official authority humble, earnest prayer to God for direction."

We add also a few other tributes taken here and there from a great number. Dr. Thomas E. Elliott, of Seattle, Washington, wrote:

"At the annual meeting of the Board of Foreign Missions in this city I secured Bishop Edward G. Andrews to preach for me at the Queen Anne Methodist Episcopal Church on November 10, 1907. It occurred to me this may have been his last sermon. He preached from the text: 'He saved others; himself he cannot save.' He preached with vigor for fifty minutes and made a profound impression on the congregation. At the close of the sermon I had to go immediately to a funeral. He, knowing this, said, 'I will not go over to dinner with you, as I know you have to hurry'—this in answer to my invitation to him to dine with us. He left the church for the hotel, and as we watched him for a short distance, and saw an approaching car, we said, 'There, that is too bad, he will miss that car.' But, to my surprise, he ran

like a young man and caught it. The next day he spoke with much fervor on the missionary work.

“Bishop Andrews was one of the most saintly men I ever knew. Never did a pastor get anything but the best he could give from his hands. His kindly look won his audience; his words brought his hearers to tears; his sermons, as a whole, left a lasting impression. His life, so far as I have known him, has inspired me, and will continue to inspire to the end.”

Dr. W. D. Marsh, pastor at Little Falls, New York, writes thus concerning the last sermon of our Bishop's life. The sermon was delivered at Little Falls on the Sunday before Bishop Andrews reached home from his last trip:

“I never heard Bishop Andrews preach as well as he did that day, though I had heard very great sermons from him before. That day he seemed inspired. In very deed and without exaggeration, it was massive, magnificent, and glorious. His long life of thought and experience fitted him to declare the gospel of God as few men have ever done it. I shall never forget that day nor the preacher. He was so delightful, too, in our home, that we loved him as well as honored him.”

Professor William North Rice, of Wesleyan University, wrote:

“He was so true and brave and gentle—an Israelite indeed, in whom was no guile. His vision of the truth was so clear, his spirit so candid, his loyalty to his best convictions so perfect. Well-deserved honors came to him richly, and how meekly he bore them! How absolutely unpretentious he was! How much of

deep and earnest thought he could conceal in a sermon apparently so simple that a child could enjoy it and think he understood it! How the whole church has loved and trusted him! No head so clear, no hand so steady at the helm in church affairs in our generation.

"I am thankful that I have seen and known him, not only in public, listening to the sermons which were so clear that thoughtless hearers did not know how deep they were, or watching the judicial temper and mingled firmness and courtesy with which he presided in a Conference; but that I have also had the privilege of meeting him in his home and mine, where I have seen how gentle and unobtrusive a great man could be. He has been one of the saints who have been to me an inspiration.

"How young he was when past fourscore! Hospitable to new ideas as when he was in his prime. Yes, he *was* in his prime at fourscore. He seemed to grow in power at an age when other men decay. And, if he must be mortal like the rest of us, I am glad that there was no long period of decay, no weary time in which he who had borne so strongly and so tenderly the cares of others had to be borne in weakness and helplessness by others. From an earthly life so full and strong, so rich in honor to himself and in blessing to others, he has passed suddenly—in his case it is easy for us to believe—into a life yet fuller and stronger and richer."

Dr. William V. Kelley, at a memorial service held at Saint Louis by the General Committee on Foreign Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church, November 9, 1908, spoke as follows:

“In the make-up and methods of Edward G. Andrews there was nothing startling, dramatic, or spectacular. His qualities were of the sterling, not the showy, sort. The man was so rounded and symmetrical in himself, and so uniform, regular, and unostentatious in his ways, as oftentimes to prevent the undiscerning from perceiving his superiority and real impressiveness. No particular quality or faculty was conspicuous, for all faculties in him were uniformly excellent. As were his abilities, so was his work—uniform, regular, reliable; not spurts, but maintaining steadily a high level of efficiency, administering all affairs wisely, and carrying all interests safely.

“Twenty-five years ago one of the supreme judges of our communion said: ‘Bishop Andrews fills the bill all round; the Church perceives no deficiency in him on any occasion or at any point.’ And in the closing decade of his life, so unimpaired were all his faculties, so great and broad was his wisdom, and so sound his judgment, that his colleagues spoke of him as ‘a wonderful man.’

“He was modest in his self-estimate, and did not feel that in any particular he had fully attained or was already perfect; but his fellow men sometimes said to each other when he passed by, ‘Mark the perfect man.’ Certain it is that so large a number of strong and useful abilities and of admirable and attractive qualities has seldom in all the history of our Church been assembled in one personality. And from this sum total there seems nothing to deduct on account of freak or flaw or observable fault. There

was no seamy side to his character or life, but smooth consistency on every side.

“Michael Angelo in advanced age worshiped the beauty of the normal. The blind old artist used to have himself led to the famous Torso in the Vatican that he might pass his hand over it and feel with his fingers the perfect outline of part of a normal human form, no bone in it displaced, no muscle distorted, no excess or defect at any point—the marble embodiment of human symmetry. In Edward G. Andrews we saw the beauty of the normal and the symmetrical.

“As he was possibly unsurpassed in the aggregate excellence of his character and life, so also he rendered a probably unsurpassed and possibly unparalleled sum total of official service. For this fact a list of explanations can be given. His unvarying health enabled him to keep going all the time. In all his life he never sent for a doctor to come to see him until after he was seventy-three years old. The almost equal good health of his family also kept him from detention by domestic affliction. Not more than once, or at the most twice, in his over three decades of episcopal work did anything prevent him from presiding over a Conference to which he had been assigned. In addition to his own work, he often took the Conferences and filled the engagements of his brother Bishops when they were ill or in affliction.

“Moreover, his inflexible habits of fidelity and punctuality insured his presence at every meeting or occasion where duty or promise or expectation required him to be; and at every meeting of committee

or board or Conference, it was his habit to be present at the moment named, in time for the opening of business and to remain until the close to see the last least item of business finished. The fact that he kept this up incessantly through thirty-two long years of active effective episcopal life makes it probable that in sum total of official service his record is unsurpassed, and quite possibly unequaled in all the history of our Church.

“Furthermore, as adding to his sum total of values, his knowledge of Church law and his judicial mind, together with his habitual prudence, cautiousness, and careful consideration, made his administration and rulings wise and sound and entirely profitable to the Church. Still further, his methodical habits, scrupulous, conscientious, and painstaking accuracy, saved his work from confusion and his reports from error.”

Dr. Theodore L. Cuyler wrote in the *Christian Advocate* of September 3, 1908:

“My acquaintance with him and with Gilbert Haven began in 1845 at Middletown, when they were students in the Wesleyan University. Almost thirty years after that I had them at my table to meet D. L. Moody, and I said to him, ‘There are two noble Bishops, and I knew them both when they were promising youths in college.’ My departed friend never sought the office of Bishop; but the fact that the General Conference that elected him was meeting here in Brooklyn, where he was then stationed, helped to swell his majority, for every one had a loving word to say for him. During my long life of four score

and six, I have been well acquainted with a large number of your Bishops, from the venerable Elijah Hedding onward, and with some of them intimately. But not one of them has ever surpassed my dear Brother Andrews in winsome courtesy, clear-eyed sagacity, sound wisdom, and most fervid Christ-loving zeal for everything true and holy. In behalf of his Presbyterian brethren let me lay this brief tribute among the thousands that crown his beautiful memory."

The following affectionate tribute came from Judge Andrews:

"His history as educator and as minister and Bishop in the Church he loved is an open book. Others are better qualified to estimate the influence he exercised in his ministry. It has seemed to me that in him the intellectual and emotional natures were so harmoniously blended as to give him peculiar power as a preacher. He had a broad intellectual vision united with an intense human sympathy and an ever-dominating sense that religion alone was a power capable of meeting the needs of individuals and of protecting society and civilization against disrupting influences. He accepted with unquestioning belief the mysteries of the Christian faith, but in his preaching he put little emphasis on theological subtleties. His primary aim was to win men to the acceptance of the gospel and to the leading of a Christian life. The life of my brother is full of precious memories to those in the family circle. He was eminently social and had a keen sense of humor. He loved his family and relatives with an affection never abated

or dulled by distance or by the difference in pursuits or circumstances. He was always tender, considerate, and helpful. He seldom failed to visit his brothers and sisters on his journeys at however great a sacrifice of time or strength, and they looked forward to these occasions with unqualified pleasure. Shortly before his death, on his return from Seattle, the surviving brothers and sisters met at Minneapolis and the pleasant memories of that meeting will not soon be effaced. The husband, the father, and the brother has left us, but his fragrant memory and life is a consolation to the bereaved and sorrowful."

Dr. Thomas Bowman Stephenson, of England, wrote:

"I must begin this letter by laying a wreath, in the name of British Methodism, on the grave of Bishop Andrews. I am confident that the entire mother Church of Methodism will approve my action, for Bishop Andrews visited our Conference in the year 1894 and made an impression which has never faded in the minds of those who heard his official utterances and met him in private. Already venerable in age, 'his bow abode in strength.' Modest, courteous, dignified, brotherly, wise both in speech and silence, and carrying with him an unction of the Holy One, he was the very model of a Christian Bishop. His address, long but not a moment too long, was one of the finest utterances we have ever heard from a representative. Bishop Simpson, by his two marvelous sermons, at Liverpool in 1857, and at Burslem in 1870, left upon the Conference an impression of mighty preaching which has never been equaled, and

which is a golden memory to those, now becoming very few, who can recall those occasions. But even Simpson's addresses were not finer than that of Bishop Andrews. It could not be surpassed as an exposition of the principles which underlie the constitution of his Church, as a picture of the march of his Church to ever-widening victory, and as a sagacious anticipation alike of the successes and the dangers which awaited his Church in the coming time. His was a great personality, without the least self-consciousness. He was a true saint, without a tinge of sanctimoniousness. He was a 'master of assemblies,' yet simple and sincere as a little child. When such a servant of Christ is granted to the prayers of the Church until he is well past his eightieth year, murmuring at his removal would be unseemly indeed. Surely we must say, 'Our loss is his infinite gain,' and give thanks to the Lord of life, for his 'servant departed this life in his faith and fear,' while we pray that 'with him and all the saved we may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom.' I have one delightful memory of Bishop Andrews, in company with another great Bishop of the Church, Randolph S. Foster. I was spending a few days at Marthas Vineyard. Foster was also staying there, and I spent delightful hours in listening to his wonderful talk of things deepest and highest. Andrews came down for a day or two. Their courtesy to me was beautiful, and much beyond my desert. They suggested to me that we should have a drive together. So in due time we set out, driving on a road which bordered the breathing Atlantic. A bright sun was shining, all nature seemed at her best,

and these two fathers of the Church conversed on the welfare of the Church and the mysteries of faith and love. They accepted with respect my little contributions to the talk of the moment. But I was well content to listen, so far as courtesy would permit. And that golden association with these great and good men is a picture in my mind which I think will not fade throughout eternity. I cannot finish this little offering of affectionate respect better than by quoting the words in which the British Conference recognized the character and the work of its American visitor: 'We received with high satisfaction your fraternal messenger, the Rev. Bishop Andrews. His dignified and affectionate bearing, his eloquent and luminous exposition of the constitution, genius, and position of your Church, his sermons and speeches on several important occasions commended and endeared him to us all. We rejoice that God gives you, in your chief pastorate, worthy successors of Asbury, McKendree, and Simpson.' 'Long may the bright succession rise among you of noble Christian men in Church and state.'"

Dr. H. A. Buttz, of Drew Theological Seminary, wrote:

"The characteristic which impresses one in relation to Bishop Andrews was his universality. He had broad visions of the work of the Church, and nothing pertaining to its welfare was foreign to him. He cheerfully accepted positions of responsibility in many fields and with all of them he was profoundly sympathetic. This universality of his sympathies was a part of his personality. Breadth of appreciation and

of interest in human welfare characterized him to an unusual degree. With his universality there was combined concentration. While he was interested in all, he gave special attention to each. He studied with care every interest committed to him, and the minutest matters received his careful consideration. The closeness of his study of the affairs of the seminary was manifest in all the deliberations of the Board of Trustees. No detail was regarded as unimportant, and for the time being that one interest was his great concern. He exemplified the maxim, 'A whole man to one thing at a time' in a remarkable degree.

"Another characteristic of Bishop Andrews was development. He recognized the necessity of all interests to grow, and he grew with them. I have in another place referred to his own powers of growth down to his latest years. Those most closely associated with him recognized a constant growth in his relations to great interests and in his capacities, and he was ever fresh to meet immediate conditions. I recall that on one occasion he was called upon suddenly to deliver an address at the seminary in the place of another who had been expected. He came without hesitancy and exhibited a freshness of thought and a freshness of adaptation to the immediate necessities of the occasion which astonished all who were present. It was the expression of youth and not of age, although he had reached the age of eighty."

Bishop J. W. Hamilton wrote:

"He had so much of youth that he took part in the discussions of the young people with as much relish as if he expected to be elected to the General Confer-

ence because of his well-known opinion of 'paragraph 248.' His last paper which was printed in the Methodist Review was a serious contribution to, and quite comprehensive of, the whole subject of popular amusements. He had 'a talent for affairs,' and was just as intensely interested in all the letters, science, and politics as he was in the religion of the times.

"He 'grew up into things' from his youth. He made a steady onward march from the years of his boyhood to the end of his days. Fortunate as to his family, his early privileges and his health, he has given us a splendid example of 'the perseverance of the saints.' He appears to have been successful in everything; his methods, his habits, his circumstances all contributed. He united with the Church when he was ten years old, was licensed to preach at eighteen, graduated from the university on his twenty-second birthday, and entered the Conference the following year. He was twice president of denominational schools, eight years pastor of the large churches in or near New York, twice a member of the General Conference and for nearly thirty-six years in the episcopal office. He was eminent as a teacher, conspicuous as a preacher, and distinguished as a Bishop. He was cautious and conservative and not always in advance of the thought of the Church, or even abreast in its forward movements; his opinions relative to the colored preachers and people underwent several changes of garments during his administration as general superintendent of their churches. His oppositeness to the General Conference when the women were admitted to its member-

ship, if not shifted, 'carried its oar loose,' that it might be shifted 'hither or thither at pleasure,' according as the measure was a failure or success. But he has more than merely held his course since. His tolerant views of the claims made by the 'liberal professors' in the theological schools have put him in 'advance' of a number of even the younger Bishops. And his latest opinion of amusements is far and away in the lead of the legislation of the Church."

Dr. John C. Ferguson, of Shanghai, wrote in *Zion's Herald*:

"How sad the death of Bishop Andrews! And yet how full of usefulness his life was! His was the path that shines brighter and brighter unto the perfect noonday. He had a larger variety of endearing qualities than any minister whom I ever knew. I saw him once at Nanking, when the two Chinese coolies who were carrying his trunk on board a boat dropped it into the water, soaking all his clothes and some of his papers. After the accident I helped him in rearranging his things and getting them dried; but, during the whole process, I did not hear from him one impatient word. He stayed with me, in my house, for nearly a week with Mrs. Andrews, and was a model of thoughtfulness to every one in the household. I remember hearing Merry Ketcham say that when the General Conference met in Cincinnati and he was acting as a page at the door, opening and closing it for those who went in and out, Bishop Andrews, of all the delegates for whom he opened and closed the door, was the only man that always turned his head and said, 'Thank you.' These two incidents,

in the smaller affairs of life, show the real greatness of the man. What a loss his departure is to our Church!"

The Rev. Dr. Clarence O. Kimball, of Spokane, wrote in Zion's Herald:

"It was my privilege to entertain in my church the fall conference of the Bishops during the first week in November. The advance correspondence had informed us that Bishop Andrews would come in the company of Bishop McDowell, and the two were provided entertainment together. The senior Bishop seemed so vigorous and alert that the precaution appeared unnecessary. Only two weeks ago a large cut of Bishop Andrews adorned the title-page of the Pacific Christian Advocate, with this inscription: 'The best loved and most trusted man in Methodism.' This high ascription of praise would have appeared fully substantiated to all who could have observed the reverence manifested toward him in all the committee meetings, and on the part of the entire Church of this territory. His vision was so clear, his grasp of facts so sure, his memory so accurate, his judgment so sound, his statement so lucid that his word on any question had tremendous weight. Add to this his courtly manner, his gracious spirit, his deep piety, and his consummate tactfulness, and you have the ideal Bishop.

"He spoke at the public banquet tendered to the Bishops at Spokane, and preached Sunday morning at Sprague, a small town near the city, on the special request of the pastor, whose wife is a niece of Bishop Andrews. Sunday night Bishop McDowell was to

preach in my church, and upon leaving the hotel before Bishop Andrews had arrived, he left word with the clerk to tell the venerable Bishop where his colleague had gone, but that he, Bishop Andrews, was not to follow, because he would need rest and should retire early. While we were singing the hymn just before the sermon the benign face of the good old Bishop appeared at the door, and the usher was seating him there at his own request when I intervened and took him to the platform, where he sat during Bishop McDowell's great sermon on 'The Sower,' and then led in choice words of memorable prayer. My last definite memory of the Bishop is of his address following the banquet at Portland. He occupied a place among the guests on the platform. Dr. H. C. Jennings, who sat by my side in the audience, remarked to me: 'Do you think that when you are eighty-five you will sit on the platform and speak like that?' The next day, with Dr. E. S. Tipple as traveling companion, he started on his return East, being excused from further attendance on the committee meetings in order that he might attend at Minneapolis a family reunion of four surviving members of his father's family, the youngest of whom is eighty-one."

Bishop E. R. Hendrix, of the Methodist Church, South, wrote:

"For more than half of his long life of eighty-two years I was intimately acquainted with Bishop E. G. Andrews. Although he graduated at the Wesleyan University in 1847, the year of my birth, yet twenty years later, while he was on a visit to his alma mater, he showed much interest in a graduate of the class

of '67, and when I was taking my theological course at the Union Seminary in New York city I frequently preached for him at Sands Street and Saint John's in Brooklyn, and found that it was on his suggestion that I filled a number of other Methodist pulpits in that city. It was on his motion that I became assistant pastor of the Pacific Street Methodist Church, with Dr. Thomas Sewall, whose health began to fail in 1868. With such kindred spirits as E. G. Andrews and A. S. Hunt, a friendship was begun that grew more intimate and sacred with the years. Few letters passed between us, but whenever we met there were heart-to-heart talks as of old, and as free and hearty as if we were of one communion. Some of these in the Bishop's room in New York, and others at the great ecumenical and centennial gatherings of Methodists, revealed the great ecclesiastical statesman no less than did his episcopal address written when he was seventy-five years of age, a notable state paper of the highest order, from which I quoted in my address to the British Wesleyan Conference in 1900. How often we discussed together the future of Methodism in America! And few minds saw more clearly what wise statesmanship would be needed should there be but one episcopal Methodism."

Dr. A. J. Lyman, pastor of the South Congregational Church of Brooklyn, wrote:

"Sagacity without intrusiveness, benignity without effusiveness, fidelity without favoritism, and piety without conceit—such as these were the qualities which, existing in high degree, blended in a certain excellent symmetry, and toned to a rhythm of manhood

at once genial and noble, made Bishop Andrews to be the Bishop of us all—*our* Bishop Andrews—true 'Bishop,' friend and counselor, not only in his own communion but also in the entire arena of our American Protestantism. The American Church has not produced a wiser or dearer ecclesiastic, a more winsome embodiment of catholic urbanity. And yet the words, somehow, fail to render forth the spring and charm of the spirit of this man, and are quite too barren to compass the impression actually conveyed by his open and sunny personality. To know him was an education in the sentiment of confidence in which honor and affection were equally mingled. Almost before you knew it, certainly before he himself in his rare modesty had suspected it, you had given him your best of reverent regard. One loved to recognize in him Saint Paul's ancient and immortal picture of the *good* Bishop, reproduced upon the true scriptural lines, and yet mellowed and brightened and set in a singular felicity of just adaptation to the living scenery of the present age. In the result dwelt a noble simplicity, together with a subtle and spiritual distinction. You always felt it impossible to be otherwise than happy after meeting Bishop Andrews.

"One trait, springing from the depths of his Christian manhood and brought to the most exquisite finish by constant exercise, seemed to the present writer supreme in its kind, irradiating his entire office and ministry, namely, his intelligent and sympathetic fellow feeling for and with the *younger men* of his vocation. This grace of senior comradeship was in him as far from patronage as it was from mere pro-

fessional civility. Nor was it simply that good-natured paternalism which sits among its 'boys' in the undress of easy but commonplace companionship. Bishop Andrews *stood up* to greet his young comrade, as though the Great Captain's eye were on both, and in answer every fiber and filament of true soul in the young man *stood up* also to receive the good man's greeting—a salutation which was an accolade, a 'God-speed' which was at once a benediction and a charge."

President W. F. Warren, of Boston University, writes:

"Who shall be found able rightly to characterize Edward Gayer Andrews? Hardly one who loved him as devotedly as I; certainly no one who, knowing him, could love him less. When or where I first met him I do not remember. Wherever or whenever it was, he at once seemed to me an old acquaintance with whom I had enjoyed unnumbered years of good fellowship. We were together in the General Conference of 1872, but served on different committees. It was thereafter ever a pleasure to me to have given a vote toward the making of such a man a Bishop in the Church of God.

"Bishop Andrews always impressed me as one of the rarest of men in the variety and harmony of his excellences. The services he rendered our Church were many and great, but the greatest of them all escapes grasp or formulation. It was that unconscious and indefinable effluence of personality which has been the inspiration of young men, the invigoration of fellow workers, the harmonizing of colleagues, the

uplift and comfort of the total Church. How good were his words and works! But

“Best seemed the thing he was. He joined
Each office of the social hour
To noble manners, as the flower
And native growth of noble mind;

“Nor ever narrowness or spite
Or villain fancy fleeting by,
Drew in the expression of an eye,
Where God and Nature met in light.”

We come to the close of this inadequate sketch. We have not attempted a formal biography of the Bishop but have sought merely to look at his service in the different spheres of his ministry. We feel that after we have said all we have not said anything. The best part of Bishop Andrews was what he himself was, and this escapes description. Those who stood closest to him realize this most and to all such no word of tribute can be satisfactory. Our hope is that the mere reference to the different spheres that the Bishop filled may call to the friends of the Bishop the memory of the Bishop himself.

We have said that the close of the Bishop's life, coming as it did while he was still in full mental vigor, was in a sense fitting and appropriate. We would not by such expression, however, seek to disguise the sense of loss which increases as the days go by. Bishop Andrews has not yet been gone two years, but already we are beginning to see that the loss to the Church is greater than we could have imagined at the moment of his death. Especially is this true

in the case of the younger ministers, hundreds of whom were born since the date of the Bishop's election. To these the sense of desolation is most acute. The older ministers valued Edward G. Andrews for his brotherliness and companionship. The younger men had come to look to him for light upon the ever-changing situations which make their lot increasingly bewildering. As we have already said, the Bishop has not been gone two years, but hundreds of the younger men exclaim now—not out of sudden impulse, but out of a deepening conviction as to the value of the leadership of Edward G. Andrews—"My father, my father: the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof!"

IV

PAPERS AND SERMONS

I

ADDRESS OF BISHOP ANDREWS AT FUNERAL SERVICE OF PRESI- DENT WILLIAM MCKINLEY, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1901

BLESSED be the God and Father of our Lord, who of his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope of the resurrection of Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us who are now, by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time.

The services for the dead are fitly and almost of necessity services of religion and of immortal hope. In the presence of the shroud and the coffin and the narrow home, questions concerning intellectual quality, concerning public station, concerning great achievements, sink into comparative insignificance; and questions concerning character and man's relation to the Lord and Giver of life, even the life eternal, emerge to our view and impress themselves upon us.

Character abides. We bring nothing into this world; we can carry nothing out. We ourselves depart with all the accumulations of tendency and

habit and quality which the years have given to us. We ask, therefore, even at the grave of the illustrious, not altogether what great achievement they had performed, and how they had commended themselves to the memory and affection or respect of the world, but chiefly of what sort they were; what the interior nature of the man was; what were his affinities. Were they with the good, the true, the noble? What was his relation to the infinite Lord of the universe and to the compassionate Saviour of mankind? What was his fitness for that great hereafter to which he has passed?

Such great questions come to us with moment, even in the hour when we gather round the biers of those whom we profoundly respect and eulogize and whom we tenderly love. In the years to come the days and the months that lie immediately before us will give full utterance as to the high statesmanship and great achievements of the illustrious man whom we mourn to-day. We shall not touch them to-day. The nation already has broken out in its grief and poured its tears, and is still pouring them, over the loss of a beloved man. It is well.

But we ask this morning of what sort this man is, so that we may perhaps, knowing the moral and spiritual life that is past, be able to shape the far-withdrawing future. I think we must all concede that nature and training and—reverently be it said—the inspiration of the Almighty conspired to conform a man admirable in his moral temper and aims. We none of us can doubt, I think, that even by nature he was eminently gifted. The kindly, calm, and

equitable temperament, the kindly and generous heart, the love of justice and right, and the tendency toward faith and loyalty to unseen powers and authorities—these things must have been with him from his childhood, from his infancy; but upon them supervened the training for which he was always thankful, and of which even this great nation from sea to sea continually has taken note.

It was a humble home in which he was born. Narrow conditions were around him; but faith in God had lifted that lowly roof, according to the statement of some great writer, up to the very heavens and permitted its inmates to behold the things eternal, immortal, and divine, and he came under that training. It is a beautiful thing that to the end of his life he bent reverently before that mother whose example and teaching and prayer had so fashioned his mind and all his aims. The school came but briefly, and then came to him the Church, with a ministration of power. He accepted the truth which it taught. He believed in God and in Jesus Christ, through whom God was revealed. He accepted the divine law of the Scripture; he based his hope on Jesus Christ, the appointed and only Redeemer of men; and the Church, beginning its operation upon his character at an early period of his life, continued even to its close to mold him. He waited attentively upon its ministrations. He gladly partook with his brethren of the symbols of mysterious passion and redeeming love of the Lord Jesus Christ. He was helpful in all of those beneficences and activities; and from the Church, to the close of his life, he received inspira-

tion that lifted him above much of the trouble and weakness incident to our human nature, and, blessings be to God, may we say, in the last and final hour they enabled him confidently, tenderly to say, "It is His will, not ours, that will be done."

Such influences gave to us William McKinley. And what was he? A man of incorruptible personal and political integrity. I suppose no one ever attempted to approach him in the way of a bribe; and we remember, with great felicitation at this time, for such an example to ourselves, that when great financial difficulties and perils encompassed him, he determined to deliver all he possessed to his creditors, that there should be no challenge of his perfect honesty in the matter. A man of immaculate purity, shall we say? No stain was upon his escutcheon; no syllable of suspicion that I ever heard was whispered against his character. He walked in perfect and noble self-control.

Beyond that, this man had somehow wrought in him—I suppose upon the foundations of a very happily constructed nature—a great and generous love for his fellow-men. He believed in men. He had himself been brought up among the common people. He knew their labors, struggles, necessities. He loved them; but I think beyond that it was to the Church and its teachings concerning the Fatherhood of God and universal brotherhood of man that he was indebted for that habit of kindness, for that generosity of spirit, that was wrought into his very substance and became him so that, though he was of all men most courteous, no one ever supposed but that courtesy

was from the heart. It was spontaneous, unaffected, kindly, attractive, in a most eminent degree.

What he was in the narrower circle of those to whom he was personally attached I think he was also in the greatness of his comprehensive love toward the race of which he was part. If any man had been lifted up to take into his purview and desire to help all classes and conditions of men, all nationalities besides his own, it was this man. Shall I speak a word next of that which I will hardly advert to—the tenderness of that domestic love which has so often been commented upon? I pass it with only that word. No words can set forth fully the unfaltering kindness and carefulness and upbearing love which belonged to this great man.

He was a man who believed in right, who had a profound conviction that the courses of this world must be ordered in accordance with everlasting righteousness, or this world's highest point of good will never be reached; that no nation can expect success in life except as it conform to the eternal love of the infinite Lord, and pass itself in individual and collective activity according to that divine will. It was deeply ingrained in him that righteousness was the perfection of any man and of any people.

Simplicity belonged to him. I need not dwell upon it, and I close the statement of these qualities by saying that underlying all and overreaching all and penetrating all there was a profound loyalty toward the great King of the universe, the Author of all good, the eternal Hope of all that trust in him.

May I say further that it seemed to me that to

whatever we may attribute all the illustriousness of this man, all the greatness of his achievements—whatever of that we may attribute to his intellectual character and quality, whatever of it we may attribute to the patient and thorough study which he gave to the various questions thrust upon him for attention, for all his successes as a politician, as a statesman, as a man of this great country, these successes were largely due to the moral qualities of which I have spoken? They drew to him the hearts of men everywhere, and particularly of those who best knew him. They called to his side helpers in every exigency of his career, so that when his future was at one time likely to have been imperiled and utterly ruined by his financial conditions, they who had resources, for the sake of helping a man who had in him such qualities, came to his side and put him on the highroad of additional and larger successes.

His high qualities drew to him the good will of his associates in political life in an eminent degree. They believed in him, felt his kindness, confided in his honesty and in his honor. His qualities even associated with him in kindly relations those who were his political opponents. They made it possible for him to enter that land with which he, as one of the soldiers of the Union, had been in some sort at war, and to draw closer the tie that was to bind all the parts in one firmer and indissoluble union. They commanded the confidence of the great body of Congress, so that they listened to his plans and accepted kindly and hopefully and trustfully all his declarations. His qualities gave him reputation not in this

land alone but throughout the world, and made it possible for him to minister in the style in which he has within the last two or three years ministered to the welfare and peace of humankind. It was out of the profound depths of his moral and religious character that came the possibilities of that usefulness which we are all glad to attribute to him.

And will such a man die? Is it possible that He who created, redeemed, transformed, uplifted, illumined such a man will permit him to fall into oblivion? The instincts of morality are in all good men. The divine word of the Scripture leaves us no room for doubt. "I," said One whom he trusted, "am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

Lost to us, but not to his God; lost from earth, but entered heaven; lost from these labors and toils and perils, but entered into the everlasting peace and ever-advancing progress. Blessed be God, who gives us this hope in this hour of our calamity, and enables us to triumph through Him who hath redeemed us.

If there is a personal immortality before him, let us also rejoice that there is an immortality and memory in the hearts of a large and ever-growing people who, through the ages to come, the generations that are yet to be, will look back upon this life, upon its nobility and purity and service to humanity, and thank God for it. The years draw on when his name shall be counted among the illustrious of the earth. William of Orange is not dead. Crom-

well is not dead. Washington lives in the hearts and lives of his countrymen. Lincoln, with his infinite sorrow, lives to teach us and lead us on. And McKinley shall summon all statesmen and all his countrymen to purer living, nobler aims, sweeter faith, and immortal blessedness.

II

BACCALAUREATE SERMON AT CORNELL COLLEGE, MOUNT VERNON, IOWA, JUNE 12, 1904

“Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice”

(John 18. 37)

NEVER more conspicuously than in these words shone the lofty self-assertion of the Man of Nazareth. He had often before spoken great things of himself. “I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” “I am the resurrection and the life.” “Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.” But now, standing at Pilate’s bar, denounced by the chiefs of his people, clamored at by the mob, awaiting sentence and speedy execution, he falters not, retains and declares his sublime self-confidence, claims supreme kingship. “Yes, I am King, you speak truly, O Pilate. A King indeed. But not a king over men’s bodies and estates. My empire is over human minds. It is a kingdom of the truth, and for all who love the truth. The sensual, the ambitious, the proud, and the worldly may reject me, but now and always hereafter, *true* souls will hear my voice, will find in my words a more than human utterance, will recognize in them the wisdom, the authority, the tenderness of God.” Such was the claim when questioned by the Roman governor.

Eighteen centuries have passed, and the question concerning Jesus still continues. But with modifications. Not now concerning an obscure member of a despised race, rejected by his own nation, contemptuously described by one of Pilate's successors as "one Jesus who was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive." To-day his "one Jesus" has a vast empire, has the homage of uncounted millions, dictates civilization, law, art, education, is, in fact, the chief name of history. And further, in all civilized lands, men understand that the real question is between Christ and Christianity, on the one hand, and no revealed religion, real or possible, on the other. All questions concerning a personal God, and his care for man, and concerning man's possibilities and hopes are in this question concerning Jesus of Nazareth. Evidently, the whole spirit, philosophy, law, and aim of life are in debate.

Now, proportioned to the importance of the question is the importance of a right method and spirit of inquiry. If modern science is immeasurably indebted to the inductive method which Lord Bacon emphasized and made dominant, how transcendently necessary must a right method be in inquiries which concern that which is highest, most enduring, most central in being, namely God, man, righteousness, and life eternal.

Two methods, distinct but not exclusive, present themselves.

I. The method of the *Clear Head*. Natural in an age of great intellectual activity and marvelous scientific achievement, that the alert, trained, and

vigorous intellect should be deemed adequate of itself to decide on the claims of Christ and Christianity. What has not the intellect ascertained, in the heavens above us, among the masses and molecules of the earth, in the midst of invisible power of the universe! Shall it not, after such triumphs, be held competent to pronounce on the questions whether Jesus of Nazareth is the helpful Lord and the only Saviour of man? Let his claims be scrutinized with scientific thoroughness—and one answer be given.

To which plausible proposal some objections may be made:

1. This method, however valid for scholars and men of business, is not valid for the masses of men who have neither time nor books nor training sufficient for such inquiries. Such men, if this is the only method, must either have no opinions concerning Christ, or must accept their opinions only upon the authority of others.

2. It is probable, nay certain, that a redeeming revelation from God to men will contain moral and spiritual elements, will meet moral and spiritual needs, will have moral and spiritual adaptations, for which the speculative intellect has no calculus. We know that alertness and vigor of intellect will not qualify men to enjoy or criticise the "Transfiguration" or the "Sistine Madonna," or to be moved by the impassioned strains of "The Messiah," or to thrill at the varying aspects of sky, or earth, or sea; nor can they, apart from other qualities, compute the value of human love, or heroism, or remorse, or the anguish of bereavement, or spiritual aspiration, or the beauty of

holiness. And so certain trained moral qualities, a quickened conscience, a subtle susceptibility to the pure and the good, an apprehension of the soul's possibilities and need may be indispensable to the recognition of the reality and the value of a professed revelation of God to man.

3. And if in the absence of practical righteousness, with confirmed habits of unrighteousness, the truth were to be ascertained, what would it profit? He who habitually disregarded the primal law written in every heart, the law of conscience, will be likely to disobey all subsequently ascertained laws. He would still be likely to hold the truth in unrighteousness.

II. Over against the method of the Clear Head, the New Testament sets forth the method of the *Pure Heart*. This, it holds, is the supreme condition and instrument of religious knowledge. The love of truth, with obedience to it, is the way to the complete truth. The intellect is not to be condemned and disused, but rather to be honored and vigorously exercised; but only when it is under the inspiration and aid of a heart supremely set on righteousness are its conclusions likely to be valid and authoritative. Light duly used is the condition of more light. The purpose to do the will of God leads to the truth and will of God. As Wordsworth says,

But above all, the victory is most sure
 To him *who, seeking faith by virtue*, strives
 To yield entire submission to the law
 Of conscience, Conscience reverend and obeyed
 'As God's most intimate presence in the soul
 And his most perfect image in the world.

Now, concerning this, several things may be said:

1. It is the rule affirmed by Holy Scripture. The pure in heart see God. If the eye be single the whole body is full of light. They who will to do his will shall know whether the doctrine be of God. To them that have (to purpose) it shall be given. They that are of the truth hear his voice. Some cannot believe because they seek the honor that comes from men rather than the honor that comes from God. The gospel is hid from those whom the god of the world has blinded. Some have the evil heart of unbelief.

2. It is a just rule. Why should not increase of religious knowledge be conditioned on the right use of knowledge already possessed? The common judgment of mankind approves this conclusion. The penalties of negligence, inattention, wrong purpose, partly fall on those guilty of them. To such men misdirection and failure to reach the true goal is but inevitable, and equitable. If men will not come to the light, why should they not walk in darkness?

3. It is a rule founded in the constitution of the human soul. We are ever to bear in view the unity of the mind. Our books of psychology do indeed analyze its faculties; and its chief divisions, as intellect, sensibility, and will, and of the subordinate divisions of each, and of the relation and interaction of these. And this often impresses the student with the thought of a distinct entity underlying each form of mental action. We easily forget that it is one simple individual being which acts and is acted upon in all the various experiences of our lives. One side of our soul life cannot be isolated from another. They inter-

act, they modify one another. Our judgments cannot free themselves from the influence of our inclination, and of our prevailing tone of mind and feeling. The poet tells us that

Trifles light as air
Are to the jealous confirmations strong
As proofs of holy writ,

and the common proverb runs,

A man convinced against his will
Is of the same opinion still.

Some bodily diseases affect the eye so that outline and color of objects are not clearly discriminated. So the fumes of a bad heart or of an unrecognized selfishness may rise before the mental vision and forbid right judgment. How else may we account for the dreadful moral misjudgments which have shown themselves in the defense of slavery, and of polygamy, and in the hatred with which good men, the benefactors of the race, have often been followed? And may not the argument against Christianity be a bad heart? Men may not be willing to come to the light lest their deeds be reproved. As one says, "Infidelity may be due either to deficiency in evidence, or to a state of mind or heart on which the clearest and strongest science has no power."

But, further, all faculties, bodily, intellectual, and spiritual, by use acquire keenness and vigor, and yield delight. And must not a trained conscience, the heightened walls of goodness and the strong affection therefor that comes of use, the keen perception of human need and of human possibilities, the increased

volition of the human soul and its worthiness of redemption, make a man who has all these a different judge of Christ and of Christianity from the man who has them not? The judgments of the true heart may be as just as those of the cold intellect.

4. And in religion this rule is of paramount importance. Demonstrations belong only to the region of pure mathematics. Their conclusions are irresistible. In all other regions of inquiry we find our way by balance of probabilities. So in questions of history, of governmental policy, of philosophy. We cannot avoid the weighing of contrary presumptions, but we may reach conclusions that almost compel assent.

Now, in Christianity there is a range of unique and impressive evidence—prophecy, miracle, the Jew in history and in the twentieth century, the unapproachable character of Jesus, the exalted spirit of the Christian law which makes for the highest and deepest necessities of the soul, the beauty, holiness, and power of the Bible, the founding of Christianity and its marvelous growth, and, finally, its transforming influence on the world. Singly these proofs are each most convincing; combined they seem irresistible.

But is there nothing to be said on the other side? Two presumptions at least confront these proofs. They are, first, the *magnitude of the universe*, which seems to make incredible the Christian's theory of God's care for this earth among so many planets and stars; and, second, the *reign of law*, a truth universally accepted as the postulate of all our sciences and all our art—a truth which seems to brand Christianity as an unreasonable, and, some would say, an impos-

sible irruption on the noble uniformities of nature. Now, how a man will balance these antagonistic probabilities will depend on whether he has been trained by spiritual fidelities to discern magnitudes greater than the stars, values higher than all the simply material universe, a moral order more wide and inflexible than physical law, necessities and possibilities to meet which all grandeur and orders of the physical universe may well, if need be, give place.

To this eminence of spiritual apprehension he has come whom Christ describes as "of the truth." His candid soul is discharged of the pride, conceit, and self-will that avoids reproving light. His quickened and strong conscience has made him cognizant of a moral law, pure, far-reaching, inflexible, and eternal, and of the divine Lawgiver and Judge. His purified heart has brought him to a quick, delighted, and controlling recognition of righteousness, purity, and love wherein they are found. He loves them, he longs for them, but with the love and longing has grown a sense of distance and of unspeakable loss and need thereby both for himself and for his fellow men, a loss and a need so infinite in its measurement that the hand of an infinite God may well be occupied with its repair. And the good for which he longs, and the love which he feels and fears, give immeasurable value to the unseen soul which is the subject of such experiences. Upon the vision of such an one dawns the face of the Christ—the spotless life, the matchless teaching, the grandeur of his self-humiliation even to death, the revelation of the Father, the perfect adaptation of his system and help to the needs of a

world of sin and sorrow. Can this seeing man doubt? What if the coming and life of Christ be the interruption of the usual course of nature? Shall not nature wait on its Lord and obey his will while he does a work transcending all nature? What if it is a small planet which witnesses such a revelation? Are not souls which are made for God and goodness more than the suns which they see and number and trace? All magnitudes, all glories, all lower orders, pale into insignificance beside this revelation of the divine that man may be lifted up to God. The trained soul knows, accepts, adores its Lord, its Teacher, its Brother, its Saviour.

And with the acceptance, a new series of evidences arises—the peace conferred, the holiness imparted, the victory achieved over temptation, the answers to prayer, the conscious ennoblement of the entire nature, the singing hope—is not all this “the witness within himself” indisputable and ever-growing? On this solid foundation rests the faith of most Christians. They read few books. They can solve few difficulties. They are puzzled by the questions of skeptics. But their experience of the fitness of Christianity to meet the supreme needs of the soul, to purify, comfort, and ennoble it, is the warrant of its divine origin. The soul and its Saviour testify each one of the other.

III

THE PASTOR AND HIS BIBLE¹

THE founders of the Garrett Biblical Institute, as its name indicates, intended that here the Bible should be the central subject of study and the norm of all instruction. They wished that every teacher and every scholar should be, in the broad sense in which Mr. Wesley used the phrase, "a man of one book." It may be presumed, therefore, that you leave this school of the prophets for the pulpit and the cure of souls enriched with much biblical learning, and enriched yet more with purpose and aptitude for a lifelong study of the inexhaustible volume. If, then, this final hour of your undergraduate life be given to thoughts concerning the pastor and his Bible it may fitly link your years of preparation with your coming ministry of the Holy Word, a ministry which we trust may be prolonged, faithful, rich in usefulness, and crowned at last with the "Well done" of the Master.

Our discussion will touch only incidentally on the great subjects now in debate among biblical scholars, such as the Canon and its validity; Inspiration, its nature and degrees; the Prophetic Element in Israel; the Literary Character of the several books of the "Divine Library" as indicating age, authorship, and

¹ Address to the Graduating Class at Garrett Biblical Institute, May 9, 1906. *Methodist Review*, July-August, 1906

historic value; the Authority over faith and conduct both of the Bible as a whole and of its several parts. Such topics are too vast for our limited time, too difficult of treatment by any but a master in sacred science. Our task is a humbler one, namely, to note the present condition of biblical opinion and study among us, to ask for the genesis of this condition, and to offer some practical suggestions related to it. Even here difficulties await us, some inherent in the subject itself, some arising from the divided opinions of our scholars. But such difficulties do not excuse us from study. They rather call us to increased diligence, to greater candor and openness of soul, to a more implicit dependence on the Spirit of Truth, and to an inviolable fidelity to the truth as it shall be given us to see it.

I. The Present Condition of Biblical Study among Us. It is matter of common knowledge that within the half century past a new view of the Bible and a new method of Bible study have found place within the Methodist Church, as within other churches. The ministerial life of the present speaker covers the whole period of this change. He was admitted to the itinerant ministry in the year 1848. In that year our New York book house issued *The Patriarchal Age*, one of three octavo volumes which, under the title, *Sacred Annals*, were at once placed in the Course of Reading for young ministers. They were reprints from England, the author being a scholarly Wesleyan layman, George Smith of Camborne. The preface gives definitely the standpoint of this historian. "The volume of inspiration," he says, "is the only source

of information which we know to be unalloyed by error and unadulterated by fiction." "It has been our constant aim to admit, maintain, and illustrate the truth of the sacred oracles." Accordingly, he admits no question concerning any item of the Scripture narrative. The chronology of Genesis (but according to the Septuagint version), the longevity of the early patriarchs, the universality of the Deluge, the standing still of the sun and moon at the command of Joshua, the historic accuracy of the first and the last chapters of the book of Job are all stoutly argued. These items exemplify the book. In the same year, 1848, and for many years before and after, our text-book in theology was Watson's Institutes, a work lucid, comprehensive, cogent in argument, and occasionally touched with a noble eloquence. It admirably set forth the cardinal truths of revelation, but it also taught us that "the worlds," to use its own words, were produced, in their form as well as substance, instantly, out of nothing; that the creative days of Genesis were natural days of twenty-four hours each; that the best explanation of the work of the fourth day is that on that day the annual revolution of the earth around the sun began; and that to the Noachian Deluge is due, in part the deposit, and in part the disclosure of the fossiliferous rocks. Probably if Mr. Watson were now living (the Institutes were published in 1823) he would not think that the sacred text enforced all these conclusions. The books thus cited represent the general trend of opinion among us fifty years ago. It was held that an equal inspiration obtained throughout the Bible and

gave an equal authority to all its books and chapters. All its statements were parts of the inerrant word of God. The various topics differed, as all consented, in relative importance, the incarnation and work of Christ being doubtless the center and crown. But all details, preceding and preparatory, in the patriarchal history, in the wars of Israel, in the lives of David, Solomon, Mordecai, and Jonah, were of some importance and were given to us with absolute accuracy. Together with a vivifying assurance as to central things, there also came in those days to the young theologian much perplexity as to things less important. He must, if possible, reconcile Genesis with geology (Darwin had not then published the *Origin of Species*); must show that the apparent discrepancies in Scripture were not real discrepancies; must harmonize the sacred narrative with secular history and the monuments; must vindicate the unchangeable holiness and impartial goodness of God in the permission of slavery and polygamy among the patriarchs, in the law of the blood-avenger, in the command to exterminate the Canaanites, and in the imprecatory psalms. How well he succeeded need not here be said.

Since that time some of our brethren have journeyed far. How far their books will show. One holds that the early chapters of Genesis contain both historic and unhistoric matter. Another holds that at B.C. 4500 there existed in Babylonia a civilization which presupposes, to use his own words, "millenniums of unrecorded time." Alas for the Usherian Chronology! One, whose book burns with a passion-

ate loyalty to Christ and his redemptive work, tells us that "the Bible is not a final authority upon any scientific question"; that "even in matters not scientific absolute inerrancy in the Bible is not required"; that the rib, the tree, the apple, the serpent of Genesis 2 and 3 are a picturesque way of talking concerning "historic facts," and that Christian scholars, emphasizing strongly the word "Christian," "have four regions of liberty in biblical discussion": (1) the Canon, (2) the Text, (3) the Literature, including date, authorship (single or composite), style, quotation, and (4) the Interpretation. If the liberty thus conceded is a real liberty, both as to opinion and speech, no one should ask more. Many hold that the Pentateuch was not completed till after the Exile, that Isaiah had two or more authors, and that the book of Daniel is of late date and of doubtful authority. And an eminent professor in one of our oldest universities writes: "There are historical inaccuracies in the Bible as unquestionably as scientific errors. In multitudes of cases various parts of the Bible contradict each other. The Bible is not inerrant, nor is there any reason why it should be." It would gratify many if such opinions could be treated as eccentric and of rare occurrence, but this the facts forbid. At this present time the masters in theology, those whose books are most widely read by our thoughtful men, are by a vast preponderance the friends and advocates of this freer treatment of the Bible. Even the conservative Dr. Orr claims only "a substantially Mosaic origin of Pentateuchal law" with "minor modifications and adjustments" thereafter. And, further, it

is believed that the heads of our chief universities and colleges, though selected for their present positions without reference to this question, are, with few exceptions, of the same tendency. No one is authorized to speak for them as to particular questions raised in this great debate, but the drift among them to a less rigorous view of the Bible is unmistakable. These facts indicate that the number of our ministers and laymen who sympathize with the new views is large, and not likely soon to decrease.

As our statement of the earlier view of the Bible closed with a reference to the perplexities to which it subjected the young student, so we close this statement of the new view by calling attention to two most serious problems which it entails. First, how can the Bible be maintained in reverence and authority among the people if they are taught that in it historical and scientific errors, contradictions, false morality, and the crudities of superstitious ages are intermingled with much that is highest and seems divine? And, again, how shall the men of the new view themselves go through the book, and, separating part from part, say "This is human" and "That is divine"? How far, and by what methods, these problems have been solved we cannot indicate.

II. The Origin of the New Condition. To what is this new attitude of many Christian scholars due? What is its genesis? Many answer promptly and with much assurance that it is closely related in origin and effect to positive unbelief; that it is simply a dilution, with different degrees of attenuation, of the denial of God and the spiritual world; that the causes which

have produced avowed skeptics have also produced a race of scholars who would evacuate the Bible and the history of Israel of every supernatural factor for whose removal any plausible pretense can be found. Doubtless there is some truth here. All men, in some degree, respond to their age. Its spirit affects thought and life. Especially is this true of an age so pronounced as our own. It is an age of science, and the large devotion of men to material nature diminishes their relish and aptitude for spiritual thought, tends to hide personality and efficient cause behind the specious phrase "the reign of law," and tends also to find inexorable order everywhere and freedom nowhere. It is an age of marvelous attainment and achievement, and it thereby grows self-confident and rashly adventurous. It is an age that has outgrown many old and once honored opinions, and thereby tends to irreverence toward all the past. And, more than in any previous age, scholars seem to be ambitious for recognition as subtle investigators, discoverers of new truth, and broad-minded men. In such an age men who do not like to retain God in their knowledge—whose souls do not cry out for the living God—easily become skeptics, and often of a virulent sort. They resent, sometimes with contemptuous pity, all allegations of supernatural interference, whether by inspiration or prophecy, miracle or incarnation. For them there is no divine book; the Bible is simply human literature. The infection of their unbelief, we must admit, has reached many who would strongly protest against being classed among skeptics. The ideas of law, fixed order, and evolution so far

dominate many Christian scholars, and are so far reinforced by self-sufficiency and a pitiful ambition, that these scholars reluctantly admit and continually minimize the divine factors in the Bible. The real miracles, they think, are few; prophecy is rarely prophetic; and inspiration is an almost negligible quantity. So near do some who believe themselves Christians approach to absolute denial of the faith.

But is this an adequate account of the present condition of biblical study? Is skepticism, complete or partial, the prevailing motive in the new reading of the Bible? Two facts warn us from this conclusion. Many scholars of the new type in Europe and America are eminent in Christian faith, in Christian character, and in Christian work. By word and life they declare unhesitating loyalty to Jesus Christ—God manifest in the flesh, the Prophet, Priest, and King of the human race. And, further, this new intellectual apprehension of the Bible synchronizes with the unparalleled growth of the Christian Church in numbers, in varied benevolences, in missionary zeal, and in general influence. Faith, and not doubt, is the law of our time. Whence, then, the new phenomenon? The answer must be this: the modern mind, in its legitimate activity, explains the modern study of the Bible. It does not, let it be noted, validate any one of the modern opinions concerning biblical questions, say, the canon of Scripture, the documentary hypothesis, the date of Leviticus or Deuteronomy, the authorship of anonymous books, the relation of Israel to neighboring nations, or the religious life of Israel during the period of the Judges. Much less does it

justify the doctrinal vagaries of any biblical student. But the modern mind does explain why these and all other matters pertaining to the book are brought into question, are subjected to the most searching scrutiny, are treated with a freedom and an independence of traditional opinions which seem to many irreverent, and even touched with unbelief. Let the case be stated thus: Given a century, the nineteenth, of prodigious and diversified intellectual activity. Given to such a century, as an inheritance from immediately preceding centuries, certain notable factors in equipment and tendency, of which four may here be named:

1. The new learning in ancient languages and literature brought at the fall of the Byzantine empire by its scholars into Western Europe; thereafter to be matured and enlarged both by decipherment of the hieroglyphs of the Nile and the cuneiform letters of the Euphrates and by vast archæological discoveries, to be at length critically used in all problems of the early world.

2. The recoil of men's minds from the puerile speculations of the scholastic philosophy to the world of reality and fact; a recoil into which men were startled when Columbus, sailing westward, and Vasco da Gama finding India by rounding the Cape, revealed, as it were, a new earth, and when Copernicus and the "Tuscan Artist" unveiled the mechanism of the skies and gave a new heaven to human eyes.

3. The final establishment, under the leadership of Bacon, of the Inductive Philosophy as the only true method of inquiry, a method which, treating with scant courtesy the unproved assumption and the *a*

priori theory, insists that truth in nature be established by due observation and experiment and in history by adequate testimony.

4. The liberation of society, by the Reformation, from ecclesiastical authority, and the assertion therewith of the right and duty of every man to study for himself the Word and will of God.

Given, again, a century which, thus equipped and directed, has made almost all things new; which, for instance, has rewritten all classic and Oriental history, has created new sciences and has so remade old ones that they are as if new, has added new planets and stellar systems to man's universe, has to new discoveries added new inventions which indefinitely multiply the race force, has, by the study of comparative religion, attained new views of man's moral constitution and moral history, has founded new governments and new social systems on the bases of justice and equality, and has thus broken with the past that it may attain a nobler future. The possibilities of life seem indefinitely widening. Men are expectant. They search with eager eyes every quarter for new facts and new forces. They hold all traditional opinion under question. They wait for light to break forth in every field of thought.

To a century of such equipment, achievement and tone the Bible was given from the hand of a reverent past. It came with an immeasurable prestige. It claimed, and had been accorded for centuries, sovereign authority over faith and conduct. It was the record of God's speech to man. It proposed to establish fellowship between the divine and the human.

It opened the endless vistas of immortality. It was the Book of books. But, with this open Bible, the Protestant Churches came to hold two doctrines which necessarily restricted the range of biblical study. The one was that of a completed, perfect, and authorized canon; a canon to which nothing could be added, from which nothing could be removed. The other was that of a plenary and inerrant inspiration pervading with an equal authority every part of every included book. Under these conditions the work of the student was necessarily simple, though twofold: he must find the true text, then interpret it. But he could admit no question as to the truth of any statement thus found and interpreted, whether the statement was related to history, science, ethics, or theology. Over all was the broad ægis of canonicity and inspiration. "Thus far and no farther" was a headline for every page. Was it not inevitable that in such a century as we have described the surges of thought would at length beat vehemently against these limiting barriers? Men would come to ask, Who established the canon, and by what authority? Who framed, and on what authority, a doctrine of inspiration which validates as true every statement from "In the beginning" of Genesis to the "Amen" which ends the Revelation? Such questions were sure to rise, and with them, soon or late, questions on every item related to the final decision. All alleged textual discrepancies and larger disharmonies must be examined. Ancient histories, legends, and monuments must be compared with the biblical narratives. The literary character of the books must be discriminated for indications of

date, authorship, and value, just as the student of English letters notes the difference between the English of the Canterbury Tales and that of Paradise Lost. The ethical worth of ancient command, psalm, and deed must be weighed. The testimony of the fathers must be considered. These and many other topics demand attention when the alternative question is asked, "Is the Bible equally authoritative throughout and in all its statements, or, on the other hand, is it a veritable depository of divine truth, law, and grace, yet preserved for us with human imperfections of knowledge, feeling, and language?" What issue shall come on these main questions, or on any of the subordinate ones, we do not here consider. Will the old opinions be confirmed or will new ones be established? This question we leave unanswered. But again we say that the rise of these questions was inevitable. The opinions accepted for generations must show their credentials. And the study of these credentials is right, is obligatory, is the only way open before men who love the truth.

III. Practical Suggestions Related to the New Conditions. In these new conditions what should be the attitude of the Christian pastor? In what spirit and with what directive principles shall he study and use his Bible? He cannot, if he would, escape the new conditions. He belongs to his times. He cannot ignore the great debate. Its voices, unheard by the fathers, disturb his soul. Men near him, of his own household, assail some cherished articles of his traditional faith. At times the very foundations seem in peril. How shall he bear himself

in this crisis? A few suggestions only are here possible.

1. The pastor is now, as heretofore, entitled to hold and assert an unshaken faith in the Christian system, in its divine origin and its ultimate triumph. It has survived many severe ordeals, it will survive this. The foundation standeth sure. The nations are forever given as an inheritance to Jesus Christ. There will be individual damage and loss through the new discussions. Many who in thought have inseparably linked the divine revelation with an infallible book will be tempted to abandon both. This is an old story in human life. Every transition from an inherited faith meets such peril. The infidelity of France, Italy, and Japan is in evidence. But, though the faithful and wise pastor will be grieved unutterably by the havoc thus wrought, he will neither hold it to be a valid test of the New Study nor any prophecy of the ultimate failure of Christianity. We must recur to a fundamental principle. Any inevitable movement of the human understanding must be held as a part of the divine order for man and an element of human progress. Its contribution to progress may be the direct gift of new truth; it may be the overthrow of ancient errors by new emphasis on existing truths or their inevitable corollaries; it may be chiefly a stimulus to new inquiries which shall confirm, purify, and exalt accepted views. Of such a movement the present biblical study seems unquestionably a part. However long delayed, it was sure at length to arrive. The Christian mind, partaking the eager and inquisitive spirit of the age, would confront—as in science,

history, government, and social order, so in religion—every traditional opinion and institution and demand the reason for its existence. This is God's order writ large in present intellectual conditions. It must, therefore, be wholesome in its final outcome whether it confirm the old or establish the new. Meantime the process will be attended by innumerable blunders born of manifold human infirmities, such as haste, self-conceit, idiosyncrasies, narrowness, ambition, and unbelief. Our Brooklyn Beecher once said that men reach the truth as our ferryboats reach their docks; not by direct course but by bumping, now on this side and now on that, against the deep-driven piles which guard the approach. Let it be noted that when once alarming views are promulgated there is only one right way of dealing with them. Not avoidance, not peremptory denial, not hot denunciation will serve; only larger learning, surer logic, deeper insight. When, in 1835, Strauss in his *Das Leben Jesu* delivered what McClintock characterized as "the heaviest blow which infidelity ever struck against Christianity," many alarmed theologians advised the Prussian government to suppress the book. "No," said the great Neander. "Let it be met not by authority, but by argument." His counsel prevailed, with the result from that time of a wider and more profound study of the Divine Life on Earth—of which Neander's own *Life of Christ* was the unsurpassed product—the overthrow of the mythical theory, and the steady growth of evangelical views. The skeptic proved in the end to be the servant of the truth. Why doubt the issue of present discussions? Fear is not always

a true prophet. Let the past instruct us. The Church at Jerusalem heard with alarm that Peter of the keys had opened the door of faith to Cornelius, the Roman centurion, and that Paul had absolved the Gentile Church from the rites of the law; but in this freedom of the apostles was the salvation of the nations. The Roman Christians were dismayed when on the declivity of the northern mountains hung the black cloud of barbarism threatening to engulf in a common ruin the ancient civilization and the new faith; but the new race was the gift of a new vigor and ultimately of a larger liberty to the Church. There were pious souls in the Roman communion who shrieked in alarm when Luther nailed his ninety-five theses to the church door at Wittenberg—but that act of the reformer was the renaissance of Christianity. The Protestant doctors of Holland abhorred Arminius as a destroyer of the faith; but the heretic uttered a sentence of death, now well-nigh executed, upon an awful distortion of Christianity which made the All-Father unjust, cruel, and insincere. The Church no longer insists that Galileo shall recant; no longer executes witches because of certain texts in Exodus and First Samuel; no longer justifies slavery by the example of the patriarchs, or the divine right of kings by Paul's declaration that "the powers that be are ordained of God"; no longer holds theories of the atonement once highly accredited; no longer rejects geologic truth, nor even some forms of the doctrine of evolution. Evidently, theology, whether exegetical, doctrinal, or ethical, is a progressive science. But the fundamentals are not deserted nor obscured. God is

in Christ reconciling the world unto himself. And it may be that Neander speaks truly when he says: "But of this I am certain: that the fall of the old form of the doctrine of inspiration, and, indeed, of many other doctrinal prejudices, will not only not involve the fall of the essence of the gospel but will cause it no detriment whatever; . . . that from such a struggle a new theology, purified and renovated in the spirit of the gospel, must arise; . . . and neither a stubborn adherence to antiquity nor a profane appetite for novelty can hinder this work of the Lord which is now preparing."

2. As the Christian pastor is entitled to an unswerving faith in Christianity, so he is entitled to an undiminished veneration for the Book which is its record. Nothing has been established by modern study which diminishes the essential glory of the Bible. There are spots, it is said, on the face of the sun. It is not therefore passing into permanent and disastrous eclipse; it still cheers and fructifies the earth. It has yet unmeasured treasures of heat and light. And so of the Bible. If, as some think, the history of Israel, as the history of all other great nations, begins in a region of mist and legend which early Genesis reports, yet with many a foregleam of the coming glory, does this destroy faith in Abraham and Moses, David and Nehemiah, ministers of an incalculable good to their own and all after times? If the Genesis account of the marriage of the sons of God with the daughters of men puzzles us, have therefore the twenty-third and the thirty-fourth and the one hundred and third Psalms lost their truth and power?

There is a criticism which would blot out the sun; a criticism predetermined in its course by positive disbelief of spiritual verities and prosecuted both with reckless disregard of historic facts and forces and with astounding mutilations of the sacred text. It finds that Abraham and Moses are myths, that Bible prophecies are little, if at all, above Delphic oracles, that the song over Bethlehem, the spotless life of the Man of Nazareth, his works, his atoning cross, and the vacant tomb are fond and foolish conceits, and that Paul was a false witness, and a weak and simply rabbinical reasoner. But such rationalistic unbelief has no place among us. The Bible with us has been, is, and will be as the ark of the covenant, which no irreverent hand may touch. What it is and what it does insures its position. Its contents are transcendent and unapproachable. Not dwelling now upon that progressive disclosure of the one all-perfect God, which separates the Old Testament by the whole orb from all other sacred books of antiquity, we come to that hour when the Dayspring from on high visited the earth. Can any other book tell us of the God-incarnate, of the divine life among men and for men, and of the perfect unfolding in the Son of Mary of the holiness and truth, of the tenderness, patience and self-sacrifice—of the large redemptive purpose and power—of the Father of men? Is there any literature comparable to this story of august advent to lowliest conditions; of the long, obedient silence in the Galilæan home followed by the wonderful inauguration to Messianic service at the waters of Jordan; of inflexible personal holiness allied with compassion for

sinful men; of loftiest claims and works attended by unparalleled meekness and humility; of universal philanthropy coupled with an ardent and weeping patriotism; of sublimest teachings in simplest forms of speech; of the death of the life-giver; of a grave that could not hold its tenant; of foundations thus laid for ascent to eternal dominion and glory that a world might be transformed? Light, love, and life eternal have here, and nowhere else, come to earth. And the Bible is also the history, in part, of man's response to the divine overture, of the struggle toward the Infinite Father of souls beset with evil—a struggle now triumphant, and singing, "The Lord is my portion, my shield, my sun, my salvation," now wailing, in consciousness of painful but not hopeless defeat, "Have mercy upon me, O God; according to thy loving-kindness blot out mine iniquities," but at last attaining complete issue in those who, joined to the risen Saviour, can exclaim, "Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." Proportioned to the grandeur of its contents has been the beneficent influence of the Bible upon human life. This influence has been attained, and it will continue, not by reason of minute accuracy as to the years of Methuselah, or the number of armed men in the Exodus, or the genealogical tables of the Old or the New Testament. In things immeasurably deeper, higher, broader than these is the hiding of its power. In its disclosure of God, in its holy law, in its provision of redemption for enslaved and condemned souls, in its doctrine of brotherhood and of immortality, lies its victorious strength—and there

it will remain, whatever the issue of the present study.

But time forbids any attempt now to set forth its work in the world. Let all be summed up in the words of Wendell Phillips: "The answer to the Shaster is India; the answer to Confucianism is China; the answer to the Koran is Turkey; the answer to the Bible is the Christian civilization of Protestant Europe and America."

3. A due sense of the limitations of the human mind is imperative in biblical study. Our age, as we have already noted, is not given to intellectual humility. Great attainments and achievements engender self-conceit and contempt for the past. "The Dark Ages" is a common phrase among us. No one denies that we inherit some values from the scholars, ecclesiastics, and statesmen of those times. But our praise of them is faint, and not without a subtone of commiseration for their intellectual poverty. The rude hand-press of Guttenberg, on the one hand, and on the other the complex and powerful constructions which give us each morning the tidings of the round world, seem the proper symbols of that age and this. Nowhere more than in biblical study does this self-appreciation appear. Passing by those who in the name of law eject from the Bible and from life all supernatural elements, we take note of the almost sublime assurance with which many of a different type proceed at will to dissect, amend, transpose, enlarge, diminish, and distribute the sacred text. If these would but agree among themselves we might believe. But by some occult impulse each weather vane contradicts

its fellows and changes its own direction with each passing hour. These variations and eccentricities of opinion are as wonderful as the transformations of the kaleidoscope. Scholars remember, though the world has already forgotten, how recently there was a polychrome Bible, sometimes irreverently styled the rainbow Bible. It never came to completion, being laughed out of being when half done. It was a thing to wonder at. By all the colors of the spectrum it indicated what portions of the text were due to Elohist¹, Elohist², Elohist³, to Jahvist¹ and Jahvist², to this redactor and that. Chapter, verse, and phrase within verse were thus separated and distinguished. Joseph's coat could not compare with it. It was philology run mad. Men assumed to have such knowledge of the Old Testament Hebrew that, though no contemporary literature in that language has survived to aid their investigations, they could yet confidently assign each passage in the Pentateuch to its proper date along the line of several centuries. Dr. Emil Reich's book, *The Failure of the Higher Criticism*, is a keen, caustic, and, we must add, amusing exposé of this folly. Dr. Reich is no conservative. He speaks freely of what he calls legends found in early Genesis. He nowhere claims inerrancy for the Bible. He finds, indeed, a new origin for Israel. But he wars on the philologists—such ones as banish Abraham and Moses from Hebrew history. He does not believe in philology; he believes in geo-politics. His onslaught is irresistible, but also irresistibly humorous, for Greek meets Greek. The lofty self-confidence of the philologist is matched and even surpassed by the over-

weening vanity and absolute certainty of his critic. Which of them knows that he knows the most, who can tell? We can only wonder, admire, and smile.

An earlier instance of haste and overconfidence in Bible study is Luther's well-known rejection of the Epistle of James as an epistle of straw. It does not mention the atonement, nor righteousness by faith; let it, therefore, be cast out, said the great reformer. But men have now come to see that Paul and James are not antagonistic; that they differ chiefly in point of view; that the one is speaking of the source of life, even Christ received by faith, the other of the proof of life, even obedience to the law; that, both standing before some verdurous and fruitful tree, one of them says, "That tree lives; for mark how it sends down its roots and rootlets into the dark, damp earth and draws thence vital supplies," and the other says, "That tree lives; for see you not bud and blossom, and leaf and golden fruit?" And thus what Luther rejected we have learned to accept as part of the orb of Christian truth.

The lesson, then, is this: Let the Bible student be slow to yield opinions held by generations of Christian scholars; let him insist on adequate proofs. "Make haste slowly" is for him, as for others, a safe motto. But let him not refuse new light if it shall come, nor anchor himself to an immovable past. We repeat the good words of Neander: "An obstinate adherence to antiquity; a profane appetite for novelty." Let both be avoided.

4. A fourth condition of wise Bible study is a living faith in essential Christian verities, a faith in

which all faculties of the soul, intellect, conscience, heart, and will concur, and which therefore delivers the whole man continuously and gladly over to the law and love of God. These central verities need not be here recited. From the beginning they have been the recognized basis of the Church. They are in every great creed of Christendom. At times they have been overlaid and obscured by false rite, organization, dogma; but they have, nevertheless, remained unquestioned and constructive in every Christian communion. And, if we except the avowed antisupernaturalists, we may say that they are to-day held and affirmed by a vast majority of Bible students. Whether these students adhere to the traditional views, or in varying degrees accept the new, they stand on these impregnable foundations. Differing on many questions, they agree that in the Bible—the work of many authors, separated in many cases from one another by centuries of vast historic change, and separated still more by inward qualities and experiences—that in this book there, nevertheless, appear, and with ever-increasing clearness, these doctrines concerning God and his relation to man, culminating at length in his transcendent manifestation in Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, our Lord and Saviour. Many of these students say that they find defects and errors in the book; but they say, further, that as no one doubts the main facts in the life of Washington because of the blunders and disagreements of his biographers, so no one may doubt that in these imperfect books the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ shines forth with indisputable splendor.

The Bible, indeed, shines by its own light. It attests itself. "It is an ultimate authority for men," says Professor Curtis, "because it appeals to them with spiritual cogency." The divine transmitter and the human receiver are keyed together, notwithstanding man's imperfections. The honest and earnest soul hears in the Bible the word of God; the sinful soul finds in it pardon and renewal; the needy soul finds in it adequate relief; the dying soul finds in it the resurrection and immortal hope.

The late eminent Dr. Dale, of Birmingham, England, in his book, *The Living Christ and the Four Gospels*, narrates an interview between himself and a Japanese Christian who came to him with letters of high commendation, and who soon evinced himself an intelligent, broad, and masterful man. Much conversation ensued. The silent night had fallen about them when Dr. Dale, profoundly interested in his visitor, and referring to himself as a Christian by inheritance and to his guest as one of a race separated by the darkness of eighteen heathen centuries from the glory of the incarnate Lord, asked him how he became a Christian. The answer was the biography of a rare soul. A Confucian by birth and training, but earnest and inquiring, troubled at length by doubt whether the *heaven* of Confucius meant a blind fate or a living and supreme person with whom life and destiny were interlinked, filled with unrest and anxiety which learned men of his own faith could not allay, for years he was groping in fear and hope after a God unknown. Then a Chinese New Testament was given him, with the remark that he would be

charmed with its literary beauty. He did not know who were its authors, whether the names which its books bore were genuine, when or where they wrote, or what were their claims or their credentials. He read with interest, but unmoved, until he came to the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians. He was startled. What morality is this! Whence came it? He turned back to the Gospel which bore the name of John—an unknown, unaccredited man. He read, and still read, until, as at the transfiguration, the Son of Mary shone in the glory of the eternal Father. The humble, docile, seeking soul saw its God—and knew him.

That these self-luminous verities should become the dominant convictions, the determining law of thought, feeling, and will, the soul of the human soul, need not here be argued on general grounds. That obligation is obvious. But the relation of this vital faith to sane and safe Bible study may be briefly discussed.

First. In this practical surrender to the truth the truth itself becomes more luminous and sure. Its adaptation to all man's highest needs gains for it the highest of proofs, namely, experience. Its fitness to unfold all faculties declares that the Father of souls and the Author of Christianity are one. The key fits the lock. Established in this most interior and convincing assurance, the student of the Bible remains calm, clear-eyed, open of mind, and courageous when around him sound noisy speculations in philosophy, science, philology, comparative religion, ancient history, or in whatever other studies some may hope and some may fear to find damage for the Christian faith.

He knows whom he hath believed. He is sure that no weapon against his Lord will prosper. Because of this faith in Him who guides into the truth he will be cheerfully patient in inquiry—not hasting, not resting—willing to accept light if it be light and not an *ignis fatuus*. He accepts changes in incidentals if enforced by sound reason, yet remains immovably confident in the God and Saviour revealed in the Bible. His soul is his teacher.

But, secondly, this personal, vital faith furnishes not only a right temper, but also a needful criterion in Bible study. A recent writer has said that both in the Old Testament and in the New are found elements which are not consonant with the central and constitutive truths of Christianity, and are, therefore, to be rejected. There is base alloy, he holds, in the books which follow the Gospels as well as in those which precede. If this is possibly true, or because it is alleged to be true, the Bible student must have some rule by which to assess the value of every part of these writings from Genesis to Revelation. That rule and criterion is the Christian soul; the Christian faith incorporate with the whole moral and spiritual nature, the domination of the whole man, his tendencies, tastes, affections, aspirations, by Christian elements. Let it be noted that such an assessment of Bible values is inevitable. All students practice it, though often unconsciously. Some who sing with a cheerful consciousness of their own orthodoxy,

Faith of our Fathers! Holy Faith!
We will be true to thee till death,

would probably be surprised at a clear view of their own practical discriminations in the Scriptures.

The reformers cast out the Apocrypha, which Rome received. Martin Luther rejected the Epistle of James. Wesley rejected some psalms from The Sunday Service as not fit for public use. Adam Clark treated the Song of Solomon as indelicate, lascivious, and unspiritual. We go through the book of Job with continued discrimination even among the utterances of the patriarch himself. To many the Revelation of Saint John the Divine is in its central parts an insoluble mystery. Ecclesiastes, Jonah, and other books are weighed and found wanting by many orthodox scholars.

How, then, shall the pastor be fitted for the discussions that still await him? The answer is, by knowing by heart the central facts, forces, and aims of the Scripture. The genius of Christianity must possess, inspire, illumine him. Let him have the mind of Christ, his faith in the Father, his comprehensive and self-sacrificing love, his loyalty to the eternal righteousness, his hatred of sin and yet his patience toward the sinner, and he cannot go far astray. He will still err both by overvaluation and undervaluation; he is human. But he will appropriate from every book of the divine volume that which will nourish the soul, will often find manna in the desert, will learn how to estimate the imperfect good of the early ages, and will wonder at and admire more and more the progressive unveiling of the heavenly Father to his human children.

5. How far may the pastor use his pulpit in the discussion of questions of biblical criticism?

Obviously no definite and inflexible rule obtains. And this is true whether the pastor favors the old views or the new. Distinctive factors mark each pastor and each congregation. Has the pastor adequate learning? Has he a sound judgment as to the place and proportionate value of particular truths? Has he due humility and freedom from dogmatism? Is he capable of clear, conciliatory, and convincing speech? And, on the other hand, do faulty opinions have place, and in what degree, in the congregation? Are they seriously faulty? Do they notably obstruct the gospel? Are they held aggressively or in quietness? Evidently, the wisdom of critical discussion, whether for or against the newer view, depends on the man and the occasion. Sometimes, yet rarely, aggressive courage is wisdom. It is said that about 1830 Charles G. Finney, the notable evangelist, came on his mission to Rochester, then a rising city of western New York. He found that with few exceptions its leading professional and business men and its people generally were avowed infidels. They would give no hearing to his usual topics. He formed a new plan of campaign. He ceased warning and appeal, and went to argument on fundamental things—to formal and protracted proofs of Christianity, and to like refutation of infidelity. Trained as a lawyer, he used a lawyer's methods. With his peculiarly incisive speech and relentless logic he challenged their attention. They must needs listen. He established his position—they could not resist the

force with which he spoke. A revival swept the city and left on it and the region around an impress which survived the century. The adequate man and the exigent hour had met.

A few preachers only can wield such weapons and effect such results. Others should not attempt it. Let it be noted, in the first place, that a sentence may suggest a doubt which pages cannot resolve. An error brought to notice only that it may be refuted will often long outlive the refutation. Project upon the congregation a denial of some statement found in the Bible: some hearers will infer the falsity of the whole book. Project on the congregation an unqualified affirmation of every statement, historical or scientific or moral, of the Bible; many hearers will repudiate a book which seems to them to war on reason and the moral sense. If need be, the statements must be made whatever the hazard—but the impending danger imposes extreme caution. One of our most noted preachers, now doubtless living in the light supernal, thought it wise to give his people a series of sermons in disproof of atheism. Two of his hearers met in the vestibule at the close of the series. "What did you think of it?" said one to the other. The significant answer came: "O, I still believe there is a God." It is easy to disturb faith by unnecessary proofs of evident truth and by unnecessary emphasis on subordinate truth.

Let it be further noted that men live the religious life, not by faith in the minutiae of the Scripture, either of the Old or the New Testament, but by faith in God, the Father Almighty, Maker, Upholder, and

Lord of the universe; in Jesus Christ, his only Son, in whom dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, who died, the just for the unjust, and who lives forever to give the eternal life; in the Holy Ghost, by whose abiding indwelling men are re-created in the image of God; in the unchanging obligation of the holy law which is summed up in Love; and in the indissoluble union of character and destiny. These truths, when believed, make men free in the liberty of the sons of God. However men may differ as to the interpretation and the truth of incidental and subordinate parts of Scripture, if they believe these, they are all in Christ Jesus. These, therefore, with their manifold illustrations and applications, are the chief, I might almost say the only proper, topics of the pulpit.

And let it be again noted that these central truths have for the pulpit this advantage, that they are to a great degree self-luminous. They commend themselves to man's highest reason, to his moral constitution, to his noblest aspirations, to the deepest necessities of his soul. They meet him at the topmost of his being. Preach God in his natural and especially in his moral perfections, and the soul assents, adores, submits, and trusts. Preach the supreme law of love, and the moral sense acknowledges its sovereignty, its completeness, its adaptation to man's life. Preach the immanent Spirit of Holiness, and the moral incompetency and the despair of the natural man is replaced by a divine energy of goodness. Preach the irrevocable connection between goodness and peace, sin and woe, and man's present

experience responds in affirmation. Preach the God-man, the ineffably Highest stooping to become the lowest, a man, a servant, a victim, to redeem a lost race—how it touches, melts, uplifts, thrills with immortal hope! Without this there is no gospel, and preaching is vain.

He who did most shall bear most; the strongest shall stand the most weak.

'Tis the weakness in strength that I cry for! My flesh that I seek

In the Godhead! I seek and I find it. O Saul, it shall be
A Face like my face that receives thee; a Man like to me
Thou shalt love and be loved by forever; a Hand like this
hand

Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee! See the
Christ stand!

Brethren of the graduating class, to this ministry I commend you. There is no work purer, nobler, more divine. If the things invisible are the real and enduring realities, and if the fashion of this world is in seeming and soon passes away, how eminent the calling of him who would open blind eyes and lift up sordid souls to the eternal good! He will not escape hardship. There will be indifference, criticism, reproach. There will be heart-breaking failures, often scant success, and a consciousness of insufficiency. There may be poverty like that of the Master and his servant Paul. There may be persecution, and even the martyr's death. But with one heart we this day pray that none of these things may move you—and that you may fulfill the ministry which you have received of the Lord Jesus to testify the gospel of the grace of God.

IV

THE NEW TESTAMENT METHOD OF LAW¹

SAIN'T PAUL represents the law of Moses as "of the letter," as "written with ink," as "written and engraven in stones." He thus notes an obvious feature of this ancient legislation. It was chiefly a system of *rules*, and not of *principles*. It was preëminently outward, dealing more with particular actions than with spiritual qualities and motives. It was copious, minute, exact. It hedged in the whole life of the Hebrew with injunction and restriction. It had, for example, regulations for house, dress, food, ablution, sanitation; for marriage, dower, divorce, adoption, inheritance, burial; for trade, agriculture, loans, usury, land-redemption, servitude, enfranchisement. It forbade many specified acts without affixing penalties, and to many crimes it denounced various and often severe punishments. And it had provisions, constitutional in their nature, for the distribution of jurisdiction both quasi-legislative and judicial. In the field of religious ceremony the law became even more explicit and particular. One exclusive seat of national worship was to be selected. It were wearisome to recall the exact prescriptions given for the tabernacle and its furniture; for the qualification, consecration, duties and support

¹ Methodist Review, July-August, 1907.

of Levites and priests; for the sacrifices, expiatory and eucharistic, national and individual, which filled the year; for innumerable ritual observances; for gifts, tithes, fasts, and feasts; for holy days and for sabbatic and jubilee years. Suffice it to say that to a sharply defined civil and moral code was added a vast and complex ceremonial order.

But the Mosaic law, as it stands in the Pentateuch, was not destitute of spiritual elements. It obviously lacked some conceptions common to modern thought. There was in it no explicit recognition of God as an infinite and immanent Spirit, of the human soul as distinct from the body, of a future life of rewards and punishments. Though it enjoined some high qualities and many arduous duties, in only one passage (Deut. 30. 6) did it promise or even intimate any divine help in the inevitable struggle. But, on the other hand, the majesty and holiness of Jehovah, and his love shown in the deliverance from "the land of Egypt and the house of bondage," repeatedly enforce his claim to the unqualified obedience of Israel. A few times supreme love to Jehovah is enjoined; twice the Jew is commanded to love his neighbor as himself. And it is to be further noted that great truths concerning God and man and their mutual relations are implicit in all laws concerning justice, purity, and helpfulness, and in all the ritual, which allowed approach to the Holy One within the veil only with ablutions, propitiations, and priestly mediations. Probably the Hebrew of the Exodus but dimly perceived these mysteries. The hieroglyphs were not easily deciphered. It was reserved for the prophets

of distant centuries to penetrate to the heart of the system, to surmise its predictive character, and to declare, in various forms, that righteousness is more than thousands of rams, or tens of thousands of rivers of oil. From form to reality, from shadow to substance, the training went slowly but surely on.

How far the "statutes and judgments" given by Moses were an inheritance from the patriarchal and tribal life of Israel, or how far the long sojourn in Egypt led to the adoption of some parts of its civil and ceremonial law, it is impossible to decide. To admit such contributions to the Mosaic law need not affect our estimate of its divine authority or of its wisdom. In his training of men toward a new era God does not discard existing facts and forces. He uses and ennobles them. And the new era for Israel had come. Enslaved tribes were to enter on an independent national life. And together came from Jehovah, their Deliverer, a home, a government, a church, and a covenant. The new system was not ideally perfect: "the law made nothing perfect." If tried by the standards which thirty-five additional centuries of training have established it is in many respects defective. Yet it fitted the age and the people to which it was given; in many particulars it was far in advance of other existing systems of law; and it held in it germs capable of an indefinite development. The acorn prophesied the oak, for which, however, many centuries must wait.

Meantime its stern morality and its insistence on Jehovah's right to rule was sure to awaken a sense of sin and a fear of judgment. "The law entered that

the offense might abound." "It was added because of transgressions"; that is, to the end, and with the result, that men should know their distance from God, their incompetence for goodness, and their consequent need of redemption. It was thus a "ministry of condemnation," the "letter that killeth." Even as Paul wrote these words, the system, decaying and waxing old, was ready to vanish away. The Holy City would soon fall; the priest and the sacrifice would cease, the chosen people would be dispersed among all nations. Another covenant had place. Henceforth men shall be taught to "serve in newness of spirit and not in the oldness of the letter."

II. In two vital qualities the new covenant transcended the old.

1. It was the clear revelation of the fact, vaguely apprehended before, of the intimate relation of the Divine Spirit to the human soul, of the illapse of God on man, of the incoming and abiding of a divine energy within all human faculties that they might be wrought into the image of God. It was the full disclosure of the life of God in the soul of man. The incarnation had visibly linked heaven and earth. Henceforth men shall know the Spirit of holiness, of truth, of peace, and of power as the Lord and Giver of life. Ritual law gives place to inspiration. Not in dependence on observances of any kind are men to seek goodness and peace. That way lies defeat. Let them use the observances—but wisely, as opportunities to open the soul Godward. For it is this opening of the soul and the answering inflow of the gracious Spirit that restores the broken and chaotic

human nature to the likeness of God and establishes a blessed and perpetual fellowship between the heavenly Father and the earthly son.

2. It corresponds with this that, in the New Testament, the formal code and the precise regulation give place to emphasis on moral and spiritual qualities. Not particular ethical law, but a new nature determining all duty is its chief injunction. Witness the Beatitudes, and, indeed, the whole Sermon on the Mount. The blessed ones are the poor in spirit, the mourner, the meek, they that hunger after righteousness, the pure in heart, the merciful. Anger is murder; the impure purpose is adultery. Even when particulars only are given they are often, *if taken literally*, so impracticable, so unreasonable, or so insignificant, that we are forced to interpret them only as indications of the spirit which the disciple is to cherish. Few will hold that we are to submit to all violence and robbery and invite the repetition of them, to give to everyone that asks, to pray only in the closet, to lay up no treasure on earth, to pass no judgment on others. Evidently the Great Teacher is seeking patient, loving, sincere, and just souls. The letter is comparatively nothing; the spirit is invaluable. The tables of stone are lost: the law is put into the mind and written on the heart.

This contrast calls for further illustration. Let us suppose that through the open soul and faith in Christ one has come to the renewal and the fellowship with God spoken of above. Inevitably he will ask: "What shall I render to the Lord for all his benefits? What would he have me do? What are his commands?" To such questions the common and right answer

would be, "Go to your Bible—there learn God's will." But the answer, though correct, needs supplement and interpretation.

The disciple goes to the Old Testament. What does he find? A progressive revelation of God, the Eternal and the Perfect One: the history of a movement, unshaking, unceasing, toward the redemption of men by the anointed King of Righteousness; the record of the piety of pre-Christian ages in vivid narrative, in profound drama, in glowing prophecy, and in songs which thrill the heart and inspire the hymns of later centuries—all these he finds. But when he asks for explicit law for his daily life he is perplexed at finding that what appear to be moral and permanent commands are so intimately intermingled with, and often modified by, civil and ceremonial law, evidently transitory in its nature, that at length he hesitates at receiving any precept of the Old Testament as permanently obligatory unless it is obviously founded on fundamental and immutable morality, or has been reënacted by Christ or his apostles. With profound respect for the chosen people to whom "were committed the oracles of God," he is forced to say: "I am not a Jew; I am a Christian."

From the Old Testament the disciple turns to the New. In addition to its central glory, God in Christ reconciling the world to himself, he finds every great spiritual quality—reverence, faith, humility, love, patience, courage, hope—enjoined constantly, and with the highest conceivable sanctions. He finds all these qualities exemplified in the unparalleled life of the Man of Nazareth. He finds that, as occasions

arose either with Christ or his apostles, some particular duties are enjoined. He finds here and there in the volume extended discussion of spiritual law as applied to questions emerging in the early Church, such as Paul's treatment of the use of meats offered in idol sacrifices, of the use of spiritual gifts, and of marriage—admirable illustrations of the temper in which questions of conscience are to be considered.

But he also finds that his New Testament is not a full and explicit directory for his daily life. Even for his Church life he lacks such direction. His New Testament establishes the Christian society, indicates in general the purpose, spirit, and powers of the organization, names some officers and their duties as they existed in the primitive days. But he inquires in vain for a definite, authoritative and permanent constitution for this body, for the number of orders in its ministry, and the exact function of each, for the law by which men are inducted into these orders, for the partition of rights and duties between ministers and laymen, for the method of judicial administration in the Church, and, indeed, for the vast detail of Church work. Even the Church order which, with variations, had place in the early Church is nowhere made obligatory. The Great Founder saw fit to intrust, with few limitations, the entire polity of the Church to the wisdom of the successive generations of Christian men. So also did he deal with the simple rites which he instituted. Water, the symbol of purification, was to be used in the name of the Triune God. But how many items are left undetermined—such as the amount of water, the age and preparation of the

candidate, the administrator, the locality, the accessory services. Or contrast the minute ceremonial of the Jewish passover, the memorial of deliverance from Egyptian bondage, with the simplicity of the order for the Lord's Supper, the memorial of the world's redemption. For these and all other rites of the Church the only rule is, "Let all things be done to edifying." So also the exact law of tithes is in the New Testament replaced by the larger law, "as God has prospered him"—an order which, if obeyed, would overflow the treasury of the Church. Places exclusively holy vanish from the New Testament—"neither in this mountain nor yet at Jerusalem." And in the presence of Paul's words to the Corinthians and the Galatians it is difficult to retain holy days. All places and all times become sacred to the Christian. "Not of the letter, but of the spirit" is the dominant note of the true Church.

The secular life is even more lacking in explicit directions, and the conscientious man is thereby often sorely perplexed. He is in business, let us say. May he deal in articles which he thinks to be hurtful to the user? deal in articles adulterated, but not thereby injurious? deal in margins? buy at the lowest possible price, and sell at the highest whatever the exigency which compels others to trade with him? remain silent as to facts which, unknown to others, vitally affect values? receive more than his goods or his services are worth? exact all dues which the law allows? permit any exaggeration by his subordinates? avert iniquitous legislation by paying the money it was planned to extort?

Or, consider the accumulation and use of money. The Christian is to love his neighbor as himself. A needy and suffering world is about him. How much may he accumulate? how much expend on house, furniture, equipage, dress, art, travel? how proportion his gifts between the Church, the poor, and the general interests of society? how far excuse himself by gifts from personal efforts? when retire from successful business to a life of ease?

The Christian is also a citizen. He is a partner in government. May he remit the study of political problems to official men? vote for the least bad of two bad candidates, and for a partial good when the ideal good seems unattainable? neglect to vote at primary or election? refuse to bear arms, if duly summoned? avoid taxes and jury duty when the avoidance does not require falsehood or fraud? disobey unjust laws?

The subject of amusements is scarcely touched in the New Testament. Paul did not need even to name the horrible cruelties of the arena or the shameless immoralities of the Roman stage. They stood self-denounced. But does the spirit of Christianity enjoin total abstinence from amusements? If not, how far may one use time or money on innocent sports? When does indulgence become excessive? Are the theater, the opera, the card-table, the race course allowable? Is the dance, in any form and in any place, to be indulged? What limit should be placed on social entertainments, on humorous speech, on reading of fiction?

The family life presents difficult questions. In

what actions shall the mutual love and honor of husband and wife declare itself? How far must unreasonable tempers and actions be endured? How vigorous shall be the rule over children, and at what age shall it be relaxed? What education is due to each child? How early and how far must the child contribute to family support? What is the just authority of the parent as to the choice of the life-work and the marriage of the child? How much is it wise that the child inherit?

In the presence of such questions the New Testament evidently is not, and it was not intended to be, a particular directory for life. It is not a book of rules, but a book of principles. The New Covenant has this glory, that it furnishes the disciple with fundamental truths, with right aims, with pure, noble, and powerful affections, and thus fits him to decide all things in faith, justice, and charity. Out of the soul renewed in righteousness must come the law of the daily life.

III. The fitness of this New Testament method of law for the larger life of the race is obvious.

1. As a book, the New Testament thereby becomes portable and readable, brief and attractive. No book of particular laws, however bulky, could cover the world-wide, diverse, and fluctuating conditions of Christian life. The Moslem doctors, it is said, have delivered to the faithful 75,000 distinct precepts—an intolerable burden. Every question of duty stands by itself, having some factor or factors which differentiate it from all other questions, and therefore enforce an individual answer. The variations are innumer-

able. The nine digits can be arranged in more than 360,000 different orders. The statutes of a state may be contained in two or three volumes: but vast libraries are needed for the discussions and decisions of the judges who apply these laws and the principles which underlie them to the everchanging conditions of our modern civilization. If the New Testament is to be of moderate compass, and inviting, it must avoid such details, wearisome and only occasionally applicable to current life. The glory of redemption through the Divine Son and all the possibilities which it opens to man for the present and the coming life, the love which comprehends the whole law, and the vivid depiction of these as they wrought in the new kingdom—these are its topics. Simple in style, easily translated—a book for the vest pocket yet inexhaustible in truth, in sympathy, and in spiritual provisions—it is fitted for all races, and for all stages of human life.

2. By this method of law the highest moral results are secured. The valuing of external acts above character was the pharisaism which our Lord so sternly denounced. But the pharisaic tendency belongs to all ages. Many Christians are disposed to say, "I fast twice in the week: I give tithes of all that I possess." But because the penitence of the publican was the beginning of a new nature, capable of all good, he went to his house approved. With God religious observances and gifts to the poor have no value except as they are duly related to faith, aspiration, and charity. It is character, and not achievement, which he seeks. Accordingly, in the New

Testament he subordinates the particular to the general, the precept to the principle, the deed to the motive. Above all eloquence, all knowledge, all miracle-working faith, all gifts, and even above the martyr's death, is charity. Without this we are nothing, and we are profited nothing.

And this is the method of all wise parents and teachers. To the young, the ignorant, the undeveloped they give particular and exact rules. "Do this," "Avoid that," "Do it in this way—not in that" are the customary orders. But with advancing years and enlarging capacities the style changes. Now the aim and reason of the law are set forth, the meaning of life is unfolded, the freedom and responsibility of the child and the pupil are recognized—and outward authority gives place to self-guidance. Undoubtedly the transition is perilous to its subject, and often inexpressibly disquieting to the parent. What possible wreck of life waits on this new liberty! Were it not better, if it were practicable, to withhold the liberty? But only by self-guidance is manhood attained, is success achieved. The venture must be made whatever the peril or fear, or the boy remains weak and worthless. Not otherwise does the heavenly Father deal with the advancing generations. He removes the limitations of the Judaic law that he may set men in the glorious liberty of the sons of God. They shall know truth, shall have the mind of Christ, shall judge and determine all things by their fitness for unfolding the spiritual nature. They will often err, for they are but men; they may make shipwreck of character. But the sincere seeker after truth and right-

eousness, even when in error of judgment, is, in the divine estimate, far better than he who happens to think and act rightly in an indifferent and mechanical way. The struggle in the midst of uncertainties develops the noblest character.

3. By this method of law Christianity is fitted to be a universal religion. Note, first, that the unfettered organization of the Church and the variety admissible in its rites allow it place among men of every stage in civilization, of various habits of life wrought by monarchical, feudal, or free governments, and of different zones. Both authority and freedom have their place in Church history as in political; and rites and ceremonies are naturally modified by temperament, training, and climatic conditions.

Note, secondly, as an instance of the world-wide adaptation of Christianity, the abolition of slavery by its spirit in the absence of the letter. In the hot debate which preceded our Civil War, many excellent people, indignant at the evil system and its aggressions, were astonished to find that their New Testament was almost silent on the subject: that masters were recognized as Christians, that slaves were bidden to be obedient, and that Paul even sent back one of his converts, a fugitive slave, to his owner. And all this happened while the infamous Nero was on the throne, and when one half of the Roman world, sixty millions according to Gibbon, were slaves, their lives as well as their liberty at the absolute disposal of their masters. Yet neither the Great Teacher nor his chief apostle had any explicit rebuke for the despot or the slave-owner. Could a book of this character, some

thought, give fit law to enlightened and benevolent men?

The critics simply mistook. They forgot that a change in outward conditions avails little for men unprepared for it, and that, in the then existing conditions of the Roman empire, to insist on rights rather than on character would precipitate a horrible anarchy and a poverty more disastrous than war, and would end in a more ruthless despotism. Instead of such issues came the slow, but certain, relief of society by the doctrine of Christ. He taught, and his disciples after him, the universal Fatherhood and love of God, the common redemption by Jesus Christ, the gift of the transforming spirit to all that ask, the one mercy seat and the one Communion table accessible to high and low, to master and slave alike, the all-comprehending law of love, the equal responsibility of all at the judgment seat, and for every believer an unspeakable peace on earth, and an immortal glory beyond. It was impossible that such teachings should not transform human minds and human society. Laws gradually became more just and lenient, masters recognized the common brotherhood, the Church advised manumission, schools for all classes were multiplied, new charities were created, abuse of power slowly abated, governments were reformed. At length, in the last century, legalized slavery, as abhorrent to the spirit of the gospel, ceased in all Christian lands. The ideals of Christianity are yet far from perfect realization, but the history of nineteen Christian centuries indicates the transforming power of New Testament principles in the absence of distinct enactments, and

prophesies a future far beyond and above the present life of the race.

4. Let it be noted that, with this method of law, obligation expands with expanding opportunity. "As we have opportunity, let us do good unto all men" is Paul's word to the Galatians. But how narrow the possibilities of these early Christians! With no part in government, with scanty resources, having little knowledge of, or intercourse with, distant peoples, in literature restricted to the manuscript even where this was possible, under the ban of public opinion—how circumscribed their field of usefulness! To relieve the needy, the sick, the prisoner, the sorrowing at their door, to instruct the child and the neighbor, to reclaim the sinful, to edify saints by holy living and mutual exhortation—these were their chief opportunities. But vastly greater are the obligations of men of the twentieth century, who as citizens can aid the enactment and enforcement of just, humane, and uplifting laws, whose wealth is ample for every benevolent and Christian enterprise, to whom all nations are now neighbors and open for a world-evangelization, with whom experience and organization have multiplied power, in whose hands is the wonder-working press, multiplying the message of truth and peace for all men. Still, as did the Galatians, should they address themselves by personal effort to the ignorance, the sin, and the suffering immediately about them. But by the divine law they are now, and hereafter will increasingly be, responsible for good laws, good literature, good schools, good customs of business and labor, good amusements, and an effective gospel mes-

sage to the whole world. The law of love puts all their faculties, their resources, and their relations at the command of the human brotherhood.

IV. Important practical conclusions issue from this discussion.

1. In the presence of ethical questions the Christian must accustom himself to the silences of the New Testament. It declines to aid him by explicit rules. There are a thousand duties which it does not expressly enjoin, a thousand sins which it does not expressly forbid. The silence is not conclusive—it is neither here nor there. The Christian must disregard it, unless attending circumstances, as sometimes happens, give it meaning. He must find duty by the rule of general consequences, by the fitness of particular actions, or courses of action, to advance righteousness in the individual and in society. Not otherwise will he find the mind of the Master.

For illustration, let the question be concerning the theater. May the Christian attend, or ought he to avoid it? Here the New Testament is absolutely silent. And no sane man is likely to hold that the dramatic impersonation of character, whether historical, as of Julius Cæsar, or fictitious, as of Shylock, is in itself wrong. Recreation in some form is plainly admissible—it is truly re-creation. If some exalted souls do not seem to need it, their life cannot be a law for the majority of men. Even the question, "What would Jesus do?" is not decisive: for his was a life necessarily limited by transcendent relations and aims. But all these facts do not conclude the case. A broader view must be taken. There must

be a study of the history and past influence of the theater, of the conditions under which it now exists and the tastes to which it now chiefly ministers, of its tendency toward or away from a nobler life and influence, of the character and reputation of actors taken as a body, of the contrast between the brilliancy and excitement of the play and the sober duties in which the true blessedness of life abides, of its relation to the watchfulness against sin and the hunger for righteousness on which the spiritual life depends, of its part in the growth of an excessive craving for absorbing pleasures, and of the Christian stewardship of time and money concerned in the case. Only by studies like these can right conclusions be reached. Not interest nor inclination may rule in this and other questions on which the New Testament is silent. Men who believe that the supreme aim of life is character, and the supreme law of life is Christly service of others, will weigh all things by their relation to this aim and this law. There will often be painful hesitation, inward conflict, the need of self-abnegation; but all this they will accept as part of the discipline by which the Lord of souls prepares a purer and nobler race for his glory.

2. It follows, further, that only those of a trained moral and spiritual faculty are likely to reach right ethical conclusions. "He that is of the truth," said Jesus, "will hear my voice." Sincerity and uncalculating loyalty to right lead both to Christ and to the knowledge of his will. The careless and indifferent, the self-indulgent, the worldly and unambitious, the unloving, will almost surely miss the way.

The fumes of their selfish hearts will rise to obscure their vision. Unspiritual themselves, how can they discern and duly value spiritual qualities, tendencies, and necessities? They will call evil good, and good evil. On the other hand, let a man live in the vision of God, his Lord and his Judge; let him know something of the unspeakable value of righteousness for himself and his fellows, and of the imminence and deadly peril of sin; let him deeply feel that the human soul is made for God and cannot rest without him; let him know the brevity of life and its immeasurable issues; let there be wrought in him a divine compassion for his human brethren, even the mind of Christ Jesus, the servant and suffering Saviour of the race; let him partake of the peace that dwarfs all worldly good; let thus the inspirations of grace quicken and exalt all his spiritual faculties and tastes, and he is prepared thereby to think, to decide, and to act with his Lord. He has become sensitive to all spiritual qualities and forces. He has an almost instinctive discrimination of the good and the evil. His new life has positive appetencies and aversions. It has often happened that, by the transformations wrought by the Holy Spirit, evil habits, judgments, and tastes have been so purged out, have so sloughed away, that without conscious process of reasoning the man has come to new moral conclusions—and wonders at his former opinions. New senses have wakened in him; new affections have emerged; new joys make former delights insipid, or even hateful.

Without some participation in this new life no man may rely on his moral judgments. The eyes of his

understanding are not opened. He lacks the balances of the sanctuary.

3. The relation of the New Testament law to the authority of the Church requires a larger consideration than is here possible. The following propositions seem defensible:

(1) Every explicit law given in the New Testament, taken in its proper interpretation, should be enforced by the Church.

(2) Some inferences from the larger ethical principles of the New Testament are so immediate and undeniable that the Church is justified in requiring conformity to them by all its members. For example: gambling, the publication of indecent and pernicious literature, the bribing of voters and officials, and usury are such plain violations both of the law of love and the law of the land that one who persists in any of these offenses has no right to continued membership in the Church, and should by due process be excluded from it.

(3) The moral quality of a third class of actions is not so easily determined. Christian men of unquestioned piety and wisdom differ concerning them, as do also the Churches. The question is often one of degrees—of either total prohibition or moderate use. One Church, for instance, forbids without limitation the wearing of gold or costly apparel, the laying up treasure on earth, the use of intoxicating beverages, the dance, games of chance, attendance on the theater or the circus. Are such prohibitions within the rightful authority of the Church? It is obvious that a body of Christians in a divine fellowship for

the promotion of righteousness may and should consider the probable influence of all questionable acts and customs on the spiritual life of men, and should unreservedly declare its judgment thereon. It is also obvious that the pastor should faithfully discuss before his people not only the New Testament principles which underlie all right moral conclusions but also their just application to all important individual and social questions. He must speak without fear and without favor. But may the Church go beyond this, and prohibit, under penalty of expulsion from its bosom, all the class of actions now under consideration? We doubt both the right and the expediency of such prohibition. It is an assumption by the Church of an authority over the individual judgment which the New Testament nowhere confers upon it. A part of the invaluable liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free is that in the vast domain of morals a multitude of questions are delivered to the determination of individual Christians. Neither Christ nor his apostles determined them, nor did they convey to any hierarchy or other sacred body the right to determine them. At one time, for instance, Christians differed sharply as to the use of meats clean or unclean or which had been offered to idols, and as to sacred days. Saint Paul had knowledge on those questions, and declared it. But he asserted no authority in the case. On the contrary he said: "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. . . . Every one of us shall give account of himself to God. Let us not therefore judge one another any more." This freedom still abides. It may be

abused. If it lapses into indifference or self-will it will issue in ruin. But it is the indispensable condition of Christian manhood. The Church may use freely, and even vehemently, argument, warning, and appeal; but it may not by authority invade the sacred region of personal conviction and self-determination. If it attempt such invasion it is likely to overpass reasonable bounds, to show itself provincial, and to provoke reaction. Witness the Methodist law of 1784, which under the head of superfluity in dress proscribed ruffles, rings, and high bonnets, and under which, within the memory of men now living, women who wore a bow of ribbon or an artificial flower were excluded from the love feast, and many men held it unchristian to wear buttons on the back of the coat. We are bravely past such pettiness—but what enormous claims does such legislation imply! If the Church will regulate our reading, why not at once establish an Index Expurgatorius after the fashion of Rome? If it will regulate our songs, why not justify the Church which expelled George H. Stuart, the noble president of the Christian Commission during the Civil War, because he sang with fellow Christians the hymns of Wesley, Watts, and Doddridge? If it denounces with penalties the dance in every kind and circumstance, why not take legal cognizance of all social entertainments, festivals, and fairs? Many believe that a high-license system is better than the unrestrained sale of liquor. But if the Church here asserts its authority, may it not with equal right control the vote of its members as to temperance legislation? We must conclude that the limitations of


Church authority pertain alike to doctrine, organization, and life. A few comprehensive facts, principles, and laws are given us in the New Testament; but, within these, freedom is the birthright of each Christian.

To recognize this liberty is highly expedient. In vain, in the long run, will any Church attempt to rule its members in matters on which the New Testament is silent. The age grows impatient of the *ex-cathedra* law. It emerges more and more from ecclesiastical sway into the broader life of developed personality. This fact, working with a deplorable self-indulgence, worldly-mindedness, and feeble faith, has brought many who were once strict in their views and habits to a most perilous, if not absolutely sinful, abandonment of their former respect for Church law. For instance, the fact cannot be disguised that excessive amusements and questionable amusements threaten the spiritual and eternal life of many. But this is in spite of law. The law may remain—but it will continue to be disregarded far and wide; contempt for all Church law and order will be engendered by this disobedience; the conscience of many who find that they have given a pledge which they think ought not to have been exacted from them, and which they are unwilling to fulfill, will be weakened and defiled, or they will withdraw from the Church; and some upright and spiritually-minded people who do not agree with the absolute and unconditional prohibitions of the law will withhold themselves from a communion otherwise their natural home. Something diviner than a Church law of doubtful authority must be our reliance for a higher life.

Bi
F

This is not a formal biography of the usual sort. The author disclaims attempting such a thing, although he could have done it well. He has done something different, and, perhaps, under the circumstances, better. He has given us the great Bishop on his different sides and on the different aspects of his large usefulness, as the statesman, the judge, the presiding officer, the appointing power, the theological counselor, the resident executive, the administrator, the traveler through the connection. This makes up the book. A few pages are given to the years of preparation, and a few to the period of retirement. There is a selection from the many tributes paid. There are four papers and sermons, including one article from the *Review*, entitled, "The New Testament Method of Law," the address to the graduating class at Garrett on "The Pastor and his Bible," the baccalaureate sermon at Cornell College, and the address at McKinley's funeral. Another paper of great interest, not before published, is given in full, namely, one prepared on the case of Professor Mitchell to assist his counsel (the author of this book), treating very thoroughly and judiciously the question whether "The World Before Abraham" was sufficiently at variance with Methodist belief to warrant the condemnation of its author for heresy. Bishop Andrews shows conclusively that it was not, that the positions of the book are in entire harmony with the conclusions of very many most eminent and most orthodox scholars. Bishop Andrews stood for freedom of thought in theological matters; he was distinctly on the side of those who believe in the process of reconstruction now going on, as did Bishop Merrill. It was Prof. William Newton Clarke's "Outline of Christian Theology," we learn from these pages, issued in 1898, when the Bishop was seventy-three years old, that made the turning-point in his thinking — a marvelous fact. He says of this book: "A nobler combination of freedom and conservatism, of clear intellectual processes with the sweetness and fervor of devoutness, of strength of material with grace of form, has rarely or never come to my library." It influenced him profoundly, as it must any one who reads it with an open mind. Bishop Andrews had an open mind up to the last, and also a humble spirit. A remarkable illustration of this is given by the biographer. He was to preach one day for Dr. A. H. Tuttle. Just before he rose to preach he walked over to Dr. Tuttle in evident distress and requested him to leave the room, giving as a reason: "I can preach before the people, but not before you." His ideals were so very high that they kept him modest. He was a truly great man, one of the best of all the Bishops that our great church has had. This admirable volume will help to show it and to perpetuate his well-deserved fame.





BOSTON UNIVERSITY
BX8495.A64F09 BOSS
Edward Gayer Andrews



1 1719 00093 9266

